Summary

Principles and foundations of Sadra’s self-knowledge have numerous and significant principal and fundamental differences from self-knowledge concepts of his predecessors. As a result of these differences is that Chairman of Theologians (Sadr Al-Motaallehin) is successful in solving the problems and explaining existing problems of Divine Wisdom. In this article the characteristic of impact of Sadra’s perception of human self-knowledge on solution of some of those problems have been studied. Philosophy of Sadr al-Motaallehin leads to almightiness of the self and its bases are comprised of “theory of casting doubt on the existence and quintessential action”, and also in regard with the existence of distinct philosophical system called transcendental wisdom alongside with Peripatetic and Illumination philosophy which to significant extent is the same class of self-recognition, it can be ranged with the significance of Sadra’s self-knowledge in solution of philosophical dilemmas.
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Özet
Şeyh Sadra’nın fikrine göre ruh mücereddir(yani maddi değildir), insanın kâmil (dünüayi terketme) makamında olduğundan, belli zaman ve mekan anlayışından uzak olduğu için, herhangi bir vasıta olmadan maddi varlık olan cisme etkisi olamaz. O,ruhun beden için yaratıldığına inanıyor. Bu yazida onların arasındaki ilişki şekv ve aşka dayanarak incelenmeye çalışılıyor.

Anahtar kelimeler: Ruh, bildiri,Sadra, kendisini terk,felsefi dilemma.

Introduction
Although problem of how the self relates to the body and issue of manner of aggregation between occurrence and precedence, problem of mental existence can be justified and explained based on renowned principles before Molla Sadra as well, they were achieved in light of principles of Sadrayi’s psychology with the explanation that faces less problems. According to the view of Chair of Theologians dependence of the self on the body in the phase of occurrence, is the dependence of a material form on the matter. But in the phase of eternity dependence of the self on the body is dependence of abstract being which is associated with the body in the point of action and it is not acceptable that a really existing and material being be joined and form one type.

Subject topic:
Aristotle with his own logic removed the difference of self and body to the extent his professor believed. And he believed that the relationship between self and body was a type of relationship between form and matter, and the form and mobility of matter (body) is by means of the self. Human self is abstract and is associated with but not within the matter, and a being, called self which has been created before the body, exists in no way, but self at the beginning is in the form of power and ability, later reaches the stage of abstraction.

Aristotle’s theory until the time of the late Sadr Al-Motaallehin (c. 1571–1636) has been completely recognized at the scientific centers of East and West. But at the same time of great scientific developments two other theories have occurred. One of them was a type of return and retreat to Plato, and another one was a new theory based on a range of new scientific principles.

Descartes (1596 -1650) with the belief in independent three principles of God, self, body (1, p. 157-158) vitalized Plato again. But Sadr Al-Motaallehin through proving the general motion in the essence of the abstractions created tremendous transformation in the identification and relationship of the self with body. He proved that seeming, accidental and sensory motions dominant over the world are manifestation and appearance of a substantial and depthward motion of the essence of the world, and the motion in the essence of the world is the manifestation of a
part of these seeming and sensory motions, appearance of the species is due to the law of motion, the self is a product of the law of general essential motion of the world, source of appearance of the self is changing and dynamic, the matter has ability and competence of developing the creature by itself (2, p. 11), there is no problem for the material being to be transformed to an abstract being in the stages of its progress and evolution. Sadr Al-Motaallehin establishes the following proof for the existence of the self: “We observe substances that do not perform monotone, mono-dimensional works with no will, but on the contrary, perform various works due to the will and have the powers of sense, motion, nutrition, growing and production. These various works require subjective source, the source of which cannot be substance. Because the substance is receptive and capable and there is no action and influence in that direction. Physical image also cannot be source of these various acts. Because the physical image is available in all the bodies while there are bodies that do not have various acts and their work is mono-dimensional and monotone. So, in the creatures, whose work is multi-dimensional there is a thing called self” (3, p. 344). This philosopher in the Section “Power and Act” divides the power to acting and receptive one. He divides the acting power also to “monotone and mono-dimensional works performed or to the various works received”. He calls the acting power which performs multi-dimensional and different works, self.

Theory of thinkers about human self is related to its privileges and features. Human self, unlike the animal and plant selves, which do not reach to the world of abstraction and therefore ultimately vanish, after separation from the body continues its existence as an abstract essence and does not disappear with the deterioration and disappearance of the body. The main evidence of the thinkers on the proof of abstraction and eternity of the self is based on cognition of general notions. They believe that “speaking self” cognizes general notions and comprehensive notions reasonable images are simple and do not accept division, according to this, the place where the images are imprinted, i.e. the self is simple. Simplicity of the self also requires not being destroyable and perishable, because perishability of thing means that it is created from the mobility of the existence and power of being non-compound, and thereupon, if the self is perishable it is compound, and it is in contrary to the assumption, i.e. the inherent simplicity of the self. So, perishability and corruptibility are among the features of the body and materiality. According to Molla Sadra, the abovementioned points are the points ultimately achieved by the preceding philosophers in the identification of the self and their other findings also does not exceed this level.

Some of these problems impossible to solve according to the psychology of the predecessors are as it follows:

1) If we assume as the thinkers did that the self is inherently simple, we must be committed to its precedence. In other words, every simple matter is abstract and abstract things are old (from the time perspective). Accordingly, how the occurrence of the self must be considered (3, p. 344)
2) If the self is a non-material and abstract reality from the beginning, as well as, is considered reasonable, how can it be dependent on the material body and its reaction be explained by the disposition and physical symptoms of the body.

3) Abstraction and simplicity of the self with its numerical multiplication is not compatible with the diversity of the bodies. If the spirit does not have any bodily and material background, so, what is the destination of its diversity and multiplicity?

4) Another problem of the well-known theory concerning the self is that the thinkers deny that the self enjoys the movement for the essential perfection and during this movement enters the world passing through the worlds of sense and imagination.

5) On the Molla Sadra’s opinion, another exact problem is relevant to the theory of the “Academy” which is not possible to solve except in the light of Sadra’s self theory.

With respect to the mentioned foundations and principles it becomes clear that if we do not accept heightening and essential motion of human self and its inherent evolution and by this way do not explain the entrance of the self to domain of the abstraction we do not have choice except recognizing the self always and in all the stages of its existence as bodily creature, and this is incompatible with the words of the thinkers on the occurrence and the abstract eternity of the self.

6) The sixth dilemma whose definitive solution is possible only in the light of Sadra’s dealing with the human self is concerning survival of the self after body. We know that in the view of the Thinkers every object that lacks the bearer of the possibility of existence and nonentity is everlasting and eternal. In other words, nonentity antecedent to existence and nonentity subsequent after the existence, both of them are impossible.

Very important point that distinguishes Molla Sadra from foregoing philosophers is the definition of self. Sadr Al-Motaallehin on the definition of self says: “The first perfection for the body is natural, automatic. The spirit is perfection, because the spirit is the complementary of the body. When the body and spirit are united, the species become complete. The perfection is the first so that it ensures the grade of the object. The second perfection is those works which stem from the species and as the species actually are realized, they do not need to achieve these perfections. For instance, being sword is realizable; sharpness is its second perfection. The self similarly ensures the grade. The first perfection is natural, automatic. (Automatic refers to the power and the perfection by which the works are accomplished is called automatic perfection and against it is the basic perfection which implements the works without power and tools ) (6, p. 3). Sadr Al-Motaallehin believes that this includes the definition for all the selves, because automatic means powers not organs, in order not to include the astronomical selves. But definition of the self in the opinion of other philosophers is related to the essence of the self not to selfness of the self. While in the opinion of Molla Sadra there is no difference between essence of the selves and selfness of the self.
“Academy” philosophers say: “When we define the self with perfection in fact we have not defined the self “in terms of her”, but have defined it in terms of its dependence on the body. In the explanation on the spirit we have essential bodily from one hand and essential abstract from one hand, and an addition between both of them. Therefore, addition of the essence of the self (abstract essence) to the body, is not inherent to it, but rather is a symptomatic matter that occurs to it” (4, p. 17). Avicenna (Ibn Sina) and others after defining the self as the first perfection for the natural body said clearly: “This definition clearly expresses that the self is mastermind of the body and expresses the essence of the self from the perspective that it is not essential abstract and parting. They also believe that the self in addition to abstract, parting nature enjoys aspect of counsel and command. While the self from the perspective that it is identified as the commander of the body, the truth and the essence of the self which is essential and parting still has not been identified” (9, p. 3). Sadr Al-Motaallehin says in response to Avicenna (Ibn Sina): “It is the arrangement that lies in the self and comprises the whole of its essence. If we recognize the self from this perspective we would recognize essence of the self. The self has no identity except the very identity of arranging, and this arranging identity for the body is not such as being mason or writer for a man. Because the both of them have occurred to a man while the arranging aspect of the self is neither necessary symptom nor parting symptom for the essence of the self, rather it is latent in the essence of the spirit” (3, p. 12)

Expression of almightiness of the self in the opinion of Molla Sadra: “The philosopher preceding Sadr Al-Motaallehin who were accepting the self as single were attributing the cognition and stimulation activity to the self. These philosophers ascertained powers and mechanisms for the self and considered the attribution of acts to powers metaphorical and to the self real. Sadr Al-Motaallehin considers the self as the proof of all the cognitions which are attributed to outward and inward powers. For the proving the claim that the self is the source of all the powers, he adduces three proofs – from the known, from the knower and from the knowledge. (3, p. 221)

This philosopher in explanation of his conception states that the self is a single creature that has collective oneness. Collective oneness assumes ranks where it performs special work with every rank which is not performed with another rank. Consequently, what is ascribed to all the acts and characterizations is a truth while the ranks are not the same of each other. Neither the reasoning is the same of illusion, nor is the imagination the same of will. The self in the cognition and the stimulation toward the type of oneness is in the diversity where the self itself is present. The self is extensive monad which responsible for general reasoning on the ascending arc, and for cognitions and acts at the medium stage and on the descending arc (3, p. 221-228). Therefore, in opinion of this philosopher, mechanisms and powers are considered as the ranks of the self and are the same of the powers. The self is not another personal unit to which the powers, tools and mechanisms belong and the problem that one object is both abstract and material is not needed because the self is one collective object which has various ranks.
Why the theory of almightiness of the self has not been raised before Sadr Al-Motaallehin?

In response to the question what can be said is that philosophy of Sadr Al-Motaallehin is set on the bases which lead to the theory of almightiness of the self, and this philosopher himself has stated these bases which are as it follows:

1) Theory of casting doubt on the existence: the creatures are different effects or various ranks of one existence. The self is also the same of sensitive, imaginary, illusory and mental powers. Because it is the one truth that has different degrees and ranks in the strength and weakness, and this rank also is imaginable in the one truth. Thus powers are attributed to the self, not to objects.

2) Quintessential movement: the self with the inherent change and quintessential motion advances toward the perfection and when reaching every rank its surroundings and coverage increases, acquires new traits and also keeps the features of lower ranks. Thus from the beginning until the end it moves according to law of quintessential motion in its essence and inside and covers the ranks, at the end reaching the final stage obtains all the perfections and becomes all-powerful (almighty). On the same basis the self becomes the main source of all the perfections and stimulations.

Although philosophers before Sadr Al-Motaallehin were agreeing to oneness and simplicity of the self, but were not looking at the course of perfecting from the perspective of quintessential motion. Therefore their views did not conclude on almightiness of the self (3, p. 223). The circumstances of belonging of the self to the body and its quintessential perfecting: we know that there is an excess and negligence in this matter like in other matters. There were views which were regarding human personality only as flesh and were not conceding originality of the spirit. In Europe there were people who were conceding only the originality of the spirit. The most famous theories are dualist theories, according which the self is one essence and the body is another essence. Plato said that the self was created beforehand and after emergence of the body integrated to that. Aristotle and Avicenna believed that the self and the body both emerged and were created together. In Europe Descartes had more dualist thoughts. But in Molla Sadra’s philosophy this problem has been solved in other form (5, pp. 257-258). According to the concept of Sadr Al-Motaallehin belonging of the self to the body at the stage of occurrence is the belonging of a material image to the substance. But at the stage of eternity the belonging of the self to the body is the belonging of an abstract creature which is at the point of act is in correlation with the body (3, p. 27). He justifies his opinion so that this question is not acceptable that a material creature is united altogether and comprises one species. Because how can one truth be composed of two abstract and material parts? The self is a source of separation and separation occurs from the image, the same as sort is obtained from the material. Separation is the constituent of species essence and the resultant of the existence of sort. This link, be it essential or existential, leads to the unity. This unity is the adjuster of the carrying so that we can carry the sort on the separation and the
separation on the sort. The existence of sort and separation is outside of oneness and at the intellectual analysis are separated. Consequently, if the human self at its very emergence is actually abstract, it is carried on the sort which is the same body. Now how can an abstract creature carried on a material one without the fact that material becomes abstract and abstract becomes material. That is, we should either raise the sort or extend it to the level of an abstract; either should lower the self, while at the natural level it is impossible. So, we must inevitably lower the self and put it at the beginning of the emergence on the same level with the nature and define it as the united with the body (3, p. 223).

Based on the theory of Sadr Al-Motaallehin, quintessence or essence and the truth in every body is in motion, change and permanent evolution and directed to the perfection. The self at the beginning of emergence is considered to be an image from the natural images which was imprinted in the substance, in light of quintessential motion passes through rank of imaginary abstraction, illusive abstraction and animal abstraction and reaches the rank of human abstraction and finally achieves perfect abstraction. At all these stages the self is not more than a truth and the same truth rises and seems in different manifestations. Self with its inherent change and quintessential movement on every stage it reaches by maintaining new features becomes a complex of perfections (3, pp. 330, 347; 6, p. 244).

The self is root and the body is branch: human is a combination of the self and the body. Sadr Al-Motaallehin posits the self as abstract and the body as material. Question that is raised is whether self and body are both original and together constitute the human truth or one is primary and another one is consequence both together constituting two forms of human reality? Sadr Al-Motaallehin says: albeit the self and body have differences in position and rank it is because the self is abstract and the body is material. But both constitute an external reality expressed in human being. As if both are single object. This one truth has two aspects: one aspect is a body which is, in its turn, a branch and exposed to transformation, change and perishability; another aspect is the self, what is eternal and original (7, p. 89). In explanation of the statement by Sadr Al-Motaallehin says that according to three proofs the self is root and the body is branch:

1) Abstraction of the self: the self is abstract and the body is material. An abstract can not subordinate to a material. Consequently, originality belongs to the self and the body is considered subordinate to the self. The verses which state that we receive you completely and perfectly also is the proof of the fact that the human self constitutes all his/her actual identity. Otherwise, if the body also would be a part of the actual existence of the human being the human would not be received completely and perfectly at the moment of death and with the decomposition of the body a part of actual human identity would be destroyed (8, p. 115). In fact, Molla Sadra with the statement of the principle of “physicality of the emergence and spirituality of the eternity” has touched upon the solution of that problem. According to this principle the self at the beginning of the emergence is material,
but does not remain permanently on this stage and achieves the stage of abstraction.

Circumstances of achievement of the abstraction with Molla Sadra: Sadr Al-Motaallehin relying on four principles, i.e. “originality of the existence”, “casting doubt on the existence”, “quintessential motion” and “heightening of the existence” deals with the explanation of how to achieve the abstraction in the self. Thus, what is original in appearance (originality of the existence) and these creatures are not contradictory realities, rather are the realities with ranks (casting doubt on the existence). There is no disconnection and cessation between the ranks of the existence, rather an existential link is established. The self can cover descending stages of the existence to reach higher ranks (quintessential motion). The descending rank of the existence is called “substance” and higher rank is called “complete intellectual abstraction”. Accordingly, the human self does not have certain position and is not like other creatures which have certain ranks. That is, weak creature in the context of quintessential motion transforms into a strong creature (heightening of the existence). Due to these principles with respect to the state of achieving the abstraction it should be stated that the self in the forefront position is material. Then from the platform of matter advances through the quintessential motion to have the form of plant which has not understood yet, but performs coordinated works. Then reaches a stage where in addition to coordinated works it cognizes. This stage is the stage of animal self which in fact is the lowest rank of the abstraction and is called “exemplary or purgatorial abstraction”. According to Molla Sadra animal selves are eligible for this type of abstraction. The self then continuing to move achieves intellectual general points, and this stage is the human self (4, p. 7)

2) Mobility of the self: in the object that is composed of substance and form, substance provides the aspect of power and ability of that object and form undertakes the mobility. From this perspective it is impossible for power and mobility to be monotone and substantially equal in relation to that object. Because the power is a weak degree of the existence and form and mobility have a degree of perfection and superiority at the existence. In the problem of the self and the body also the self is regarded as form and the body is regarded as the material. The self which has the perfection and mobility for the body, intervenes much to the composition of human reality. Accordingly the self is regarded as root and the body as branch subordinate to the former.

3) Life and death subordinate to the self: in the philosophy of Molla Sadra the self is physicality of the emergence and spirituality of the eternity. The self which is material in the emergence continues its quintessential course incessantly to reach the stage of the perfection. During this course the body is used as a carrier. The more the self approaches its destination the less its relation to the body becomes to reach the position where it does not need a body and its relation to the body is cut and the body remains without supervisor (3, pp. 54-55)
Conclusion:

Principal and logical impact left by Sadr Al-Motaalehin Shirazi in the psychology, as expressed in the principle of physicality of the emergence and spirituality of the eternity, is dealing with the solution of this problem, and having different degrees and genesis of abstractness of the power and illusion is not deniable in the change of philosophical description of various problems. Although philosophers before Molla Sadra were not agreeing with oneness and simplicity of the self, but they were not regarding the course of self perfecting from the perspective of quintessential motion, and therefore their views did not lead to almightiness of the self.
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