

## Evaluate on the Views of Avicenna and Suhrawardi about Second Comprehension

Hosein falsefi

Graduated faculty, Islamic Azad University, Khoram Abad, Branch, KHoran Abad , Iran

---

### ABSTRACT

Whether human knowledge, the second depends on whether comprehension. Comprehension of these aspects can be investigated. As they stand, their knowledge of how the mind familiar with it, giving it and ... .In this paper, are defined first and the second comprehension about the place; they are external or mental with a passing reference to the view, Plato and Aristotle and Avicenna and Suhrawardi's view on this issue will be reviewed and evaluated, is clear that the views of Suhrawardi, is much more stable than Avicenna's view.

**KEY WORDS:** philosophy, contemplative second, objective, subjective.

---

### INTRODUCTION

History and philosophy, epistemology, philosophy has always been a big emphasis on comprehension and celebration about the place, they would have. Among these are clearly Plato, Aristotle, Avicenna and Suhrawardi's pointed. Each of these thinkers on the exterior or mental comprehension, words are audible. Understanding the concept of the second story and the logical and philosophical, philosophical inquiry is the most important part in philosophy.

In this article first, First and second sound; the second sample are defined with logical and philosophical, then the views of Plato and Aristotle described on the contemplative position after that, the claims and arguments about Avicenna and Suhrawardi evaluate and will be clear that Suhrawardi's view is as the same of Plato and Aristotle view.

To begin the dialogue, which must first be clear what the meaning of the first and second? To see some examples: 1) Babakis man. 2) Babak, is. 3) is man 4) may man and .... . In this example, the word "Babak", "Man," "is" and "may" are very different. Babak, which is a minor thing in mind and out of mind. Man, this sample, it is a general concept in mind and it's out there. Out of mind, we can show people and find them, but "is" and "may" are different kind and because, we cannot show something that is out of the mind such as "is" and "may". The "is" and "may" and the meaning of this, we cannot rest on the outside of the mind to show other attributes also have Diversity.

Among the latter concept, the concept of existence is more valuable. In other words, all the second paradigm, are the word concept. The first one who is thought about the concept was Socrates. After him, Plato all its efforts to show secure a place and value of the concept. He spoke first of the second logical and philosophical ideas relate to the theory. View of his ideas, the fact of objects is small. Residents of some immortal ideas that are not there and not go through. The idea, which is the only way of sensory perception in the light of rational thought, it can be achieved. Ideas do not have any physical features .They are divine beings and stable, existence of material things depend to them. Because of things enjoy them are exist, but this is not something that the productivity is reduced. It is said that they are a world apart from this world. All thoughts of Plato, they are not separate from this world's just put in top position of the universe because they are not material to be in place. It is clear that what we mean by the second, are not out of mind and in today's language are genuinely. In other words at his initial concept, such as humans and trees and rocks and ..., the latter concept of logic, such as animal and vegetative, and ..., the second and philosophical concepts, such as the existence and oneness ... are out of mind, in many cases but a bite are different for instance, the concept of existence with all things blends but living concept just blend by some things, and human concept blend by limited things. Aristotle, for the first time declared philosophy Subject as it is. The concept of existence, from his perspective, the concept is clear and self-definition, Aristotle declare of universe concept is spiritual, to this mean that all usage of it is as the same. His conception of the universe is doubt. In other words, the meaning of existence in his view, is limited and expand of being. From his perspective, there are four meaning for universe: 1. Dependent existence 2. existence in right way 3. existence in the meaning categories 4. existence in the meaning acting. Considering first and second meaning of exist is not philosopher job.

The philosophy speaks about powers and verb of exist categories. Aristotle, does not define the judiciary and the act and basically do not useful define them, but it pays to bring examples of it and suggest should look around world and see things are active and by measure things found power and act. If it be asked, "What is power?" We can show something different to the questioner. For example, eggs, is his power chicken, and the verb ... the things I find out the nature of mind are power and act.

## METHODOLOGY

Last meaning of universe, are different. Categories, meaning that the existence show of external things. Categories are 10 parts. One is meaning not width. So speaking of the categories, to speak the truth of everything, even the judiciary and the verb.

Categories, in the logical - philosophical Aristotle's device are used in three part: Ontology, epistemology, and linguistics. These applications are not apart from one another throughout the territories. In Greek thought, existence, reason and language, three of which are single fire.

Aristotle's categories to know sometimes eight, sometimes ten. However, it is known that are ten categories: Nature, number, quality, increase, place, time, status, property, interaction. All the things you have one of these categories fit, and other words, categories, established that it can identify things.

We said that the first category is nature. Aristotle introduced it in two species. First, nature has got basically meaning, It is not an issue and not be told in such a place is subject, for example "this is human", "the horse" .... For example, look at these statements: A) Babak is human. B) Human is alive. Babak, never be the predicate what is the essence so is first concept but the human and organism, both are the predicate of the second concept. All especial external things involve first concept and all Substantial concept put in second category.

Aristotle divide first concept to tangible corruption, tangible and stable, intangible and stable. Nature can ruin concrete; all things are made of the four elements water, wind, fire and earth. In other words, all things in the world soil, fire and wind and water, are visible and corruption. Tangible things that Aristotle's view, corruption is inevitable. They just are not the fate, are made of specific element called ether.

Subtle essence of the eternal God and the wisdom to do first and also covers the human intellect. Can ruin a tangible essence of Aristotle's view, three things: matter, face and body. What then was said to be short, the inputs are going to find the best are nature and width , world outside is filled small things (of nature) , and the philosopher's work is to identify these things are not speaking of being. In other words, what is the concept and categories are equal to the external things; like this cup, this pen, and things that fill the mind. Avicenna, the great philosophers of Initiation in the Muslim world, the concept of first and second time recognizes. The second philosophical concept defined by an integral, comprehensive and clearly sees itself. Between this concept universe has got especial place. He decides that universe is out of mind. Out of mind, the nature of the universe will increase; In other words, the universe is a wide variety of nature. On these, other concepts such as the existence, within and outside things are adjectives and adjective of not more than. In other words, this pen and universe are out of mind, but pen is outside one's own self out there and universe infollow of pen.

Can be said of the Avicenna view, the world outside the mind is filled well things are things that have no existence outside. For example, fire is something outside the mind and fills the outer, as can heat, burn, smoke and ... And the second because it has. Suhrawardi's do not accept this speech of Avicenna exist outside the mind, the nature will increase. His conception of the universe and everything like that, only in the mind are never out of mind cannot be found. Suhrawardi to clarify his words, bring some example: Suhrawardi The first reason being the lack of other means, the width of existence outside the mind is like a black and white and ... nature, such as humans and horses and is used in a sense ... the implication is that, overall, and we generally do not mind the existence of the other sense, are subjective and lacking foundation.

Second, it may be assumed that the existence of nature, wider, and on these Out of mind can be imaginary, but this is not over because you're meant to be the essence of a broader, more nature will not tell you, also nature will not feature of universe. Third: to escape from difficult, that being said, the universe and its existence in other things such as humans and horses and has two meanings ..., Because exist by, but exist by world and the things that you are human, and horse. There is no need for its existence upon something else to the endless chain of cause and effect, we caught.

Initiation of this response is not correct, because philosophers have accepted that their existence does not mean everything and everywhere, a few mean.

Fourth: When you say, for example, "black is not." Means that black, you're not then be. We're talking about black is also used, being black is not because then you have, again this dark universe, a universe that was, and the existence of the universe and ... This endless chain goes to. Know the meanings of existence and the like, are

characteristic so is being black and every other entity, the adjectives are endless with you, but know that with the endless adjectives in the universe is a thing or referenced, meaning that the micro foundations.

Fifth: Babak to clarify something, because it will make things clear make reason. Bahram make something else clear by the same way but Babak does not accept the results obtained from Bahram. This reason that, say counterexample. Initiation of the philosopher Mashae and Suhrawardi, is as Bahram and Babak. Mashaeen argue about separation in this way: Apart from the nature of universe what we have in mind. Two things in mind when apart from each other, out of mind are separate too, so what are you in and out of the mind are separate.

Suhrawardi's why they're working on it but do not accept Mashaeen. He argues that the existence and you're in two minds. Each of the two being open and each of the four are existence implies that the universe is an endless chain or referenced reached and it is.

Sixth: It is the nature of existence, and then it is a link. The existence of this link has. This two link, the link with the chain to the existence of such a thing as an endless chain will, after being out of mind and sense of wisdom is the foundation.

Seventh: outside things are nature or width. Some things, just like in mind and the existence, uniqueness and... We also saw that Mashaeen believe that the existence, uniqueness and ... So they're out of mind. Suhrawardi considers this view is incorrect.

The reason being the lack of substance, the existence, nature is a trait. The essence of character is no such thing as adjectives, are all within the essence of existence.

The essence is that you cannot then it should be width. If the width cannot stand alone and apart from the things (of nature), whether before or after it is created, Lasting because the width to be such a thing is or referenced things can not arise because the local universe, the universe does not appear along with it and it is or referenced Cannot or referenced after it emerged that its meaning is clear and then you do not like it, out of mind.

We attribute the existence of the substance can be added. If existence is related to the nature then is width. Among the wide variety, can only be how it accidental is that all its parts with each other and the need of thinking things out of the sector and its dependence. Now if you are within how, you should already be there and it is clear that it is the existence or referenced, and generally be more inclusive sense because some things, like how it is and how pervasive they are, many species have.

If exist add to nature is width not nature. Each cross, not because they own the place (of nature) depends on the location will depend on the existence. On the other hand, implies that things have to depend on the existence. or referenced so it is far from being out of mind, on what is added, and the only meaning is the foundation of wisdom.

Eight: Mashaeen philosophers to prove the nature of existence, out of mind would have said: the nature of the mind, being added or not added. If not added, nature is not destroyed and is still in the way it is obvious that we know and out of mind, because of the nature of nature are being added. This is not imaginary and it rises on the philosophers, the first entity in the minds and think they are then forced to argue that his.

This is wrong on both sides of the Mashaeen: First, the views of Suhrawardi, its external nature, is not the creator of the universe. For example, the creator, burning... rather it creates the universe. Second, if his words are true, why are you arguing about the nature of the data, we used and we relate that to being added to the creator of nature, for example, you fire, you have not. If the answer is no, then you, and if there is no answer is yes, then you're back on, the question is finally, the chain will be endless and it is also the creator or referenced on the nature, and not being added, but it raises its.

Perhaps the answer to this cavil to be answered based on the nature of Suhrawardi, for his not being required to exist will not be added to it, but you're not there because they are their own and do not lead to an endless chain. If this is true of Mashaeen, we use it about the nature of the work It can be said is that nature itself is not something else. What we said it was clear that the nature of its creator, not me, it raises.

For example, the human is "essence, body, vegetative, animate, thoughtful, bipedal, writer and ..." Some of these are attributes of his or referenced from, such as ink, physical, vegetative, animate, thoughtful, and some removable, such as bipedal and Writing. The adjectives are inseparable, say intrinsic characteristics and removable, the transverse. Mashaeen philosophers say that man can find out are empty of people but empty of substance, physical, vegetative, animate, not thinking thinker after you cross a human and a removable. Transverse nature of existence in the mind, is nothing but the true surprise is that this philosophy, cross it out of mind. He found that they are misguided in mind is the nature of the cross, which had developed out of the judge's mind and this is misguided. They are consistent with this argument because you have accepted the living human being: First being alive second man is a human being. Now if the organism isolated from human or referenced so you should accept that there is a human being, in other words the existence of man is separated or referenced. They're one of the two species, for example, living human being as an integral but detachable back his life count, and this is a contradiction. If a living human being is integral to the human being is inseparable from the nature of the mind, not out of existence.

Ninth: We said that all philosophy, Islamic philosopher Suhrawardi's philosophy of existence is not. There are a variety of applications, in other words several times. Are all applications, it also means being crushed the foundation is lacking, other words, instead of being mean, all of which sits a small after being crushed, the Foundation. Suhrawardi view, meanings are not out of the few species: 1. relat 2. links 3. the essence. First sense, such as "Babak is in the home." In this instance, instead of being "in" and because the client is "in" is only in the mind of the universe is only in the mind.

The second meaning, like "Babakis man." Subjective link between subject and predicate, and is instead linked to the mind, you can sit and because of this link, you are the subjective mental.

The third means "the essence or truth of something" that things outside the mind but rather the fact or nature of the mind and "the essence or truth" is called "being nothing."

All of these are in some sense. If you are aware Mashaeen of other means to tell people not to know it by saying "being the most obvious is" to speak about it.

Now, if you break the conceptual foundation and is not out of mind, is what the world around us and fill in other words, what are the things around us? It is clear that (nature), especially those, like humans, trees, etc. that fill the world. The nature, they are in time out of mind. For example, the human mind can mean out of mind as well is indicated.

Philosophy should be including a subject. Overall it must be other things all out of the philosophy of mind must be learn. It is clear that these things should be, out of mind, otherwise the foundation will be crushed adjective. The followers of Aristotle, so I knew I saw it and saw it as the foundation of wisdom about what adjective being Suhrawardi? From Suhrawardi, the thing Lighting is. Something outside the mind is filled, lighting.

In some of his writings, words that tell you not to be exterior lighting. Sometimes his God, his world seems superior to the material world, does the existence of pure. It can be judged based on these remarks, he turned his vision of the Suhrawardi ?is certainly not. Suhrawardi never returned from his perspective is that His words were not found to the right because he knows the universe is alive with knowledge and awareness and also has the same brightness. The existence of such a high brightness is the brightness of the outer world.

Short of what we said it was clear that the concept of Plato's early second, the perception is particularly because he believes that all of the outer, He looked from the first second of the output from the wider and also became clear that the thought of Aristotle, Avicenna and Suhrawardi, is somewhat of a species. However, Aristotle's views on these concepts and Suhrawardi, very close together and made friendlier.

## Conclusion

Researchers suggest that the range of philosophy, without any internal attitude to this or that philosophical system, the method of phenomenological; The way I see and read these philosophers, rather than reporting them to reporters, thought he knew, Scholars thought they knew, as their thoughts, their way of thinking. For recognition of intellectual thought is a long road ahead and much work has been done. Some of these things are: search deep in their hands, handling it right, its translation to other languages, especially Persian, check the individual topics, assessment of these ideas with the ideas of other philosophers and ... .

## REFERENCES

Ross, Sir David, Aristotle, London and New York, 1995.

Plato, The collected dialogues, ed. by E. Hamilton and H. Cairns, Princeton, N. Y., 1969

Aisha Khan (2006). Avicenna (Ibn Sina): Muslim physician and philosopher of the eleventh century. The Rosen Publishing Group. ISBN 9781404205093. (Goichon 1999)

Paul Strathern (2005). A brief history of medicine: from Hippocrates to gene therapy. Running Press. pp. 58. ISBN 9780786715251.

Brian Duignan (2010). Medieval Philosophy. The Rosen Publishing Group. pp. 89. ISBN 9781615302444.

Michael Kort (2004). Central Asian republics. Infobase Publishing. pp. 24. ISBN 9780816050741.

Ibn Sina ("Avicenna") Encyclopedia of Islam. 2nd edition. Edited by P. Berman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Henrichs. Brill 2009. Accessed through Brill online: [www.encyislam.brill.nl](http://www.encyislam.brill.nl) (2009) Quote: "He was born in 370/980 in Afshana, his mother's home, near Bukhara. His native language was Persian."

A.J. Arberry, "Avicenna on Theology", KAZI PUBN INC, 1995. excerpt: "Avicenna was the greatest of all Persian thinkers; as physician and metaphysician".