Durham E-Theses

Mulla Sadra and the mind-body problem: A critical assessment of Sadra's approach to the dichotomy of soul and spirit

Abdulaziz Daftari

How to cite:

Use policy

Introduction

The soul has been the subject of great controversy since the dawn of civilization. This is because its existence has been questioned in many periods during history especially among philosophers. Studying the works of some scholars from Ionia which is the birth place of Greek philosophy[1] and also the view of some philosophers such as Anaximenes[2], Heraclitus[3] and Anaxagoras[4] about the soul shows the extent to which the issues of the soul have caused diversity of opinions.

There are many arguments for and against the existence of the soul, however in this writing we do not intend to explain those arguments. Nevertheless man faces a number of main questions such as: Where do I come from? Why have I come to this universe? Where am I going to after this? Am I different from my body? And so on. Also the soul's relation with the body is investigated and numerous other related issues have been discussed. Many philosophers, theologians, psychologist, scientists and researchers have tried to find the answer to these questions.

Some major theories concerning the human soul have been popular among philosophers. One of these theories is the Platonic theory of the soul, which suggests that the existence of the soul is eternal, spiritual and exists prior to the creation of the body. Basically, dualism, which was introduced by Plato is the theory that there are two kinds of substance[5] - physical and mental.[6] Physical substance is something that is material and is known as the body

---

[1] Hassan, Hasan zāda-i Āmulī, *'Uyūn-i masā'il-i nafs*, Qom: Qīyām Press, 1380 SH, pp. 113-115.

[2] F. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*, translated by Jallāl al Din Mojtabavī, Tehran: 1362 SH, vol. 1, p. 36.

[3] *Ibid*, pp. 53-54.

[4] *Ibid*, pp. 83-86.

[5] In Persian translations it is common to use the term 'substance'.

[6] *The Series of Plato's Works, Jomhourī*, translated by M.H. Lotfī in Persian, Jomhourī Publications, p. 1177 (896).

while mental substance in the human being is what is considered as the immaterial self or the soul. According to Plato human beings do not possess a soul, rather they are the same as the soul i.e. every human is only a soul. In other words it is the spirit which forms the reality of the human being.[7] The dualist thinks that souls feel and believe. The soul and body are two different substances and are separate, with no substantial and natural connection characterizing unity. Their relation can be described only as accidental and nominal. Therefore, essential connection and interaction between the two are merely superficial.[8]

The second of these theories was Aristotle's theory of the soul; he believed that the human being actually has two countenances which are body as matter and soul as form. He believed that one can understand the relation between body and soul as more than just interrelation and interdependence of two different separate substances. Aristotle in *De Anima* says that every natural body that possesses life is a substance of the composite kind and since such a kind of body exists, the soul cannot be a body, for a body is not something which belongs to a subject but rather exists as a subject or as matter. Accordingly, the soul must be a substance as the form of natural body potential with life, and such a substance is an actuality. So the soul is the actuality of such a body.[9] So, based on his opinion, the soul is a function of an organized body and therefore is not a subject of independency and separate existence. Aristotle has, to some extent, provided a more sophisticated understanding of the soul-body relation. According to his theory the soul is not eternal but generated and therefore a subject of time and corruption.[10]

---

[7] W. D Heart and others, *Philosophy of the Soul*, translated by Amir-i Dīwānī, p. 13.

[8] Hasan zāda-i Āmulī, *'Uyūn-i masā'il-i nafs*, pp. 7, 10, 93, 279.

[9] Aristotle, *Nafs-i Arastū (De Anima)*, translated by Alimurād-i Davūdī, University of Tehran Publications, second edition published by Ḥikmat Publications, p. 92.

[10] *Ibid*, p. 79. As will be considered in Chapter Five, when Aristotle speaks about the active intellect as a part of the human being he says this part may be left after the death of body. It

It is worth mentioning that some Muslim philosophers such as Kindi, Farabi, Ibn Sina, up to Sabzawari, attributed the immateriality of the soul to what Aristotle said. However this mistake was made because they thought *Athologia*, written by Plotinus, and *Liber de Causis* written by Proclus, were both written by Aristotle. This mistake caused an understanding of Aristotle's words which is between what Aristotle said and what Plato said.[11]

The third theory belonged to the Peripatetics, and Ibn Sina provided a thorough explanation for it. This theory dealt with the immaterial or non-corporeal origination of the soul, along with the corporeal origination and creation of the body.[12]

Another is Mulla Sadra's theory. His view on the soul-body relation is quite different from that of any other philosopher. Sadr al-Din al-Shirazi, known as Mulla Sadra (d.1641) was one of the most profound and influential philosophers in the history of Islamic philosophy among such well-known names as Ibn Sina (Avicenna) and Ibn Rushd (Averroes).

He presented an innovative theory on this subject, proving that although man's soul ultimately becomes immaterial in its particular course of development, it is corporeal at the outset of its creation, and is born from the body. He says: "The soul is bodily in its origination, spiritual in its subsistence *(jismānīyya al- ḥudūth ruhānīyya al-baqā)*".[13]

In Sadra's view, man's soul is initially solid, and then, after leaving the stage of solidity behind, turns into an embryo and steps into the vegetative stage (vegetative soul). Later it arrives at the animal stage (animal soul), and then, in the process of its real maturity, reaches the stage of human soul and

---

can be thought of as a source of contradiction in Aristotle's idea regarding the soul. However by considering the dichotomy of the soul and the spirit this contradiction can be removed.

[11] H. Nasr, *Sih Ḥakīm-i musalmān*, translated by A. Ārām, p. 10.

[12] S. J. Sajjādī, *Farhang-i Ma'ārif-i Islamī*, vol. 5, p. 115.

[13] Sadra, *Al-Shawāhid al-rubūbīyya*, p. 309. See also: Sadra, *Asfar*, vol. 8, p. 302; Sabziwārī, *Sharh-i manzūma*, vol. 5, p. 115.

becomes a 'rational soul'. After this stage, in the light of its efforts, practice, and rational and spiritual training, it can also achieve human maturity (which he calls the holy soul and actual intellect (intellectus in actu). This is a stage which few are capable of reaching.

A great amount of philosophical research by scholars in the history of philosophy has concerned the soul. Almost all philosophers have expressed ideas about it, since knowing the self and its abilities, talents and limitations has been the basis of other knowledge for man.

The soul and its related issues are the basis for many other sciences such as ethics, psychology, educational sciences, philosophy and commentary of Quranic verses and the Traditions. Although perceiving the soul (self) is easy[14], realizing its essence is more difficult as the soul is immaterial and cannot be felt by the normal senses and it is above man's simple understanding.

Philosophical psychology of the soul is one of the most important issues in Islamic philosophy. Philosophers have discussed this issue in two main parts: the first concerns the soul *(nafs)* and the second concerns resurrection *(ma'ād)*.

In the first part, the soul, some questions such as defining the soul, proving existence, substantiality and immateriality of the soul and also its unity or dichotomy, origination or pre-eternity, its precedence in regard to materiality or immateriality, its powers and its communication with the powers and body[15] etc have been considered.

The second part, the resurrection, mainly deals with arguments about the soul after death, the real cause of death, immortality of the soul, refutation of

---

[14] Everybody knows his/her feelings such as happiness, sadness, pain etc and also his/her self this is known as presential knowledge *('ilm-i ḥuzūrī)* in Islamic philosophy which will be explained further later on.

[15] In modern western philosophy the relation of the soul and body is called 'the mind-body problem'. Mind was used instead of soul for the first time by Descartes.

reincarnation, limbo, the reality of the grave and punishment, proving the resurrection and how it will happen, the assembling *(ḥashr)*, the reality of the scale and counting of the actions, the reality of the path, the reality of heaven and hell and the reality of weal and woe.

Research aims, objectives and hypotheses

The main aim of this research is to explore whether the human being has an independent spirit in addition to the body and the soul. In other words it aims to investigate if man is a tripartite existence made of body, soul and spirit. In doing so, Mulla Sadra's philosophical position will be the main reference point. This research, therefore, will consider the following issues:

1- Sadra's ideas about the soul have to be considered, since by analyzing these ideas and how they differ from those of other philosophers, a better understanding of Sadra's principles about the soul and its related issues will be achieved. Also his solutions for the other philosophers' problems will be better justified.

2- It will be argued that Sadra's idea, despite being able to solve many problems related to the soul, is flawed since it ignores the dichotomy of the soul and the spirit. This has not been investigated by anyone until now and will be the main aim of this research. In other words the researcher's central hypothesis is that man is a tripartite being made of a body, a soul and a spirit.

These two research objectives are explained in more detail as follows:

1. Sadra's idea and principles regarding the soul

Some Greek philosophers such as Heraclitus, Empedocles and in some aspects even Plato believed in trans-substantial motion. Heraclitus, for example, was the first philosopher to believe in fluidity of existence and to deny any stability in the world. On this basis he named his second

philosophical principle 'universal fluidity of existence'. He introduced fire as the substance and pre-material of this continual and essential conversion.[16]

Aristotle and the majority of Muslim philosophers, including the Peripatetic philosophers, denied motion in substance and believed that if motion means perfection for a potential object or gradual movement from potentiality to actuality it is not possible for it to occur in substance. This is because motion in substance is always instantaneous and a kind of generation and annihilation and none of the stated definitions are true about it.[17] Ibn Sina also explains this in the second essay of *Tabī'īāt-i Shifā*.[18]

However the denial of trans-substantial motion by philosophers before Sadra meant they were unable to introduce a comprehensive theory about the soul. They were not able to find the link between the non-corporeal aspect of the soul and its affection by the material body on the one hand and its immaterial station after death on the other.[19]

Sadra had an innovative idea regarding the soul. It should first be explained that Sadrian philosophical system, which he called 'transcendental wisdom', is a coherent structure, some parts of which are the basis and pillars for the rest of this structure. Without a true understanding of these bases, it is impossible to understand the rest of this philosophical system. These bases include: fundamentality of existence, gradation of existence and trans-substantial motion. Therefore, before studying the philosophical contents of this system it is essential to know its bases. Understanding Sadra's theory about the soul and its related issues depends on his other two principles i.e. fundamentality

---

[16] H. Malikshāhī, *Ḥarikat wa istīfāy-i aqsām-i ān*, p. 151.

However as will be explained, although Sadra believed that the entire material world is moving in the notion of trans-substantial motion, his basis is totally different to that of Heraclitus's.

[17] Malikshāhī, *Ḥarikat wa istīfāy-i aqsām-i ān*, p. 274.

[18] Ibn Sina, *Tabī'īāt-i Shifā, third essay, chapter. 3,* p. 3.

[19] A. Pahliwānī, *Rābita-i nafs wa badan az nazar-i Mulla Sadra* (the relation between the soul and body from Sadra's point of view), p. 161.

of existence and trans-substantial motion.[20] Without a correct understanding of his idea about fundamentality of existence and trans-substantial motion or by not accepting them, we will have difficulty understanding his view.

i. Regarding fundamentality of existence, existence is no longer a mental and abstract issue. In other words fundamentality of existence proves that existence is a reality in the external world and not a mental issue with no place on the outside.

Previous philosophers rejected motion in substance because they thought according to fundamentality of quiddity. Fundamentality of quiddity is compatible with instantaneous unit of motion, not with a flowing continuous unit. According to fundamentality of quiddity and considering existence as a non-external reality, quiddity is no longer a mental image of the external reality, rather it is the external reality itself. Therefore the meaning of motion in a category, like motion in substance, is that during motion a specific quiddity *(māhīyyat i-nuʿīyyih)* belonging to that substance occurring in the body in one instant is different from the specific quiddity in other instants.

By inference the actual separation of these quiddities from each other, requires infinite instantaneous continual quiddities to occur in the body in continuous instants during motion, which is impossible.

However, according to fundamentality of existence quiddity is only the mental image of the external reality, not the external reality itself. The external reality is a single continuous and flowing reality from which our mind can take some images (quiddities) and which are different from each other and there is no problem with this. Therefore rejecting fundamentality of existence requires denying motion in substance just as the philosophers before Sadra did.[21]

---

[20] Malikshāhī, *Ḥarikat wa istīfāy-i aqsām-i ān*, p. 303.

[21] ʿUbūdīyyat, *Darāmadī bi nizām-i ḥikmat-i sadrāʾī* (An Introduction to Sadra's Theosophical System), ISBN 964-530-080-0, vol. 1, pp. 295-296.

ii. Regarding trans-substantial motion Sadra says that all philosophers were confused because they ignored the principle of trans-substantial motion with regard to the soul's manner, origination, subsistence, immateriality and its belonging to the body.[22]

By accepting trans-substantial motion of the soul, many of the problems regarding the origination and subsistence of the soul will automatically be solved, because one of the real instances of trans-substantial motion in the Sadrian system is origination and subsistence of the soul.

According to this basis corporeal origination and spiritual subsistence of the soul can be easily explained and a more complete theory can be presented.[23]

Sadra criticizes the reasons provided by the philosophers before himself in the commentary of his views. He proves motion and gradual change in substance via rational and traditional reasoning.[24]

He believed that not only the phenomenon and appearance of nature is constantly changing and in motion, but its essence and substance is moving too. He stated that existence has intensified motion and moves from low stations to higher ones and substance experiences essential conversion in its essence.[25] Therefore he explained that occurrence and appearance of corporeal types such as the human soul is based on the rules of motion. He said that although the soul is material at the beginning of its existence, it will reach an immaterial stage through trans-substantial motion.[26] We will explain Sadra's principles i.e. the fundamentality of existence, motion and trans-substantial motion in the main chapters.

---

[22] Sadra, *Asfar*, vol. 8, p. 279.

[23] Pahliwānī, *Rābita-i nafs wa badan az nazar-i Mulla Sadra,* p. 162.

[24] The corporeal soul will be converted to the ideal *(mithālī)* and intellectual soul by its trans-substantial motion.

[25] Sadr Al-Din-i Shīrazī (Sadra), *Al-ḥikma al-Muta'aliyah fil- Asfār al-'Aqliyyah al-arba'ah* known as *Asfar*, Dār-i 'iḥyā' al-turāth al-'arabī Publications, (1981 AD, Beirut), second edition, 9 volumes, vol. 9, p. 186.

[26] M. Motahari, *Majmū'a-i āthār*, vol. 13, p. 34.

2. Sadra's main problem in regard to the soul

One subject that is usually discussed regarding the soul is the dichotomy or unity of the soul. No Muslim philosophers, including Sadra, believe in dichotomy of the soul or dichotomy of soul and spirit. Sadra believes that the soul performs all its actions despite being simple.[27]

Dichotomy of the soul (not the soul and the spirit) was first introduced by Plato. He believed that the reason for internal conflict is the existence of numerous souls within the human being[28]. Muslim philosophers, especially Sadra, rejected Plato's theory on the basis that 'The soul is all powers although it is simple'. Therefore unity of the soul was a proved issue for Muslim philosophers after Sadra.

However, this writer believes that, although Plato is right that dichotomy of the soul exists, it cannot be the cause of internal conflict. Even Sadra's idea has not been able to solve this, because if the united soul manages all its affairs, it will not allow any confliction between its powers.[29]

However, if the soul and the spirit are seen as one thing a basic problem is created for philosophers and especially for Sadra's philosophical system about the soul. That problem is that Sadra believed that the soul is created with the creation of the body and has no existence before the creation of body.

Considering the spirit as an immaterial and heavenly existent, as many philosophers like Socrates, Plato and illuminative philosophers did, is contrary to Sadra's idea that the soul is bodily in its originatedness. If the soul is the same as the spirit and the spirit is an immaterial existent which comes down from heaven and enters the body despite its perfection, it cannot be something which was born from the body due to trans-substantial motion of

---

[27] Sadra, *Asfar*, vol. 8, p.221.

[28] Plato believed that a human being consists of several parts, all of which have the power to control him or her. A perfect man is one whose intellect can control the other parts. See: Chapter Five, pp. 170, 207-208.

[29] We will explain this issue in Chapter Five.

matter that will grow to become immaterial by that essential motion and become free from the body at death.

With due attention to the difference between the definitions of the soul and the spirit, believing in both of them together is believing in two contraries or even in two contradictories.

Sadra denied the existence of the soul before the body and throughout his life he tried to justify or deny all the traditional evidences which show this.

The problem which Sadra faced is less of a problem for philosophers who believe in spiritual origination of the soul such as Plato, Ibn Sina and Suhriwardi, but it is a problem for a philosopher who believes that the soul is bodily in its origination. This is because there are many evidences which explain that the spirit existed before the creation of the body.[30] Therefore Sadra must have an acceptable answer for these evidences otherwise his philosophical system regarding the soul is flawed.

However Sadra acknowledged the existence of the spirit before the body in some books written at the end of his life.[31] If Sadra believed that the spirit was created before the body as well as the soul being bodily in its originatedness, a basic question arises as to why Sadra believed the soul to be something which was born from the body and created at the same time as its creation while he believed that the spirit existed before the body. This is the main question which this research aims to answer.

Is it possible to say that by accepting the existence of the spirit before the body Sadra accepted that the soul and the spirit both exist and are two distinct realities, one of which gets created at the same time as the body and the other exists before the creation of body? In other words the question is:

---

[30] See Chapter Five pp. 203-205; also see: Sadra, *Asfar*, the first pendant of Sabziwarī, vol. 8, p.330; Vol. 8, p. 355; L. P. Peerwani,, Spiritual Psychology, pp. 302-303; Henry Corbin, *Avicenna and the Visionary Recital*, pp. 205ff.

[31] Given the fact that Sadra believed that the soul and the spirit are the same, he sometimes uses them interchangeably.

Did Sadra ignore his idea of bodily originatedness of the soul when accepting the existence of the spirit before the body?

Significance of the Research

Regarding the first issue many commentators have described Sadra's ideas in all fields especially with regard to the soul and its related issues. However there is no coherent work which explains the soul using Sadra's relative principles. Furthermore, all the written commentaries are in Arabic or Persian and there is no account for English readers at this level.

Regarding the second, the distinction of the soul and the spirit, there has been no research; in other words none of the philosophers believed in the distinction of the two. This makes this research more important because the lack of distinction between the soul and the spirit has created many problems in different sciences.

In philosophy, for example, there is much diversity of opinion about the soul and the spirit. Regardless of the difference in philosophers' understanding of the soul and the spirit, ignoring the difference between the two (soul and spirit) has created many problems and diversity of opinions about the soul and its related issues like immateriality or materiality, originatedness or eternity and unity or dichotomy of the soul. Some of these disputes will be explained in the main writing.

In psychology, however, there are some who accept that the soul and the spirit are separate, but they have not provided intellectual reasons for their claims. The book *Ḥaqīqat-i rūḥ* (*The Reality of the Spirit*) by Zumurrudiyān is a main source from which these opinions can be understood.[32]

Using the soul and the spirit synonymously is seen in almost all Quranic commentaries. Also, in commentaries based on the Traditions, using the two interchangeably is very common because considering and analyzing the usage

---

[32] See: Ahmad Zumurrudīān , *Ḥaqīqat-i rūḥ*, considering soul and spirit (Tehran: Daftar-i Nashr-i Farhang-i Islami Press, 1368 SH.)

of the soul and the spirit in traditions requires a wide research which has not been done yet. This has caused scholars to be unsure of how to use these two words.

These are evidences which clarify the necessity for research on the reality of the soul and the spirit from the aspect of dichotomy or unity. This is a work which has not been carried out until now and, if proven, it will remove the ambiguities on this subject and be a step towards knowing the realities of the existence of the human being.

Methodology

This research is a critical discourse analysis based research, which aims to explore the discourses of various individuals, mainly Mulla Sadra, in relation to the subject matter.

In conducting the research, thus, textual and discursive methods but also hermeneutics within critical discourse analysis was utilised. For this, interpretative approach, philosophical analysis which is based on priori-statements has been employed.

In other words the method employed in this research is the research method in philosophy. Here there needs to be an explanation about research methods in different subjects. The research method in a subject is the method by which the truthfulness or falsity *(al-sidq wal-kizb)* of the statements of that subject can be determined. For example, determining the truthfulness or falsity of the statements of an experimental or intellectual subject can be achieved by experimental or intellectual methods only. The difference between a priori-statements and a posteriori-statements should now be explained. Consider the following two statements:

"The sum of the interior angles of any triangle is 180°" and the physical statement "all metals expand due to heat". When comparing the two statements it is clear that if we find a triangle in the outside we will find that this statement is true, but if we find a metal that does not obey this rule we

will say that this statement is false and that it is not true for all metals. The reason for this difference has to be found in the method of proving these two statements. The truth of the first statement is proved by an intellectual method and the truth of the second statement is proved by an experimental method. Finally an intellectual method is a reasoning which is based on primary self-evident statements *(badīhīyyāt-i awwalīyya)*.

This is because both understanding the truth of primary self-evident statements and rules of logical inference, upon which argumentation is based, are independent from experiment. The point is that intellect can understand their truth before doing experimentation and without it, therefore perceiving the truth of such statements is also independent of experiment and does not require it.

This is contrary to the second statement, the truthfulness of which can only be understood by experimentation. In technical terms the first statement is called an a priori-statement and the second one is called an a posteriori-statement.

In this philosophical research we are mostly applying a priori-statements, the truthfulness or falsity of which can only be understood by intellectual and analytical demonstrations. Here the subjects have been taken from the main sources, then analysed via intellectual methods to examine their truthfulness or falsity. This method has been used in all the subjects of this research such as the issues of time, motion, motion in substance, motion in the substance of human soul and etc. Therefore as a summary it can be said that:

The method in the first four chapters is descriptive textual analysis. In each subject the related ideas are stated and analyzed. The critical philosophers' ideas about subjects are explained as well as Mulla Sadra's critical ideas about other philosophers' ideas on most subjects.

In Chapters Five and Six ideas are mentioned and discussed to determine their strengths and weaknesses. The difference between these two chapters is that in Chapter Five the intellectual and philosophical reasons from

philosophers are considered and discussed and in Chapter Six the traditional reasons are stated and analyzed.

Literature review and resources

A literature review has not been written for this research because the dichotomy of soul and spirit is a completely new issue in philosophy which has never been investigated before. Therefore considering the ancillary works is beyond the subject of this research. However a wide range of sources of information have been used which will be explained briefly.

The important resources for this research are Sadra's books such as *Asfar, al-Shawāhid al-rubūbīyya, al-Mabda' wal-ma'ād, 'Arshīyya* etc.[33] All Sadra's works are mentioned and explained in Chapter One, therefore to avoid repetition they will not be mentioned here.

The ideas of famous philosophers have been mentioned from their own works in this research. For example Ibn Sina's philosophical ideas are mainly expressed in two of his books, *Shifā* and *al-'Ishārāt wal-tanbīhāt,* which have been used extensively in this research.

Suhrawardī's ideas and books have also been used to the same extent. His ideas have been directly taken from his own works. It should be mentioned that Sadra, Ibn Sina and Suhrawardī are all Muslim philosophers who have

---

[33] *Asfar* is Sadra's most complete book, but it also includes a large amount of other philosophers' ideas. The eighth and ninth volumes of *Asfar* are specific in the issues of the soul.

al-Shawāhid al-rubūbīyyah consists of Sadra's own ideas. Trans-substantial motion, for example, has been fully explained in the first and fourth shāhid (witness) and in the seventh and eighth ishrāq (illumination). Also the third and fourth shāhid (witness) are totally devoted to the soul.

However, it cannot be said that by studying *Asfar* and *Shawahid*, Sadra's ideas about the soul can be understood. In three of his books i.e. *'Arshīyya, 'Asrār al-'āyāt, Sharḥ-i ḥikma al-ishrāq* and also *Risāla al-Ḥashr* (some of the books written in the final years of his life) he states some ideas about the soul and the spirit which have not been mentioned anywhere else.

their own philosophical systems. Therefore their ideas have been used more in this research.

Also, regarding non-Islamic resources, the original sources have been used where possible and if the original version was not available reliable translations have been used instead. *The Series of Plato's Works* translated by M.H. Lotfī and Aristotle's *De Anima* translated by A. Davūdī are two examples.

In order to explain the ideas of great philosophers, known authentic commentators' works have been used. Sabziwārī, Tabātabā'ī, Motaharī, Āshtīyānī and 'Ubūdīyyat are some well known commentators whose works have been used in this research. In addition in all cases the aim has been to compare and analyze the ideas. These are some resources which have been used in the first five chapters that are mostly about intellectual and philosophical issues.

Chapter Six considers traditional arguments. The main sources in this chapter are the Quran and some reliable commentaries of it such as *Al-Mīzān*, written by Tabātabā'ī. In the second section of this chapter authorized Traditions about the soul and the spirit are used. Although the Traditions used are from both Shi'ite and Sunni sources the majority are taken from Shi'ite sources.

The importance of this research is to identify fields for further research by providing a large amount of resources on every subject.

Research outline

Chapter One includes Mulla Sadra's biography, family and three periods in his intellectual life. It also provides a brief review of his philosophical system, the main scholars who influenced him and his teachers and students. His important philosophical principles are mentioned in this chapter. This chapter also describes his personality and situation and his works and the order in which they were written as well as classifying them.

In Chapter Two one of Mulla Sadra's basic principles, 'fundamentality of existence' *(aṣāla al-wujūd),* is explained briefly due to research limitations.

The importance of this chapter is that, using this principle, existence and the fact that it is real and external is philosophically proved. Fundamentality of existence proves that existence is real and external rather than subjective. The arguments begin with an introduction, then the meaning of terms such as existence and quiddity, fundamentality and subjectivity and essential and accidental are explained. After that the principle of fundamentality of existence is explained and also the evidences that were used to prove it are stated. Finally other Sadra principles which are based on fundamentality of existence such as gradation of existence *(tashkīk-i wujūd)*, trans-substantial motion *(harika al-jawharīya)* and trans-substantial motion of the soul are mentioned. These subjects have to be explained before Sadra's idea about the trans-substantial motion of the soul since, as previously mentioned, trans-substantial motion will only be proved by fundamentality of existence.

Chapters Three and Four explain another one of Mulla Sadra's principles, trans-substantial motion. The issue of motion has a direct influence on Sadra's idea about the soul. As mentioned, the difference between Sadra's idea and those of other philosophers is due to his belief in trans-substantial motion. Therefore explaining motion and trans-substantial motion is one of the requirements for a true understanding of Sadra's idea regarding the soul.[34]

The main topics in Chapter Three are: philosophers' ideas about change and constancy, reality of time, issues related to time and issues unrelated to time, types of motion, substances *(jawāhir)* and accidents *('a'rāḍ)*, the types of categories *(maqūlāt)*, prerequisites of motion and the relation between time and motion. This chapter and Chapter Two provide an introduction to trans-substantial motion which we will discuss in Chapter Four.

---

[34] The issue of motion in Islamic philosophy has an inseparable connection with time. In Chapters Three and Four some issues about time, issues related to time and issues unrelated to time will be explained briefly. Without grasping these issues understanding motion will be problematic, especially motion in substance which can only be proved and understood via the issue of time.

Chapter Four is a continuation of Chapter Three. In this chapter two issues are discussed. First trans-substantial motion is explained together with the problems which have prevented motion in substance being accepted by other philosophers. Then Sadra's solutions to these problems are stated. After that the arguments which prove trans-substantial motion are mentioned. Secondly the relation between material and immaterial existents is considered. In this section it is shown that motion only has meaning when material existents are viewed through material vision. However if material existents are viewed through immaterial and non-temporal vision then the entire universe will be stable. Therefore motion loses its meaning since time loses its gradual reality in that vision.

The aim of all three chapters (Two, Three and Four) is to understand the following questions: Does the human soul have motion and, if so, what kind of motion does it have? Another question is: What level can the human soul reach with its motion? It will then be shown that it is through the spirit that the soul can attain these levels and the spirit will not be proved unless by accepting that it is a distinct unit and different from the soul. This distinction has caused ambiguity in Sadra's system regarding the soul.

In Chapter Five, the dichotomy of soul and spirit is considered philosophically. In this chapter, the ideas of some scholars such as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus, Ibn Sina, Mulla Sadra and others and their definitions of the soul are stated and then analyzed. In the second part of this chapter the problems and disputes between philosophers about the soul are expressed and it is concluded that most of these problems arise when the separation of the soul and the spirit are ignored. The difficulties that ignoring this separation has created for Sadra's system regarding the soul are also shown. The method for resolving the disputes is also explained separately in each section. In this chapter the point is also made that it appears from his last books that Sadra changed his mind about the existence of the spirit before the creation of body.

Chapter Six is divided into two separate sections. It attempts to prove the theory of dichotomy of soul and spirit with traditional reasons. In the first section Qur'anic verses are considered. In this chapter using Qur'anic verses and the remarks of some scholars on Qur'anic affairs and also some authoritative commentaries on the Qur'an, it is concluded that the Qur'an regards the soul and the spirit as two independent realities and the spirit as something other than the soul. The spirit is what enters the human body by being breathed into it. In continuation of this section, five evidences are expressed, each of which can prove the differentiation of the soul and the spirit.

In the second section of this chapter Islamic Traditions about the soul are investigated. This section attempts to classify the Traditions on this subject, something which, up to now, has not been done. After stating each group of Traditions they are analyzed to see what they show. Then it is concluded that we can find many evidences in the Traditions to show that the soul and spirit are separate.

Finally, it is necessary to mention some points:

1. When we talk about philosophers we mean Muslim philosophers, and by philosophy we mean Islamic philosophy, otherwise we will mention the name of the intended philosopher or philosophy.

2. The aim is show the issues in all subjects and not to prove or reject any ideas. However we have rejected or accepted some ideas where doing so could help to understand the subjects better. Also the manner of writing is clearly critical when stating an idea which is different from that of the writer.

3. In some cases where Sadra's idea is not clear but his commentators' explanation is more detailed we make reference to them.

4. In this research there are many proofs that the soul and the spirit are separate, however some of them might not be as powerful as others, but using them together with other proofs can provide reasonable justification.

5. A complete investigation about the issue of separation needs more research and PH.D research with all its limitations is not able to fulfil this. However because unity of the soul and the spirit is taken as accepted by Muslim theologians and philosophers, the highest target which this research aims to reach is to show there is still an unanswered question and that is whether the soul and the spirit are two separate realities which have formed a single unit by their unity. Creating such a question for the reader is the whole purpose of this writing because it will open the door to further research until hopefully the reality of the issue will be revealed.

6. In all sections the intention has been to introduce important and numerous sources so that other researchers can easily find the required subjects for their study.

7. Traditional evidences cannot be used in philosophical arguments so it should be mentioned that in this research traditional evidences are given to support ideas, not to provide intellectual judgment. For this reason these evidences were stated in a separate chapter to avoid confusion between philosophical and traditional arguments. It is common among Muslim philosophers to take a subject from verses and Traditions and then prove it with philosophical and intellectual reasoning.[35]

8. The translations of Quranic verses have all been taken from Abdullah Yusuf Ali's translation of the Quran.

---

[35] Mulla Sadra, for example, inspired the idea of trans-substantial motion from this verse: (Thou seest the mountains and thinkest them firmly fixed: but they shall pass away as the clouds pass away: (such is) the artistry of Allah, who disposes of all things in perfect order: for He is well acquainted with all that ye do.(Qur'an, 27: 88)) but he states it via philosophical arguments as has been shown in Chapter Four. This does not prevent the subject being philosophical nor convert philosophical arguments into theological ones.