



Vol. 14/ Issue: 32/ autumn 2020

**Mulla Sadra's Evaluation of Suhrawardi's
Eschatology**

Received date: 2020.06.13 Accepted date: 2020.06.27
PP.148-168

DOI: [10.22034/jpiut.2020.40314.2587](https://doi.org/10.22034/jpiut.2020.40314.2587)

Simin Mowlaie

PhD student of Philosophy at Islamic Azad University Yadegar -e- Imam Khomeini (RAH) Shahr-e-Rey Branch, Tebran -Iran

siminbirgani@gmail.com

Mohsen Garavin (corresponding author)

Assistant Professor Imam Khomeini Higher Education Center Tebran -Iran

alirezagharavian@gmail.com

Mehdi Najafiafra

Professor of philosophy at Central Azad University, Tebran, Iran

prof.m.n.afra@gmail.com

Abstract

The present article explains and analyzes the impact of Suhrawardi's eschatology on Mulla Sadra's philosophy and Sadra's critical evaluation of it. In this research, we have tried to explain and analyze Mulla Sadra's critiques of Suhrawardi's thought about identity, celibacy, self-occurrence, self-survival, and post-mortem souls, and in general, relatively clear pictorial resurrection from Suhrawardi's position in the philosophical system. Let's present Sadra. In this research, we first try to explain and analyze Suhrawardi's eschatology theory in the form of concepts such as the abstraction of occurrence, survival of soul, and finally the state of soul after departure from the body, and then the effect of Suhrawardi's resurrection on Mulla Sadra's thought. We explain and at the end of Mulla Sadra's critiques of Suhrawardi we evaluate and show that most of Mulla Sadra's critiques on the most important issues of Suhrawardi's eschatology do not seem logical. Here, too, we have tried to provide the reader with a fairly accurate analysis of this subject by remaining faithful to the texts of both philosophers and using the opinions of the commentators and experts of these two thinkers.

Keywords: Eschatology, Self-Survival, Reincarnation, Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra

Introduction

Criticizing any philosopher's or thinker's opinions would make it possible for sophists and scholars to avail from other's findings to promote their own awareness and awareness. This would therefore be conducive to the formation of direct mental bond between philosophers and their predecessors to experience an intellectual challenge as a result of critiques intellectual confrontation. Suhrawardi has not only criticized the viewpoints of Peripatetic philosophers, but also has taken advantage of their standpoints in developing his own theories. Mulla Sadra had the same story as well.

We can say that the intellectual and theoretical dialogues among philosophers further shaped their intellectual richness. The main focus of this article is to investigate what the characteristics of Suhrawardi's and Mulla Sadra's resurrections are and what how does Suhrawardi's resurrection influences Mulla Sadra's resurgence philosophy and then finding out how Sadra's appraises Suhrawardi's resurrection? However, we know we are not able to construe this subject in this article; we will try our best to cast reasonably enough light on the issue. Indubitably, there are numerous related researches published in Persian in this respect that the inquirer of this study has not lost sight of for commendation and has availed from as the point of research reference. Needless to say that that there has been limited studies on this issue outside of Iran out of which Herman Landolt's new research is worth mentioning. In his article entitled "Towards Resurgence: Mulla Sadra's Critique of Suhrawardi's Resurrection" (2017), he pointed out that Henry Carbon's interpretation of Sadra's critique of Suhrawardi's resurrection is influenced by Heidegger's death. Nonetheless, what differentiates this article from previous studies is that, firstly, no qualitative comparison has been made between Suhrawardi and Sadra's resurgence, hence this is quite necessary for understanding the two philosophers' standpoints, and secondly, the Mulla Sadra's critiques need critical analysis and interpretation, and almost none of the previous studies have focused on the issue, however the inquirer has particularly criticized and evaluated Mulla Sadra's critiques in this research.

Suhrawardi's standpoint regarding Self- occurrence or self-survival

The issue of self-occurrence and self-survival of soul is one of the significant issues of philosophical sophistry that can be the preamble to resurrection. Most philosophers have attempted construe the concept rationally and solve its intricacies. There are two main standpoints among philosophers regarding self- occurrence or self-survival: Plato and his followers believe that self-occurrence emanates from occurrence and survival (Plato, 1988, vol. 4, pp. 2357 and others, vol. 1, pp. 514 and 388) and Aristotle and his followers, as well as Suhrawardi believe that self-occurrence emanates from accident of human body. We know that self-occurrence and precedence is one of the esoteric issues of philosophy and one of the inherent complications of existence and their explanation cannot be fulfilled in this article, however, when we construe occurrence here, we pinpoint here the temporal or time occurrence not intrinsic occurrence. Temporal occurrence is construed as when some like a pen did not exist at some point in time and then came into existence or being, and therefore when it is said that soul is accidental or fortuitous, it means that there was a time when soul did not exist and when we say that soul is accidental, we mean that there was not a time when soul did not exist.

Light and occurrence

Suhrawardi assumes light to be the question of philosophy, and evidently it should be said that Suhrawardi does not associate "light" with the concrete light outside, but brings it

into play in its general sense and therefore maintains that light refers to some that "appears or occurs" and is either "enlightening" or "revealing" (Walbridge 2005: 217). Such a standpoint designates that all lights are of two kinds: some are crystallized lights, and some are not. The second type of light is called absolute light, or self-occurrence light or lights that emanates from itself or other than itself which can be of two types: adverse to matter and adverse to the abstract. Matters that are not light by nature are of two types, either independent of a place or dependent. The first type is termed as the submerged essence, and name it limbo and body. The second type is called the residue of darkness. (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 2, pp. 107, 108, 117 and 118)

The uniqueness of abstract light from Suhrawardi's standpoint is: sole light emanates from the body and is not tangible. It has no direction. Since light stands on itself, and emanates from itself, it is intangible and imperceptible, so it is abstract and undermines its essence so is alive. (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 2, pp. 107, 117, 121 and 138)

Human orator soul is a sole light that can only reside in individual and incomplete bodies because of its flaws. The link between the orator soul and body is not of causal nature. Orator soul is nurtured by the body, and soul is subdued by the body, hence soul feeds the body;

(Translated from Arabic); "The built-in soul is soul which permanently resides in the celestial body and the non-permanent soul resides in the human soul (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 1, p. 463)

The nature of human soul is the transcendental light of Cairo or the master of species that requires soul to control the intermediary universe. Suhrawardi believes that not all masters of species need prudent light; however the dominant masters call for mediators to control the intermediary universe. As an illustration, the human-type master, the Gabriel or the clairvoyant, needs the orator soul and the prudent light, the absolute universe power, to manage the body. This master of the universe creates soul and body in an exceptional and infallible form in terms of awareness. (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 2, p. 146)

As Suhrawardi's asserts, the occurrence of soul is adjunct to the occurrence of body, and soul occurs when a particular spirit, fitting human soul, emerges and remains (Suhrawardi, 2009, p. 227). Suhrawardi provides several reasons to approve of his belief, and therefore the acceptance or rejection of which is part of philosophical interpretation:

1. If soul exists before the formation of body it can be either abstract or compound; both of these assumptions seem not viable since, at the outset, if they were integrated, everyone must be aware of the state of others. Secondly, it is impossible for an integrated entity to be detachable after being created. Souls before incarnation cannot be compound because their peculiarity is either due to passion and flaw or vague span. Obviously, the first perspective is unfeasible since the extent of passion and flaw is inestimable, and the second perspective is also impracticable because the vague span is specific to the universe of events, movements, and matters, while souls do not live in the universe of matters.

2. If souls transpire, they need to pass through the universe of pure light, and since the universe of light is unchanging, souls stay unaffected. In this case, at the outset, it is useless that souls revive in the bodies, and secondly, since each soul is not in essence superior to the other, so all souls do not outnumber the bodies. Body precedence to a particular soul is a matter of the materialistic universe.

3. If souls transpire, two postulations are plausible: Firstly, some prudent lights do not reincarnate in any body in any form or shape. The tenet requires a rational process of creation indicating that the creation of human is vain and useless. This is completely preposterous.

Second, all modest lights transpire the body. The insinuation of such a tenet is that there has been a time when all such lights were transpired in the bodies. The prerequisite of such a tent is that there is no diffuse light for the ensuing bodies. This is also preposterous.

4. There is no end to the incidents of the universe, and reincarnation is also negated and rejected. Based on the earlier two prologues, if orator souls exist before the body, they should

have infinite dimensions in the universe of intellects as well as the universe of metaphysics, because each infinite soul needs a cause in its crystallization to be different from other souls, and there would be cause for another cause. So this leads to a series of never-ending causes and effects in the universe of light. The crystallization of such a reign is not viable in the universe of light, so souls are the effect of the body as the cause. (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 2, pp. 200-203; *Homo*, 1388, pp. 228-231)

Mulla Sadra; The materialistic aspect of occurrence and the mysticism of survival

Mulla Sadra has approved of the accidental nature of soul and is in line with Suhrawardi's standpoint, but he does not approve of its immateriality, and he proposes a new theory termed as the materialistic nature of occurrence and the mysticism of survival, which by nature criticizes Suhrawardi's views.

Mulla Sadra acclaims that the problem of the occurrence or incidence of soul is basically false, since he assumes that the human soul is by nature materialistic as it transpires to the body, therefore soul is not spiritual and discrete, however soul has the capacity to grow to be spiritual, as he asserts, soul is "the materialistic nature of occurrence and the mysticism of survival." Mulla Sadra rejects those who regard human soul as abstract by nature (Mulla Sadra 1391, pp. 346-347; *Homo*, 1383, vol. 8, p. 354; *Homo*, 1382, p. 95).

Mulla Sadra assumes that the conception of soul comprises three stages: the first stage is the conception of soul, which comprises the embryonic stage of the fetus, in which the fetus is only a seed like a plant but with the capability of becoming an animal which is the distinguishing feature of human soul from other souls. (*Ibid.*, 1383, vol. 8, p. 186). We can conclude out of Mulla Sadra's words that by "materialistic nature of occurrence" he refers to soul at the plant stage and before that which is the absolute materialistic stage of being and then he reaches perfection in seed or plant form. He also adds that:

(Translated from Arabic) "Our awareness of the human soul has progressed from the image into the image and from perfection to perfection, it has not been initiated in the creation of the materialistic origin, which is connected with the invented images and from it to the plant and seed, p. 461).

There are two reasons for the materialistic nature of soul: The first reason is that the plant soul is taken from matters in the conception stage and the other reason is that because intrinsic nature of soul belongs to the human body and therefore this possession feature approves of its materialistic nature which is prevalent throughout human mortal life. As Mulla Sadra asserts, the essence of soul, since it belongs to body and its essential form, its occurrence is ongoing like other sensory forms, therefore soul is materialistic and its nature is abstract when it reaches perfection and when it unites with the intellect (*Ibid.*, 1999, p. 193). The second stage, the animal stage, from birth to adulthood, involves voluntary movement and is different from that of other animals in a way that the human soul can reach the human status, whereas other animals stay in the animal status. Soul therefore becomes divine and then survives (*Ibid.*, 2004, vol. 8, p. 401) The third stage is when the orator soul turns into the rational soul and acquires rational shrewdness (*Ibid.*, 1999, p. 193 and the same, 1383, vol. 8, pp. 402-403). Mulla Sadra asserts in this regard that;

"(Translated from Arabic) the materialistic universe is the existence of existence, there are only rational beings that do not need to be present in the body and condition and capacity. The capacity of the body is not inherently inherent and survival, but it possesses if there is no existence, it is their existence and survival is the limit of its existence. The paths to the beginning are active in the physical truth of occurrence and the spirituality of survival" (*Ibid.*, 1383, vol. 8, p. 450).

Mulla Sadra disapprove of the first reason using a number of rationales. Mulla Sadra's first critique reasonably questions the first part, i.e., if souls existed before the creation of the body, they should be integrated and distinct, because if awareness means instrumental consciousness, such reasoning is not required, and if Suhrawardi's standpoint indicates that

awareness means non-instrumental consciousness, such reasoning is required. However, we do not go through the integration of all such assumptions in it because awareness of soul of its very nature is the common feature and therefore they do not need instrumental consciousness to perceive primates.

Mulla Sadra's second critique rejects the second rationale which holds that if soul existed before the body it should be disintegrated. Mulla Sadra disapproves that souls have disintegrated essence, however their unity is more like the apparatus of one thing with rational integrity because to some philosophers rational gems do not exist except by the mediation of feeble and harsh effects and consequently souls do not have identity before possession to a body.

Mulla Sadra's critique of Suhrawardi's second reason is that soul does have an essence in the universe of logic and a different essence in the universe of matter. Soul is pure and unobtrusive in the universe of logic, and therefore it has its own evolutionary process, however there are various virtues for soul to be obtained through the body, so being possessed by the body is not in vain since God determines the gain. Mulla Sadra questions Suhrawardi on why he accepts its unchanged ascend from the universe of matters to the universe of logic, however he refutes its descent in another place. Mulla Sadra comments on this part of Suhrawardi's views that he is not superior based on the nature of soul-to-body stipulation. He asserts that the existential identity of each soul belongs to a body, so every soul belongs to the body, not every soul to each body and each soul to a particular body. (Mulla Sadra, 1391, pp. 348 -359)

In his third reason Suhrawardi asserted that if soul self-occurred, some prudent lights should not occupy a body by any means. The precursor to this assumption is that in the universe of logical creation should be the creation of futile and useless creature which is by nature the denial of the philosophy of creation.

To criticize this reasoning, Mulla Sadra claims that we can conceive soul in two forms. First, soul as being separate from the body, since it is in fact detached, and that not possession to body does not mean lack of existence, second, if soul by nature does control the body, then it should be denied.

Mulla Sadra's second critique governs any time and any soul and asserts in this respect that if Suhrawardi's interpretation of time means limited time and of all souls, it does not entail his speech, however if time is interpreted as of all times and of all souls, the improbability is not required, since timelessness and existence of all souls are quite probable (Mulla Sadra, 2012, pp. 360-362).

Mulla Sadra's critique of Suhrawardi's fourth rationale on the occurrence of soul asserts that if soul is not accidental, it should appear in infinite aspects of differentiation. He adds that the existence of soul in the universe of logic is at variance with the existence of soul in the universe matters and the infinite souls are actualized in this universe logically and this will define its logical existence. Such infinite power is intense within the infinite influence and actuality, and such a thing is probable, however it is improbable based on the principles of logic (Mulla Sadra, 2012, pp. 363-364).

Abstraction of soul according to Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra

One of the most important issues of soul is whether it is abstract or concrete. Such a view is of great importance firstly because of inquiring the existence or non-existence of the dooms day and life after death; and that if soul is abstract, there is life after death, otherwise the answer is No, and secondly, man's honor over other creatures is tied with being abstract, hence Ibn Sina asserts that: "Man's honor has roots in two notions: soul and the intellect, both of which are concrete by nature, quite contrary, they come from the universe of metaphysics and abstraction (the Alawis), the Shia school of thought indicating that soul and

the intellect possess the body but do not reside in the body, and that such notions cannot be restricted by time and place, and whose influence regulate the body to be in order" (Ibn Sina, 1984, p. 85). Celibacy is therefore to be materialistic but to stand against the concrete and concrete is anything that is materialistic or relates to matters. There are two types of matters:

1. The core essence or *anima*, which is the mere clout and acceptance of the presence and is nothing but the ability to accept the presence, and 2. The ensuing essence, which is by nature the body that turns into the second essence for the presence according to divergence as Suhrawardi stated. Therefore, concrete is anything that is physical and material, and by material we mean the features that are attributed to the body, such as divergence. Consequently, what is called abstract (abstract) essence if does not have a body or is not tangible. There is a deep-seated and fundamental disagreement between Ibn Sina and Mulla Sadra about the celibacy of soul being stated here as. "...as a general rule, the erudite state that the abstract is purely divine and not unified with matter. For example, souls and intellects are abstract, that obviously intellects are purely abstract, whereas souls are inherently and existentially abstract, however in action, they both are possessed by matter" (Sajjadi, 1982, p. 528).

From the standpoint of Suhrawardi, the plant and animal soul is concrete and the only rational soul is abstract in existence and survival, and therefore plants and animals are destroyed by death, and even an embryo which has not yet possessed soul would be destroyed by death just like plants and other living organisms. The orator soul is naturally detached from the matter, but needs matter to function, therefore soul needs the body to do what it intends to, and the bond between soul and the body is like a captain and a ship, in which the captain controls the ship.

Mulla Sadra also believes in three forms of souls: plant, animal, and human souls. Quite contrary to Suhrawardi's doctrine, he regards all souls as to be of bodily occurrence nature. The plant soul is concrete and it never becomes abstract. The animal soul is first concrete and transpires by means of spiritual movement into concrete-exemplary soul and finally turns into absolute exemplary soul. The orator soul is by nature concrete and then via spiritual movement turns into concrete-exemplary soul and in the next phase into absolute exemplary soul and finally into exemplary-rational. (Mulla Sadra, 1383, vol. 8, p. 347). In his works, Suhrawardi has discussed orator soul and its abstraction and has provided several proofs for such abstraction, which can be found in the works of his successors.

Immortality of soul

Conceivably, the strongest human inclination is to become immortal, whereas it is more horrifying to feel that one will perish completely by death. Many scholars and philosophers have sought to prove the man's immortality, and these were the philosophers who have painstakingly endeavored to find logical reasoning's. Philosophers have done their utmost to clarify which human souls will remain immortal and if so, do they lose their nature or turn into the intact soul.

Suhrawardi assumes that soul is will not vanish after the body decays, neither will it die out by other factors, nor souls will disappear by fusion, and then every individual's soul will remain intact and eternal. However, from Mulla Sadra's standpoint, absolute departure of soul from the concrete or exemplary body and reaching abstract intellect will not be potentially probable for all human beings (Mulla Sadra, 1383, p. 451). In our life, our soul belongs to the concrete body and our soul controls the body, however it belongs to the exemplary body in the universe of limbo and controls it. If soul passes through this universe and turns into the potential intellect, soul no longer belongs to the body. At this stage, soul loses the capability to turn into the potential intellect and therefore reaches actuality, and such actuality is the abstract intellect (Mulla Sadra, 2004, vol. 9, p. 232). At this stage, soul will step into fusion

and multiplicity, and such a multiplicity like that of the intellect, is the rational and individual multiplicity, since soul has returned to its cause and should have its elements.

Suhrawardi accepts immortality of all human souls as true and believes that soul does not vanish by human death and is immortal like its creator. Soul occurs with the occurrence of the body, but it does not perish with death, because its natural cause, that is, the active intellect, remains forever, and the effect remains as long as its cause exists. (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 2, p. 22)

Suhrawardi brings forth several proofs to approve of the immortality of soul (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 1, pp. 81-80; pp. 297-496; Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 222; Homo, 1388, p. 237 Ibid., Vol. 3, p. 65; p. 169 168 Ibid., Vol. 4, pp. 81 80; pp. 119-120; p. 235) that can be narrowed down into three reasons: The first one is to prove through the survival of its cause, the second one is through its minimalism and the third one is through its physical and non-physical nature.

(Translated from Arabic) "And soul remains after the body, and from what is closest to us, it needs: that soul is a non-printed essence, which is different from the body, and because of it the body remains, and it has no body with it except the interest of passion and the interest of the extra and the extra. Therefore, the invalidity of the body is the cessation of the moral turmoil, and the invalidity of soul is due to the invalidity of that, which is extravagant, but the essence is strengthened by the existence of the weak, which is extra, and it is impossible." (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 1, p. 496)

"Given that soul is free and is the essence of diversity, hence for the concrete the negation of its essence would be absent; and, as a general rule, between death and life, cessation of interest brings about difference, and the interest itself is terrestrial, and the negation of the superfluties and the essence is not required; "Therefore, the presence of the cause is everlasting, and the capability of the body, though owing itself to soul, should not be conducive to the negation of soul." (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 3, 366)

As Suhrawardi attests, the bond between soul and the body is the connection of passion and excess, and the absence of this bond has no impact on them. Among Suhrawardi's various proofs, only two are credited by Mulla Sadra. He has not independently dealt with soul survival and in numerous occasions in *Asfar* (Healing through diversity) he embarked on construing and criticizing the views of Ibn Sina and Fakhri Razi (Mulla Sadra, 2004, vol. 8, pp. 380-388). Here are the two reasons Mulla Sadra has contemplated deeply and evaluated as:

Suhrawardi delineates souls as the one which exists by itself and whatever perishable should have the potential to annihilate, and since soul is abstract and is liable in every respect and since in an integrated entity survival and annihilation cannot exist together, then soul will not perish and stays intact:

(Translated from Arabic) "Soul is actually existing and they are the actual ones, and all of us reject it, but it has the potential of evaluation with the power of proof and the unifying soul, and it is as if it is in reality" (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 1, p. 80). »

Mulla Sadra delineates Suhrawardi's first argument as: Soul exists in reality and it is immortal and there is no potential in it to lead to its annihilation. Those things with the essence of matter and form will exterminate, and that matter is the agent of devastation and the form is the agent of survival, and since soul is plain and has no potential to annihilate, it survives. What is capable of being mortal and immortal like the bearer of material forms and departure are perishable, however soul is by nature abstract and has no potentiality. The body only carries the possessions and then governs of soul. By carrying soul, the body is prone to temperament, and with the decay of the temperament, the bond between body and soul will break.

The second Suhrawardi's evidence being construed by Mulla Sadra is: abstract light means that soul is not perished after the decay of the body because the abstract light does not negate itself or else it would not exist at all. The cause of the abstract light, i.e., the light of

power, does not wipe out it out, since it remains stable, soul is not shattered (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 2, p. 222). Mulla Sadra approves of soul immortality, but except for admitting the proofs of others and criticizing the evidences by Ibn Sina and Fakhr-e Razi, he does not provide a new proof in this regard (Mulla Sadra, 2004, vol. 8, pp. 380-396 and vol. 5, p. 289).

Mulla Sadra assumes soul to be the body of occurrence and considers it impossible to be abstract in time of occurrence because he presumes that it is impossible for the orator soul to be created before the body (Mulla Sadra, 2004, vol. 8, pp. 331-332) and on the other hand the body cannot be preferred to soul. If soul is abstract (Ibid., Vol. 8, pp. 374 and 384-385; Ibid., 1341, p. 41), then it occurs with the occurrence of the body and it must be materialistic.

Soul is coupled with the body after occurrence, not of a concrete permutation type, but as a blend of soul and the body. In this permutation, soul is the form of the body and is mingled with it. In other words, soul is the body and the body is soul. The body needs soul in its recognition and soul also needs the body in its actualization and emergence of its identity.

(Translated from Arabic) "The body needs to be researched to soul, not to the particular, but to the absolute and soul is deprived to the body, not from the point of view of the absolute truth of the intellect, but from the point of view of the existence of the individual and the occurrence of the identity of soul." , 1341, p. 41)

This bond causes the existence of soul to lead to the existence of the body and vice versa, and then after the departure of soul from the body, what is left over is not the same body, it is a different cadaver. In short, the body is body as long as it carries soul and soul remains soul if is carried by the body. (Ibid., Vol. 8, pp. 382-383).

Mulla Sadra delineates types of possession and then casts lights on the type of possession soul and body own. Types of possession are: 1. Possessing to another is either in nature or in existence. If it belongs to existence it is either dependent or independent. 3. If it is independent or possessed by another, such as the need of one essence to another or as the need for breadth to essence. If it is like the need of one essence for another or it needs both in occurrence and in endurance 5. Or it needs it only to occur 6. Or it needs it only to evolve. (Mulla Sadra, 2003, vol. 8, pp. 379-384 and also Mesbah Yazdi, 1996, pp. 193-197)

Mulla Sadra considers the sixth type of possession to be the weakest one and does not consider the bond between soul and body as an illustration. (Ibid., Vol. 8, p. 381) and considers the bond between the two as an instance of the fifth type because, he assumes that soul needs an indistinct essence in its creation, which is the body. (Mulla Sadra, 2003, vol. 8, p. 382)

According to Mulla Sadra, the human soul is primarily material, then material-exemplary, and then absolute exemplary, and in some individuals it elevates to rational exemplary.

(Translated from Arabic) Mulla Sadra claims that "it is for souls after this natural origin that the last ones are among the average animal origin between the intellect and the nature, and the last is the rational origin. The first plant breath; It is purely material, after which it becomes a nominal and sensitive moving above the will (exemplary material), and in this evolution it may reach the material exemplary level of reason (Mulla Sadra, 1341, p. 41).

Mulla Sadra believes that the existence of soul gradually elevates from the material to the abstract. This movement of matter is peculiar to mankind, and it is the man who can elevate to the highest level of existence from the lowest.

(Translated from Arabic) "The human soul does not have a known position in the spirit and it does not have a certain degree of existence in the existence of other natural, psychic and rational beings, all of which are known to the position of the human soul. The universe of other forms "(Mulla Sadra, vol. 8, p. 398)

Mulla Sadra illustrates the cause and effect of soul and the body in such a way that soul is an actuality with different levels and the body is the lowest level of soul and soul is the highest level of the body. Each time one affects the other and the effect is conventional (Mulla Sadra, 2004, vol. 4, pp. 269-271)

Mulla Sadra assumes all beings to pass through three longitudinal stages: material, exemplary, and intellectual. These universes of existence all share the same principle of existence, and the differences have got roots in the principles of their existence.

The universe of matter or nature, the lowest level of existence, includes elements, inanimate entities, and plants. The universe of exemplary or imagination or imaginary forms is abstract from matter and potentials of matter. The universe of absolute intellect and abstraction or the universe of rational forms and divine resemblance is the highest level of existence.

(Translated from Arabic) "The products of universes and things ... are limited to three ... they are the universe of natural images ... the universe of perceptual images is abstract from matter ... If these three are left with their survival in person, then man is one from the beginning of his childhood, who is natural and is considered a human being. And the resurrection and to the carnal limbs and he is the second human being, then he transmits from this who is also gradually graduating to the intellectual and he is considered a rational man and to the rational limbs and he is the third human being" (Mulla Sadra, 2003, vol. 9, pp. 317-318).

Mulla Sadra supposes that these three universes are manifested in human beings and man is a naked truth with a scale similar to the universe.

Degrees of souls after death from Suhrawardi's standpoint

One significant issue in the debate of the resurrection is that to what level of spirituality humans will elevate after death and what would the reward of each individual be as balanced with the level of spirituality and general why it is this way. To Suhrawardi, human beings pass through various levels after death, and he has also illuminates the cause of each change of levels. He has two standpoints on the degrees the human beings will pass through after death: one in his book of *Knowing the Divinity* (Yazdan Shenakht) and the other in the book of *Wisdom of Enlightenment* (Hekmat Eshragh). In Yazdan's discourse, Suhrawardi ranks the cognition of souls on the grounds of theoretical and scientific awareness and defines them as: "A pure simple one who does not have theoretical and practical awareness like soul of children and idiots who neither enjoy nor suffer after death, since they are neither attached to this nor to that universe" (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 3, 438).

Second, the simple impure soul, unaware of the divine universe and not eager to reach God, and attach to this universe after death, remains attached to mundane and mortal affairs, and because of the detachment with God, such a soul will suffer. These souls gradually get out of this state and reach the status of simple pure souls (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 3, pp. 439-438). Suhrawardi does not give an example for such a spiritual rank.

The third is not a total simple and pure, with theoretical and practical awareness. After death, it joins the universe of spiritual intellect and essence. Such a soul has certain awareness and good deeds, hence; it is immortal in the presence of God and enjoys it so much so that not be capable to being detached from God. (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 3, p. 439). These groups are souls who are brimmed with happiness in awareness and practice (Shahrzuri, 2001, p. 603).

Fourth, the simple and impure soul, which is mundane, but besides doing good deeds, it suffers the sin, and thus suffers from dreadful pain after death, because one way round they do not have absolute discernment, and on the other God and physical pleasure are what they love. Hence the torment of detachment from their bodies is unbearable. They do not stay in this state and gradually get out of it and reach spiritual bliss. (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 3, pp. 441-442). They are the mediocre and their place in the universe is exemplary. (Shahrzuri, 2001, p. 601).

Fifth, simple, incomplete, pure souls who, on the one hand, have a desire for excellence and purgation but have not yet attained it, and after death there is a desire in them, and on the other hand, they have not reached the beloved one, therefore, they suffer a great deal of pain, and they must seek refuge in God to ease the pain. (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 3, p. 442).

Sixth, imperfect, defective, and impure souls who, with little awareness, have strong body desire and mundane affairs. In addition to suffering like the previous group, this is a pain they have to endure because of their love for the body after death. The suffering caused by the desire for universely affairs will disappear after a while. (Suhrawardi, 1373, pp. 443-442).

The description and explanation of the levels of souls in the wisdom of enlightenment also has more depth, along with Mulla Sadra's words in explaining and criticizing the levels of souls with the contents of the wisdom of enlightenment.

The classification of souls in the Wisdom of Enlightenment has been described and explained with special care and copious restrictions, and it seems that his synopsis is composed on this ground. In this book, he describes five classes of souls and in Yazdan's treatise as six.

In the Wisdom of Enlightenment, Suhrawardi attribute awareness and experience of individuals to the rank and level of souls. Accordingly, souls are either 1. Perfect in awareness and experience, or 2. Imperfect in both, or 3. Average in both, or 4. Perfect in imperfect awareness in practice, or 5. Perfect in practice and imperfect in awareness (Suhrawardi 1373 ʃ 2 ʃ P 226-230; Shahruzi 1380 ʃ S 469)

Before discussing Suhrawardi's standpoint regarding the level of spirituality, we ought to refer briefly to the levels of matters as expressed by Suhrawardi.

From Suhrawardi's standpoint, all subjects; from God to the lowest creature, should first be divided into light and darkness, and each of them into substance and transcendence, because everything is either light itself or darkness. What is light itself, or whether it is independent of another, is the first pure and abstract light, which comprises the human and celestial minds and souls. The whole universe of human intellect and soul and the constellation are abstract light. Light that is not upright is oblique light. Lights are of two kinds: those groups that are attached to objects such as sunlight, etc., which are added to the essence of these things, and groups that are exposed to abstract light, such as light moves bottom up. What is itself dark or needless of place, which is the essence of the essence of the body, or that darkness of the body for another, which is the body of darkness by itself.

Suhrawardi stresses that the universe has several stages according to this: Nour Al Anwar. The lights of Cairo, which are of two categories: a- The lights of Cairo (longitudinal). B- Anwar Cairo transversal, lord of all kinds or sorts or like Nourieh; Like Plato. Anwar Modbareh soul of the human and constellation 4. The universe of exemplary, suspended images and the universe of abstract ghosts. The universe of purgation or the universe of immersion of the essence, purgation and body. Considering such a definition, soul is discussed from Suhrawardi's standpoint. Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 2, pp. 121 and pp. 138-142 and pp. 145-146 and pp. 211-213)

Suhrawardi calls the first group as the utterly or absolutely happy group in awareness and practice, who travel in the universe of light after death, because they are not defeated by filthy deeds, i.e., anger, imagination, lust and illusion, and their desire for the universe of light is greater than their desire for the universe of purgation. The more they are merged into their virtues, the more their light is increased. (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 2, pp. 222-223; Suhrawardi, 1388, pp. 252-253)

As Suhrawardi asserts, while these perfect souls in this universe are united with their bodies, the unification process, they also find intellectual unity with light and light after death. This unification does not mean to be united with lights because such a thing is not viable. The reason for the impossibility of such unification is that two things never become one, so whether one or both are destroyed, then two things do not befall one. In addition to the impossibility of unification of two entities, we know that in the abstractions of union, there is no integration and completion because these three characteristics belong to that body and the abstractions are not corporeal. Therefore, the distinction of souls is a kind of intellectual differentiation that each soul achieves due to self-awareness and awareness of its lights and

illuminations, as well as the type of possession in the body. (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 2, pp. 229-228; Suhrawardi, 1388, pp. 257-258) After the unification of souls, because of the impact of Qayyumi- Tames light (a steady and intense light) that eradicates all attachments and egos for from such individual, establishes a theological connection with the light and the supreme values, and reflects the truth, and disappears in the light and reaches spiritual bliss (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 1, p. 502).

In short, after the separation, the entire soul goes to the universe of Anwar al-Qahir, and accordingly, the number of Anwar al-Qahir, that is, the same sanctities, continues indefinitely (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 2, p. 236; Suhrawardi, 1388, p. 263)

The second group is the mediocre in awareness and practice and the third group is the ascetics. They are introduced to the universe of maxims, the suspension of which is manifested in some of the higher elevations”

(Translated from Arabic) "Al-Sa'da from the mediocre and al-Zahad from the purified have entered the world of proverbs, which are manifested in some lofty heights." (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 2, 230-229; Shahrzuri, 1380, p. 601).

Suspended forms are different from the Platonic allegory since, like Plato, there are lights in the universe of rational light, while these suspended figures are in the universe of ghosts, some of which are dark for the unfortunate and some of which are light for the happy. The pleasing images of the happy are the white and the tormenting forms of the miserable black and blue.

(Translated from Arabic) "Suspended images are like Plato, they are like Plato, a fixed light, and this is like a hanging pendant of darkness, and from it is a document for the slain on those who are suffering from the dead ovary and the love of gold" (Suhrawardi, 1373, 133, vol. 2, p. 320)." 2, pp. 320-and 331).

These souls reach physical happiness because the manifestations of these faces are constellations and souls of the mediocre and the ascetics remain in the eternal heavens. Hence they can have delicious food and brackish faces and good songs for themselves. 2301; Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 4, p. 237; Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 3, pp. 73-72).

The fourth group is sinners and transgressors that Suhrawardi has not mention them in the wisdom of enlightenment about life after death and did not provide any explanation of such souls. Hence, his opinion may be found in his other writings.

He mentions in Lamhat that the awareness elevates this group to the apogee and sin will lead them to the lowest levels of the universe and therefore they are in torment and maybe this suffering will gradually fade away (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 4, p. 237). These are in fact the same simple, unfinished, unclean souls mentioned earlier in other works by Suhrawardi.

The last groups are the miserable and the malicious souls, who after death as the Holy Qur'an assert "kneel around the hell" and "become lifeless in their lands". From Suhrawardi viewpoint, after death, they will enjoy only shadows of suspended forms (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 2, p. 230). He implicitly expresses the same unfortunate fate and states that they belong to the objects under the moon and above the fire, and that this belonging causes them to have horrible delusions and fantasies. (Suhrawardi, 1373, vol. 1, pp. 89-91)

Mulla Sadra's critique of souls after death from Suhrawardi's point of view

Mulla Sadra's critique on Suhrawardi's views regarding the first category of souls after death is worthy of reflection. His first and foremost critique is that Suhrawardi believes that soul of the faultless souls becomes pure and abstract intellect after death and is detached from the purgation and darkness, and such a thing is impossible because intellect and soul are inherently different from each other. Others are differentiated, and it is impossible for nature to be transformed from one to another, hence; how can man, as an element, become an abstract intellect? Obviously such a thing is unfeasible (Mulla Sadra, 2012, p. 474)

Mulla Sadra himself defines the concept differently. Mulla Sadra claims that soul becomes a rational substance due to the essence movement and the attainment of certain truths and assertions, and from the stage of the evil intellect to gnome intellect and then from this stage to genuine intellect, and finally becomes active like intellect and with the development of practical and theoretical intellect. Sinister and animal traits disappear and soul reaches the sacred intellect (Mulla Sadra, 2012, p. 481)

In Asfar, Mulla Sadra integrates the existence and delight, and since existence has degrees, delight, which is the awareness of existence, has degrees as well; therefore, the existence of God is the most perfect existence, and his perception is also the most perfect bliss.

(Translated from Arabic) "The corruption of soul and its perfection is the existence of the abstract independence and the conception of the intellects and the awareness of the truths of things upon us and the observation of the intellectual matters and the enlightened essences; And do not compare these pleasures to the source of the senses from the insatiable pleasures" (Mulla Sadra, 2003, vol. 9, p. 173)

Passing through the material universe and reaching the intellects, soul is reunited with God and His works, and this is the state of paradise and spiritual resurrection.

(Translated from Arabic) "The paradise of meeting and the paradise of refinement bears fruit for the full realization of awareness" (Mulla Sadra, 2003, vol. 9, p. 131)

Mulla Sadra's second critique on Suhrawardi's statement is that perfect souls after death, because of their awareness of nature, light and enlightenment, are intellectually distinguished from one another. Mulla Sadra states that the distinction of souls is not due to the awareness of their essence or light, but because of their existential position. In this universe, man goes through stages and reaches a rational stage, and in this stage, he finds the distinction of perfect souls as the existential level of each, not the awareness of the essence (Mulla Sadra, 2012, p. 485).

According to Mulla Sadra, in this life, soul belongs to the material body and controls it, and in the purgatory, it belongs to the exemplary body and controls it. If it passes through this universe and reaches the actual intellect, it no longer belongs to the body. At this stage, it loses the power to become the actual intellect and reaches actuality, and its actuality is the same as pure intellect and at this stage soul has diversity and its multiplicity is like diversity. Minds are a sort of shrewdness because soul has reached its origin and must have the attributes of origin. (Mulla Sadra, 2003, vol. 9, p. 232)

Mulla Sadra's third critique of life after death of the faultless is based this statement by Suhrawardi that the number of Anwar al-Qahir, that is, the holy ones, continues to the abyss of infinity. From Mulla Sadra's perspective, such a statement is perverse because the difference of light or if it is relentless and feeble, it is impossible to be infinite and if it is due to rareness and consequences, it is impossible again because the two things that differ in characteristics are united and souls in this universe are determined by deeds. And after death, they souls reach the status of reason and leave these belongings, so it is still impossible for the diversity of any kind to be infinite. In short, from Mulla Sadra's stance, the universe of intellect cannot be elevated to reach infinity (Mulla Sadra, 2012, pp. 561-562)

It was mentioned that the second group of mediocre souls in awareness and practice and the third group are Ascetics and their place in the universe after death is like suspension. There are dangling images in the spirit universe, some of which are dark for the unfortunate and some of which are light for the fortunate.

This group of souls attains bodily happiness because the manifestations of these forms are constellations and souls of the mediocre and Ascetics remain in the eternal heavens. These souls can create pleasant, ugly, and painful faces and enjoy and build on the properties they have acquired in this universe; an immaculate soul in awareness and practice joins the light, and soul that is not dependent on the body reaches the bliss light.

Mulla Sadra criticizes the denial of the exemplary universe from Ibn Sina's stance and considers it as a kind of reincarnation. The peripatetic, rejecting the universe of exemplary or the abstraction of purgation, cannot explain the congregation of the average human souls. The average souls are those who do not reach celibacy and excellence, as a result of which they do not have intellectual resurrection, and conversely, they do not return to the material universe.

Ibn Sina asserts that after detaching the body, these souls are resurrected in the celestial body and perceive the details with the celestial body, like life in this universe, where they perceive the details with the body and see the partial reward of their deeds through these perceptions. If they have a good end, they will meet fairies and elves, and if they have a bad end, they will meet a snakes, scorpions, and fire. According to Ibn Aflak, they have understanding like human beings. (Ibn Sina, 1989, vol. 1, pp. 428-429, pp. 114-115 and also the same, 1379, p. 696)

Mulla Sadra states that their answer is incorrect and asserts that such an answer means the acceptance of reincarnation because soul has been transferred from an earthly body to a celestial body and such a transfer is exactly the reincarnation and all the arguments that reject reincarnation, reject such a transfer. (Mulla Sadra, 2003, vol. 9, pp. 51-53)

Mulla Sadra accepts Suhrawardi's view on the resurrection of the commoner and ascetic souls and is based on such a concept and view; Suhrawardi and other eleven principles of resurrection elucidate and approve of physical resurrection (Mulla Sadra, 2012, pp. 510-516)

Overall, Suhrawardi's opinion has criticisms which are discussed hereinafter.

Mulla Sadra's first critique of Suhrawardi in this respect is that there is no causal, situational, or natural connection between souls and constellations that are the manifestation of suspended forms. Soul can then use the constellations as the subject of its imagination in the creation of pleasant and painful images, which is a bond between soul and the constellations, and since there is no such bond, they cannot use them. Another critique that is fairly related to this critique is why a particular soul should be associated with a particular crime and not with another. In addition to the two critiques, it must be argued that how limited crime can be perceived by souls as infinite, and since such a thing is not possible, such a topic is irrelevant. (Mulla Sadra, 2003, vol. 9, pp. 44-45)

Mulla Sadra's other critique is that the objects and forms of this universe, whether elemental or constellation, are changing and do not have permanence and stability, and therefore the last forms that have permanence and stability cannot be based on these objects and its forms, and basically such a thing It is impossible. (Mulla Sadra, 1391, pp. 517-516)

In Mulla Sadra's standpoint, the mediocre who are deprived of the true awareness but have refined their morals and have done good deeds on this basis, after death, see the befitting reward of their deeds in the universe; if they are good, their deeds symbolize in the form of good elves and fairies, and if they are evil, they symbolize in the form of snakes, scorpions, etc., like what one has in a dream, which is sometimes pleasant and sometimes a terrifying dream.

Mulla Sadra assumes that all such phenomena occur in the universe of exemplary for the mediocre, not in the heavens. He says that if there were no such universe, these souls would have perished because they 1. Have not reached the level of actual intellect, so they do not reach the territory of intellect. 2. Their presence in the celestial body is an example of reincarnation and reincarnation is negated, and 3. Their body is also disintegrated on earth. The world of exemplary is a world between the world of intellect and the world of matter. (Mulla Sadra, the same, p. 154).

To approve of his opinion of Ibn Arabi, Mulla Sadra affirms that the forms of the Hereafter, which cause the delight of the blessed and the suffering of the unfortunate, are neither in the constellations nor in other bodies, however are the images of the human soul itself (Mulla Sadra, 2003, vol. 9, pp. 44-45; Mulla Sadra, 1362, pp. 430-432). The last category,

as mentioned, is the miserable and malicious ones, who, according to Suhrawardi, after death will have only shadows of hovering faces and are possessed by the objects under the moon and above the fire, and this belonging causes them to have horrible delusions and fantasies. Mulla Sadra also criticizes the second and third categories on this category and believes that souls are successful or deprived of dreadful image. (Mulla Sadra, 1382, vol. 9, pp. 47-49).

Suhrawardi's true view on reincarnation

There is no consensus among commentators and scholars as to what Suhrawardi's true opinion is about reincarnation. Qutbuddin Shirazi assumes Suhrawardi as the one who denies reincarnation and says that contrary to the surface meaning of Suhrawardi's words, he did not approve of reincarnation:

(Translated from Arabic) "And the righteous gold - on which he recites apparently and he does not believe in its authenticity, as he sees - until the interest of the middle-aged people from the forearm is transferred to the celestial bodies and the lovers to the animal corpses. Shirazi, 1379, p. 458)

In opposition to Qutb Shahruzi, he sturdily introduces Suhrawardi as the reincarnation of religion and says:

(Translated from Arabic) "And Shaykh Qarr in the book and the choice of the religions of reincarnation of my religion says that it is permissible to reincarnate from the human body to the bodies of the animals that are permissible to transfer some to some of the plants and minerals" (Shahroozi, 2001, p. 520)

Shahrzuri considers the tendency to reincarnation to be from any sage and considers it an all-encompassing religion that is not peculiar of Suhrawardi:

(Translated from Arabic) "And the wealth of all the virtuous sages is the same as this opinion (O reincarnation) from Persia, Babylon, Greece and Greece." "They say that the perfect souls is immortalized after the physical separations in totality ... The perfect ones who are not perfect will not be liberated in their entirety, but their interest will be transferred to the celestial forbidden and the lovers to the animal corpses." (Shahrzuri, 2001, p. 520)

Shahrzuri himself has reincarnated religion and specified it.

In opposition to Qutb and Shahrzuri, Mohammad Sharif Heravi assumes that Suhrawardi is hesitant between accepting or rejecting reincarnation and has not preferred either one over the other, and considers believing in reincarnation to be practice by Ishraqis: "Animals other than humans do not have the talent to accept the light of Cairo ... and since the author does not believe in proving or denying reincarnation ... and therefore, he said that it is not obligatory." (Heravi, 1363, p. 160)

Mulla Sadra expresses the same opinion as well about Suhrawardi's real stance on reincarnation and asserts that Suhrawardi was hesitant about the validity of reincarnation and did not firmly reject or accept it. (Mulla Sadra, 1391, H2, p. 347)

Suhrawardi does not seem to have taken a firm stance on the impracticality of reincarnation because he rejects reincarnation in an implied and controversial manner, but Haykal al-Noor turns away from tormenting sinners, and such rage can be realized in reincarnation. In the Wisdom of Enlightenment, he equates the views of reincarnates and deniers with it, and states that whether reincarnation is right or wrong, because the arguments of both parties are fragile, hence this indicates that he has no tendency towards either of them and is confused between the two.

Suhrawardi has accepted that the limited light in existence and survival depends on its creator, and since its creator eternal, soul does not perish with the decay of the body. This light is the indicative of how and to what extent it is purified by the acquisition of practical and theoretical wisdom, or how it is perfected in them, or how it remains mediocre or perfect, and in the other it is incomplete, or vice versa, or it remains imperfect in both.

If he is perfected in acquiring practical and theoretical wisdom, he will reach delight and after death he will go to the universe of light and intellect. The mediocre reaches moderate delight and after death they go to the relative exemplary universe. The relative exemplary are both dark and luminous to all. Delightful exemplary is the place of the mediocre, and relative exemplary is the place of the miserable and the unfortunate, and therefore it the reincarnation of this category is like the relative exemplary, and they will suffer there.

Mulla Sadra's critiques of Suhrawardi over reincarnation

Mulla Sadra delineates various forms of reincarnation and says: "We conceive reincarnation in various forms: First, soul in this universe is transferred from one body to another, whether this transfer from the existing body of Ashraf (human being) to the existing body of Akhs (low creature) or vice versa which is impossible and forbidden. The second type is the transfer of soul from the earthly body to the heavenly body, which is appropriate to the attributes and morals it acquired in this universe, and such a soul will appear in the Hereafter as an animal in which its attributes have prevailed, and this is a problem which has been proven by the great scholars and sophists who discover by intuition. This has also been proven that such notions are narrated from the lords of the laws and religions of nations, and for this very reason they have said: There is no religion in which reincarnation has no great influence (Mulla Sadra, 2003, p. 341). The possessive reincarnation approved by Suhrawardi considers the transfer of a soul from one body to another impossible, either descending or ascending, and gives reasons for the accuracy of its words (Mulla Sadra, 2012, pp. 435-436; Homo, 2003, vol. 9, pp. 3-5 and 10-30).

Mulla Sadra's first criticism of Suhrawardi is that the cause of soul's possession to the body is its inherent belonging attribute and its existential poverty, and this beginning has been made to prove the accuracy of reincarnation (Mulla Sadra, 2012, p. 441). Suhrawardi asserts that due to his special talent, which is subject to the light of soul, he seeks the light of soul. (Existence of discreet light and rational soul in the body is the desire of the body itself) and for this reason, for enlightened light with the body, there is love and affection, and enlightened interest in the body is due to its inherent poverty and its view of its superior is due to its light. . » (Suhrawardi, 1987, pp. 218-216).

From Mulla Sadra's stance, if the reason for soul's belonging to it can be justified in another way, we will not fall into the trap of reincarnation. Mulla Sadra's second critique of Suhrawardi is that all human actions with his body are possible because such an interpretation is itself the prelude to devaluing reincarnation; Soul is given to the body due to the need to reach perfection, and the best body is the human body, and if soul does not reach the desired perfection in this body, it is transferred to the appropriate body based on its acquired character (Mulla Sadra, 2012). P. 441)

In this regard, Suhrawardi adds: "The body is the manifestation of actions and the hub of light and the container of deeds and the abode of the forces of light; and when the dark forces of the body are fascinated and fall in love with the light of the universe, it hangs on him in love and draws him from the universe of pure light to his universe and attracts him, so the enthusiasm of the universal soul is cut off from the universe of pure light and therefore belongs to darkness. The human body (in the system of nature) has been created so completely that the light of the universe execute its actions. " (Suhrawardi, 1987, pp. 218-216)

Mulla Sadra's third critique pinpoints Suhrawardi's remarks that the submerged essence (Ghasiq) is inherently eager for orator light. According to Mulla Sadra, this is an eloquent statement because the body and its forces and the submerged essence cannot perceive light and because they do not comprehend, they do not have desire because desire is the same as perception (Mulla Sadra, 2012, p. 443).

Suhrawardi adds in this regard: "... because the submerged essence is by nature eager for the incidental light to appear, and conversely, it is eager for the abstract light to contemplate him and be revived by it, the embedded essence because of the poverty that is in its influence, the (material) is eager for light, just as the poor is eager for the unwanted, so any kind of creation that overcomes the light of the universe and any kind of dark body in which it becomes rich and the light of the universe to it he adheres, it will cause his interest, after the annihilation of his body, to be transferred to a body of base animals that is suitable for that body of darkness "(Suhrawardi, 1987, pp. 218-216)

Mulla Sadra's fourth criticism of Suhrawardi is that Suhrawardi believes that only soul is imparted to the human body and no temperament deserves such. Mulla Sadra himself prefers human spirit over other jokes, but accepts that other spirits can also seek the proper form with him based on the direction of unity and avoidance of contradiction, and God (creator of the form) gives it such an appearance. Accordingly, this statement that is imposed only on the human disposition of soul and does not enter into any spirit of the animal soul is a false statement (Mulla Sadra, 2012, p. 446)

Mulla Sadra's perspective over reincarnation

Before putting forth the eminent proofs over reincarnation, Mulla Sadra in a short prologue considers reincarnation as one of the great slips of humans which has led him off the track and has led to the denial of the resurrection. He stresses that that one of the causes of error is that in Quran and Hadith and in great words such as Plato and Socrates, there are words that speak of reincarnation, but these words have an appearance and an inwardness that expresses the same heavenly reincarnation. (Mulla Sadra, 2003, vol. 9, p. 3)

Mulla Sadra divides reincarnation into property and kingdom, and considers civil reincarnation impossible and kingdom possible, and believes that properties can meet exemplary bodies with divine eyes. The body itself makes a paradigm of itself (Mulla Sadra, 1987, p. 342; Homo, 1378, p. 8) To Mulla Sadra,

(Translated from Arabic) "Because the issue of transmission is very suspicious of its exact behavior, and that is why it became famous among people that the ancient philosophers, with their ranks in wisdom, spoke of reincarnation, and what was said about it was attributed to them as a pure fabrication for us, based on suspicion between the cramming of human souls and their reincarnation." (p. 26)

Mulla Sadra adds a third type to the types of reincarnation in the book Evidences of Al-Rububiyyah, and it is the metamorphosis that occurs in two ways: internal and external. Internal metamorphosis occurs as if someone is outwardly a friend but is secretly your bloodthirsty enemy. External metamorphosis is that someone outwardly resembles an animal as a result of sin:

(Translated from Arabic) "That reincarnation is conceived in three ways: And secondly: the transfer of soul from this body to the other universally body is suitable for its attributes and morals, acquired in this universe and manifested in the hereafter in the form of overcoming its attributes ...; And the third: we disfigure the inner and change the appearance from the face ... and but the transformation of the inner image without the appearance (Mulla Sadra, 1981, pp. 233-232)

It was said that among these three types, the first type is impossible. Before restating the reasons of his predecessors, Mulla Sadra gives a proof called the face of the throne which

indicates that this evidence is the result of light radiation in his soul and not the result of his intellectual effort.

First, Mulla Sadra states that the bond between soul and body is an intrinsic, natural, and existential one because the existence of soul and body are interconnected, and therefore the excess of soul and the body is not a transverse addition, unlike Ibn Sina, who considers its bond as oblique. Second, Mulla Sadra reflects on the blend of matter and form to be a unified abstract permutation, not a concrete one. Accordingly, the body of matter is for soul and soul of the face is for the body. Third, Mulla Sadra believes soul to be the concrete of occurrence and the spirituality of survival, because the material body is elevated by the movement of matter and eventually becomes abstract and detached from the body. Fourth, in substantial movement and elevation, it is not possible to go backwards because the verb does not return to power naturally, in part, deliberately and by accident.

On the basis of the above four tenets, soul that is abstract never returns, and therefore such a soul, because it is actual, will not be resurrected with a potential body. The abstract soul does not return to the universe after detachment from the body to enter another human or animal body or another plant and concrete, and therefore reincarnation is negated. (Ibid., p. 3-7).

One of the drawbacks of the assumption which holds that human spirit is the atom is that human as (Ashraf), the central purpose of the universe, demands a more eminent and superior soul, and a perfect soul is one that has passed from the plant and animal and is transferred from the plant and animal body to the human body. This is reincarnation.

Mulla Sadra adds that the human soul is an occurrence caused by occurrence of the body; In other words, as soon as the body occurs, soul also occurs in the same stage of human semen (seeds) and embryo, unlike the peripatetic ones, where soul occurs when the body is complete by nature. Soul is perfect and complete in the stage of semen with innate and continuous perfection and reaches the plant stage and then the animal stage and then the stage of celibacy and humanity. This process of perfection is continuous, not discrete, occurring both in the body and in the existing soul.

From Mulla Sadra's stance, such a hypothesis about matter and form; the body and soul are inaccurate, and the accurate explanation is that inherent perfection occurs in the body and soul, and in the meantime matter does not remain constant, and that it is said that matter is the substantial movement of the matter is false, for the reason that substantial motion does not require a fixed theme. What supports a stirring unity is the bond and the flow of its development. There is no detachment of faces, but the faces are interconnected, because every face that pursues a face is the one that has become more complete, and in short;

“He is worn after wearing because he is worn after khula”

The reason for the inaccuracy of the post-disguise cover is that no natural subject can assign its natural verb to another subject matter because it is impossible to transfer the natural subject matter from one natural action to another with the disappearance of the subject of the verb; For example, being the form of semen that has a natural verb in semen cannot give this verb to another, but in Ibn Sina's thoughts, the subject assigns his natural verb to another. Covers after departure are in oblique transformations, not in substantive transformations. For example, in evaporation, the face of being water becomes a vapor.

(Translated from Arabic) "The human soul is the event of the occurrence of the human temperament from which the man and the fetus reach it until it reaches the human order, which is the degree of the plant and the animal on which the natural perfection is formed and the fruits are formed and the fruits are formed on the sides of the material. The creation of creation - as if you were frozen, then plants, then animals, then human beings are on this aspect, which is not the position of the republic - from them they are after corruption and corruption after that from the image to the image of the one who has left behind whom you have left behind. In the material to the natural last act, the analogy of the inclusion of the

actions of the chosen ones in a abstract position in their industry and how the transfer of the natural action from one of the natural actors to the other is possible. 1382, vol. 9, p. 19).

Another issue that Mulla Sadra raises under the title of reincarnation is the issue of the universe of exemplary. Suhrawardi, though accepting the universe of exemplary, has not been able to explain the unification of the mediocre human souls. The mediocre souls are those who do not reach celibacy and perfection, as a result of which they do not have intellectual resurrection, and on the other hand, they do not return to the material universe.

After leaving the body, these souls are resurrected in the celestial body and perceive the details of celestial body, like life in this universe, where they perceive the details of the body, and through these perceptions they receive a partial reward for their deeds. Conversely, they see the snails if they are bad, they see snakes, scorpions and fire. According to Ibn Aflak, they have understanding like human beings.

Mulla Sadra considers such answer incorrect and asserts that such an answer is to approve of reincarnation because soul has been transferred from an earthly body to a celestial body and such a transfer is the crystallization of reincarnation and the rejection of all the arguments against reincarnation.

In Mulla Sadra's standpoint, the mediocre souls which are deprived of the true awareness but have refined their morals and have done good deeds, after death, see the reward of the deeds they have done in the universe befitting those deeds; If they are good, their deeds are represented in the form of fairies and elves, and if they are evil, they are represented in the form of snakes, scorpions, fire, etc., like what one dreams of is sometimes a pleasant dream and sometimes a terrifying one.

According to Mulla Sadra, all these phenomena occur in the universe of exemplary for the mediocre, not in the heavens. He adds that if there were no such universe, these souls would have perished because they 1. Have not reached the state of potential intellect therefore they will not reach the universe of intellect 2. Their existence is tantamount to reincarnation, and reincarnation is denied, 3. Their bodies are decayed on earth. The exemplary universe or the transitional universe exists between the universe of intellect and the universe of matters. (p. 154).

Explanation of Death

According to Suhrawardi, death is the detachment of soul from body. When the breath leaves the body, the body can no longer provide its analyzed substance and replaces it with new substance. In this case, the bond between soul and body disappears because the temperament, the center of the moderation of the elements, loses its restraint. (Suhrawardi, 1373, p. 168)

In a nutshell, when the body is decayed, death comes. The reason that the cause of death is the decay of the body is that everything in this universe is composed of matter and form, and soul of the body is also composed, and as long as the composition is not damaged, soul uses the body to fulfill its desires, which is called soul. If it leaves the body, it is called soul, and the body is the body as long as it is connected to soul. When the bond is broken, it is called a corpse. According to Mulla Sadra, death is a prolongation of the evolutionary movement of soul that enters from one intoxication into another. (Mulla Sadra, 2003, vol. 9, pp. 31-33) According to him, death is of three types: 1. Natural: the soul becomes independent of the body and moves from one intoxication to another. 2. Asthma: A death that soul leaves the body as a result of an accident such as murder or illness. 3. Intentional: It is a death that happens by killing the desires of soul for the sake of soul. (Ibid., Pp. 16-18).

In natural death, Mulla Sadra does not accept Suhrawardi's view and discovers a new aspect. The cause of natural death is the independence of soul from the body; the detachment of soul from body is due to soul reaching perfection, and the perfection of soul is the same

as reaching its ultimate goal, which is celibacy and abstraction. Soul needs body and when it is abstract, it becomes self-sufficient and free. Mulla Sadra further discusses that all moving matters are in motion, and soul is not an exception. Soul gradually moves from matter to abstraction with the movement of matter, and separates from matter and reaches abstraction. The more abstraction the soul experiences, the less interest it shows to body. When soul reaches celibacy, it does not need the body and the body is decayed. Suhrawardi's reasoning is inefficient in a way that it disregards the return of soul. Soul, when has reaching celibacy, leaves the body, not when the body is decayed, the soul is detached and gone.

(Translated from Arabic) "And the sentence most of the people when they did not understand in the soul this reactionary movement, which is the journey to God, which we have proven in most of the foundations, they mentioned unflattering faces in the wisdom of death, and in what we have shown the occasion appears in giving the natural term to this death without what they mentioned and ... » (Mulla Sadra, 1382, c.9, p. 66)

Resurrection from the standpoint of two philosophers

There are various theories about the resurrection: Some believe in a corporeal resurrection and deny any spiritual resurrection. Suhrawardi assumes soul as abstract and holds that after death the restoration of body with the same features is unfeasible and soul is transferred to the universe of abstractions and detachments after death and experiences resurrection. In Mulla Sadra's view, the one who considers the resurrection to be exclusively spiritual is as short-sighted as the one who considers it to be exclusively corporeal, because man is composed of soul and body, and not an angel who is only spiritual, not animal and solid. This man, composed of the two, does good deeds with these two in this universe, and it is liable to be punished for each of them to be rewarded and punished according to their deeds.

Conversely, man has two dimensions: materialistic; the body and its partial forces and abstract; Soul and its intellectual powers. Believing resurrection in one of these dimensions is tantamount to shutting down properties. Suhrawardi, who believes only in the spiritual resurrection, commands the closure of most souls because many souls do not reach complete intellectual celibacy, and therefore there should be no reward or punishment for them. Mulla Sadra's critique of this theory is how those who have low morals and misconceptions and do not enter the rational level will suffer. (Mulla Sadra, 2003, vol. 9, p. 237)

Mulla Sadra articulates his peculiar views on the resurrection after delineating various views and criticizing them. To explain his standpoint properly, he mentions principles that are either necessary or useful for the bodily resurrection. The principles he states are; 1. Originality is non-existent, not nature, 2. Existence is the criterion of individuality, not transcendence, 3. Existence is skeptical 4. Essence movement, 5. The objectivity of everything is as it is, 6. The integrity of soul, 7. The individuality of the body is soul, 8. The abstractness of the imagination, 9. The Absence of Imaginary Perceptions, 10. The quantitative and formal forms and the body of mass are sometimes created with the emergence of matter and sometimes without the participation of matter, 11. The universe has three levels: matter, exemplary, and reason.

From Mulla Sadra's standpoint, man faces the other universe and his mortality has his afterlife in his sleeves. This mode of existence, that is, the transformation from material transient intoxication to the hereafter intoxication, is exemplary for all souls, whether to be believers or infidels, monotheists, polytheists, or atheists. The ultimate perfection of man is to reach the universe of intellect and get closer to God, not exemplary celibacy. Some souls are imprisoned at the purgatory level between this universe and the hereafter when they leave the universe, and for a while they cannot elevate higher, however they elevate with a cause. Mulla Sadra believes that if a person is not misunderstood and has no mental illness and is

not biased, he will find that it is the body and soul that are reunited. Evidently, the body has experienced exemplary celibacy and its soul has composed an exemplary body based on the bodies, ethics, and properties, not the body of a material element. (Chapter 11, Chapters 1 and 2).

Conclusion and evaluation

What can be concluded from the above discussions is that Suhrawardi considers soul as a casual being that occurs with body, and Mulla Sadra also asserts the human soul as the occurrence and possession of earthly bodies and the spiritual nature when it survives; i.e., the materialistic nature of occurrence and the spirituality of survival. Mulla Sadra first criticizes Suhrawardi's evidence and said that some of those critiques seemed right and some wrong, and secondly the alternative theory, namely the materialistic nature of occurrence and the spirituality of survival, does not prove to be true because soul is soul when it is not physical and has perception. In addition, this theory is incapable of explaining the integrity of souls in the concrete sense of the rational stage. Regarding the abstraction of soul expressed by Suhrawardi's and Mulla Sadra's critique, it can be said that Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra consider soul as abstract, but Mulla Sadra's interpretation of the abstraction of soul is different from that of Suhrawardi. Suhrawardi has provided several proofs for the abstraction of the narrator's soul, which Mulla Sadra has criticized; and it was stated that some of those criticisms are included and some are not, but regarding Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra's critique of soul survival, it can be said that both philosophers believe in the survival of soul and have given various reasons for its existence, i.e., virtuousness. In this regard, he has accepted and tried to complete it, and finally, regarding the levels of soul's elevation after death from Suhrawardi's standpoint and Mulla Sadra's critique, we can also briefly point out that none of Mulla Sadra's critiques of Suhrawardi about human levels of elevation after death seem solid. Although different on the surface, the theories by Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra seem to converge by nature. However with respect to Mulla Sadra's critiques of Suhrawardi on the issue of reincarnation, Mulla Sadra's criticisms on Suhrawardi do not seem to have solid grounds and we can say that there are still unanswered questions in this regard. Regarding death, it can be said that their theories are in the same boat because neither of them is evidence-based, and one has no logical superiority over the other.

References

- Akbarian, Reza (2003) *Mulla Sadra is the transcendent wisdom in the four intellectual journeys*, 9th volume, corrected, 1st edition, Islamic Wisdom of Mullasadra foundation, Tehran, (in Persian)
- Avani, Gholamreza (2004) *Mulla Sadra is the transcendent wisdom in the four intellectual journeys*, 1st volume, corrected by Mr., 1st edition, Islamic Wisdom of Mullasadra foundation, Tehran. (in Persian)
- Ibn Sina, Hossein, (1984) *Origin and Resurrection*, Tehran, Institute of Islamic Studies of McGill University with Tehran University's cooperation, (in Persian)
- Ibn Sina, Hossein, (1989) *Explanation of signs and warnings*, translation of Mr. Hassan Malekshahi, Tehran, Soroush Publication. (in Persian)
- Landolt, Hermann (2017) "Being-Towards-Resurrection?: Mulla Sadra's Critique of Suhrawardi's Eschatology," in Sabastian Günther and Todd Lawson, with Christian Mauder (eds), *Roads to Paradise: Eschatology and Concepts of the Hereafter in Islam*, vol. I Foundations and Formation of a Tradition: Reflections on the Hereafter in the Quran and Islamic Religious Thought, Leiden: Brill, pp. 487–533
- Mahmoudabadi, Mohammad Hossein Dehghani and. Jalili, Ali Mohammad Mir (2014)'Investigating Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra's approach to reincarnation" *Quarterly Journal of Rational Education*, Fall and winter of 2014. <http://maarefaqli.nashriyat.ir/node/728> (in Persian)

- Mazhari, Nayereh Seyed (2011) "Review and critique of Suhrawardi's resurrection in the light of transcendent wisdom", *Contemporary wisdom*, Second year, spring and summer of 2011. http://wisdom.ihcs.ac.ir/article_1294.html (in Persian)
- Mesbah Yazdi, Mohammad Taghi, (1996) *Description of the 8th volume of the four journeys* (1st Component), research and writing by Imam Khomeini educational research institute, Qum, 1st edition. (in Persian)
- Mulla Sadra, Sadreddin Mohammad, Sadr al-Mutalahin (2012) *comments on the explanation of the wisdom of illumination*, 2nd volume, research of Seyed Mohammad Mousavi Bayegi, Tehran, Hekmat Publication, 1st edition. (in Persian)
- Rahimpour, Forough Alsatat and Zare, Fatemeh (2013) "The fate of the human soul after the death of the body in the thought of Ibn Sina, Suhrawardi and Mulla Sadra", *Ensan Pazboobi Dini Scientific Research Quarterly*, 10th period, No.: 29, summer and fall of 2013. <https://www.sid.ir/fa/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?id=205122> (in Persian)
- Sajadi, Seyed Jafar, (1982) *Culture of Rational Sciences, includes Philosophical, Theological and Logical Terms*, Tehran, Islamic Association of Iranian Wisdom and Philosophy Publication. (in Persian)
- Shirazi, Ghotbeddin, (2000) *Description of the Wisdom of Illumination*, with cooperation of Mr. Abdollah Nourani and Mr. Mehdi Mohaghegh, Tehran, Motaleat Islami Institute, (in Persian)
- Sohrevardi, Shamseddin Mohammad (2001), *Description of the Wisdom of Illumination*, corrected, research, and introduction by Hassan Ziyaiee Torbati, Tehran, Institute of Humanities and Cultural Studies Publication, 2nd edition. (in Persian)
- Suhrawardi, Yahya ibn Habash, (2009) *Wisdom of Illumination*, translation of Mr. Fathali Akbari, 1st edition, Tehran, Elm Publications. (in Persian)
- Suhrawardi, Yahya ibn Habash, (1994) *Works of Sheikh Isbraq*, 4th volume, corrected by Mr. Najafgholi Habibi, 2nd edition, Tehran, Pazhooheshgah Ulum Ensani Publication, (in Persian)