



University of Tabriz-Iran  
Journal of *Philosophical Investigations*  
ISSN (print): 2251-7960/ (online): 2423-4419  
*Vol. 12/ No. 24/ fall 2018*

## **Mulla Sadra and Hume on Comparative Analyzing of Causality\***

**Qodratullah Qorbani\*\***

*Associate Professor of Philosophy, Kharazmi University- Iran*

### **Abstract**

*One of the most important causes for comparative studying on philosophical systems is to find their commonalities for responding common questions and to emphasize on their differences for taking functional answers encountering modern philosophical challenges and problems. Here, causality is chosen as the case study. Causality is of the basic philosophical issues that have been continually considered by both Islamic and Western philosophical traditions, but the answers which have been rendered by modern western philosophers with empirical approach and Muslim philosophers, like Mulla Sadra, with intellectual and intuitive approach, is necessitated to compare such answers and clarify the efficacy of each one towards the other one. Mulla Sadra's philosophical, intellectual and illuminative thought in Islamic tradition, in comparison to Hume's modern empirical and phenomenal tendencies, is able to remove fundamental ahead problems concerning causality and to answer skepticism derived from it. In Mulla Sadra's Transcendent Wisdom, since the whole system of being has its plural hierarchical universes in which there are causal longitudinal relations. In fact, for Mulla Sadra, causality is not merely restricted to the natural world, and our phenomenal knowledge about it is inadequate, but whatever we see in the natural world is only the weak and thin level or surface of the deep and fundamental reality of causality. Meantime, for Mulla Sadra, in such the causal relation, the effect has nothing and no reality except it is as the manifestation, shadow and act of the cause.*

**Keywords:** Causality, Being, Transcendent Wisdom, Empiricism, Intuition.

---

\* Received date: 2018/9/30

Accepted date: 2018/ 10/ 16

\*\* E-mail: qorbani48@gmail.com

### **Introduction**

Comparative philosophy is one of the most significant aspects of philosophical thought pertained to Islamic, Christian, western and eastern philosophical traditions. In the first stage, comparative philosophy is comparing between some philosophical subjects or theories of two schools, or comparing two philosophers of one school or of two different schools. Comparative philosophical study that is done between two philosophers or two philosophical schools or two philosophical subjects and problems, should seek a goal beyond that two thinkers or philosophical problems. In the other word, comparative philosophy is merely not finding similarities or differences of two philosophers or philosophical systems, although such cases are studied, but deeper than it, comparative philosophy is struggling to see philosophical systems from other perspectives, and to find the answers of our philosophical questions through other diverse approaches. When the importance of reflecting on philosophical problems from other perspectives is cleared that is accepted that every philosophical problem can't merely be reflected from one epistemic approach, but it is possible to contemplate on that philosophical problem from plural epistemic approaches, and when it is possible to see a philosophical problem from different epistemic perspectives, then we can claim every philosophical question maybe has many possible answers which are the results of our thinking of that question from different approaches. When, this vital outcome, that is accepting the plurality of philosophical approaches to determined philosophical questions, is effective and significant that is paid adequate attention to the importance of comparative philosophy. Since this is only comparative philosophy that can contemplate common philosophical questions of philosophers and schools from plural perspectives, and find different answers, and compare them and indicate that which answer has more sufficiency than others. In fact, although it may be some philosophical questions were originated from one philosophical background, but it does not mean that its correct answer can be necessarily sought in that background, since it is possible that philosophical school has not taken necessary principles for answering such questions. So when we welcome to comparative philosophy, we can contemplate on different philosophical questions from comparative approaches, and find their efficacy responses. In fact extending the realm of comparative philosophy makes possible for us to reread philosophical questions from plural comparative perspectives and to reconstruct and reform our old answers, which if such a thing is achieved, not only our tendency to philosophical questions are reformed and rebuild, but it is possible to reform our answers, to find better ways and compare them. So, comparative philosophy opens new philosophical horizons before our eyes that they can free us from

philosophical illiberality, to extend our philosophical thoughts, and to provide the possibility of multidimensional approaches to our contemporary philosophical questions in order to find many answers from different angles.

In addition to mentioned cases, it should be asserted that welcoming to comparative philosophy helps us very much to resolving philosophical crises, finding the answers of problematic philosophical questions, and establishing new philosophical schools and tendencies. The requirements of achievement of such ideals concerning comparative philosophy is that we should demystify, criticize and clarify our philosophical school and thought, that is, we should put aside this thought that only our philosophical school takes the best answers for philosophical questions, then we have the best philosophical school. In the contrary, we should consider philosophical legitimacy and worthiness for all or most of other philosophical schools and tendencies, and take care more about their answers to common questions without any prejudices. We, also, should avoid of any exclusive tendency regarding our philosophical thought, and accept this fact that there are some philosophical systems that have good virtues maybe we have not. So it is only due to humbly comparative philosophy that we can get to other philosophical horizons, and by extending our philosophical tendencies can find suitable responses for our new and ahead questions, and also play an effective role for answer of other philosophical schools.

#### **Fundamental Problems and Question of Comparative Philosophy**

Now by considering the necessity of paying attention to comparative philosophy for discovering new horizons in philosophical contemplations, it seems there are two groups of philosophical questions that can be studied comparatively. The first group is philosophical questions and foundations which are as constitutive of different philosophical systems. In this case, it can be possible to compare ontological, epistemological, methodological, theological, anthropological, moral and so on systems based on their ahead common questions. The result of such a comparative study is rethinking and rereading of philosophical foundations, principles and problems of our system of thought from other philosophical systems' approach that maybe is led to reforming, completing or strengthening of some of our philosophical theories, or maybe we success to find the merits of our philosophical school in comparison to them. The second group is those of philosophical questions that generally maybe our philosophical school, or other schools or most of philosophical schools are seriously involved to them, and have not found satisfying answers regarding them. In this case, it can be possible to address some questions like contemporary human being's conception of God, the role of God in human being's life, the role

of believing in the Day of Judgment, the problem of evil, the meaning of life, the relation between reason and faith, religious pluralism and so on. The significance of such questions is that, first, all philosophical systems of thought, less or more are mostly involved to them, second, by taking into account into given answers from one philosophical school, they were not adequate. Consequently, by welcoming to comparative philosophy, we are able to reread contemporary ahead and vital questions from multidimensional aspects in order to close in upon or contact to correct responses. In the other word, comparative philosophy takes possibility to scholarly investigating regarding contemporary philosophical questions from many angles which maybe is concluded to discovering their unknown aspects and to free us from our exclusive thinking concerning our schools of thought. In this case, let me speak about the causality. In western philosophies, in particular modern ones, under the influence of empiricism, thinking of causality mostly is phenomenological approach and based on empirical recognizing of causal relations of the external events. It, in this approach, for example in Hume's philosophy, is neglected from the hierarchy of existents and the worlds that natural universe is of their lowest level, and the reality of the whole system of being is restricted only to the material world, and is tried to infer natural causality from it. For Mulla Sadra, in the contrary, we are witnessed to rational and metaphysical tendency to real causality which it takes place in all stages of the whole system of being, and that the natural world shows the natural causality alone, while as well as it, we have many levels of metaphysical, immaterial and spiritual causality that has effective role in totality of the worldly system and human being's life. The significance of this matter is that contemporary philosophy of the modern West, by denying metaphysical levels of causality and restricting it only to material one based on external experience, is unable to take efficacious answers to contemporary philosophical questions that directly is pertained to causality. For example, in this case, we can consider such problems: the relation of God with the world, the problem of evil, the relation of soul and body, spiritual healing and so on that they have no logical and rational answers in empirical tendency to causality, while metaphysical thinking of causality is able to take logical answers concerning such questions and problems. This matter is a sample of merits of welcoming to comparative philosophy in the contemporary age, since it extends the horizon of our philosophical thought, put aside our exclusive thinking to our philosophical school and benefits us from other schools' data for rebuilding our philosophical answers. Here, as a case study, we comparatively study on Hume's point of view as the prominent representative of modern empiricism and Mulla Sadra's thought as the prominent representative of Islamic transcendent wisdom. This

research will show that what epistemological and ontological horizons can be opened by comparison of Mulla Sadra and Hume's thought related to causality ahead contemporary philosophy, that maybe it can effects contemporary understanding of causality in its most aspects.

### **Hume on Empiricism and Causality**

Hume has played an effective role for strengthening empirical epistemology, and was able to show the importance of empirical attitude in all of human being's epistemological system. In this attitude, all human being's knowledge originates from experience and there is only external experience which has epistemic credibility and authority as our epistemological base. Therefore the existence of every reality is accepted epistemologically, when recognizing it is possible through external experience, and we can know it by our concrete epistemic faculties. Such an empirical thinking of Hume into the world and its existents is seen in his views regarding causality. Meantime Hume has the most significant points of view concerning causality among empiricist modern philosophers of the West that has impressed next thinkers extensively. Since, he based on his philosophical principles of empiricism was encountered to causality and was able to present an empirical explanation of it so that has extended after him up to now.

The starting point of Hume's contemplation on causality is his debates on the nature of human being's perceptions. According to his empirical approach, Hume deduces all human being's mind's perceptions from the external experience, and divides all human being's perception into two kinds of Impressions and Ideas (Emmanuel, 2001, P153-154). Impressions are as direct and immediate data of sensation, that is, whatever is gained through contacting of our internal or external sensations with objects, is called as Impressions, and when this impression exists that such a contact exists, like the impression of warm that is acquired through our hands contacting with a heater. Ideas, but, is consisting of remembering that impression after disappearing that contacting, such as the idea of warmth in human being's mind, when his/her hand is separated from heater. So impression is very sensation or sense perception that is made on the condition that such contacting between them exists, but ideas are very imaginary after cutting off such contacting. While, for Hume, clarity and clearness of impressions are more than ideas (See: Hume, 1988, P63-64). Hume, then, divides impressions into two kinds including of impressions of sensation and impressions of reflection. Impressions of sensation originate from unknown causes of the soul, and impressions of reflection mostly arise from ideas. For example, the impression of coldness that accompanies with the idea of suffering, can originate the reflective impression of hating. So,



for Hume, every idea that exists in our minds must be originated from one impression in order to be used in the functional process of the mind. Hence, our mind makes many ideas by its creativity. So human being's imaginary faculty is freely able to combine impressions with each other and produce new ideas. In the other word, in Hume's point of view, although the faculty of imaginary can combine ideas together, it ordinarily works by bases of association. There is an inseparable relation between ideas in retentive faculty, while such a relation does not exist in imaginary, although there is a linking origin between ideas or a kind of associated quality that it produces an idea through another one (Hume, 1969, P55). In the other word, after acquiring empirical perceptions for human being's mind, his/her retentive and imaginary faculties analyze and synthesize by using such data and produce new ideas and conceptions which indicates human being's mind creativity based on sense data that was arisen from the external world.

By considering this matter, Hume's main question is that, from which impression has been originated, the conception or idea of causality? Hume's clear answer to this question is that the idea of causality has not originated from any impression. In fact, he, first, introduces a general rule according which all ideas should be originated from one impression. He, however, is faced with an idea that has not originated from any impression, and at the same time it is as an idea, that is meantime causality is an idea, it has not been originated from any impression that this fact can involve Hume with a contradiction. The only thing that he says is that the idea of causality should be originated from the relation of things, and we should try to discover such the relation (Copleston, 1991, Vol.5, P 296). So, although causality is an empirical impression, but it is inferred by considering relations among external objects that are pictured in our minds. Hence, it can be said that external experience helps our mind to take association of ideas. But it is not a certain rule.

### **Contiguity and Temporal Priority**

Hume speaks of two causal relations that are called as Contiguity and Temporal Priority. He regarding contiguity says: "I first see that all things that are called as effect or cause are continued and integrated" (Copleston, 1991, Vol.5, P 496), that is, we see in the external world that striking of a ball to another one is closed and in the one place, then we by considering of contiguity of the even A with the event B can judge a kind of causal relation between them. While, it can't be inferred causality from spatial contiguity, since maybe there are many repeated contiguities between many things that do not indicate any kind of causal relation. The second is temporal priority that means the cause should be prior to the effect temporally which fact can be tested and confirmed by experience. Hume,

also, thinks about another kind that is temporal coexistence of the cause and effect, and considers it as the sign of real causality. As far as, his attention, however, is paid to the empirical world, in which it is only possible to consider temporal priority of the cause to the effect not their temporal coexistence. In the other word, for Hume temporal priority of the cause to the effect is as the necessary condition of causality and such a condition doesn't exist, then there is no causality. He argues that temporal priority is merely as the necessary condition for actualizing of causality not its sufficient condition, that is, it is possible to think of temporal priority and contiguity of the even A and the event B, while there is a causal relation between them. Hence, Hume says that can we satisfy and suffice to contiguity and temporal priority, and think that we have a complete idea of causality? Never, since there are no sufficient reasons to think that contiguity and temporal priority are adequate conditions for making causal relations (Hume, 1969, P 125).

### **The Necessary Relation and Causality**

For Hume temporal succession of even unlimited events can't demonstrate causality and be as its origin, that is, if we repeatedly see that the event B happens after the event A, we can't argue that A is the cause of B, unless that there is a kind of necessary causal relation between happening of A and B. Here, Hume, but asks that from which impression has originated the necessary relation of causality? He, after many reviews, concludes that neither the idea of causality can be demonstrated through intuition nor by argumentation. So, the only origin is experience, namely, we should investigate and study that can external experience originate and produce the necessary relation of causality or not? Hume by speaking of necessary relation, thinks about causal cognition, and asks that first, why and for what necessary reason do we say that everything which has been originated should has a cause? Second, why do we conclude that such determine causes should have such determine effects, and what does mean our argumentation in such arguments and our beliefs (Copleston, Ibid, P297)? Now that it is impossible to demonstrate causality through intuition and argumentation, Hume hopes to experience and maintains that it is only through experience in which we repeatedly see contiguity of two things, and call the first as cause and the second as effect, then based on experience, we can define cause and effect as follow: the cause is a thing that is followed another thing after it, when this relation and such events is repeated many times, we consider the first event as the cause and the second as the effect, if the first event does not happen, the second does not exist (Beneth, 1971, P 282-287). Although, we see such things and relations in experience, for Hume, however, we can't guarantee that such relations and events always

and repeatedly are happened in cases we have no knowledge or are not able to examine empirically. Since experience can't guarantee the necessity of causal relations and they are not arguable through intuition or demonstration. So causal necessity is not inferred through empirical considering of contiguous external events, hence Hume argues that if we repeat every impression infinitely, never the idea of causality is originated, and there is no difference between one impression or infinite ones (Hume, 1988, P 64-66). In the other word, infinite and endless chains of experiences and their spatial contiguity have never indicated the necessary of causality. So, as far as we have the relation of necessary causality in our mind, and it can't be guaranteed by intuition, demonstration and experience, we should seek for it's another origin.

### **Psychological and Mental Association of Ideas**

By considering mentioned notes, the only way for Hume regarding justifying causality and its necessity is referring to human being's mind and paying attention to his/her psychological and imaginary creativity for combining and analyzing mental ideas and conceptions. In fact, this is human being's mind's imaginary creativity that can make new ideas and conceptions that they have no origin in the external reality, experience and intuition, and can't be demonstrated by argumentation. Some clear examples of such ideas are horned giant, mercury sea, gold mountain and seven headed dragon and so on. Hume, here, considers the conception of causality and causal relation as mental ideas that are made by human being's mental creativity, although Hume refers it to reflective impressions. In replying previous question that why do we conclude that such certain causes must necessarily have such certain effects, and why do we infer from a cause to an effect or vice versa, Hume by psychological approach and indicating to observing their stable contiguity, argues that such observation makes our mental tendency through which is made a series of associations within which our minds naturally goes from one conception to another one, for example from the idea of fire to the idea of warming. So it is only through our mental creativity that we pass from the first event to the second, and by repeatedly observing them, make the idea of causality and causal relation, while in effect such relation is impossible to infer and conclude. Hume calls such virtue of mind as habit that is the guider of our reason in ordinary and practical life. Therefore concerning affaires of ordinary life, we have practically no choice to accept causality. Since our natural life causes and guides us to believe so on. So our beliefs and the nature of practical life have essential role regarding our life that causality is one of its necessary foundations.



So Hume's point of view on causality can be illustrated in such a way that he considers causation from two epistemic and objective aspects. From objective approach, namely practical life, causal relations and the principle of causal necessity certainly exist, and he believes in them. His main problem, however, is epistemic approach to causality and its virtues, that is, what does mean the sentence: "causal relations or causal necessary relations exist"? And can we demonstrate such claims through epistemic methods? So far, Hume is an empiricist philosopher, concludes that through epistemic methods, neither intuition nor demonstration is possible to argue such claims. So the principle of causality is epistemologically invalid and vain. Consequently, for Hume, incorporeal substance is omitted as well as corporeal one. Therefore there are only accidents like conceptions and impressions, and there is no foundation for causality except psychological association that everybody uses it differently. So causality from scientific and epistemic point of view is disappeared which this is a new great turning point of human being's attitude to the Being.

In short, it is considered that Hume's thought regarding causality has phenomenological and epistemological virtues. In fact, he tries to give two different analyses of it that can be titled as philosophical and psychological analyses of causality. Regarding these analyses, he introduces some criteria like contiguity, temporal priority, necessary relation of cause and effect, and psychological association, and tries to argue that rational and philosophical thinking of causality is problematic. While by exact evaluation of his thought, it can be said that some criteria, like contiguity, never has not been considered as the sufficient condition of causality, that is spatial contiguity of cause and effect can't be taken into account as the necessary condition for causal relation, that Hume, also, finally accepts this fact (Hume, 1969, p285). Here, we argue that spatial contiguity of cause and effect can be considered as formal factor regarding empirical and material causality which such causations are as defective samples of causality. In addition to this, it can be said denial of necessary relation between cause and effect can't be justified merely based on observation and empirical examination, that is, the relation of cause and effect is not mere empirical one within boundaries of time and space. So Hume's conception of causality is only an empirical conception between temporal and spatial events that can't establish philosophical and logical necessity regarding them. Since logical necessity is related to our judgments not to external events, namely, rejecting such necessity is led to logical contradiction. Hume considers such necessity between conceptions, while it exists regarding judgments. Philosophical necessity, also, is one of objective necessities concerning the principle of causality that Hume has ignored it. It means rational and metaphysical necessity between cause and effect, that

the principle of causality has its complete meaning only based on the existence of such necessity.

In short, regarding criticizing Hume's thought, it can be said his main problem related to causality is pertained to his epistemological foundations. Since his empirical approach is unable to demonstrate some universal and necessary principles. Hence all or most of empirical principles are not universal and necessary laws that can be applied to proof causality. In fact Hume and his followers, due to believing in empirical base of human being's knowledge, have neglected rational and metaphysical and necessary principles of causality that its outcome is reducing it to an empirical phenomenon. For example, since Hume's attitude to causality and in particular to necessary relation between cause and effect is an empirical one, then rejecting necessary relation between cause and effect in his viewpoint has not universality and generality, and if Hume asserts on universality of such relations, his assertion is not an empirical argumentation but is a rational one that indicates Hume's going out of empiricism that is contrary to his empirical philosophy.

### **Causality in Mulla Sadra's Transcendent Philosophy**

Mulla Sadra as the founder of Transcendent Philosophy (Wisdom), has abundantly benefited from previous Islamic philosophical schools, like Peripatetic, Illuminative, mystical and theological doctrines as well as Islamic teachings. Regarding philosophical theories, especially causality and its principles, he is under the influences of Ibn Sina's philosophy and Ibn Arabi's mysticism. On the other hand, Transcendent Philosophy is a philosophical and mystical school that has been established based on Principality of Existence and its principles like gradation in the reality of existence, unity and plurality of existence, simplicity of existence, and so on. Here we give some short explanations about them and their necessary relation to the causality.

### **The Principality of Existence and Causality**

The first and main base of Transcendent Philosophy is principality of existence (Esalate Vojoud), and it means existence is the only reality that constitutes the reality of objective being, that is, although when we analyze every being mentally and rationally, we are faced with two realities included of existence and essence (Mahyat), and can separate them mentally. Existence, however, is the only reality and the base of all objective facts, and essence is its boundaries and virtues. Hence, Mulla Sadra, in the book of Al Shavahed Al Roboubiyah, regarding explaining the principality of existence, says: "existence is the most deserving thing regarding concrete actualizing, since essence is actualized mentally and

objectively in the light of existence, then it is existence only through it everything is reached to its reality” (Mulla Sadra, 1996, p7). So it can be said according to the principality of existence, it is only existence that authentically exists in the concrete world and has external and objective effects. And that essence is a mental and nominal fact, and has no authenticity before existence, but its authenticity is dependent on existence. Hence, if there is a kind of causality in the world, it is in the light of existence and its objective or mental manifestations. Meantime mental causality is as weaker appearances of real and concrete causality. Here, by existence is not meant corporeal being which is supposed by empiricists, but it means real and concrete and metaphysical existence that encompasses all material, corporeal, incorporeal, rational, concrete and mental beings. So if there is a causation it includes material, empirical and rational causality, namely it takes place in the whole system of being.

### **Unity and Gradation of the Existence's Levels**

One of essential virtues resulted of principality of existence is gradation of its levels and stages, that is, although existence has principality, it but has gradual stages in its reality. Hence we have some levels of existence, like weak and rich, potential and actual, necessary and contingent and so on. In fact, all existents have not participated of the reality of existence equally, then there are different stages of existence in existents. Hence, the existents of the world make a longitudinal chain of existence in which there are arranged from pure potentiality to complete actuality, while their common and distinguishing factors is existence. So the reality of existence has gradual unity, that gradation in existence denies existents' differentiation and accepts their hierarchical ontological stages. In fact all different and plural stages of the reality of existence are one reality and in length of each other that is started from God as the Perfect Being to the weaker existents. Mulla Sadra, in this case, says “existence by itself is self-determined and at the same time manifests in many ways and different degrees, then individuation and instantiation of every existent is due to its priority or posteriori, perfection or imperfection, richness or poverty (Ibid, p13).

So the result of acceptance of gradation in the reality of existence concerning causality is that the chain of the world existents is a unique chain based on different stages of the reality of existence which their relation is explained through weaker being into richer one. Since such chain has longitudinal causality in which richer existent has a perfect that the weaker one lacks it, and that the weaker takes place the lower level than the richer one. Therefore the only ontological relation between members of such chain is causal one in which the cause gives being and perfection to the effect. Through this process, we pass from Ibn Sina's Possibility of Essence

(Emkane Mahouvi) to Mulla Sadra's Ontological Possibility (Emkane Vojoudi).

### **Ontological Possibility**

For Ibn Sina and Peripatetic philosophers, the criterion of effect's needing to cause is related to the possibility of effect's essence, that is, an effect as a possible thing so far as has no necessary preference to existence or non-existence, then there must be a cause to create existence from nothing. In Sadrian philosophy, however, and based on principles like principality, gradation, unity and plurality in the reality of existence, the criterion of effect's needing to cause is related to the reality of existence no its possible essence. Since essence is an inauthentic thing and in comparison to existence has no authenticity. So whatever exists is existence, then existence is the base of causality, and since the reality of existence is gradual, and we have different stages of being graded from the weakest to the richest one, that their differentiation is pertained to the measure of their participation of the reality of being, hence the criterion of effect's needing to cause is effect's ontological poverty that is called ontological possibility. Mulla Sadra, with emphasizing on this fact and on the construction that is allocated to existence, argues that the criterion of needing to cause is ontological possibility which is essential virtue of contingent existents (Ibid, 1996, p1220). He asserts that existence so far as is existence, without considering any additional properties, is both cause and effect, although the existence of cause by itself is different from effect (Ibid, 1996, p15).

### **Definition of Causality**

For Mulla Sadra, the cause is an existent that another existent (effect) is created from its existence, and if it does not exist, the effect is annihilated. Hence, the cause is a thing because of its existence is necessitated the existence of effect, and due to its negation, the existence of effect is impossible (Ibid, p113). This definition shows that the totality of effect's existence is depended on the existence and manifestation of cause, and if the cause, in particular adequate cause, does not take all conditions regarding the existence of effect, it never is created. So, here, causal relation is a real relation of giving existence or creation, and it does mean taking backgrounds for the existence of effect. Therefore, for Mulla Sadra, the existence of every effect is of requirements of its cause and as its manifestation, and whenever the cause emanates, the effect is created and issued (Mulla Sadra, 1999, Vol.6, p251). Hence Mulla Sadra and some Muslim philosophers introduce the rule that is meant "whenever a thing is necessitated, is created". Then the cause is both the giver of the existence and necessity of effect. So far as the existence of effect is relying on

actualizing of its adequate cause, if it is actualized the existence of effect is necessitated, and there is no choice to come into existence which is causal necessity. In addition to mentioned notes, one of the essential principles of causality is the principle of causal cognation, namely, from a certain cause is come into existence a certain effect, then it is impossible to refer every effect to every cause. Some Muslim philosophers believe that this principle is concluded of the rule that is called “every one cause has only its own effect” (Ibrahimi Dinani, 1993, Vol.2, p642-633). This fact shows that there is a special ontological relation between cause and effect, so far as only one effect is issued from one certain cause from one determined aspect (Mulla Sadra, 1996, p113; Dinani, 1993, Vol.2, p299-303). In addition to this, we can pay attention to principles like the necessity of the existence of cause when the effect exists, and the necessity of the existence of effect, when its complete cause exists which are as more significant principles in Sadrian philosophy (Tabatabaei, 1415, p159-165). It is necessary to note that such necessity of being is different from Hume’s spatial contiguity, although maybe they have some similarities. Hence it is possible that the ontological level of cause is more higher and nobler than the effect that can’t be explained by spatial contiguity, but as far as the essence of effect is the same as needing to the cause, then the effect in its becoming and continuity depends on the cause, and that its poverty and needing to the cause never has been annihilated, that this fact indicates effect’s ontological dependency on the cause.

#### **Inhering Being and Illuminative Relation**

Inhering being (Vojoud Rabti va Ezafeh Ishraqiyeh) is contrary to being by itself, then inhering being has no ontological independence, and its being is relying on other being. Therefore, the existence of inhering being is the same as its dependency and relation to other being. On the other hand, illuminative relation, which is contrary to categorical relation, is a relation in which one part of relation has an independent existence, and other part is as relying and dependency on it. In fact, illuminative relation is a relation that all of its identity is as its added part. So regarding Sadrian causality, it can be possible to explain the relation between cause and effect like illuminative relation in which only one part exists, that is, the effect has no independency in its being, but is as a relation to or illumination from the cause, or by mystical speaking, the effect is as a manifestation of the cause. Therefore, for Mulla Sadra, the effect not only is poor, but is the same as poverty. It not only completely depends on the cause but is the same as dependency and has no essence by itself, but its essence is essentially relying on the cause (Mulla Sadra, 1996, p115). So it can be said in Sadrian causality based on mentioned principles, the causation is changed to



manifestation, and the effect is become as an appearance, and causality is as the clear sign of manifestation.

It also can be said with considering gradation of stages of existence, causality takes place even in the possible and corporeal worlds, namely we never have ignored causal relations in the possible worlds. Since the natural world is as the systematic and lawfulness universe within its phenomenon are causal relations, like necessary and individuated ones. So causality is as a law that encompasses all levels of the whole system of being, even corporeal things, meanwhile it at all is not restricted to the sensible and material universes. Finally, although causality is as real and ontological relation between existents, it is not like logical and conceptual intelligibles, that is, it is not like external things or like logical concepts, but it is as philosophical secondary intelligibles that its place is our mind but it describes the external world. In fact, causation illustrates the virtue of the relation of the external objects (Tabatabaei, 1987, p318-322). In addition to this, it should be said dominancy of the causation principle in the world indicates the sovereignty and authority of divine lawfulness and ontological system of the world and its finality, that these properties can be proved in the light of the causation principle.

#### **Comparative Analysis on Hume and Mulla Sadra's Causality**

Regarding comparing Hume and Mulla Sadra's point of view about causality, we can pay attention to as follow notes: 1. Hume's attitude to the whole system of being is empirical and phenomenal attitude which is acquired only through sense perception and empirical knowledge. By contrast, Mulla Sadra's attitude to the whole system of being is rational, philosophical and mystical one in which all empirical, rational and mystical perceptions have their own suitable function and place. Hence, Mulla Sadra's epistemological attitude, in comparison with Hume, has more functions and can discover new horizons of the being that Hume's attitude is unable to do so. 2. Hume's empirical thinking of causality is led that his understanding of causality is become phenomenal, and based on apparent virtues and relations of events is caused to ignore the role of metaphysical and internal virtues and unseen relations between things. Hence, Hume's attitude regarding spatial contiguity, temporal coexistence and causal necessity and so on are totally depended on empirical and phenomenal understanding concerning relations between things which is unable to recognize internal and intrinsic layers of their causal relations. In the contrary, Mulla Sadra's assertion on the principality of being and its gradual stages indicates that logical result of accepting gradual stages of being is confirming its gradual and causal and hierarchical levels that apparent and empirical causation is as its weakest and clearest layer. In the other word,

the vital outcome of Mulla Sadra's viewpoint is inviting us to pass over phenomenal cognition and penetrate to internal layers of causal relations of things. 3. In Hume's approach to causation, it is ascribed to two or more material independent existents, that is, causation is a kind of accidental and secondary relation that two external things can have it which one of them is called as cause and the other as effect. For Mulla Sadra, however, gradual understanding of existents' stages and interpreting their causal relation by illuminative relation, is led to this logical result that the existence of effect is totally depended on the cause, and that the effect is as a ray of the manifestation of cause, and the effect has no independency. So regarding the principle of causation, the principality is only allocated to the cause, and when the effect is came into existence that its cause necessitates its existence. 4. Although Hume's attitude to causality is empirical epistemological approach, he, finally, leaves empiricism and by appealing to rationalism, tries to deny epistemological aspect of causality, while is unable to deny its practical aspect. Mulla Sadra's philosophical and mystical attitude, in the contrary, is able to prove the presence and existence of causality epistemologically and practically. 5. Hume's appealing to psychology and mental association and the nature of belief neither is logically able to demonstrate the principle of causation nor to reject it. Mulla Sadra's rational and metaphysical approach, but, through paying attention to gradual stages of the whole system of being, helps him to recognize and prove the principle of causation in all layers of the world. 6. Hume's empirical approach to causality, because of its ignorance into internal layers of the world system and hidden epistemological and ontological aspects of human being, like intuition, rational thought and so on, neither can get certain knowledge about concrete existents nor to deny the existence of immaterial and unseen ones, that causality is one of them. While Mulla Sadra's rational and metaphysical attitude makes possible to recognize both human being's internal aspects, that have epistemic functions, and to know more about immaterial and unseen realities and their relation with each other and with the natural world.

### **Conclusions**

This research as a sample of comparative study shows that accepting comparative study on philosophical problems and theories maybe helps us to find the answer of our unanswered questions, and guides us to some new philosophical horizons in which other thinkers can travel. Here, the notable point is that there was no big difference between Hume and Mulla Sadra's lifetime, but due to the lack of philosophical dialogue between them, there is no contact regarding common issues and philosophical problems. If there were such contacts, maybe each one could use other's thought in order to

reform and complete his philosophical system. Since if we compare Hume's empirical thought and Mulla Sadra's rational and metaphysical one concerning causality, as if they see one fact or reality, but from plural aspects and by different glasses. Now, if their thinking approach or glasses is changed, maybe they see new aspects of causality that didn't see previously. In fact, as far as, we are limited human kinds, never can't claim that our knowledge of things and realities of the world are comprehensive, that Kant emphasizes on this fact. When human beings try to recognize the world by using all or most of their epistemic faculties, it can be possible to claim that we get closer cognition about the world and its realities. So the story of causation is the like, that is despite Hume's worthiness investigations for empirical recognizing of causality, and his struggling regarding inferring its virtues like temporal coexistence, spatial contiguity, causal necessity and individuation and mental association, but due to his denial concerning possibility of rational and metaphysical recognizing of causality, he is unable to know its internal and hidden layers. Meantime he denies legitimacy of rational knowledge; finally by appealing to it rejects the possibility of causation. In the contrary, Mulla Sadra's rational and philosophical attitude to causation invites us to see internal realities of the world, and remarks us that through mere empirical and phenomenal knowledge, we never can positively and negatively judge about the world's facts and realities. Finally, empirical and phenomenal tendency to the world maybe is led to deny unseen existents like God, intellect, soul and angles, and human being's internal characteristics like love, hate, bravery and so on that apparently all or most of them have no empirical sign. In this case, human being have lost all or most of essential and authentic realities, truths and values, while in rational attitude the existence of all of them can be demonstrable and acceptable. So of logical merits of welcoming to comparative philosophy is avoiding of exclusive attitudes regarding philosophical schools and thoughts, and participating of other philosophical theories and extending our philosophical thought, finding rational solutions concerning our unanswered questions and crises of contemporary philosophy.

#### **Resources**

- Copleston, Fredrick (1991), *History of Philosophy*, Vol.5, Trans by Amir Jalaluddin A'alam, Tehran, Elmi and Farhangi Press.
- Emmanuel. M. Steven, (2001), *Modern Philosophers*, New York, Black well press.
- Hume, David (1969), *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Penguin Book.
- Hume, David (1988), *Enquiry Concerning Understanding*, Open Court.

- Ibrahimi Dinani, Gholam Hossein (1993), Philosophical Universal Rules in Islamic Philosophy, Vol.2, Tehran, Institute for Humanities & Cultural Studies.
- Mulla Sadra, Sadrudin Muhammad (1999), Asfar, Trans by Muhammad Khajavi, Tehran, Mowla Press.
- Mulla Sara, Sadruddin Muhammad (1996), Al Shavahed Al Roboubyieh, Trans by Javad Mosleh, Tehran, Soroush Press.
- Tatabaei, Muhammad Hossein (1993), The Principles of Philosophy and the Method of Realism, with Martyr Mutahhati's Illustrations, Tehran, Sadra Press.
- Tatabaei, Muhammad Hossein (1994), Nihayah Al Hikmah, Qom, Jame'h Modarresin Press.

