



Investigation of Mental Existence and its Proof Based on Mulla Sadras Perspective

Sommayyeh Marhaba*

Pure philosophy (M.A), Department of Theology, Astara Branch, Isalmic Azad University Faculty Member, Astara, Iran

Received: 16 October 2017

Accepted: 24 November 2017

Published: 01 December 2017

Abstract

Epistemology has not been stated as an independent discussion in primitive books. Following Kant it was appeared as a dependent field. Independent subject matter was not expressed in this issue, albeit in Islamic philosophy. However, the bases of epistemological discussions have applied in the heart of other philosophic topics. One of the primary topics which assuredly relates to major topics of epistemology is subjectivity discussion. Meanwhile it will be explained that how it is possible to escape sophistry and attain real cognition and object knowledge. The present paper firstly has attempted to design mental existence issue and advocates–stated problems and then indicates Mulla Sadra's initiative to respond the problems and solve mental existence issue.

Keywords: Epistemology; Mental Existence; External Being; Genitive Approach; Ghost Approach

How to cite the article:

S. Marhaba, *Investigation of Mental Existence and its Proof Based on Mulla Sadras Perspective*, *J. Hum. Ins.* 2017; 1(4): 194-198, DOI: 10.22034/jhi.2017.86980

©2017 The Authors. This is an open access article under the CC By license

Introduction

Mental existence issue is one of the originated traditions which was stated and created by Muslim theosophists for the first time. There has not been existed such a specific topic among old philosophers as Alfarabi and Avicenna. Although their sophistry speech and the subjects they have stated following to other topics as categories, it can be concluded that they believed on mental existence. The first person who was involved in was Fakhr Razi and the next one was Khajeh Nasir Aldin Toosi. In the case of mental existence, it should be noted that it is true that mental existence come true through objects natures, however as it appears and proves through object's external being outside, it can also be capable of appearing and stabilizing in mind with mind. It means that when this is what you are, you imagine external world in your mind. We create existence which does not originate external effects whereas it contains other external effects, such as

creating science and knowledge in human beings [1].

Islamic theosophists believe that each essential substance may cover two types of existences: one is external being and the other mental existence. External being indicates such an existence in which all expected effects out of essential substance in that existence is applied on the respective essential substance. Hence if essential substance comes true outside, both effects related to its nature and natures – which is called primary perfections – will be eligible and also affairs which are taken out of outside nature of the essential substance and will be applied on that nature following the nature completion – which is called secondary perfections – will be required. Mental existence is a sort of existence in which expected effects of respective essential substance is not applied on it [2,3].

Mental existence subject is one of philosophic divided subjects. In a comprehensive division it is classified in three subjects as follow:

* Corresponding Author Email: S.marhaba@iau-astara.ac.ir

1. Topics about the origin of the existence and the applicability of its unity including the subject of gradation of existence
2. Topics having more than one applicable instance such as primordiality of existence.

Derived issues including issues pertinent to possible must of material and abstract cause effect since these issues are stated following to division of existence.

One of the divisions is that existence is either an objective or subjective thing. It is objective, namely, existing outside or independent of human mind which is the origin of external effects, whether they are supposed or not. Haj Molla Sabzehvari has chanted in his book, Manzomeh, about mental existence issues, drawbacks and reported responses (Motahhari, 1987) as follows:

Definition of mental existence:

- For an object (essential substance) except being in objective world.
- There will be another existence sprung out of its own in the subjective world.

The reasons of mental existence:

- Because of affirmative judgment on a non-existent.
- Because of generally essential substance abstraction.
- Mere truth which experiences no multiplicity in itself.
- It will occur without rational adjuncts of wisdom.

Two drawbacks of mental existence:

- Nature (essential substance) is preserved in all stages of existence.
- Summation of oppositions (preserving nature) have been considered derived out of it.
- How will it be possible for essence to be summed with accident (substance)?
- Or how is it possible for categories to be fitted inside the quality category?

Responses to the drawbacks:

- Therefore, those people (clans) have denied mental existence.
- Some have differentiated between upholding of soul and acquisition of soul.

It has been noted that objects are manifested in the form of ghost (not of essential substance) in soul and it has also been stated that the objects are manifested in essential substance; however essential substance would be revolutionized.

It has also been claimed that theosophists frequently considered knowledge and perceptions on the route of negligence and analogy.

- subjective manifestation is categorized as primary prediction (not a common prediction).

- The unity of intellectual manifestation has been supposed by a wise.

Disadvantages of existence theory

1) While knowledge is appeared in our mind it indicates a state in which it is dominated our mind, therefore it will be necessary to imagine a single object both essence and substance and it is impossible.

2) Since some philosophers (except Mulla Sadra) believed that knowledge and perceptions should be regarded as mental quality, therefore it is necessary to consider mental existence and accept that a single object subjectively contains two categories and includes more than an essential substance, while categories are naturally diverged and this case is impossible [4]. These two major disadvantages dominated on subjectivity have led each group to choose various solutions for their problems. Although Iman fakhr-e-Razi denied mental existence in his book, Almohasel, and did not consider knowledge as genitive, however in the book mabahas-al-Mashreghieh, which is his essential book, he explicitly confessed to mental existence (subjectivity) and stated that it was not manifested in the form of knowledge rather he supposed it genitive /annexation between known and knower [4]. It is worth noting that genitive is classified in two categories: Categorized genitive refers to existence of two independent objects which there is just a relationship between them such as the relationship between two brothers. Thus there is an overall relationship in them. Noun governing the genitive, a noun in the genitive case and the genitive. Illumination genitive points out a one way case in which noun governing the genitive and a noun in the genitive case are in fact similar and their contradictions are credited. This genitive refers to the same created genitive which displays existence cause with respect to its own effect [5]. Therefore, if the genitive between soul and mental existence experience a categorized proportion, then knowledge will be in genitive augmentation, not qualitative one, this is contrary to mental existence theory.

The theory of Fazel Ghooshchi

In the book Sharheh manzomeh (epopee explanation) authored by Morteza Motahhary (1979), he stated Ghooschi's perspective that: he denied identity of the knower and the known in the mind [1]. Two things are manifested in the mind, one of them reincarnates in the soul, that is, soul plays the role of its container and contained is known. A reflection emits to the slate of soul from the appearance of known in the soul container which is called knowledge. It simulates the role of a crystal sphere in the middle of which a colored

object locates; the reflection of the object on the crystal is emitted by the crystal and it is crystal-subsistent.

The theory of stating ghost

What is created in the mind is not objects' essential substance but is objects' ghost. It means that knowledge just displays objects' image in the mind and it is merely qualitative which is similar to external object in some way. Therefore, the above mentioned disadvantages are excluded [3].

The theory of non-stating Ghost or revolution

What is founded in mind is not the essential substance of objects but is not similar to it yet. It means that essential substances are revolutionized in the mind and are altered to essential substance quality and the mental object lose its essence. The above mentioned theory is cited by Seid Sadr-Al-Din Shirazi known as Seid Sanad [3].

Researcher on wild-goose chase theory

The theory believed that theosophists who considered knowledge and perception a qualitative category stated them based on analogy and negligence and knowledge really posited in the known realm. It was not dissimilar to the category of mental quality, however. Therefore, if known posited in the realm of essence, knowledge would be essence and if it placed in the category of quality, knowledge would be quality [1].

Theory of illumination

Although master of Illumination has not discussed in this aspect separately, but the principles he noted respective to light and darkness caused to consider knowledge in the classification of light and interpret perceptions in the realm of the development. In has also been claimed somewhere that knowledge refers to augmentation between knower and the known. Peripatetics also believed that the criterion of essential object perceptions was object but essence is abstracted out of material (Tabatabaee, 2000).

Nullification of annexation approach

If our essentially-known appeared with the same external objects as annexation advocates believed, two following flaws would be created:

Firstly, intellection of what do not exist outside must be impossible.

Secondly, the mistake must not appear in the intellect since the approach of annexation necessitates us to earn external reality directly, therefore there will not be any mistakes [2].

Nullification of the theory of stated Ghosts

The theory experiences two deficiencies: firstly, if something come true in the mind, and it is the ghost of external object, there will not be substantive consistency between mental effigy and external object and necessitates sophistry.

Secondly, mind can only narrate from outside if it has previously knowledge about, while based on the theory knowledge to its own stated is constrained by the narrative and is subject to transmission from stating to stated and it is not except what we refer to as cycle [6].

Nullification of the theory of non-stated Ghosts

Firstly, the requisite of this theory is not just this word that all of our knowledge lapses and any realities are not discovered for our mind and this is what we call sophistry.

Secondly, this theory experiences internal contradiction since its content specifies that all our knowledge is mistake and this theorem covers one of our perceptions and sciences. As a result, the verity of this theory required to its own nullification. Thus when necessary of what its content nullifies, required one will be verified which is verity of theorem [6].

Sadr-ol-Motalehin Theory

Sadr-ol-Motalehin explicitly expressed the point that philosophy adherents believed that nature and object's reality are created in the form of external existence formed as formal one called mental existence in ego. Therefore, human being imagined mentally is a real and true man who contains all his substance and essential substances which include rational animal pictured in mind and there is no substantive contradiction between imaginative mental man and external man, except that external man existed on the existence of what is called mental existence named formal existence and aegis existence which lacks effects except state and quality out of which existence will be built in soul [6].

Mulla Sadra reasoning to prove mental existence

One of the reasons Mulla Sadra presented to prove mental existence was that the exalted God has created human being communicative soul in such a way that it is capable of forming object's image in nature and its own universe. Since communicative soul is classified in world of domination and world of power and capability, therefore soul is able to build object's image in its own substance and outside, too. However, it is prevented from the effect and power on creating objects outside, overcoming embodiment ordinances (derived out of belonging soul to body), reduplication and

increase of possible points and lacks and angles dignity which appeared regarding to communicating with material and material interests in him [6].

The other reason which Sadr ol Motaallehin pointed out to prove mental existence was based on making differences between primary essential prediction and common technical prediction. He claimed that there were differences between primary prediction and common prediction with respect to creation and subsumption of an object in a category, in such a way that if a category applies common prediction in a case, the mentioned case necessarily will be in that category. However, if primary prediction is applied there will not be such a necessity [6]. Sadr ol Motaallehin stated that it does not mean that while imagining an object, that object's nature itself appears in mind. The effects are applied in external existence not in mental existence. Therefore, since mental form of area does not have the effects of area, it is not area according to common prediction and it is not subsumed in little category.

Thus mental form is an existence which has two parts and each one has its own special ordinance. Thence it is spiritual feeling or angel for soul, it is external existence, and the person is inherently qualitative. Thence it is stating from outside, the person is mental existence and any effects are not applied to him. Therefore, it is not subsumed in any classification but it can be virtually and based on dissipation of ordinance of an object's aspect on the other aspect considered in qualitative category. It means thence mental form anecdotes outside world and it is regarded quality by accident. Motahhary (1980) has claimed about above mentioned subject that: if we suppose knowledge and perceptions in the category of quality, mental person is qualitative [7]. It means that he is qualitative according to common technical prediction... this person is also substance. It means that he is substantive regarding to primary essential prediction but he is not truly substance. What is considered impossible is that a single object truly proves two categories or two categories are naturally and conceptually sprung out of a single object.

Another reason that Mulla Sadra has applied to prove mental existence is that we percept affairs with generality and purity which are palpable in external world such as human and horse, and judge them to generality and purity, for instance, we consider human substance in such a way that it be compatible with multiplicity – that is generally – and also we consider it abstract out of every complications and troubles – that is merely and purely and we state that: this person is general and mere. Since these kinds of affairs do not harmonize with description of generality and purity outside – because everything which exists outside is defined

and blended with complications – therefore they emanated in another container, the container in which their external effects are not applied on them and we call it mind [6].

Mulla Sadra's perspective is based on two prefaces:

A) There are two predictions. It means that verity of predicate on subject matter and identity between them via ordinance is in two types. Firstly, it is verified in subject matter substance and essence hierarchy, that is, it points out conceptual unity of subject matter and predicate (primary essential prediction) and secondly, in existence level it indicates predicate verity on subject matter both mental existence and external existence, that is subject matter and predicate identity (common technical prediction). In fact it has been expressed in the book *Bedaya -ol Hekmat* that common prediction is possible when the effects of predicate is applied on the subject matter and this type of application is only fulfilled in an object's external existence not its mental existence. Therefore, there is a contradiction in the case that common prediction is assigned to subject matter and predicate identity in the level of external existence or in the level of external and mental existence [6].

B) It has been contradictory proved that contradiction is created when one of the contradictory ideas literally eliminate the other one. It means that two cause effect and negative theorem contradicts each other when effect does not negate what cause has proved. Thus two contradictory theorems should have unity in eight cases. Unity in subject matter, predicate unity, condition, genitive, details, generality, strength, and act, place, time [6]. Mulla Sadra believed that prediction unity was also necessary to have unity in requirement and deprivation in addition to above mentioned unities.

Mulla Sadra's response to the given drawbacks

If substantive context to common prediction satisfy conditions for something, the reason for subsumption, is subsumption of that object in essential substance. However, an essential substance to common prediction will satisfy the requirements for something if its effects derived from that object. Therefore, it cannot be stated that the concept of human in our mind for example is similar to the concept of substance and the concept of body and it satisfies the needs to it for primary prediction. It is in the category of substance and common prediction also satisfies its requirements. As a result it contains all effects of body and substance, too. Hence mental existence is not manifested in its own category, that is, when one claims that: imagining an object, its self-essence appears in mind, it satisfies the conditions for primary prediction to mental form, and it does not

mean what emanates in mind covers those of that essence. Mental form includes two perspectives: in one direction it is a mental existence (creature) which places apposite to external creature and anecdotes it without having its external effects existing in that creature, and regarding to what has just been stated it cannot be included in any categories. However, with respect to the self or angel directed to the soul, it is an external creature which contains its own effects. According to this direction it can be included in mental quality such as mental cases [6].

Mulla Sadra's perspective about knowledge

Mulla Sadra believes that having initiative power human beings minds depict the image of creatures. It means that our knowledge encompasses the modes of mind. Therefore, knower, known and knowledge are included in the same category. It seems that knowledge is a sort of fact which its existence is exactly similar to its essence, so it does not have gender and part. It is not definable therefore knowledge will be defined according to formal mode not range and limits, but he rejects Sohrevardi's definition about knowledge. He has asserted that since genitives are dependent affairs and attaining them depends upon bidirectional genitives but we most frequently intellectualize about objects which are not observable, therefore knowledge is not genitive between knower and known. Knowledge is sort of existence and abstracts out of material and even existence is actual. Existence contains knowledge it is fact and as much as it frees from inexistence, the power of its light increases. He rejects the approaches of those who state that knowledge includes in substance category and proposes that knowledge is in known category, that is, if it is essence, it will be essence and if it is substance it will be substance [3]. He also rejects this approach that knowledge is in the domain of mental quality and states that if knowledge places in the domain of mental quality it requires that when our known is essence, at the same time it be both essence and quality. He also deems the approach to ghost inaccurate and claims that objects will be depicted in mind by themselves and naturally. It means that knowledge in various disciplines refer to the way of object's existence, that is, objects contain effects and discipline in

themselves in which existence of mind is one of them. He considered knowledge in known category and therefore the category of known is dichotomous including: (object) known by essence and (object) known by accident. (Object) known by essence can be referred as 1) Presented form in the soul of abstract essence, and 2) Some occasionally suppose outside as (object) known by essence [3].

Conclusion

Regardless of mental existence and knowledge theories, one will not be able to prove the argument of intellect, wise, and rational identity; hence it is impossible to admit the Trans-substantial motion but does not accept primordiality of existence. According to well-known perspectives among Islamic philosophers, Mulla Sadra believes that beyond external being of objects, images of those objects are sketched in the mind which that form leads to illumination of external essential substance, this existence remarks about its own metaphysics without satisfying the requirements of stated effects. It is assigned to natures since natures do not exist or do not in-exist (decline) per se. therefore this existence is supposed somewhere its stated exists outside or it contains predestined (non substantive concepts which are created by mind) existence.

References

1. Motahhary, M. 1979. *Series of Works (Sharh Manzomeh)*. Sadra Publication, Tehran.
2. Shirvani, A. 2005. *Bedayat-ol-Hekmat*. Tablighat Islami Office Publication Center, Hozeieh elmiyyeh Ghom, Iran.
3. Shirvani, A., 2000. *Nahayet - ol - Hekmat translation and commen*. Alzahra Publication, Tehran.
4. Sabzehvari, H. 1980. *Sharh Manzomeh*. Tehran Nab Publication, Tehran.
5. Iman fakhr-e-Razi, M. 1981. *Mabaheseh Mashreghieh*. Maktabeh Bidar Publication.
6. Mosleh, M. J., 2006. *Translation and comments of al - Shavahed - ol - Roobubieh Authored by Sadr - ol - Motaallehin Muhammad -ebn - Ebrahim Mulla Sadra*. 4th edn. Soroosh Publication, Tehran.
7. Motahhary, M. 1980. *Brief Comments on Manzomeh*. Allameh Tabatabaee Publications, Tehran.