

## Comparison of Mahwi's and Plato's Philosophical Texts on Theology

### Saya Rashid Ahmed Raq

English Department, Faculty of Arts, Soran University, Soran, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

**E-mail:** [sra246@ena.soran.edu.iq](mailto:sra246@ena.soran.edu.iq)

### Chaware Neamat Saleh

Kurdish Department, Faculty of Arts, Soran University, Soran, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

**E-mail:** [chaware.salih@soran.edu.iq](mailto:chaware.salih@soran.edu.iq)

### Abdelrahman Jalal Othman

English Department, Faculty of Arts, Soran University, Soran, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

**E-mail:** [abdelrahman.othman@soran.edu.iq](mailto:abdelrahman.othman@soran.edu.iq)

### Abstract:

This study deals with the comparison between Mahwi's poems and Plato's philosophical texts on theology. It draws the assimilations and the differences between both views by analyzing Mahwi's selected poems and Plato's selected works including; The Timaeus and The Republic. It shows how a Kurdish poet delivers a philosophical idea within his poetry, and that great poetry is often deeply philosophical. The paper also proves that there is a strong relationship between literature and philosophy. However, many do not see the correlation between them, but if we look back into history, we see that some philosophers delivered their philosophical ideas through one of the literary genres. Such as Voltaire, Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, Maulana Jaladini Romi, and Plato himself at first attempted to write tragedy in verse and he was reading great Greek poetry.

**Keywords:** Mahwi, Plato, Theology, Comparative Literature.

## Introduction:

This study is an attempt to exhibit theology as a keystone to indicate the differences and assimilations between Mahwi as a Kurdish poet and Plato as a Greek philosopher about theology. This study shows how a Kurdish poet delivers a philosophical message through his poetry and proves that there is a strong relationship between literature and philosophy. The question of the relationship between philosophy and literature is a provocative debate, many do not see the correlation between them. Plato himself, rejects some poetry. He argues that poetry is a story about misbehaving gods and its influence is always harmful, because it is immoral and based in falsehood. He also claims that poets pander to the popular tastes and narrate tales of man's pleasantly vice. Besides poets tell lies about gods, and they cannot explain what they write.

However, many others argue that there is a strong relationship between both. "Philip Kitcher claims that philosophy can be done not only by philosophers but also within some art forms, such as literature and music. He claims that philosophy lies within the literary text, it lies in the showing and how the readers think and preserve the world" (Iris, 2014, p. 1).

There are shreds of evidence to prove that philosophy can be shown within the literary texts and there is a strong relationship between both. In William Golding's (1911-1993) *Lord of the Flies* which is the classic novel, the author employs an allegorical island to represent human mind through the lens of Sigmund Freud's (1856-1939) theory and depict his concepts of Id, ego, and superego. There is a philosophical idea behind the *Lord of the Flies* novel, so there is a connection between literature and philosophy.

The ideas and the philosophy of the Eastern Muslims come to us through the literary texts. Islamic poetry is passed on from generation to generation. Therefore, literature is a very important agent to deliver the philosophical ideas, as we can see through the works of Omer Khayyam (1048-1131), Ibn Arabi (1165-1240), and Maulana Jaladini Romi (1207-1273).

Firstly, this paper gives an introduction, literature review, and comparative literature. It also illustrates the relationship between philosophy and literature, poetry in particular. After giving a general introduction about the study, the paper elucidates the theological philosophy of Plato and explains two of his most famous works; *The Republic* and *The Timaeus*. Then it explains the philosophical aspects of Mahwi's selected poems. Finally, this paper gives the conclusion of the study, in which it shows the similarities and the differences between Mahwi's and Plato's perspectives on theology, and proves the relationship between philosophy and literature.

And also, this paper has used analytic-comparative method in order to get the result.

**Literature review:**

In “*The Reformed Objection to Natural Theology*,” Alvin Plantinga<sup>i</sup> gives some examples to prove that believing in the existence of God needs no arguments. He is arguing that a proposition is properly basic for a person only if it is self-evident to him (such that his understanding or grasping it is sufficient for his seeing it to be true) or "evident to the senses," as he puts it, and he refers to propositions whose truth or falsehood we can determine by looking or listening or employing some other sense-such propositions as:

- (1) There is a tree before me
- (2) I am wearing shoes
- (3) That tree's leaves are yellow
- (4) The snow is white

He is arguing that you are completely sure, and you are convinced that you see a tree or the snow is white, you need no basic arguments to believe. Here Plantinga argues that believing the existence of God is the same as the practical truths. It is an essential belief that the believer in his or her way of *sensus divinitatis* is sure about the existence of God (McKim, 1998, p. 72).

Thomas Aquinas<sup>ii</sup> thinks that God’s existence is not self-evident to us, so that the finite human mind has no ability to know what God is directly. Therefore, he argues that the existence of God can be proved in five ways; Aquinas’s first demonstration of God’s existence is the Argument from Motion. He explains that human has an ability to know there are things that moving due to the senses. Each thing in the universe that moves is moved by something else, and these movers must have begun with the prime mover that had not itself been moved. This prime or unmoved mover is God. The second way is from the nature of the Efficient Cause. In the world of senses, we find there is an order of efficient causes. Aquinas argues that everything has a cause to its existence, which means nothing comes before its existence and nothing can cause itself. Therefore, the first cause is God. Aquinas’s third argument of God’s existence is Contingency, which he advances by distinguishing between possible and necessary beings. Possible beings are those that are capable of existing and not existing. If every being were contingent, there could have been a time when no things existed. Thus, there must be at least one necessary being, because no being can come into existence except through a being that already exists. That is God. Aquinas’s fourth argument is that from Degrees of Perfection. There are degrees of perfection in different things. some are better or worse than others, but there must exist a supreme perfection that all imperfect beings approach yet fall short of. In Aquinas’s system, God is that paramount perfection. The final argument to demonstrate God’s existence is the final causes (Teleology). He explains that each thing has its own natural purpose. Some beings with lack of intelligence are incapable of directing themselves toward their ends or

purposes. Therefore, they must be directed by an intelligent and knowledgeable being, that is God (Aquinas, 2015).

In order to answer Leibniz's<sup>iii</sup> question (why there is something rather than nothing), and in order to refer to the beings' particular reasons of their existence we can depend on Nicholas Jolly's *The Cambridge Companion to Leibniz*. In his Ontological and Cosmological Arguments, "Leibniz identifies the sufficient reason for a thing with its final (or complete) reason and he locates "the sufficient reason" outside the series of contingent things. Although the members of this series are linked by "particular reason," their sufficient reason is in God." Leibniz's "The Cosmological Argument:

1. If anything exists, there must be a sufficient reason why it exists.
2. But this world exists and it is a series of contingent beings.
3. Therefore, there must be a sufficient reason why this series of contingent beings exists.
4. But nothing contingent - and, in particular, neither the existing series as a whole nor any of its members- can contain a sufficient reason why this series exists.
5. A sufficient reason for any existing thing can only be in an existing thing, which is itself either necessary or contingent.
6. Therefore, a sufficient reason why this series exists must be in a necessary being that lies outside the world.
7. Therefore, there is a necessary being that lies outside the world." (Blumenfeld, 1994, p. 367).

Johannes Kepler<sup>iv</sup> in a 1957 letter to Maestlin said: "The effect which I strove to obtain was the belief in the creation of a world be fortified through this external. Support, that thought of the creator be recognized in its nature ... then man will at least measure the power of his mind on the true scale, and will realize that God, who founded everything in the world according to the norm of quantity, also has endowed man with a mind which can comprehend these norms" (Melville, 2010, p. 59).

Steven P Ward, in the *Reflections on Plato's Theology*, attempts to explain Plato's concern that the "philosopher" should attempt to realize wisdom; for the philosopher is not necessarily wise, but he does aspire to become wise. The philosopher, therefore, is an individual who is in pursuit of an unattained goal, which is the realization of wisdom. This also entails a "love" (philia) for understanding the nature of the divine. The "divine" (theoi) is a general term, which is used by Plato to describe both the human soul, the gods, and the God who governs the affairs of men and this world, as well as the Forms that constitute another "sphere" or "realm". In this sense, the term "theology" is a combination of two words: "theos" and "logos". The second term implies, and rightly so, that our enquiry will be concerned with offering a "rational account" or "discourse" of the gods, or those matters and objects that can generally be considered heavenly and therefore "divine" (Ward, 2013).

Eric Dietrich, in his article, claims that “the universe must have been caused to exist by something else. But this causal chain cannot extend backwards in time infinitely, therefore there had to be a first cause. This cause must be God.” So, it’s obvious that everything that exists is caused by another cause. “Leibniz writes: “I claim that the existence of God cannot be demonstrated without this principle: nothing exists without a reason” (Grøgaard, 2018, p. 78).

Accordingly, God was not created, He was there before the creation of the universe, that means He was always there and will always be there. Ashharyans have given God many principles, (God exists, He is one and only, He is ancient of days, a spiritual being, immaterial being, unnoticeable, He is not in a specific shape or space, seeable, and will always be there). God is dissimilar, for there is not at all like God. As Mahwi says:

له چهند و چوونی دنیادا به ضایع چوونی عومرم چهند!  
خودایا بهس به ضایع چم، به حهقی زاتی بیچوونت! (٣٥).

le çend û çûnî dinyada be çay' çûnî 'umirm çend!  
xudaya bes be çay' çm, be heqqî zatî bêçûnt!.

Mahwi also says:

له مەکری ئەم مەجوزە و سیحری دیوی نەفس ئەمن ((مەحوی))  
پەنا دەگرم بە زاتی ئەقەدەسی بیچوونی نایدوه (٣٦)

le mekrî em mecuzê û sîhrî dêwî nefis emin((meħwî))  
pena degrm be zatî eqdesî bêçûnî naydwe

بۆ جیلوهیی بیچوونی نییه قووهتی چوونم  
(لا حول ولا قوه) که من حهولمه بۆ چوون (٣٧)

bo cîlweyî bêçûnî nîye quwetî çûnm  
(la ħul wla qwe) ke min ħewlme bo çûn

Ancient of days, is one of the definitions of God Himself (Amen, 2007, p. 85).

Although Mahwi is a very famous figure in the Kurdish literature, but unfortunately there has been few researches on him in English language. That is why I believe that highlighting his works will be very useful for Kurdish and English readers in the future.

### **Comparative Literature:**

Comparative literature is an extremely confusing word because different critics have their own perspectives for this, and each of them define it in different ways. According to Henry Remark<sup>v</sup> comparative literature is:

the study of literature beyond the confines of one particular country, and the study of the relationships between literature on one hand and other areas of knowledge and belief, such as the arts (e.g. painting, sculpture, architecture, music), philosophy, history, the social sciences, (e.g. politics, economics, sociology), the sciences, religion, etc., on the other. In brief, it is the comparison of one literature with another or others, and the comparison of literature with other spheres of human expression (Scher, 2004, p. 24).

René Descartes<sup>vi</sup> believes that:

It is only by way of comparison that we know the truth precisely... All knowledge which is not obtained through the simple and pure intuition of an isolated thing is obtained by the comparison of two or more things among themselves. And almost all the work of human reason consists without doubt in making this operation possible (Liao, 2011, p. 1).

Comparative literature as a discipline was first emerged in France in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and following the Second World War, the discipline spread rapidly in Germany, but also outside Europe, in particular in the USA.

Moreover, the French School of Comparative Literature had appeared when science was the basis for everything. The French critics see comparative literature as a historical and positivist discipline concerned with the study of influence and reception to an author or authors abroad. This School has many basic fundamentals: firstly, the comparison must be among works written in different languages. Differences in language is an essential

condition of comparative literature at the French School, and also two texts cannot be compared with different dialects in the same language. If this condition is not found, the study will not be about the circle of comparative literature. The second condition is 'literary' and 'non-literally' influence. The concept 'literary influence' originated in the type of comparative study that seeks to trace the mutual relation between two or more literary works. This sort of study is the touchstone of the French School of Comparative Literature. A comparative study between an English novel and a Kurdish novel, or Arabic and Persian poetry, for example, is a good example of literary influence. While the comparative study between Thomas Hardy's (1840–1928) *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* with French culture is based on the principle of 'none literally influence', even though culture is related at some point to literature. So, according to the French School of Comparative Literature, you cannot compare a philosophical text with a literary text, or culture with literature, but you can compare literary text with another literary text. Another condition is a 'direct influence' between two pieces of literature, beyond the boundaries of place and language. According to the French School, a literary text can have no existence before its writer's reading of another writer's 'original text' or having direct contact with him or her. That is the link of the writer to another writer and the literature to another literature. If the history does not prove that one of them has followed the idea of the other one, this kind of study will not be included in comparative literature. It is important to prove that the idea has moved from one environment to another environment and has affected it.

The comparative literature reached the shores of America much later, which means that the American School of Comparative Literature appeared. The American School came as a reaction against the French School and pointed out the weak points of the French School. Reacting to the French School, they seek to return the field to matters more directly concerned with literary criticism, de-emphasizing the detective work and detailed historical research that the French School has demanded. They always love to expand the section of comparative literature for the entrance of various global artistic and literary trends in this zone, (The American attitude to the study of comparative literature can be understood more from Henry Remark's definition).

The American School tries to change the basic principles of the French School, and make the comparison easier. The American critics criticize the basic fundamental of the French School which argues that the languages of the two comparative texts must be different. Because they believe that American has multicultural and various races, and this creates racism. They also pointed out that the French School mostly serves nationalism. The French scholars are very patriotic. This is a weak point, because the French scholars only care about the French language, and consider other languages as being inferior. Another point which they have pointed out is that the French School only cares about the influence of French literature on other nation's literature. But the influence of other nation's literature upon French literature is ignored, because they think sending is positive but receiving is negative. They have also pointed out that the French scholars view the eastern literature as being inferior.

However, the influence of eastern literature is very obvious on French literature. Only the western languages are chosen to be compared together such as (English, French, Germany, Dutch, Italian, and others). The comparison was limited according to the geographical location. Thus, they ignored Iranian, African, Turkish, Chinese and American literature and language. The French scholars only care about the direct influence of one literary text upon the other, while the Americans tend to show the esthetic value of each text.

According to American School, every nation's literature has its own importance. René Wellek<sup>vii</sup> argues:

No doubt that comparative literature wants to overcome the passions of nationalism and narrow looks, but it does not ignore the existence of different national traditions and vitality, as it does not diminish their importance. We must beware of false choices, which are not needed, because we want both national literature and general literature. We need a broad perspective, which cannot be achieved except by comparative literature (Shamsuddin, 2012, p. 3).

It is clear that Wellek represents only American trend, which does not see any border for the comparative study and includes the open comparison and the relationship between the arts and the branches of other sciences in comparative literature. He rejects difference between the methods of literary studies. According to American School, a philosophical text can be compared to a literary one. Wellek argues that comparative literature cannot be useful and fertile; if it will not be free from the artificial borders and be just a literary study. So, if you compare two different subjects from different areas it will be more successful.

In addition, according to American School, the geographical definition of the term comparative literature in the literary sense is very clear and concrete, but the format quality of the literature according to the American concept raises some serious questions about comparative among literary texts in different geographical locations, without referring one literary text as being inferior to the other. So, there is no difference between the eastern and the western literature to compare, the literature of each nation has its own importance.

Arguably, From Plato and Aristotle's ages to present, people have been interested in the others' literature, languages, cultures and customs, they have made comparisons between them. Comparative literature is important because it is a key opening all doors beyond national, cultural, linguistic, historical, social and political boundaries.

## The Relationship between Philosophy and Poetry:

The relationship between philosophy and literature, or philosophy and poetry is an everlasting relationship because if we just look back into history, we see some philosophers gave their philosophical ideas and questions through one of the literary genres. Plato himself at first attempted to define poetry and he was reading great Greek poetry, at a very young age he wrote a tragedy in verse, and when he reached 20, a great change took place in his life, he met Socrates and he took interest in his philosophy, so he let go of poetry writing.

The relationship between both has made the modern philosophers argue about the importance of literary genres and evaluate them. The philosophers have given importance to literature genres especially to poetry. One of these famous philosophers is Martin Heidegger<sup>viii</sup>, a German philosopher. As a reader of Hölderlin, Heidegger approaches Hölderlin's (Earth and Heaven) and (Greece, Griechenland), he argues that it is not that easy to understand the idea behind his poems, and that we have to think beyond our limits to do so. Heidegger claims: "My thinking has an essential connection to Hölderlin's poetry. But I do not think Hölderlin is just any poet, whose work is a subject, among many others, for literary historians. I think Hölderlin is the poet who points toward the future, who expects God." Heidegger continues praising poetry and contends that poetry is the most purely spoken language, something to which people must return in order to escape scientific attempts to understand, control, and manipulate reality.

When reading poetry, the reader engages into a philosophical thinking. Poetry can make an important source of philosophical values. Most of the philosophers send their message through their poems. Albert Camus<sup>ix</sup> explains his philosophical ideas in his novel (*The plague*). Also, Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche<sup>x</sup>, the philosopher and the poet, explains his philosophical ideas in his poems. T.S. Eliot<sup>xi</sup> admits that when a poet has pursued philosophical studies, these will have played an important part in his formation and will have informed his poetry. The poetry of Eliot manifests his philosophical bent of mind, he has used various philosophical concepts in his poetry, and his poetry is earnest and broadly philosophical. It is an established fact that the early absorption in philosophy was very important for his development as a poet. Another example of a philosopher who delivers his philosophical ideas through poems and novellas is Voltaire<sup>xii</sup> (1694-1778). He is a philosopher of the Age of Enlightenment, and has written poems and plays. His great work is *Candide* in English version, *Candide*, a novella that is filled with philosophical and religious parody.

However, to Giacomo Leopardi<sup>xiii</sup> the greatest poets are also philosophers (Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*) and that the greatest philosophers are also poets (e.g. Plato). So, philosophy is one of the tools the poet and the writer employ in order to reflect upon their artistic activity, and poetry is also a tool for philosophers to emphasize their philosophical ideas. Great literature is often deeply philosophical, and great philosophy is always

great literature, it does not mean that philosophy needs poetry in order to share and explain itself, but it is a renewal and the immortal sign of both literature and philosophy.

## Theological Philosophy of Plato:

Plato, (born in 428/427 BCE, Athens, Greece - died in 348/347, Athens), was a student of Socrates and the teacher of Aristotle. Plato was one of the best known and most widely read philosopher world has ever seen. He wrote in the middle of the fourth century B.C.E. His writings explored justice, beauty, and equality, and also discussed political philosophy, theology, cosmology, epistemology and the philosophy of language. Plato found the academy in Athens, one of the first establishments to higher learning in the western world.

From the 4th century BC to 6th century AD. The theological nature represented a fundamental element of platonic philosophy. Theology is a general term used by Plato to describe both the human soul, the gods and God who governs the affairs of men and this world as well as the forms that constitute another “sphere” or “realm”. The word “theology” comes from two Greek words, theos (“God”) and logos (“word”). It is the study of the nature of God and religious beliefs. Plato in his dialogues clarifies the rate of a theological system, where he attempts to clarify any perspective concerning the gods.

### The Republic (Πολιτεία)

It is a Socratic dialogue, written around 380 B C. The title comes from the Roman title “de re public” meaning “On Republic Affairs”. It is the longest and the most famous of Plato’s works. It’s mainly about the good life, and creating a just city. Republic consists of ten books. The summery of the work describes how Plato define justice and the development of a just city. In the book, a group decides to create an imaginary city, which includes perfect life that perfectly just and is led only under perfect conditions. The book does not only describe the just city, but also describes how women and children fit into the city and their roles. According to Socrates women should be treated as men. The writer, also, talks about the best rulers for the just city, Socrates determines that philosophers are best to take the leadership. The next book is about the two worlds and the allegory of the cave, an allegory serves to compare the future rulers with a prisoner who has spent his entire life chained by his feet and neck in the cave. It also describes Plato’s view of the two worlds, the “real” world where the ideal forms exist, and the “shadow” world where humanity exists. Plato also describes unjust rulers and compares them to the just rulers and explains the ultimate fate of the soul of the just man and unjust man (Jergens, 2016).

In the book ten, Plato’s aspect on theology is obvious, and he shows his theological ideas in this part. He explains the two worlds; the world of ideal and the world of shadows, in which he explains that God is in the ideal world and all forms are perfect in the ideal world. He begins with this question:

Socrates: Can you tell me the general nature of imitation? I really don't know what it is.

Glaucon: If you don't know, what are the chances that I do?

Socrates: Doesn't a person with weaker eyes often see some things sooner than one with keen vision?

Glaucon: True, but in your presence I'm not eager to lead the discussion, even when I might have something to say. Perhaps you should begin.

Socrates: Then would you like to proceed with our usual method, thinking of many particular things and considering them as a single idea? Do you understand what I mean?

Glaucon: I do.

Socrates: Then think of any particulars you please, such as beds or tables. Are there not many of each in the world?

Glaucon: Yes.

Socrates: But there are only two ideas of these objects: one of "bed" and one of "table."

Glaucon: True.

Socrates: And we usually say that a person who makes a bed or a table, or other thing we use, does so by considering the idea, but does not make the idea itself.

Glaucon: Of course.

Socrates: But now I would like to know what you would call another kind of maker.

Glaucon: What kind?

Socrates: One who makes all the works of all the other workers.

Glaucon: That would be an extraordinary person.

Socrates: Just wait, it gets even better. The maker I have in mind makes not only every kind of instrument but also plants and animals on earth, including the maker, as well as the earth itself, the heavens, all things in the heavens, all things in the heavens under the earth, and even gods.

Glaucon: You are describing a marvelous magician!

Socrates: Don't you believe me Glaucon? Would you completely deny the existence of such a maker? Or could there be at least one who could do all of these things to some degree? Don't you see that there is a way in which you could do this yourself?

Glaucon: Me? How could I do that?

Socrates: It would be easy. There are many ways, but the quickest would be to carry around a mirror and catch the sun, the heavens, the earth, plants, yourself and the other animals, and the rest of the natural and artificial world.

Glaucou: But Socrates, you would only capture the appearance of things, not their reality.

Socrates: Bravo! That's exactly my point. Now consider representational painters. Wouldn't we say they are that kind of maker?

Glaucou: I suppose you are right.

Socrates: But is what they paint unreal? Isn't the painter also making a bed, in a certain way?

Glaucou: Such a painter only makes the appearance of a bed.

Socrates: Then what about a carpenter? Didn't you just say that such a person does not make the idea of the bed itself, but only a particular bed?

Glaucou: Yes, I did say that.

Socrates: Then if the carpenter does not make what it truly is, but only a likeness, it would be wrong to say that the work of a carpenter or any other craftsperson is the real thing (Plato, Plato's Republic, 2001, pp. 365-367)

He also explains what the imitator is:

Socrates: Would you like to use these examples to try to understand what an imitator is?

Glaucou: That's a good plan.

Socrates: Then it seems that we have three beds. The first one exists by nature. Who could make it but the god?

Glaucou: No one else could have made it.

Socrates: A carpenter makes the second one?

Glaucou: Yes.

Socrates: And a painter makes the other one?

Glaucou: Yes.

Socrates: Therefore, there are three kinds of bed and three kinds of maker: the god, the carpenter, and the representational painter.

Glaucou: I agree that there are three kinds of maker.

Socrates: But the god, whether by choice or by necessity, made only one bed. Two or more such beds could not exist in nature (Plato, 2001, p. 368).

Through this example, Plato wants to show that whatever exists in the sensory world is the shadow of the world of ideal. Whatever exists in the sensory world is the imitation of whatever originally exists in the ideal

world. According to this example, when a painter paints a bed for instance, the bed is thrice removed from the world of ideal or the reality. Because the painter imitates a carpenter, and what the carpenter has created is not the real form of what he has made, but the imitation or the shadow of what is in the ideal world. God is the creator of everything, including heaven, the world under the earth. He is the creator of every perfect forms which exist in the perfect world. Plato believes that there are also gods, whom God has created them all. As Muhammad Kemal claims “a sensible being like the tree is not came into existence by its own, there must be a cause for its existence because it cannot be a self-existence being. God is self-existence and has created the tree, He is the cause for the existence of the tree” (Kemal, 2018, p. 86).

### **The Timaeus:**

Timaeus is mostly in the form of a long monologue given by the title character Timaeus of Lorci, written in 360 BC. It is Plato’s attempt to describe how the world came into being, and it carries Plato’s thinking on cosmology. Timaeus provides Plato’s thought on the existence of God, and the universe which is a part of this research.

Plato believes that there are two worlds or realms, the first realm is the realm of forms, this realm contains the eternal model, which itself is non material, that needs no structure to be build, it is a self-existence being. It is always the same uncreated and indescribable, and can be perceived through reason or intelligence but not the senses.

Plato also thinks that the material world we see and touch is not the real world. Rather, the true world is the world of Forms, which are apprehended only through reason or intelligence but not the senses.

Plato first argues that since the sensible world “is always becoming and never real”, and since the sensible world has a body and is visible, it must have been created, and for every creation there must be a cause, because nothing can create itself. This creator is “Demiurge”, the father and maker of the universe.

we must first ask concerning it the question which lies at the outset of every inquiry, whether did it exist eternally, having no beginning of generation, or has it come into being, starting from some beginning? It has come into being: for it can be seen and felt and has body; and all such things are sensible, and sensible things, apprehensible by opinion with sensation, belong, as we saw, to becoming and creation. We say that what has come to be must be brought into being by some cause. Now the maker and father of this All it were a hard task to find (Plato, The Timaus, 1888, p. 87).

In this dialogue, Timaeus goes on asserting that the universe must have been created by a creator and this creator is God (Demiurge), but God Himself is an uncreated creator, He is infinite and self-existing, and He is

without origin. “Understanding God as a self-causation being, makes us to believe that this being is eternal and has always existed, His existence extends endlessly in the past and the future, and He occupies no space in the present” (Kemal, 2018, p. 81). According to Plato, God has created the universe out of earth and fire to show that the universe is not created out of nothingness. Aristotle is taking the no beginning side, invoked the principle that out of nothing, nothing comes. Therefore, if the universe could never have gone from nothingness to somethingness, it must always have existed. But Plato unlike to him thinks that it is rather created out of God’s order, and argues:

If now the body of the universe were to have been made a plane surface having no thickness, one mean would have sufficed to unify itself and the extremes ; but now since it behoved it to be solid, and since solids can never be united by one mean, but require two, God accordingly set air and water betwixt fire and earth, and making them as far as possible exactly proportional, so that fire is to air as air to water, and as air is to water water is to earth, thus he compacted and constructed a universe visible and tangible. For these reasons and out of elements of this kind, four in number, the body of the universe was created (Plato, *The Timaeus*, 1888, p. 99).

To Plato there are four races; “first the race of the heavenly gods, next the winged tribe whose path is in the air, third what so called dwells in the water, and fourth that which goes upon dry land” (Plato, *The Timaeus*, 1888, p. 131), The last three races are created by God as imperfect beings, but God Himself is a perfect being. Because human changes over the pass of the time and in the world of shadows there is nothing which is created as a perfect being, everything is the shadow of what is in the ideal world. Alvin Plantinga “has concentrated on the belief in God, thinking of God in theistic terms, as an internal personal being who has created the whole world and who is perfect in wisdom, justice, and knowledge, and power” (Tomberlin & Inwagen, 2012, p. 290). For Plato, God is perfect and unchangeable.

For we say that it was and is and shall be, but in verity is alone belongs to it : and was and shall be it is meet should be applied only to Becoming which moves in time ; for these are motions. But that which is ever changeless without motion must not become elder or younger in time, neither must it have become so in the past nor be so in the future ; nor has it to do with any attributes that Becoming attaches to the moving objects of sense : these have come into being as forms of time, which is the image of eternity and revolves according to number (Plato, *The Timaeus*, 1888, p. 121).

In his dialogue, Plato is arguing that God created everything but nothing created Him, because if God had something that brought Him into being, there would necessarily be something older and more powerful than God, then God would not be God, because His existence would depend on something else that existed before Him. Thus, God has existed before the creation and therefore before time. He is the prime being. The Bible says, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth” (Genesis 1:1). Here God created time itself. Only one who is outside of time, that is, timeless and eternal. Plato argues that He has no past and no future, and He will never be younger and older, because it is impossible for the creator to be bounded by His creature which is time. Plato makes distinction between (which has always existed and unchangeable), and (which has not always existed and changeable):

First then in my judgment this distinction must be made. What is that which is eternally and has no becoming, and again what is that which comes to be but is never ? The one is comprehensible by thought with the aid of reason, ever changeless ; the other opinable by opinion with the aid of reasonless sensation, becoming and perishing, never truly existent. Now all that comes to be must needs be brought into being by some cause : for it is impossible for anything without a cause to attain to birth (Plato, *The Timaeus*, 1888, pp. 85-87).

Here, Socrates explains that God is immutable, because if a little bit change happens to Him, He will move from one state to another, and whatever moves under the influence of time, grows and dies. The objects which are created and always in motion, becoming in place and again vanishing out of place are created by uncreated and indestructible being that is God. Plato puts God outside of the sensible world, because he argues whatever exists in the sensible world goes under the influence of time, and time itself is a creation of God. Therefore, time did not exist before the Demiurge created the universe, but it is brought into being. Plato says that: “Time then has come into being along with the universe that being generated together, together they may be dissolved” (Plato, *The Timaeus*, 1888, p. 123). Also, the physicist Steven Hawking said that “almost everyone now believes that the universe, and the time itself, had a beginning at the Big Bang.” There was a time that the scientists argued that the universe was eternal, but they have come to realize that the universe must have a beginning. Therefore, they must explain what was caused the Big Bang? For the universe to explode into being at the Big Bang, as they claim, there had to be something in existence beforehand. Because as R. C. Sproul has said, “nothing doesn’t explode!” Plato also believes that the creator (Demiurge) has created gods from fire, as he argues: “The visible form of the deities he created chiefly of fire that it might be most radiant and most fair to behold” (Plato, *The Timaeus*, 1888, p. 131). Then He let that gods to govern men and the whole universe. The gods started to mitigate their creator and fashion the human body. Plato argues that humans were created by the children of the Demiurge

(gods), and this describes our dual nature, because we are not directly descended or created from the Demiurge, as he argues:

what came after the sowing he gave into the hands of the young gods, to mould mortal bodies, and having wrought all the residue of human soul that needed yet to be added”, and “imitating their own artificer, they borrowed from the universe portions of fire and of earth and of water and of air, on condition that they should be returned again, and they cemented together what they took, not with the indissoluble bonds wherewithal they themselves were held together, but welding it with many rivets, invisible for smallness, and making of all the elements one body for each creature, they confined the revolutions of the immortal soul in a body (Plato, *The Timaeus*, 1888, p. 146).

God is in the perfect world (the world of forms or ideal), He needs no eyes to see, or no ears to hear, because outside the sensible world there was nothing to see or to hear. God is beyond the material, because every material being occupies space and has a specified time, thus, God is outside of this principle. As Plato mentions:

It needed not eyes, for naught visible was left outside; nor hearing, for there was nothing to hear; and there was no surrounding air which made breathing needful. Nor must it have any organ whereby it should receive into itself its sustenance, and again reject that which was already digested ; for nothing went forth of it nor entered in from anywhere ; for there was nothing. For by design was it created to supply its own sustenance by its own wasting, and to have all its action and passion in itself and by itself (Plato, *The Timaeus*, 1888, pp. 101-103).

Plato believes that God has created the sensible world according to His own shape, in order to see Himself in it and has given the world the most beautiful shape. As He created the universe, He desired that all things should be as like Himself as they could be. Plato says:

For God desiring that all things should be good, and that, so far as, this might be, there should be no evil, having received all that is visible not in a state of rest, but moving without harmony or measure, brought it from its disorder into order, thinking that this was in all ways better than the other. Now it neither has been nor is permitted to the most perfect to do aught but what is most fair (Plato, *The Timaeus*, 1888, p. 91).

## Philosophical Aspects of Mahwi's Selected Poems

Mahwi's full name is (Malla Muhammad Osman Balkhi). Amin Zaki Bag states that he was born in (1836-1837). However, Alladin Sujadi argues that he was born in 1830. He was one of the prominent classical Kurdish poets and Sufis in Kurdistan. Besides he was a poet, linguist and Islamic scholar. He established a khanaqah in slemani (a city in Kurdistan), it was an Islamic religious school and mosque. In his poems, he mainly sealed with Sufism, but he also wrote about human conditions and questions about human life. He passed away in 1906. Mahwi, like any other poet, explains philosophical ideas in his poems, which proves that all poets are philosophers. One of the themes of Mahwi's poems is theology, as he talks about God and the creation. Mahwi argues that reality is divided into two worlds; the ideal and the sensible world, as he argues:

خۆی و هه‌موو سیفاتی که‌مالی بووه‌و هه‌یه

ده‌شبی، ئەزەلیه‌تی ئەبه‌دییه‌ت د‌دا نیشان  
مه‌حوی "ل ٤٥٤

xoyi û hemû sîfatî kemalî buwew heye

deşbê, ezeliyetî ebedîyet deda nîşan (Mala Usmani Balkhi, 1392 Hijri, p. 454)

In this couplet, Mahwi through the use of such words like: (Kemal) perfection, (azeliet) no beginning and (abediat) infinite or endlessness, states that God is absolute perfection in His character and attributes. His attributes have existed, are existing and will always exist. His attributes have no beginning and no end, and are created from nothing. In this couplet, Mahwi extremely believes in the ideal world and the sensible world. Because, for him, God exists in both worlds (The ebedîyet and ezeliyet world). According to Mahwi God is the only one who is perfect, as He was perfect at the beginning and He will always be. Mahwi also makes the relationship between beauty and perfection, as he says:

شه‌وی له‌یلا به‌ مه‌جنونی ده‌وت بنواره‌ حالی خۆت

به‌ خۆراییی که‌ چۆنت دا به‌ عه‌قل و که‌مالی خۆت

جوابی دایه‌وه‌ مه‌جنون: ئەگه‌ر تاقه‌ت ببی له‌حزئ

له‌ناو ئاوینه‌دا بنواره‌ حوسن و جه‌مه‌لی خۆت.  
مه‌حوی. "٤١٥

şewê leyla be mecnunî dewt binware ħalî xot  
 be xorayî ke çont da be 'eqll û kemalî xot  
 cwabî dayewe mecnun: eger taqet bibê lehîzé  
 lenaw awêneda binwarre ħusin û cemelî xot (Mala Usmani Balkhi, 1392 Hijri, p. 415)

In this couplet, Mahwi argues that God has created His creations in a very beautiful way. The whole universe, our body and soul are made in the image of God, and God is both beautiful and perfect.

Moreover, Mahwi claims that God is the creator of the universe, and He is the being who was before anything was. Mahwi puts God outside of time and place, God has no start and no end, he was there even before the creation of time, as Farabi<sup>xiv</sup> says “the prime being, is the first cause for all other beings, He is unique” (Al-Farabi, 2019, p. 30), and this is clearly obvious in this couplet:

زاتی خودا که خالیقی ئەکوانه، هەر بووه  
 یه‌عنی قه‌دیمی موتله‌قه «بالذات» و «بالزمان»  
 مه‌حوی ل ٤٥٣

zañ xuda ke xalîqî ekwane, her buwe  
 ye'nî qedîmî mutlleqe bizzat û bizzeman (Mala Usmani Balkhi, 1392 Hijri, p. 453)

In this couplet, Mahwi puts God outside of time and place, and he explains the attributes of God, that God is the creator of the world and the universe (ekwan), (her hebwa) that He has always existed, and has no beginning. Mahwi tries to say that God's existence is endless in the past and nothing has ever existed before Him. Some people ask “what was God doing before He created us and the universe”, to answer this question we need to explain and understand the concept of time. Since humans live in a specific time and place, we make a mistake by considering every action according to a time concept. This concept consists of past, now and future, so century, year, day, today, tomorrow is only an issue for the creation. In fact, time is an attempt servant of God just like sun. But when we come to pre-eternity, there is no past, now and the future. In fact, minds aren't able to imagine a timeline for the pre-eternity. Since we cannot put God in a timeline, it doesn't make any sense to say (before God) or (after God). For better understanding, we give some examples in order to understand that God is outside of time; suppose that I want to walk from one place to another, and it will take an hour to reach the destination. But if I ride towards this destination by a bike, it will take 30 minutes. As much as my speed is faster, time passes

slower for me. But suppose that I travel by an airplane, it may take 20 seconds. But if I travel by speed of light which is the fastest speed in nature, then it will take a millionth of second. Therefore, if the speed is ultimate speed, for sure time will be zero. So, such a speed belongs to no one and nothing except God. For God, time is zero because He is absolute in speed, just as Allah says “then they his servants are returned to Allah, their true Lord. Unquestionably, His is the judgment, and He is the swiftest of accountants” (The Quran, 6:62)<sup>xv</sup>. Time is the creature of God, then there is no before and after for Him. His existence is unchangeable and endless. Mahwi also explains that God is created by nothing, as he says:

واجب به ذاته، بوون و وجودی له خۆوهیه

فهردیکی مونفهرید به بهقاو هه‌میشه‌مان مه‌حوی" ل ٤٥٤

wacb be zate, bûn û wcûdî le xoweye

ferdêkî munferîd be beqaw hemîşeman (Mala Usmani Balkhi, 1392 Hijri, p. 454)

Everything that came into being must have a cause, and everything that was created must have a creator. This uncaused cause, this uncreated creator of all things, is God. In this couplet, Mahwi claims that it is not appropriate for God's existence to have a cause or a creator, because God is self-existence that He was created by nothing and has always existed. This is what makes Him God. He was there not only before matter, He was there even before time, He did not come into being, He just was. “According to Spinoza, God is the outside cause for the world, and he mentioned in his booklet that God is the cause for all beings and He is a self-caused being” (Kemal, 2018, p. 85). He also states:

زاتی خودا سیفاتی نه عهینه نه غهیری زات

بن ئەم سیفاته قهت نه‌بووه و قهت نیه به ئان مه‌حوی" ل ٤٥٧

zatî xuda sîfatî ne 'eyine ne xeyrî zat

bê em sîfate qet nebuwe û qet niye be an (Mala Usmani Balkhi, 1392 Hijri, p. 457)

However, in this couplet, Mahwi states that fully comprehending God is impossible for us as limited beings, and even describing him with words truly falls short of capturing who he is. The forms which exist in the ideal world are not visible, we cannot imagine or portray them in the sensible world, because what's in the ideal world is not the same with what is the sensible world. Mahwi uses the word ('eyine) to refer to the idea that God is non-material. We cannot experience God with our senses, because whenever we engage God by our senses, then God becomes a material being. God is bodiless and has no material existence. But when God is created out of material, He goes under many questions and doubts, because if God has a material body and becomes a material being, He will consist of many elements. Then the elements which have created God come before God's creation. Therefore, God would never be the prime being, because there is something else which has created Him and was existed before Him. That's why God is beyond material. We cannot experience God with our senses, human has no ability to reach the forms which exist in the ideal world, because we cannot use human brain to understand this, and if I say "how far can I see?", some people see one mile of a distance, or some others can see for 3 or 4 miles on a clear day, but if I ask you to look and see as far as 100 or 200 miles, the human cannot do that, the human's eye is limited. Humans are limited with energy, hearing and seeing, and so we are limited with brain as well. Thus, we cannot experience God with our minds and senses. According to Mahwi, God cannot be perceived by mind nor by the senses, and that He is beyond our senses and our minds. What human knows about God is not what He really is, because God is in the ideal world and cannot be portrayed and experience in the sensible world. As he says:

دهرکی سهعهبه دهم دهمه ئهسراری دهمی

چونکه بو (لا شیئ)ه، ههر سهعهبهک بکا دهروا بهلاش. مهحوی"ل" ٢٠٤

derkî se'be dem deme esirarî demî

çunike bo (la şî)e. Her se'yek bika derrwa belaş (Mala Usmani Balkhi, 1392 Hijri, p. 304)

In the above couplet, Mahwi claims that talking about God's secrets is something which is impossible. If someone talks about something which is not exist and ineffable, it is just wasting of time, because God is beyond our understanding. For that Mahwi also says:

زاتم نیه توخن به سیفاتی کهوم به عهقل

zاتم nîye tuxin be sîfatî kewm be 'eqll

ruh̄m çuwe tesewurî zat er bikem be can (Mala Usmani Balkhi, 1392 Hijri, p. 491)

Mahwi explains that he dares not think over (ratiocinate) God's attributes with his mind and his figment. The word (Jan) here has a metaphoric meaning, it means to perceive or experience with our five senses. For him, God is beyond our senses and mind. Alvin Plantinga says "One can rationally believe in God without having adequate reasons, indeed without having any reasons, for that belief" (Tomberlin & Inwagen, 2012, p. 290), Plantinga believes that God can be accepted without any proof, which is called 'basic belief'. Mahwi also argues that God is in the invisible and unknown world, we cannot imagine how He looks like, as he says:

هه‌رچی ببیستریت و بلین و ببیسترئ

مه‌حوی"ل ٤٩٢

(ماهو) خودا. خودا به خودا ((بتراست ازات)

Herçî bibîstirê û bilên û bibîstirê

(mahu) xuda. xuda be xuda ((bitirast azat) (Mala Usmani Balkhi, 1392 Hijri, p. 492)

Mahwi argues that what human knows about God is not enough and is not what He really is. He is swearing that God is much superior and greater. Because our words simply cannot describe our holy God. He is in the unknown world, there is no one from the ideal world who has come down to the sensible world and no one has ever told us what God looks like and what He really is. Mahwi is hopeless and tired of waiting for the one who had gone there and had never returned, and he says:

له کئ یا ره‌ب خه‌به‌ر پرسى بکه‌م من

مه‌حوی"ل ١١٩

که هه‌ر که‌س بۆ خه‌به‌ر چوو بئ خه‌به‌ر که‌وت

le kê ya reb xeber prsî bikem min

ke her kes bo xeber çû bê xeber kewt (Mala Usmani Balkhi, 1392 Hijri, p. 119)

In this couplet, he tries to say that no one has ever known anything about the ideal world and God. “This reason is outside of us, and therefore we cannot explain or distinctly understand it. What is not in our essence is beyond our capacities” (Grøgaard, 2018, p. 84). Mahwi also explains that God’s message has been there from the very beginning, and he argues:

حادیث نبییه، قەدیمه، کەلامی خودا به حەق

مەحووی "ل ٤٥٩

دەم بو حەدەت بە ناحەق ئەبەن «ضال» و گومران

ḥādīs nīye, qedīme, kēlamī xuda be ḥēq

dem bo ḥedes be naḥeq eben «zal» û gumirran (Mala Usmani Balkhi, 1392 Hijri, p. 459)

Mahwi believes that God has sent His word to people through His messengers in all languages from all nations. Those who believe that there was no message from God are heretics. In this couplet, Mahwi also explains that God is the prime being and He is the cause for every beings and creations. Nothing has existed before Him, and therefore, nothing has ever created Him. There is always a cause for every creation, and God is the first and the prime cause. He also believes that God exists in the universe, and governs it, as he says:

باوەر ببی خودا لەسە عەرشە موستەوی

مەحووی "٤٥٩

ئەمما بە ئیستوایهکی بی چوون و کەس نەزان

bawer bibê xuda lese 'erşe mustewî

emma be îstwayekî bê çûn û kes nezan (Mala Usmani Balkhi, 1392 Hijri, p. 459).

Allah says In Quran “((Allah)) Most Gracious is firmly established on the throne (of authority)” (The Quran, 20:5)<sup>xvi</sup>. God is subduing the throne and preserving it in His place, but we don't know how He is preserving His throne, because if we say, God is sitting on His throne like a human sitting on the chair, we have to say God is a material being which is not true and that doesn't fit for Him. In this couplet, Mahwi thinks that God exists in the whole universe, but not the whole universe is equal to God, because if the universe equals to God, then the

universe itself is God. Mahwi believes that God exists in everywhere, but He is not something in any place. God exists but at the same time He does not exist, because God's being is all different from physical matter. "Giordano Bruno<sup>xvii</sup> (1548–1600) established the relationship between God and the universe upon pantheism's principle that (God is everything and everything is God)" (Kemal, 2018, p. 36), that everything is God, human's soul and body is God, but human is material while God is beyond material. Everything is God, but God is immaterial, and according to René Descartes (1596-1650) which Kemal mentions "God is a simple and eternal being, but the world is composite and terminated. According to him God is the cause of the creation of the world, and he does not put the world as a part of God, because God is a simple being, but the world is composite" (Kemal, 2018, p. 35).

Furthermore, as Mahwi says (باوهر بیهی خودا لهسه عهرشه موستهوی), he extremely believes that God exists in everywhere, in the universe and in every being. Mahwi's God is not outside the universe but He puts every creation into motion, and that He is always in the existence.

## Conclusion:

There can be no doubt that there is a very strong relationship between philosophy and poetry. The relationship between both is very clear and strong, because what Mahwi is saying in his poems is a kind of philosophical idea. He cleverly explains the theological philosophy within his poems, and what Plato explains in his dialogues, Mahwi also has in his own poems in order to give the same ideas as Plato. So, literature feeds philosophy, and philosophy feeds poetry as well.

The study explains the similarities and the differences between Mahwi's and Plato's view on philosophy of theology. It proves that great poems are greatly philosophical. There are many similarities between Mahwi's and Plato's point of view; firstly, both authors believe in the existence of both worlds; the world of sensible and the world of the ideal. There is an extreme similarity between Mahwi and Plato's view to both worlds. Mahwi believes that what we have in the sensible world is not the same as what's in the ideal world. In *Republic*, Plato argues that the objects and the matter in the physical world are merely imitations of the forms which exist in the ideal world, and they are not the same. Secondly, both of them believe in the existence of God as a first or prime being. Both of them believe that He is self-existing and without an origin. Thirdly, both authors believe that God is beyond time, material and place. Fourthly, both authors believe that God is the only perfect being.

There are also some differences between both views as well; first, for Plato God exists only in the ideal world or the world of forms, but Mahwi believes that God exists in both worlds. According to Plato, after God has created the whole universe in the best way, then He has created gods to govern men, and He left the world in their hands and they govern and put the earth into motion. He believes that God is outside the world not inside. That means that God does not exist in the sensible world, but in the ideal world. But according to Mahwi God exists in both worlds. He extremely believes that God exists in everywhere, and that He always governs the human and puts the universe into motion. He believes that He has no other participants, not gods, but only God. Second, they have different views about how we can experience and know God. Plato believes that we can experience God only through reason or intelligence but not the senses. But according to Mahwi's perspective we cannot experience God with our intelligence and senses as well. He believes that God is beyond the Senses and mind, and it is difficult to reach God.

## Notes

---

<sup>i</sup> Alvin Carl Plantinga (born 1932) is an American analytic philosopher who works primarily in the fields of philosophy of religion, epistemology, and logic. He is the author of numerous books including *God and Other Minds* (1967), *The Nature of Necessity* (1974), and a trilogy of books on epistemology, culminating in *Warranted Christian Belief* (2000).

<sup>ii</sup> Saint Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) was an Italian Dominican friar, philosopher, Catholic priest, and Doctor of the Church and theologian. His best-known works are *Disputed Questions on Truth* (1256-1259), *The Summa contra Gentiles* (1259-1265), and the unfinished but massively influential *Summa Theologica* a.k.a. *Summa Theologiae* (1265-1274). His commentaries on Scripture and on Aristotle also form an important part of his body of works.

<sup>iii</sup> Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1648-1716) was a prominent German polymath and one of the most important logicians, mathematicians and natural philosophers of the Enlightenment. Some of his great works are (*Principes de la nature et de la grâce fondés en raison*), (*Reflections on Knowledge, Truth, and Ideas*) and (*On the Ultimate Origin of Things*).

<sup>iv</sup> Johannes Kepler (1571-1630) was a German astronomer, mathematician, and astrologer. He is a key figure in the 17<sup>th</sup> century scientific revolution. Best known for his laws of planetary motion, and his books *Astronomia nova*, *Harmonices Mundi*, and *Epitome Astronomiae Copernicanae*.

<sup>v</sup> Henry H. H. Remark was born in Berlin on July 27, 1916. He was a German Jew. He served as chairman of the Department of German during the summer of 1962, of the Department of Comparative Literature between 1954 and 1963, and of the west European studies from 1966-1969. He passed away on February 12, 2009 in Bloomington, Indiana. Remark wrote the oft-cited programmatic essay, "Comparative Literature: Its Definition and Function," which presented itself as a credo of the "American school" as opposed of the "French school".

<sup>vi</sup> René Descartes (1596-1650) was a French philosopher, mathematician, and scientist. He spent about 20 years of his life in the Dutch Republic after serving for a while in the Dutch States Army of Maurice of Nassau, Prince of Orange and the

Stadtholder of the United Provinces. His most famous works are (Meditations on First Philosophy), (The Passions of the Soul), and (The Principles of Philosophy).

<sup>vii</sup> René Wellek (1903-1995) was a Czech-American comparative literary critic. He was an eminent product of the Central European philological tradition and was as vastly erudite and "fair-minded critic of critics." He was born and raised in Vienna, speaking Czech and German. His famous books are (Theory of Literature), (History of Modern Criticism), and (Concept of Criticism).

<sup>viii</sup> Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) was a German philosopher and a seminal thinker in the Continental tradition of philosophy. He was best known for contributions to phenomenology, hermeneutics, and existentialism. Some of his famous books are (Ontology – Hermeneutics of Facticity) and (Parmenides).

<sup>ix</sup> Albert Camus (1913-1960) was a French Algerian philosopher, author, and journalist. He won the Noble Prize in Literature at the age of 44 in 1957. Best known for such novels as *L'Étranger* (1942; *The Stranger*), *La Peste* (1947; *The Plague*), and *La Chute* (1956; *The Fall*).

<sup>x</sup> Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (1844-1900) was a German philosopher, cultural critic, poet, philologist and scholar of Latin and Greek whose works have a profound influence on modern intellectual history. *Beyond Good and Evil*, *Gay Science* and *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* are probably the most enjoyable and pointed of his works.

<sup>xi</sup> Thomas Stearns Eliot OM (1880-1965) was a poet, essayist, publisher, playwright, literary critic and editor, a leader in the Modernist movement in poetry in such works as *The Waste Land* (1922) and *Four Quartets* (1943).

<sup>xii</sup> François- Marie Arouet, known by his name de plume Voltaire (1694-1778), was a French Enlightenment writer, historian, and philosopher. His famed works include the tragic play *Zaire*, the historical study *The Age of Louis XIV* and the satirical novella *Candide*.

<sup>xiii</sup> Giacomo Leopardi (1798-1837) was an Italian poet, scholar, and philosopher whose outstanding scholarly and philosophical works and superb lyric poetry place him among the great writers of the 19th century. His famous works are (*L'infinito*) which was written in the autumn of 1819, and (*Leopardi's Canti*) which is a collection of poems that was written in 1835.

<sup>xiv</sup> Al-Farabi (872 AD-950 AD) was a renowned early Islamic philosopher and jurist who wrote in the fields of political philosophy, mathematics, ethics and logic. He was also a scientist, cosmologist, mathematician and music scholar. His most famous books are (*On the Perfect State*), (*Alfarabi, the political writings*) and (*The Political Writings: "Political Regime" and "Summary of Plato's Laws"*).

<sup>xv</sup> (ثُمَّ رُدُّوا إِلَى اللَّهِ مَوْلَاهُمُ الْحَقَّ ۗ أَلَا لَهُ الْحُكْمُ وَهُوَ أَسْرَعُ الْحَاسِبِينَ)

<sup>xvi</sup> الرَّحْمَنُ عَلَى الْعَرْشِ اسْتَوَى )

<sup>xvii</sup> Giordano Bruno (1548–1600) was an Italian Dominican friar, philosopher, mathematician, poet, cosmological theorist, and Hermetic occultist. He is also known for his cosmological theories, which conceptually extended the then-novel Copernican model. Some of his famous works are (*Sacrilege*), (*Prophesy*), and (*Heresy*).

## بهراوردکاری له نێوان شیعره فهلسهفیهکانی مهحوی و دهقه فهلسهفیهکانی ئەفلاتون لهبابهتی تیۆلۆژیا

سایه رشید احمد رهق

بهشی زمانی ئینگلیزی، فاکهلتی ئاداب، زانکۆی سۆران، سۆران، ههریمی کوردستان. عێراق.  
ئیمهیل: [sra246@ena.soran.edu.iq](mailto:sra246@ena.soran.edu.iq)

چاوهڕێ نعمت سالیح

بهشی زمانی کوردی، فاکهلتی ئاداب، زانکۆی سۆران، سۆران، ههریمی کوردستان. عێراق.  
ئیمهیل: [chaware.salih@soran.edu.iq](mailto:chaware.salih@soran.edu.iq)

عبدالرحمان جلال عوسمان

بهشی زمانی ئینگلیزی، فاکهلتی ئاداب، زانکۆی سۆران، سۆران، ههریمی کوردستان. عێراق.  
ئیمهیل: [abdurahman.othman@soran.edu.iq](mailto:abdurahman.othman@soran.edu.iq)

پوخته:

ئهم توێژینهوهیه ههولێکی بهراوردکارییه، له نێوان شیعره فهلسهفیهکانی مهحوی و دیده فهلسهفیهکانی ئەفلاتون(پلاتۆ) له بابتهتی تیۆلۆژیا(خوداناسی). لهم توێژینهوهیهدا خاله هاوبهش و جیاوازهکانی دیدی ههردووکیان لهبارهی تیۆلۆژیا خراوته روو، به سوود وهرگرتن له شیعرهکانی مهحوی و دیالۆگی تیمایۆس و کۆماری ئەفلاتون. لهم توێژینهوهیهدا دهستنیسانی پهيوهندی هاوبهشی نێوان ئەدهبیات و فهلسهفه کراوه. ئهم توێژینهوهیه له سێ بهش پیکهاتوه. بهشی یهكهم له ناو خۆیدا له چوار لق پیکهاتوه، لقی یهكهم بریتیه له پیشهکیهك سهبارهت به توێژینهوهکهمان. لقی دووهم بریتیه له پوختهی توێژینهوهکانی تر لهبارهی ههمان بابتهت، ههروهها لقی سێههم بریتیه له روونکردنهوهی میکانیزمهکانی ئەدهبی بهراوردکاری و دهرخستی چۆنیتهتی کارکردنی قوتابخانهی بهراوردکاری ئهمریکی به بهراورد به قوتابخانهی بهراوردکاری فرهنسی. لقی چوارهمیش بریتیه له دهرخستی پهيوهند میژوووانهی نێوان شیعره و فهلسهفه. بهشی دووهم بریتیه له دهرخستی پرسى تیۆلۆژیا له هزرى ئەفلاتوندا. بهشی سێههم خستنهرووی دیدی مهحوی شاعیره بۆ پرسى خودا. له کوتايدا خاله هاوبهش و جیاوازهکانی نێوانیان له بابتهتی تیۆلۆژیا خریته روو.

کلێله وشهکان : ئەفلاتون. مهحوی. تیۆلۆژیا. ئەدهبی بهراوردکاری.

## References

- Al-Farabi. (2019). Farabi's şarî fazliye. (M. Abdul, Trans.) Slemani, Kurdistan: Ktebxanai Rahand.
- Amen, S. L. (2007). eş'eryet le şî're kurdiyekanî meħwîda.
- Aquinas, T. (2015). Summa Theologica. Tustin, California: Xist Publishing. Retrieved December 20, 2019, from <https://books.google.iq/books?id=G90mCwAAQBAJ&pg=PT1&lpg=PT1&dq=thomas%2Baquinas,%2Bsumma%2Btheologica,%2Btustin&source=bl&ots=sP8L4x6gAr&sig=ACfU3U3PNwk8HhdZ2bWemUYCXku27RsMqQ&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwj3gcjt2bXIAhVTQkEAHVZpBbYQ6AEwAHoECAQQAQ#v=onepage&q=th>
- Batten, D. (2010, October 18-20). Who created God? Retrieved April 7, 2020, from <http://creatrion.com/who-created-god>
- Believer, R. (2016, March 3). What was God doing before creation? Retrieved from <https://m.youtube.com/watch?feature=youtu.be&v=wwUYF1F6x1o>
- Blackcoffe. (2018). Two worlds According to Plato reality is divided into two or the world into two namely. Retrieved from steemit.com: <https://steemit.com/philosophy/@blackcoffee/two-worlds-according-to-plato-reality-is-divided-into-two-or-the-world-into-two-namely-2017924t225449832z>
- Blumenfeld, D. (1994). "Leibniz's Ontological and Cosmological Argument." In The Cambridge Companion to Leibniz. (N. Jolley, Ed.) Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <https://l.messenger.com/l.php?u=https%3A%2F%2Fbooks.google.iq%2Fbooks%3Fid%3DSnRis5Gdi8gC%26pg%3DPA367%26dq%3D1.%20if%20anything%20exists%2C%20there%20must%20be%20a%20%0Asufficient%20reason%20why%20it%20exists.%20%0A2.%20but%20this%20world%20exists%20and%20>
- Bradshaw, D. (1998). The Timaeus (27d-38c, 47e-53c). Retrieved February 8, 2020, from <http://www.uky.edu/~jjord0/Tim.htm#TOP>

Brickhouse, T., & D. Smith, N. (2019, July 14). Plato (427—347 B.C.E.). Retrieved from The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy (IEP): <https://www.iep.utm.edu/plato>

Dietrich Ph.D., E. (2015, May 12). Can God Be Its Own Cause. Retrieved from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/intl/blog/excellent-beauty/201505/can-god-be-its-own-cause?amp>

Dutta, J. (2014). *Ethnic Worlds in Select Indian Fiction*. SAGE Publications India, 2012. Retrieved March 17, 2020, from

[https://books.google.iq/books?id=\\_RqJCwAAQBAJ&pg=PA26&dq=First,+Comparative+Literature+means+the+knowledge+of+more+than+one+national+language+and+literature,+and/or+it+means+the+knowledge+and+application+of+other+disciplines+in+and+for+the+study+of++liter](https://books.google.iq/books?id=_RqJCwAAQBAJ&pg=PA26&dq=First,+Comparative+Literature+means+the+knowledge+of+more+than+one+national+language+and+literature,+and/or+it+means+the+knowledge+and+application+of+other+disciplines+in+and+for+the+study+of++liter)

Editors, B. (2019, April 16). Plato Biography. Retrieved from The Biography.com website: <https://www.biography.com/scholar/plato>

Elwes, R. (1887). *The Chief Works of Benedict de Spiniza* (Second edition, revised ed.). London: George Bell And Sons, York Street, Covent Garden. Retrieved December 18, 2019, from <https://books.google.iq/books?id=tnl09KVEd2UC&pg=PA244&dq=benedict+Spinoza,+Ethics,+Fart&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwixyMyIabmAhUyzqYKHblCQwQ6AEICTAA#v=onepage&q=benedict%20Spinoza%20C%20Ethics%20Fart&f=true>

Eternity, T. (2019, March 3). What was Allah (God ) doing before he created us and the universe. Retrieved from <https://m.youtube.com/watch?feature=youtu.be&v=wCE2dH8swGU>

Grøgaard, , Å. D. (2018, May). Leibniz's Ontological Arguments, How Existence Prevails over Non-Existence in Leibniz's Metaphysics. Retrieved from [https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/64910/Gr-gaard\\_Master.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=yWas](https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/64910/Gr-gaard_Master.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=yWas)

Iris, V. (2014, December 30). Literature and Philosophy: Intersection and Boundaries. (M. Fusco, Ed.) [www.mdpi.com/journal/arts](http://www.mdpi.com/journal/arts). Retrieved February 3, 2020, from [http://res.mdpi.com/d\\_attachment/arts/arts-04-00001/article\\_deploy/arts\\_04-00001.pdf](http://res.mdpi.com/d_attachment/arts/arts-04-00001/article_deploy/arts_04-00001.pdf)

Jergens, J. (2016, November 5). Book Review: The Republic. Retrieved from Academia: [https://www.academia.edu/31941431/Book\\_Review\\_of\\_Platos\\_Republic](https://www.academia.edu/31941431/Book_Review_of_Platos_Republic)

Jolley, N. (Ed.). (1995). The Cambridge Comoaion to Leibniz (Illustrated, reprint, revised ed.). United States of America: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Retrieved from [https://books.google.iq/books?hl=en&lr=&id=SnRis5Gdi8gC&oi=fnd&pg=PA353&dq=info:xXMc5QBjSFEJ:scholar.google.com/&ots=tMeOrgG48R&sig=M4Zw7fYSIhVk0yulM\\_yIgGtQeK0&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=true](https://books.google.iq/books?hl=en&lr=&id=SnRis5Gdi8gC&oi=fnd&pg=PA353&dq=info:xXMc5QBjSFEJ:scholar.google.com/&ots=tMeOrgG48R&sig=M4Zw7fYSIhVk0yulM_yIgGtQeK0&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=true)

Jukka, M. (2011, November 11). Philosophy through Literature. Retrieved September 5, 2019, from <https://trepo.tuni.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/66808/978-951-44-8587-9.pdf?sequence=1>

Kalligas, P. (n.d.). Platonic Theology. Retrieved from <http://n1.intelibility.com/ime/lyceum/?p=lemma&id=843&lang=2>

Karl, C. (2008, November 11). The Two Worlds: Plato's Two World Theory from the Gorgias to the Republic. Retrieved from [cameronscottkarl.wordpress.com](http://cameronscottkarl.wordpress.com): <https://cameronscottkarl.wordpress.com/2011/01/13/the-two-worlds-plato's-two-world-theory-from-the-gorgias-to-the-republic/amp/>

Kemal, M. (2018). Felsefeyi Spinoza û cewher. Slemani, Kurdisran: Serdem Publisher.

Liao, T. F. (2011). Statistical Group Comparison (illustrated ed.). Canada, United States of America: John Wiley & Sons, 2011. Retrieved March 16, 2020, from [https://books.google.iq/books?id=RR0m8MTdjcoC&printsec=frontcover&hl=ar&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=true](https://books.google.iq/books?id=RR0m8MTdjcoC&printsec=frontcover&hl=ar&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=true)

Mala Usmani Balkhi, M. M. (1392 Hijri). Diwani Mehwi (First edition ed.). Sna, Iran: Ktebi Kani.

Mangattu, M. (2011, July 27). Comparative Literature An Overview. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2. 33003.34084

McKim, D. k. (1998). Major Themes in the Reformed Tradition. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Retrieved from

[https://books.google.iq/books?id=GGhKAwAAQBAJ&pg=PA72&dq=proposition+is+properly+basic+for+a+person+only+if+it+is+self-](https://books.google.iq/books?id=GGhKAwAAQBAJ&pg=PA72&dq=proposition+is+properly+basic+for+a+person+only+if+it+is+self-evident+to%0Ahim+(such+that+his+understanding+or+grasping+it+is+sufficient+for+his+seeing+it+to+be+true)+or+%22evident+to+the+senses,%22)

[evident+to%0Ahim+\(such+that+his+understanding+or+grasping+it+is+sufficient+for+his+seeing+it+to+be+true\)+or+%22evident+to+the+senses,%22](https://books.google.iq/books?id=GGhKAwAAQBAJ&pg=PA72&dq=proposition+is+properly+basic+for+a+person+only+if+it+is+self-evident+to%0Ahim+(such+that+his+understanding+or+grasping+it+is+sufficient+for+his+seeing+it+to+be+true)+or+%22evident+to+the+senses,%22)

Melville, S. Y. (2010). Science and Religion Dialogue (Vol. One). Wiley Blackwell. Retrieved from

[https://books.google.iq/books?id=8FJaXx\\_w6-](https://books.google.iq/books?id=8FJaXx_w6-)

[QC&pg=PA262&dq=stewart,%2BMelville%2BNY%2Bscience%2Band%2Breligion%2Bin%2Bdialogue&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiN4OL90MnnAhXTwsQBHUGGDT8Q6wEIFTAB#v=onepage&q=stewart%2C%20Melville%20NY%20science%20and%20religion%20in%2](https://books.google.iq/books?id=8FJaXx_w6-QC&pg=PA262&dq=stewart,%2BMelville%2BNY%2Bscience%2Band%2Breligion%2Bin%2Bdialogue&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiN4OL90MnnAhXTwsQBHUGGDT8Q6wEIFTAB#v=onepage&q=stewart%2C%20Melville%20NY%20science%20and%20religion%20in%2)

Newton, T. (2017, February 27). A summary of Plato's Timaeus (Jowett translation 4th edition 1953). Retrieved from

[http://trevornewton.com/blog.php?id=11&title=A-summary-of-Platos-Timaeus-\(Jowett-translation-4th-edition-1953\)](http://trevornewton.com/blog.php?id=11&title=A-summary-of-Platos-Timaeus-(Jowett-translation-4th-edition-1953))

Pantheism. (n.d.). Retrieved December 19, 2019, from Encyclopedia.com:

<https://www.encyclopedia.com/philosophy-and-religion/other-religious-beliefs-and-general-terms/religion-general/pantheism>

Pavlos, P. G. (1997). Plato's Theology in the Timaeus 29e-30a. Retrieved from Academia:

[https://www.academia.edu/17053274/Platos\\_Theology\\_in\\_the\\_Timaeus\\_29e-30a](https://www.academia.edu/17053274/Platos_Theology_in_the_Timaeus_29e-30a)

Plato. (1888). The Timaeus. (R. D. Archer-Hind, Ed., & R. D. Archer-Hind, Trans.) Macmillan.

Plato. (2001). Plato's Republic (unabridged ed., Vol. volume 10 of The Theatre of the Mind Series). (A. A. Benjamin Jowett's translation revised by Anderson, Trans.) United States of America: Agora Publications, Inc.,

Benjamin Jowett's translation revised by Anderson, Trans.) United States of America: Agora Publications, Inc.,

2001. Retrieved from  
<https://books.google.iq/books?id=Ccr8skxseKQC&printsec=frontcover&dq=the+republic&hl=en&sa=X&sqi=2&pj=1&ved=0ahUKEwiIs9-V77joAhUXaRUIHVe-CI0Q6AEICDAA#v=onepage&q=Book%20ten&f=true>  
 Reasonable Theology. (n.d.). Retrieved January 16, 2021, from <https://reasonabletheology.org/q-a-who-created-god/>
- Scher, S. P. (2004). *Essays on Literature and Music (1967- 2004)*. (W. Bernhart, & W. Wolf, Eds.) Netherlands: Amsterdam; New York : Rodopi, 2004. Retrieved October 23, 2019, from  
[https://books.google.iq/books?id=Hr\\_FlhQ1b2gC&pg=PA24&dq=henry+remak+comparative+literature+is+the+study+beyond+the+confines&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwizr7H56rXnAhWjysQBHfHqCSEQ6AEICTAA#v=onepage&q=henry%20remak%20comparative%20literature%20is%20the%20study%2](https://books.google.iq/books?id=Hr_FlhQ1b2gC&pg=PA24&dq=henry+remak+comparative+literature+is+the+study+beyond+the+confines&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwizr7H56rXnAhWjysQBHfHqCSEQ6AEICTAA#v=onepage&q=henry%20remak%20comparative%20literature%20is%20the%20study%2)
- Science and Religion in Dialogue (Vol. Volume one)*. (2009). (M. Y. Stewart, Trans.) John Wiley & Sons, 2009. Retrieved from  
[https://books.google.iq/books?id=8FJaXx\\_w6-QC&pg=PA262&dq=stewart,%2BMelville%2BNY%2Bscience%2Band%2Breligion%2Bin%2Bdialogue&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiN4OL90MnnAhXTwsQBHUGGDT8Q6wEIFTAB#v=onepage&q=stewart%2C%20Melville%20NY%20science%20and%20religion%20in%2](https://books.google.iq/books?id=8FJaXx_w6-QC&pg=PA262&dq=stewart,%2BMelville%2BNY%2Bscience%2Band%2Breligion%2Bin%2Bdialogue&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiN4OL90MnnAhXTwsQBHUGGDT8Q6wEIFTAB#v=onepage&q=stewart%2C%20Melville%20NY%20science%20and%20religion%20in%2)
- Shamsuddin, S. M. (2012). A Note on French and American Theories in Coparative Literature. Retrieved March 17, 2020, from Academia.
- Shwan, I. A. (2014). *Edebî berawrdkarî*. Hewler, Kurdistan: çapxaneyî hacî haşm.
- Thoennes, K. (2015, December 11). Crossway. Retrieved from What Is Theology:  
<https://www.crossway.org/articles/what-is-theology/>
- Tomberlin, H., & Inwagen, P. (Eds.). (2012). *Alvin Plantinga (illustrated ed)*. Springer Science & Business. Retrieved from  
<https://books.google.iq/books?id=GKKhBQAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=alvin+plantinga+books&hl=en>

&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjZ5vn1x8fmAhV0AxAIHf8jBhAQ6AEIJTAA#v=onepage&q=alvin%20plantinga%20books&f=true

wallyvikky. (2011, April 16). The relationship between Philosophy and Literature. Retrieved from Scribd: <https://trepo.tuni.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/66808/978-951-44-8587-9.pdf?sequence=1>

Ward, S. P. (2013). Reflections on Plato's Theology. Xibris Corporation LLC. Retrieved from <https://books.google.iq/books?id=wa3FlgEACAAJ&dq=S.P.Ward+Phd+Reflection+on+plato%E2%80%99s+theory&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwilyLOuo6TpAhUiw8QBHYQ6CrUQ6wEICjAA>