



The Possibilities and Characteristics of the Necessary Transcendental Knowledge from the Perspective of Mulla Sadra

Soorieh Geravand¹; Mohammad Kazem Rezazadeh Joudi²

¹ PhD student of Theology, Literature and Humanities Department, Iran

² Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, Iran

Corresponding Email: sooriehgeravand1@gmail.com

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v7i4.1518>

Abstract

One of the most important topics in the view of the great philosophers is the question of the possibility and characteristics of the necessary transcendental knowledge. As one of the leading philosophers and the founder of transcendental wisdom, Mulla Sadra has argued and argued. This article aims to analyze Sadra's views on the possibility and characteristics of the necessary transcendental knowledge with an analytical approach. Examination of Sadra's views in this regard indicates that formal knowledge and Acquired Knowledge, in essence, God is impossible. But if the oneness of the uniqueness of knowledge is one can attain the right of transcendental as much as one's being is capable of, and this ontology can only be accomplished have the negative of the material and attains the highest degree of knowledge, that's mean, death.

Keywords: *Knowledge; Science; Presence; Regret Argument; Mulla Sarda*

Introduction

The discussion of the knowledge of God is one of the most elusive philosophy and mystical discourses. This has always been the subject of philosophy mystical, and logical discussions about man's innate desire for knowledge and transcendent knowledge, and his views and views have been raised by them. Mulla Sadra is one of the philosophers who have presence his epistemological theories with a focus on the arguments of truth and basis and principles of transcendent wisdom, and so on.

Mulla Sadra's epistemological discourses have been scattered throughout his work so that his epistemological disciplines have been discussed in subjects such as subjective existence, secondary, general and trivial reasoning, credentials of nature, categories, rational unity and self-discipline, and ... can be found. The importance of this prominent philosopher's theories and views on transcendental knowledge, especially the epistemic and encapsulated knowledge among epistemological views indicates the importance and the necessity of research in this regard. It should be noted that the subject of this research, namely, the examination of the inward and outward knowledge of transcendent Mulla Sadra's perspective, has not been formulated with an analytical approach to independent research, and researches

on this philosopher's views have often been compared with those of other philosophers, including Zinaly et al (2016) research entitled "The Principles of Sadr al-Mutallah in proofing the Multiple Hierarchy of Knowledge of God" based on three bases of causality, the existence of science, and the transcendental movement of the self in perception that all beings, including the soul, in all levels.

They know God. Since science is of the nature of existence and the soul is evolving in an upward motion and is united with its sciences, every person will have an understanding of God. This recognition encompasses a wide range of Knowledge by the presence, acquired, and intuitive cognition. Qobadzadeh's research (2014) entitled "The Possibility of Knowing an Infinite God from the Point of Thomas Aquinas and Mulla Sadra" has proposed the ways of sharing and differentiating the possibility of transcendental knowledge in the view of Aquinas and Mulla Sadra. In a study entitled "A Comparative Study of the Possibility and How God Knows from the Perspective of Ibn Sina, Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra," Spokesperson (2012) deals with the domain of human knowledge of God and expresses these philosophers' theories about self and ontology. In another study entitled "A Comparative Study of the Proof of the Existence of God from the Perspective of Mulla Sadra and Rumi" (Wali) (2004), Mulla Sadra's and Rumi's views on the knowledge and existence of God has been comparatively explored, and many other studies, considered each expressing Mulla Sadra's epistemological views.

But, the present study aims to discuss Mulla Sadra's epistemological perspectives concerning the possibility and characteristics of the transcendental inward knowledge from Mulla Sadra's view and seek to answer the question of how the possibility and characteristics of the transcendent inward knowledge is from Mulla Sadra's perspective.

1. Mulla Sadra's Epistemology

In the field of epistemology, cognition, the definition of knowledge, how it is acquired and the question of justification of knowledge is raised. Mulla Sadra has often used the term science in this area. Mulla Sadra's commentary in the book of Asfar states:

"في تحديد العلم: يشبه أن يكون العلم من الحقائق التي إنيتها عين ماهيتها و مثل تلك الحقائق لا يمكن تحديدها إذ الحدود مركبه من أجناس و فصول و هي أمور كلييه و كل وجود متشخص بذاته و تعريفه بالرسم التام أيضا ممتنع كيف و لا شيء ء أعرف من العلم- لأنه حاله وجدانيه نفسانيه يجدها الحي العليم من ذاته ابتداء من غير لبس و لا اشتباه و ما هذا شأنه يتعذر أن يعرف بما هو أجلى و أظهر و لأن كل شيء ء يظهر عند العقل بالعلم به فكيف يظهر العلم بشيء ء غير العلم" ..

(Sadr al-Din Shirazi, 1981: 3/26). In Mulla Sadra's view, the existentialism science is a mere of physical effects, whether it be existence for itself, which we call the science of the object itself, or an existential being, which we call science as non-rational or imagination or feeling. Mulla Sadra has also discussed this elsewhere:

«العلم ليس أمرا سلبيا كالتجرد عن المادة و لا إضافيا بل وجودا و لا كل وجود بل وجودا بالفعل لا بالقوه و لا كل وجود بالفعل بل وجودا خالصا غير مشوب بالعدم و بقدر خلوصه عن شوب العدم يكون شده كونه علما و بيان هذا أن المادة الأولى أمر مبهم في ذاته و هي غير موجوده بالفعل و إنما يتحصل و يتقوم ذاتا- متحققه بالجسم و لواحقه كالحركه و ما ينشأ منها و الجسم بما هو جسم لا يكون له وجود خالص عن العدم الخارجى فإن كل جزء مفروض فيه وجوده يقتضى عدم غيره من الأجزاء و عدم الكل فإنه إذا وجد ذلك الجزء كان الكل معدوما و كذا يسلب عنه سائر الأجزاء و لأن الوجود عين الوحده أو ملازم لها

فما لا وحده له لا وجود له و كذا الحمل و الهويه من لوازم الوحده فما لا هويه له فلا وجود»:

It means that science, is not a negative action such as Incorporeality, it is not superfluous; it is the same as existence, not any being but actual existence; Which is more severe than its purity. In general, it regards science as the Incorporeality existence of matter, since it is merely incorporeality. Thus, Mulla Sadra refers to science as being, and more precisely, refers to science as being. Therefore, science is neither essence nor width in Mulla Sadra's view, because the division of essence and width is the essence, while science is nothing but existence (Hosseini Saraei et al., 2007: 39).

It should be noted that the divisions Mulla Sadra put forward for science are credible, and science is simply inseparable and indivisible. Therefore, the divisions that come up for science are Knowledge by the presence and acquired science. In Mulla Sadra's view, it is science either through which the real and objective existence is revealed to the perceiver or through the medium that one acquires the external object of science through a mental image and concept without a direct perception of the external being. He calls the first part the science of the face and the second part the science of the ascetic. What is substantiated in the mind is the product of science. In this science the scientific existence is known other than its objective existence, but in the presence of science the two are one. Basic science is divided into conception and affirmation, but this division is not for Knowledge by presence. Predictive science is right and wrong, but it is not. But it is important to know that every elementary science is based on face science (Hosseini Saraei, 2007: 41).

Much of Mulla Sadra's *Asfar* is devoted to science-related issues. He also regards science as being of the highest degree of weakness. That science, which is at a low level of darkness, is perceived by the senses regularly, and that is why the name of science does not refer to objects and their surroundings. Sensory evidence is a very poor degree in science. The highest and the highest degree of science, the science of God and the degree of weakness, is the science of the senses of the outer senses. Because science and other attributes are so much more than the existence of God, the attributes of the perfection of the truth are in the same order of magnitude and perfection. He believes: science is the existence of one the object for another which has independent existence (Sadrudin Shirazi, 2008:1/154).

Mulla Sadra believes that Knowledge by presence is impossible, and Knowledge by intuitive is for all, Knowledge by intuitive is for man, it does not say anything, and that vision of transcendence does not say in the visual, it does not say, it is false. And this is true. "So in the mind of the general concept, it is necessary that all external and objective beings are true. The essence of the matter is vague and multiplicative and there is no particular being that does not multiply, but existence does not accept multiplicity when it exists; The scientific form itself is abstract and cannot be abstracted until it is abstracted, and the one who receives the science must be abstract and cannot be abstracted unless abstracted. Between it is the recipient of science and the container of science and form of reincarnation and gender, and the most important reason that philosophers have in the abstractness of self-talk originates here. The most important reason, and in advance of every reason stated, is that man becomes the universe, acquires science, and the science of the face is abstract, and the single word must also be abstract, and this is a very important reason. Because everyone is restricted. Therefore, each of the possibilities has as intuitive an effect as his or her table of existence. This kind of Knowledge by the presence and the the second kind of extrverted science is not for any scholar in this dispute" (Hassanzadeh Amoli, 2010: 168-170).

2. The Hierarchy of Knowing God in Mulla Sadra's Perspective

The hierarchy of knowing God in Mulla Sadra's philosophy, through the principle of acceptance, the relationship between the cause and the effect, the existence of knowledge, and the gradual movement and self-conversion of perception would be capable of proving knowledge of God to all beings, including humans, as well as to humans indicating human theology is different. Mulla Sadra observes that a kind of Knowledge by presence: Truth becomes evident, not a facet of it because God is a very simple and pure God. After all, the Truth has no different components. Now when such an observation is made, all this fact must be made clear. Mulla Sadra in the sixth volume of *Asfar* has mentioned this point:

«في أن واجب الوجود تمام الأشياء و كل الموجودات و إليه يرجع الأمور كلها: هذا من الغوامض الإلهية التي يستصعب إدراكه إلا على من آتاه الله من لدنه علما و حكمه لكن البرهان. قائم على أن كل بسيط الحقيقه كل الأشياء الوجوديه إلا ما يتعلق بالنقائص و الأعدام و الواجب تعالى بسيط الحقيقه واحد من جميع الوجوه فهو كل الوجود كما أن كله الوجود. أما بيان الكبرى فهو أن الهويه البسيطه الإلهيه لو لم يكن كل الأشياء لكنت ذاته متحصله القوام من كون شيء و لا كون شيء آخر فيتركب ذاته و لو بحسب اعتبار العقل و تحليله من حيثيتين مختلفتين قد فرض و ثبت أنه بسيط الحقيقه هذا خلف فالمفروض أنه بسيط إذا كان شيئا دون شيء آخر كأن يكون ألفا دون ب- فحيثيه كونه ألفا ليست بعينها حيثيه ليس ب و إلا لكان مفهوم ألف و مفهوم ليس ب شيئا واحدا و اللازم باطل لاستحاله كون الوجود و العدم أمرا واحدا فالملزوم مثله فثبت أن البسيط كل الأشياء. و تفصيله أنا إذا قلنا الإنسان مثلا مسلوب عنه الفرسية أو أنه لا فرس..»

”(Sadruddin Shirazi, 1981: c 6/110).

In other words, the essence of the obligatory because it is simply does not exist in more than two ways; it is either fully known or unknown. It is therefore impossible to identify a part as unknown and apart as known. So if the knowledge of God is possible, one must understand the very essence of transcendence (Javadi Amoli, 2003: 2: 189-190). But the essence of transcendence is not understood by any kind of science.

But Mulla Sadra answers these questions based on the existence of science; in science, it is known to the world. This presence would be possible in two ways, firstly, that the universe is present to the universe, in which case the universe can also find the whole universe because it is known to the universe and is surrounded by it. But sometimes that is not the case, and this is the world that must come to the fore. In this kind of presence, it is usually larger and beyond the realm of the universe. This is not about God and possibilities such as the second type. It was said that God is infinite and His presence is so universal that it is equally close to all His creatures. It is no longer possible to say of such a fact that he is going to another; it is others who are eagerly awaiting his presence. If this fact is so simple, then it would be so infinite and transcendent that other beings could not fully grasp it. Their science, which is their presence in the Absolute Truth, is nothing separate from their existence, and when their existence is limited, their science will be limited as well. No creature realizes the essential nature of mankind, but all beings attain the right intuition through the veil of their existence and by observing their souls. Like a diver swimming in the vast ocean. He is directly connected to the ocean, but he does not find anything out of the ocean except as much as the extent of existence and the means at his disposal (Abdollah Javadi-Amoli, 2003: 190).

In Mulla Sadra's philosophy, the existence and identity of every being is the same truth as with the Almighty, and there is no other identity or truth except in the context of this relationship. In various debates, Mulla Sadra argues that existential beings are manifestations of the essence of transcendence;

hence, the perception of every being seems to be a consideration of it about God. In other words, the existing truth and identity is its relation to God, which is why it is also perceived in the perception of every essential being. In such a relation, every disabled person must necessarily be aware of it because of its cause. On the other hand, in Mulla Sadra's philosophy, science is an existential thing, so it will necessarily have the same predicates. One of the most important features of Mulla Sadra's philosophy is rank and file. Science also encompasses this feature, and as a result, knowledge of God will be of varying degrees. In other words, every creature out there can come to know God, and because there are many levels and degrees of being, not all of them have a degree of knowledge of God, so we have different understandings of God. In a detailed discussion of the difference between human beings in knowing God, Mulla Sadra sees the main reason for this difference of views in the difference of observations, because each person observes God in the place where he is located, and because individuals are indifferent existential positions, their knowledge of God is also different. He argues that the most important factor is that each person sees God as the passage of a particular being and does not know God except through his own identity and being, the identity that is unique to each individual (Sadr al-Din Shirazi, 1981: 2/365).

Mulla Sadra divides perception into three parts: Perception belongs to the realm of sensory nature, which is the weakest type of perception. Then there is the imaginary perception that is related to the fantasy world, and finally, to the intellectual perception that is related to the universe and home of the higher abstractions. One can see from Mulla Sadra's writings that he believed in the possibility of knowing God in all three phases. Mulla Sadra states at the outset of the controversial theology, specifically Asfar, that there are many ways of knowing and proving God:

«فى إثبات وجوده و الوصول إلى معرفه ذاته: و اعلم أن الطرق إلى الله كثيره و اعلم أن الطرق إلى الله كثيره لأنه ذو فضائل و جهات كثيره و لكل وجهه مؤلئها لكن بعضها أوثق و أشرف و أنور من بعضو أسد البراهين و أشرفها إليه هو الذى لا يكون الوسط فى البرهان غيره بالحقيقه. و أسد البراهين و أشرفها إليه هو الذيلا يكون الوسط فى البرهان غيره بالحقيقه فيكون الطريق إلى المقصود هو عين المقصود و هو سبيل الصديقين الذين يستشهدون به تعالى عليه ثم يستشهدون بذاته على صفاته بصفات على أفعاله واحدا بعد واحد و غير هؤلاء كالمتكلمين و الطبيعيين و غيرهم يتوسلون إلى معرفته تعالى و صفاته بواسطه اعتبار أمر آخر غيره كالإمكان للماهيه و الحدوث للخلق و الحركه للجسم أو غير ذلك و هى أيضا دلائل على ذاته و شواهد على صفاته لكن هذا المنهج أحكم و أشرف»

(Sadreldin Shirazi, 12/12/1981).

Some interpreters of transcendent wisdom have divided these paths into general terms. In their view, there are infinite and multiple ways of knowing God. The partial path is the way that every creature connects to its origin through its existence. For every creature and every dignity in existence is in itself a sign of divine revelations. The best partial way is the direct and immediate connection between man and God. There are many ways to know God, as Mulla Sadra himself has pointed out, including the possibility of the possibility and the like. Another witness that Mulla Sadra considers the knowledge of God possible in all levels of existence is his emphasis on the fact that possible beings (both material and non-material beings) utterly represent God (Şadr ad-Dīn Muḥammad Shīrāzī, 1354: 158).

Accordingly, it can be said that every being in every order of existence is God so that one can find an understanding of God and fit into it. Two important points must always be kept in mind here: First, no being except the essence of transcendence knows the truth and the essence of the essential essence and every being, no matter how transcendent, cannot understand the manifestation of the essence of transcendence. Be it. Otherwise, the knowledge of God based on what mediators will be of varying degrees. Undoubtedly, tangible and physical beings, because of their low degrees of existence, are also weaker and less deficient than other higher-order beings. For this reason, Mulla Sadra considers the most

important impediment to knowing God to be in material and lust (Şadr ad-Dīn Muḥammad Shīrāzī, 1354: 37-39).

In this way, he introduces nature into the ways of knowing God. Mulla Sadra's numerous affirmations of the Fussilat surah, verse 53 are further confirmation that he considers the verses of idleness, some of which are tangible beings, valid for knowing God.

3. Knowledge of God in Mulla Sadra's View

Mulla Sadra made the innate knowledge of God, a belief derived from the knowledge of religion and revelation, perfectly rational, reflective and reasoned, and regarded this very perception and understanding of all men of God as the foundation and pillar of all other sciences and teachings in such a way that without It does not know human beings. Therefore, in Mulla Sadra's view, one of the intuitive ways in which one can come to know God is by the method of the heart or by nature. The existence of the transcendent is indigenous, and its proof is by no means necessary. The nature of every human being knows the needs of his creation and the basic building of his being without knowing and acquiring basic science. The meaning of this type of nature is the nature of the heart (Şadr ad-Dīn Muḥammad Shīrāzī 1985: 21).

In human beings, God-worship is an instinct. This instinct is a kind of spiritual attraction, that is, man is naturally inclined to love God, that being, being good, being loved, and being, being united, there is no difference in essence and no difference in the degree of intensity. That is its weakness. At the end of the perfection of existence, the Lord is obligatory, whose perfection is infinite, and each of the creatures with disabilities is and has a limit, imperfect.

The truth of our existence is not subject to imperfection and limitation. Because of their defects and limitations, beings tend to be absolute and non-atomic, ie, the essence of divinity, and seek to attain perfection with the benefit and benefit of divine love and mercy. The ultimate lover is the ultimate lord of all beings of God, and if creatures achieve everything other than the right, they do not feel at ease (Şadr ad-Dīn Muḥammad Shīrāzī, 1410: 180-189) because they still love the absolute perfection. Man, based on his original creation and nature, has tendencies and insights that do not come from outside the universe, but from within. The combination of these tendencies and the inner cognition that distinguishes human and animal forms human nature. These tendencies are central to the pulp of human existence. Our innate knowledge of God is rooted in our intuitive and intuitive self-knowledge, which is self-knowledge, that is, of degrees of intensity and weakness. The higher the spiritual being is and the stronger it is, the greater his awareness of himself. The intuitive insight of the soul is accompanied by the intuitive insight of the truth, that is, the presence of the essence of the self for itself in the light of the intuition of the truth. Sadr-ol-Mote'allegh recommends one of the highest states of the civil soul as this human soul knows the truth as it is, and believes in God, the angels, the Book of the Apostles, and the Day of Judgment, and its soul is inclined to privacy and need with its God. Thinking slowly about his property and his kingdom, he always wishes to see his birth. Man can ascend to the highest degrees of the angels closest to him. This is only if he takes care of his divine nature and nurtures it (Şadr ad-Dīn Muḥammad Shīrāzī, 1410: 184).

He believes that all beings are true verses and that in each of them, we see God whatever he is, he is God and there is no non-existent transcendence. God has appeared and objects in all things and has surrounded them all.

God is manifested in all things and manifested in them. God is the origin of light, the origin of appearances, the origin of existence and realization in faq-Infos, and the man, the earthly creature, if he cleanses his soul and removes all obstacles, hear the command of God in thought, reverence, and worship,

and attains to the intuition which gives rise to inquiry and certainty; He gets killed, then he reaches the point where he sees what he sees as of right. This is evidence of the intuitive way of nature. Therefore, sometimes it is meant to be an innate knowledge of God and to know God in the presence of God in the sense that human nature and creation are in such a way that he always finds God without any mediation and is constantly in his presence. But it is important to know that science is divided into conscious and semi-conscious. Now, if the innate knowledge of God for human beings is of the nature of the presence of science, it must be of the semi-conscious sciences, for sure not all persons in the presence of God have conscious knowledge of God.

But regarding the innate knowledge of God in Mulla Sadra's view, it can be said that innate theology of God through God can be interpreted as the science of conscience of God; Now one of the innate interpretations of the science of ascension to God is what it means, that is, the science of conscience is innate to God. The only requirement here is that one should pay attention to one's knowledge of God to be able to image it and obtain a conscience statement (Askari Soleimani, 2001: 168).

3-1. Knowledge of Acquired in Knowing of God

Regarding the inability of the intellect to know God in Mulla Sadra's perspective, it should be said: It is recognizable in two sensible and obvious aspects that the intellectual can understand the reasonable aspect of the truth. The intellect goes so far as to know the truth that he can only provide proof and argue about the attributes and names of the truth. Like the eyes, the intellect looks to God beyond the veil. We know that there is a need for proportionality between the universe and the known without which there is no sign of reasoning. The proportion between the right and the creature, which signifies the right through reason, is not inherent because the creatures have no resemblance to the essence of the right. The essence of the right is not recognizable by reason. Necessarily, existence is pure and devoid of anything other than the truth of existence, and infinite in the intensity of lightness and existence, and its truth is the same individuality and determination that it conceives of meaning, not of parity. He is the existence of atom and complement, united and simple. It is free from any kind of compound, and whatever is simple does not have the external components of matter and form, and because it is mere existence, it is also of no nature (Şadr ad-Dīn Muḥammad Shīrāzī, 1984: 55).

Therefore, it does not have the rational components of gender and season. Whatever sex and season have no limit on him, and whatever has no limit, there is no possible proof of his existence. Thus, "the essence of the transcendent righteousness is not an argument, but he is an argument over everything, and nothing is more conscious of his sacred nature. There is no evidence for him, and he witnesses everything, although the essence of the right is not arguable, it is forbidden to give proof of its meanings, meanings, nouns, and attributes since the attributes and nouns of the right are general concepts, which are generally definable. And their offspring are free" (Sadruddin Shirazi, 1360: 43).

The essence of atheism cannot be understood through the sciences of science, because we find it in the science of sciences through the making of the object and the making of the object in the mind into the object of science. If God can be understood through knowledge, that is, God must be divine, and when it comes to the nature of the essence of righteousness, the possibility of multiplicity is necessary, while we know that God is mere existence. If we come to the essence of divine knowledge, we have to imagine him in mind, and every mental being is wide and upright in mind, while God does not need latitude and space. On the other hand, since the science of possibilities of the essence of truth is a kind of science of the disability itself, no disability can be sensory or rational in its cause, and no one can encompass the essence of its cause as the cause encompasses the disabled essence and no disability It cannot, as the right of transcendence is aware of its essence, find the infinite essence of the right of knowledge. The ideas and

affirmations that come to mind are not sufficient for the knowledge of the right of transcendence and void. Mulla Sadra himself has pointed out that, like other scholars, he believes that the knowledge of the divine essence is impossible with knowledge (Sadr al-Din Shirazi, 1981: 3: 113).

What is meant by the knowledge of the divine essence is both the knowledge of the infinite and the infinite? Mulla Sadra's reason for this should be explained by the characteristics of the science of excellence and the characteristics of the burden of transcendence. Mulla Sadra considered the criterion of the ascension of science to be the difference between science and knowledge, that is to say, the difference between the qualification and the qualification. As has been said in ascetic science, there is always a form of the known in the mind, and the soul recognizes the transient in that form. In this sense, then, the only facts known as entropy can be thought of as being external as well as subjective as being in the mind. But what is external as its essence cannot be regarded as entropy, but necessary. It comes to the essence of being external by preserving its essence, that is, being external, to the mind, to become a mental being, or to change it when it is transmitted to the mind, which necessitates contradiction and revolution. Therefore, since it is obligatory for the transcendence of its essence, it cannot be transformed into another form of existence, that is, mental existence (Javadi Amoli, 2003: 183).

It can, therefore, be argued that neither knowledge of presence nor Acquired knowledge, the essence and truth are necessarily comprehensible. It can also be explained as follows: It belongs to the sensory perception of the world, and the intellectual perception of the world, so that the creature that is in a higher state than the creature, will certainly not be understood either by sense or by reason. For reason conceives the concept of existence, not the mere existence, and argues with its conceptual perception. In other words, reason dictates that there is a source which, if it was embodied in reason, would abstract the concept of existence from its essence, but that body is impossible. Reason in the field of fishes first rationalizes the abstraction and then abstracts the intrinsic conceptual meanings from it, thereby rationalizing the notion of abstract existence and then ruling that it has the original concept from which the abstraction is derived. In this case, if the obligatory is rationalized, a revolution will occur, because if the concept is conceived, it is placed in the subject, while the obligatory truth is the subject (Khosropanah, 2009: 317).

But in the other two areas, namely the domain of attributes and acts of transcendent transcendence, Mulla Sadra believes that it is cognitive. He believes that divine attributes can be recognized because they are associated with concepts (Sadr al-Din Shirazi, 2008: 17). Undoubtedly, this cognition is conceptual and a kind of cognitive cognition. These attributes are transcendent and exist in a single entity, and their difference is purely in concept. Since access to the Divine essence was impossible, it is impossible to grasp the truth of these attributes. But as we have said, in divine attributes we have concepts that we understand differently from each other because of their conceptual sharing. That is, we understand the meaning of science as meaning different from that of power, so we can apply these concepts to God as well.

An important point to keep in mind when applying these concepts is the difference between them. In other words, when we apply these concepts to God, we must bear in mind that God possesses these attributes, while others are not, and their knowledge is inferior to their essence. Mulla Sadra also finds it difficult and even impossible among all kinds of simile traits, except for the owners of insight (Sadr al-Din Shirazi, 2008: 1981; 2360: 23).

After regular recognition by attributes, cognition is by verbs, and Mulla Sadra considers this rank broad and likens it to a sea in which anyone can attain gems with genius. Verbs also fall into two categories: Verbs that are evident in the testimony world, and they are all understood, such as earth, sky, sun, sea, animals, plants, and the like. Second-hand is the actions associated with the unseen world, such as angels, spirits, spirits, and the soul. Among the verbs, the second-hand also implies the greatness and

majesty of God (Sadr al-Din Shirazi, 2008: 24). On this basis, it can be said that Mulla Sadra believes that God can be known by any being (Sadr al-Din Shirazi, 1985,143-153).

Although in this expression there is no difference between material and immaterial beings, as in the science of abstraction, abstract beings provide a better ground for cognition. Here again we see the role-play of the ontological basis of science and the causal relation of causality. The study of elementary and physical sciences is unique in feeling, imagination and reason. On the other hand, the truth of existence and mere existence does not fit within the mind and thought; in other words, the truth of existence cannot be rational. In discursive cognition, because human thought and reason have boundaries; when it reaches that limit, what can be gained in knowledge and knowledge is that it has a series of primordial possibilities that lack in it and It is obligatory and has attributes. That is why it is forbidden to think in the essence of God; "Think of the signs of God, not of his nature," "Whoever thinks of the nature of God, departs from his religion. Anyone who thinks about the attributes of right will be guided."

Knowing the attributes of God gives man more time to think about the truth. However, this recognition is a shadowy recognition of the truth and has its difficulties, so that some of the attributes are difficult to understand (Sadr al-Din Shirazi, 1985: 17).

But regarding the way of intuition in the knowledge of the right of Mulla Sadra, he believes that guidance to the right is through intuition because the Prophet is the transcendent being of the creature whose secret is due to the intensity of his emergence and the overwhelming illumination of his light and the weaknesses of his cause. Sensual and spiritual beings are all his works and effects. He is a witness to every case. Every look we have on him. This universe, which is the creator of all science and crafts, is similar to his own and cannot be found throughout the universe whose origin and truth are not in the realm of the essence of truth. All beings that have a limit of some kind and are intrinsic to the categories of essence and breadth are examples of righteousness; for example, the essence of the universe is an example of the essence of right and abstraction of its attributes. If the face of all things and their truth were not in the God *essence*, no creature would exist in the realm of being (Sadr al-Din Shirazi, 1981: 40-42).

3-2. Knowledge by the Presence, in the Knowledge of God

Knowledge by the presence, is not possible for anyone using reasoning, because the truth of the pure being never comes to mind, and the mental concepts are merely the essence and the mirror, not the essence itself. It should be acknowledged that, in Mulla Sadra's view, it is stated that by observation in person, God cannot be fully encompassed in the sense of being, since something is revealed to us through observation that it has some kind of relative existence. Being related to the present and the width is relative to the place and the subject or the impostor in comparison to the forger. Because the essence is an infinite being, it is never limited to the intuition of the being, and the status of the essence, the essence of oneness, which is referred to as the unseen or the unseen, is the position which is the name of the crown and the crown. This position is the richest position of the Animas (Sadr al-Din Shirazi, 1962: 205-208) and has no designation. It is a pure and pure existence in which there is no plurality or combination, not even bound, and because it has no boundaries, it destroys all definitions and concepts. In this position there is nothing in the truth about the essence of divinity, and the status of non-existence, annihilation, the collapse of all credentials, and the obliteration of all names and attributes. This secret identity of transcendence does not consider creatures either gracefully or forcefully. He is a secret who is immune from any form of appearance. The veil of light is not removed from the face of the essence of atheism. The sacred essence is the right of transcendence within the absolute and is the supernatural which is in no way the origin of derivation. It should be noted, of course, that the meaning of the unseen and the

abnormal is not that of the unseen and the abnormal which is opposite to the emerging, since this kind of abnormality is one of the attributes of right and the status of unity.

That is, the self is of divine names. So in essence, it is due to the use of backend and restraint because of the impossibility of language. An authority that no one has seen and cannot understand, certainly cannot speak. The essence of oneness is an existence which is pure of truth, nothing is mixed with it, it is the essence of beings, and it is because of the intensity of its emergence, its power and its transcendence that it is out of human understanding and mind. At this time, the masses can find no perception, both in and out. He is the utter unseen and the utterly unseen, and since the names and attributes of truth are all the keys of the unseen world, we inevitably turn to his attributes and attributes to know the truth, to the same extent every creature as much as enjoys the manifestation and light of God. It is capable of knowing the attributes of right. Possibilities are weak and flawed and they have veils. Certainly their perception is as defective as it is and not complete. Therefore, it is only the right itself that can fully know itself, and its essence is not known to man (Sadr al-Din Shirazi, 1962: 116-119).

Here, Mulla Sadra's argument is necessary to prove the existence and knowledge of God; He identifies the seekers of argument in three categories: the first group to prove the existence of truth as proofs of movement, assumption and possibility. They are stopped mid-way and cannot finish. A second category is a group that has come up with the creation of the right or the proofs of the possibility of poverty and the existence of the right. A third group is a group that, by the truth, comes from the right to right and does not need to meditate on the non-essence of the right, this method is the science of the person. In the face of science, there is no need to mediate other than to know one's essence, attributes and actions. This is a great way of knowing God. This argument requires no further introduction than the mere existence of existence, as the verse of "The One and the Only Martyr of Ali" refers to the fact that our Lord is above all visible and recognizing everything in need and need. Belonging to witnesses is right. He argues that Seddiqin Argument is the most perfect way for messengers to know the essence and attributes (Sadr al-Din Shirazi, 1984: 46).

Results

In epistemology, Mulla Sadra has often used the term science. According to Mulla Sadra's knowledge, science has been divided into two kinds of presence and circulation, though he believes that science is a simple and indivisible thing. Mulla Sadra on the one hand believes in the role of nature and the heart as an intuitive way of knowing God and on the other hand he believes that all beings are righteous verses and in each of them we see God.

Therefore, the purpose of knowing God is innate and knowing Him. It is important to note that Mulla Sadra's views indicate that he does not regard the cognition of the essence of transcendence with transcendental and perceptible knowledge and argues that it is the sensory perception of the human world and the intellectual perception of the universe, Therefore, the creature, which is higher than the creature and the order, will certainly understand neither sense nor reason. But in the two domains of the domain of attributes and acts of transcendence, Mulla Sadra believes that it is cognitive. He believes that divine attributes can be recognized because they are associated with concepts and that cognition is conceptual and kind of cognitive. These attributes are transcendent and exist in a single entity, and their difference is purely in concept. After regular cognition through traits, cognition is mediated by verbs, and Mulla Sadra considers this rank broad and wide. It should be acknowledged that in Mulla Sadra's view it is stated that God cannot be fully understood through in-person observation, because something is revealed to us through observation that it has a kind of relative and relative existence. The essence of atheism is an existence which, for the sake of truth, we inevitably turn to the knowledge of its attributes and attributes, in which every creature is equally capable of recognizing the attributes of truth to the extent that it has the

manifestation and light of God. Possibilities are weak and flawed and they have veils. Certainly their perception is as defective as it is and not complete. So it is only the right itself that can fully know itself, and the essence of it is unknown to man. In the case of the knowledge of God, Mulla Sadra puts forward the argument of the Siddiqi in which he divides the seekers of the argument into three groups, the third group being those who, by virtue, ie, coming to the truth through righteousness, do not need to meditate on the non-essence of righteousness. The method is the same as face science. In the face of science, there is no need to mediate other than to know one's essence, attributes, and actions. He argues that Seddiqin Argument is the perfect way for messengers to know the essence and attributes.

References

- Askari Soleimani Amiri. (2001). *Irrefutable Criticism of the Existence of God*, Qom: Qom Publications Book Publication Book.
- Ghobadzadeh inspired. (2014). *The Possibility of Knowledge of the Infinite God from Thomas Aquinas and Mulla Sadra*, M.Sc. Department of Theology and Philosophy and Islamic Theology, Faculty of Humanities, Yasuj University.
- Hassanzadeh Amoli. (2001). *Al-Esfar al-Arba'a*, Volume 2, Qom: The Book Center Institute of Print and Publishing.
- Hekmatpour, P., & Burns, T. J. (2019). Perception of Western governments' hostility to Islam among European Muslims before and after ISIS: the important roles of residential segregation and education. *The British journal of sociology*.
- Hosseini Saraei, Mojtaba et al. (2007). *Mulla Sadra According to Us*, Tehran: International Publishing Company.
- Javadi Amoli, Abdullah (2003). *Exhaustion*. Qom: Al-Zahra Publishing Center.
- Javadi Amoli, Abdullah. (1989). *Transcendent wisdom*. Tehran. Al-Zahra Publications.
- Khosrowpanah, Abdolhossein; Panahi, Azad. (2009). *Sadrian epistemological system*, Tehran: Institute for Islamic Culture and Thought.
- Mustafa. (1391). *A comparative study of the possibility of knowing God from the viewpoint of Ibn Sina, Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra*, Master's Thesis, Department of Theology and Philosophy and Islamic Theology, Faculty of Humanities, University of Sistan and Baluchestan.
- Sadr al-Din Shirazi, Mohammad. (1410). *Al-Hikma al-Mutalliyyah at al-Asfar al-Awliya al-Arba*, Beirut: Dar al-Haya al-Arabi.
- Sadr al-Din Shirazi, Mohammad. (1976). *Al-Maadi and Al-Ma'ad*, edited by Seyyed Jalaluddin Ashtiani, Tehran: Association of Wisdom and Philosophy.
- Sadroddin Shirazi, Mohammad. (1962). *The evidence of al-Rubaiyyah in al-Menahaj al-Sukliya*. With the edges of Molla Hadi Sabzevari and the correction of Jalaluddin Ashtiani. Mashhad: University Publishing Center.
- Sadroddin Shirazi, Mohammad (1981). *Al-Asifar al-Arba*, Beirut: Dar al-Ahaya al-Thar.

- Sadroddin Shirazi, Mohammad. (1961). *Three Principles*, Corrected by Hossein Nasr, Qom Theological Seminary.
- Sadroddin Shirazi, Mohammad. (1962). *Al-Arshia*, text correction, and translation by Gholam Hossein Ahani.
- Sadroddin Shirazi, Mohammad. (1964). Translated by Badi al-Mulk Mirza Emad al-Dawlah, al-Machair, by Henry Carbon, *Displaced: The Tacori Library*.
- Sadroddin Shirazi, Mohammad. (1985). *Al-Mazaher al-Allahiya in the secrets of al-Alum al-Kamaliyya*. Translation and suspension of Seyed Mohammad Tabibian. Tehran. Amir Kabir.
- Sadroddin Shirazi, Mohammad. (1985). *Commentary on the Holy Quran*, Corrected by Mohammad Khajawi, Qom: Awake.
- Sadroddin Shirazi, Mohammad. (2008). *Al-Mazaher al-Haleed fi al-Asrar al-Alum al-Kamaliyeh*, edited by Seyyed Mohammad Khamenei, Tehran. Sadra Wisdom Foundation.
- Wali, Hamideh. (2004). *A Study of the Proof of God from the Perspective of Mulla Sadra and Rumi*, MA Thesis, Department of Theology and Philosophy and Islamic Theology, Faculty of Theology and Islamic Studies, University of Qom.
- Zinli, Ruhollah, Najafzadeh, Alireza. (2016). *The Principles of Mulla Sadra in Proof of the Multiplicity of God-knowing Knowledge*, *Journal of Philosophy and Religion*, Volume 13, Number 3, p. 533-552.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).