



THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES

Volume 27, Issue 3 (2020), Pages 1-99

Director-in-Charge: **Seyed Mehdi Mousavi**, Associate Professor of Archaeology

Editor-in-Chief: **Arsalan Golfam**, Associate Professor of Linguistics

Managing Editors: **Shahin Aryamanesh**, PhD of Archaeology, Tissaphernes Archaeological Research Group

English Edit by: **Ahmad Shakil**, PhD

Published by **Tarbiat Modares University**

Editorial board:

Ehsani, Mohammad; Professor of Sport Management, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Ghaffari, Masoud; Associate Professor of Political Science, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Hafezniya, Mohammadreza; Professor in Political Geography and Geopolitics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Khodadad Hosseini, Seyed Hamid; Professor in Business, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Kiyani, Gholamreza; Associate Professor of Language & Linguistics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Manouchehri, Abbas; Professor of Political science, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

Ahmadi, Hamid; Professor of Political science, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran

Karimi Doostan, Gholam Hosein; Professor of Linguistics, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran

Mousavi Haji, Seyed Rasoul; Professor of Archaeology, Mazandaran University, Mazandaran, Iran

Yousefifar, Shahram; Professor of History, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran

Karimi Motahar, Janallah; Professor of Russian Language, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran

Mohammadifar, Yaghoob; Professor of Archaeology, Bu-Ali Sina University, Hamedan, Iran

The International Journal of Humanities is one of the TMU Press journals that is published by the responsibility of its Editor-in-Chief and Editorial Board in the determined scopes.

The International Journal of Humanities is mainly devoted to the publication of original research, which brings fresh light to bear on the concepts, processes, and consequences of humanities in general. It is multi-disciplinary in the sense that it encourages contributions from all relevant fields and specialized branches of the humanities.

Address: **Humanities faculty, Tarbiat Modares University, Nasr, Jalal AleAhmad, Tehran, Iran. P.O.Box: 14115-139**

Web Address for manuscript submission: <http://ejh.modares.ac.ir/>

Email: ejh@modares.ac.ir

Contents

The Inner City Seljuk Fortifications of Rey: Case Study of Rashkân Fortress, Gabri and Kāsni Castles	
Mohsen Saadati, Javad Neyestani, Alireza Hejebri Nobari	1
Intellectual Trends in the Post-Revolutionary Iran, A Critical Analysis of Three Decades of Public Debates on Society, Governance, Religion and the Role of Intellectuals	
Seyed Javad Miri	20
Branding and Sale of Sportswear in Iran: Based on Grounded Theory	
Azam Norallah, Mohammad Ehsani, Rasoul Norouzi Seyed Hosseini	45
Plurals in Synthetic Compounds: Evidence from Persian-Speaking Children	
Musa Nushi	61
Resistance to Deforestation Represented in Louis Owens' Wolfsong: An Eco-Critical Reading	
Peyman Amanolahi Baharvand, Bakhtiar Sadjadi, Shohreh Chavoshian	75
A Study on up-Down Orientational Metaphors in Mullā Ṣadrā's Philosophy	
Vahid Khademzadeh	86

پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی
رتال جامع علوم انسانی

A Study on Up-Down Orientational Metaphors in Mullā Ṣadrā's Philosophy

Vahid Khademzadeh¹

Received: 2019/2/16

Accepted: 2020/1/2

Abstract

According to the cognitive theory of metaphor, conceptual metaphors are an integral part of the human mind so that we can see these metaphors in all aspects of human thoughts and actions. A part of these metaphors is shaped based on up/down spatial orientations. Based on these metaphors, spatial orientations play a significant role in human understanding of many abstract concepts. These orientational metaphors are visible in ordinary and natural languages, as well as in specialized and scientific texts. It is shown in this paper that a part of these up-down orientational metaphors have also been used in Mullā Ṣadrā's philosophy: the "Having Control or Force Is Up, Being Subject to Control or Force Is Down" metaphor has been used to understand the causal relationship. The "Good Is Up and Bad Is Down" metaphor makes understandable that the source of good attributes is in transcendent and higher world and the source of bad attributes is in material and lowest world. The "More Perfect Is Up and Less Perfect Is Down" metaphor has been used to understand the gradational hierarchy of the beings.

Keywords: Conceptual Metaphor; Mullā Ṣadrā; Up/down; Causality.

پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی

1. Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Theology, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran. Email: v.khademzadeh@um.ac.ir .

Introduction

In the common view, the world around us contains objects that each one has its own characteristics, and there is a special relationship between these objects. Language also contains words that literally have one-to-one correspondence with objects and relationships in the world. The role of the language is merely a description in accordance with the reality by the literal meaning of the words. The same prevailing view makes the traditional theory of metaphor. In the traditional view, metaphor, like other rhetorical devices, is a kind of deviation from the literal meaning of the words. Consequently, the metaphor does not contribute to the description of reality, but only has aesthetic effects. According to the traditional view, the literal language is different from the figurative language. We often use the literal language to describe the reality by means of the literal meanings of words in everyday conversations or scientific texts, whereas the figurative language is often used to excite emotions with the help of the rhetorical devices in poetry and oration.

According to the traditional view, two theories have been formed about the meaning of metaphor: 1) Metaphor does not have meaning, so that any literal meaning cannot be replaced with it. Metaphors only are the fantastic things that make emotional arousal. Donald Davidson (1978) and Richard Rorty (1989) advocate this view. 2) Metaphors implicitly have the literal meaning; in other words, literal meanings can be replaced with them; their meanings can be reduced and delivered in a literal meaning. Aristotle can be regarded as the most prominent advocate of this theory. But both theories share this opinion that metaphor does not play any role in the

cognitive structure of humans, and at best, it is only a different way of expressing the same literal meaning.

From Lakoff and Johnson's point of view, though, such a view is acceptable at some cognition levels; it cannot be generalized to all levels of cognition. For instance, understanding of abstract concepts will no longer be subject to this traditional view (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999: 119). In Lakoff's view, our everyday experiences lead to the formation of our conceptual system. Through conceptual metaphors, we use the common and concrete conceptual system to understand the abstract concepts.

Conceptual metaphor is the systematic mapping between conceptual domains: a domain of human experience - origin domain- that is concrete is mapped on another domain - destination domain- that is usually more abstract (Lakoff, 1993: 203).

For instance, in "Theory Is Building" metaphor, the abstract concept of *theory* is understood through the concrete concept of *building*. Many components of the building and relations between them have been projected by this metaphor on the abstract concept of theory. The following sentences are examples of descriptions that have become possible within the framework of the mentioned metaphor:

*We will show that this theory to be without **foundation**. The theory will **stand on the strength** of that argument. The theory needs more **support**. The argument is **shaky**. We need some more facts or the argument will **fall apart**. We need to **construct strong** argument for that. We need to **buttress** the theory with **solid** arguments. The argument **collapsed**. So far, we have **put together** only*

the framework of the theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 46).

In Lakoff and Johnson's view, the process of human thought widely uses metaphors. The metaphors in language should be considered as the only signs of the existence of these metaphors in the depth of human mind. A large part of our concepts is understood by metaphors. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 6) Conceptual metaphors cannot be reduced to literal meanings. Any attempt to reduce conceptual metaphors to literal concepts leads to the loss of a large part of the meaning of the concepts (Jackel, 2002: 21-22).

Everyday conversations, as well as scientific and specialized texts, are full of conceptual metaphors so that the footprint of these metaphors can be followed even in logic and mathematics (Lakoff & Nunez, 2001). As far as concepts become more abstract, the existence of conceptual metaphors becomes more necessary to understand them.

The use of conceptual metaphors in cognition process is automatic and unconscious. Each person in a normal life automatically learns and uses a large number of these metaphors (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999:128). Non-metaphorical and literal language is a very frail and poor language, and does not have the ability to cover the whole human cognition process (Lakoff Johnson, 1999: 59-58). Conceptual metaphors are one of the tools that generalize and expand the linguistic and cognitive capacities of humans.

Up-Down Orientational Metaphors

Lakoff and Johnson have tried to categorize conceptual metaphors. A part of conceptual metaphors are formed based on spatial orientations, such as up-down, in-out, front-back, central-peripheral and depth-surface. In this category of metaphors, concepts are

understood by the spatial orientations. Since the focus of this paper is on the up-down metaphors, we will continue to introduce this series of orientational metaphors from the Lakoff and Johnson's point of view:

Happy Is Up; Sad Is Down

His spirits rose. He is in high spirits. I'm feeling up. That boosted my spirits. Thinking about her always gives me a lift. We are feeling down. I'm depressed. He's really low these days. I fell into a depression. My spirits sank.

Conscious Is Up; Unconscious Is Down

Get up. Wake up. I'm up already. He rises early in the morning. He fell asleep. He dropped off to sleep. He's under hypnosis. He sank into a coma

More Is Up; Less Is Down

The number of books printed each year keeps going up. His draft number is high. My income rose last year. The amount of artistic activity in this state has gone down in the past year. The number of errors he made is incredibly low. His income fell last year. He is underage. If you're too hot, turn the heat down

Good Is Up; Bad Is Down

Things are looking up. We hit a peak last year, but it's been downhill ever since. Things are at an all-time low. He does high-quality work

Virtue Is Up; Depravity Is Down

He is high-minded. She has high standards. She is upright. She is an upstanding citizen. That was a low trick. Don't be underhanded. I wouldn't stoop to that. That would be beneath me. He fell into the abyss of depravity. That was a low-down thing to do.

Rational Is Up; Emotional Is Down

*The discussion **fell** to the emotional level, but I **raised** it back **up** to the rational plane. We put our feelings aside and had a **high-level** intellectual discussion of the matter. He couldn't **rise above** his emotions.*

Having Control or Force Is Up, Being Subject to Control or Force Is Down

*I have control **over** her. I am on **top** of the situation. He is in a **superior** position. He is at the **height** of his power. He is in the **high** command. He is in the **upper** echelon. His power **rose**. He ranks **above** me in strength. He is **under** my control. He **fell** from power. His power is on the **decline** (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:14-17).*

Although Lakoff and Johnson have presented these metaphors in English Language, but various studies demonstrate the existence of a large part of these orientational metaphors in other languages and cultures. For instance, in a comparative study, Afrashi and Beatrice Salas proved that large part of the up-down orientational metaphors has been used in the Persian and Spanish (Afrashi & Hesami & Salace, 2013). Lan Chun has also comparatively studied the up-down orientational metaphor in English and Chinese. He claims that a significant part of the metaphors used in the Chinese and English is similar (Chun, 1996: 151-175).

Conceptual metaphors are not arbitrary or random, but the creation of these metaphors rooted in the physical structure of human as well as fundamental and common human experiences. Conceptual metaphors that do not have universality, are often rooted in the culture and social values of a society. (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003: 245). A large part of up-down orientational metaphors is universal, that is, they are not belong to a specific culture or society. The universal feature of

these metaphors reveals that they are not linguistic but their roots should be sought in the common cognitive structure of the human.

According to Lakoff and Johnson, no metaphor has the capacity to represent all aspects of a concept (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 13). For instance, in “Happy Is Up; Sad Is Down” metaphor, up spatial orientation is not the equivalent of the happiness, but it makes a part of the meaning of the happiness in the human cognitive system such that by eliminating this metaphor, a part of the meaning of the happiness in the human cognitive system is vanished.

Up-Down Orientational Metaphors in Mullā Ṣadrā's Philosophy

According to the cognitive theory of the metaphor, up- down orientational metaphor rooted in the human cognitive system. So, clear instances of this metaphor can be found in all human actions. The instances and evidences presented previously about the orientational metaphors, all belong to the ordinary language. However, we can conceivably find them in scientific or academic texts.

In the philosophical texts of Muslim philosophers, there are many terms that refer to the up-down spatial orientations. For instance, the derivatives of «*S-f-b*» (to be low), «*N-z-b*» (to descend), and «*S-q-t*» (to fall down), «*H-b-t*» (to go down) roots and the preposition «*Tah-t*» (under) all refer to the down orientation. In contrast, derivatives of «*-l-w*» (to be high), «*ṣ-'-d*» (to rise), «*r-q-y*» (to ascend) and the preposition «*Fawq*» (above) all refer to the *up orientation*. Since most of the texts in Islamic philosophy written in Arabic, then, in order to understand and analyze the terms, it is necessary to refer to the Arabic philosophical

works and analyze literal meaning of the orientational words. The aforementioned orientational words used to describe philosophical concepts and theories. Now, the question is: How can we justify the use of the up and down spatial orientations to describe the abstract and metaphysical beings and properties that lack the real orientations? Was the usage of these spatial orientations by Muslim philosophers to describe abstract entities accidental? Does the use of the spatial orientations have the cognitive effects on the philosophical views of the scholars or only have the aesthetic effects?

It seems that the cognitive theory of metaphor can provide a reasonable explanation of the role of these spatial orientations in the realm of philosophical systems. Mullā Ṣadrā (1571-1640), the founder of the transcendent philosophy, is arguably one of the most important and influential philosophers in the Muslim world. This paper tries to extract and analyze the evidences of the use of spatial orientations for philosophical descriptions by referring to Mullā Ṣadrā's works.

Having Control Or Force Is Up, Being Subject To Control or Force Is Down

This metaphor is rooted in a fundamental common experience. Every human being, who is under the influence of the gravitational force of the earth, knows that having force to control the objects from an upper level is always more effective. The pressure that flows from the upper level felt by a person is always more intense because the gravitational force of the earth intensifies such a pressure. We can generalize this fundamental experience to other cognitive domains through the conceptual metaphor. That is why in social relations, the person

who holds power often described as "high authority" or "superior manager".

It seems that the signs of this metaphor can be seen in the philosophical theories of Muslim scholars. Having control over something in the philosophical literature equivalent to the causal relation; in other words, the cause affects its effect or the effect is under the control of the its cause. Mullā Ṣadrā often defines the causal relation in terms of spatial orientations. In all cases, the cause is up and the effect is down.

According to his theory of causality, Mullā Ṣadrā calls the high existent (*ālī*) the cause and the low existent (*sāfil*) the effect. The term *ālī* from «'-l-w» root means the high level and the term *Sāfil* from «S-f-b» root means low level. Mullā Ṣadrā says:

- أن الوجود المعلول بما هو معلول مطلقا هو وجوده
لعلته و أن وجود السافل مطلقا هو وجوده لدى
العالى.

The existence of effect qua effect absolutely is its existence for its cause and the **low existent** (*sāfil*) absolutely is its existence for **high existent** (*ālī*) (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 1: 330).

Describing the position of human, Mullā Ṣadrā puts the active intellect, the cause of intelligible forms, above him, and places the effects of practical intellect lower than human:

- فلها باعتبار ما يخصها من القبول عما فوقها و الفعل
فيما دونها قوتان علامة و عمالة .

There are two faculties [within human]; wisdom (theoretical intellect) by which he takes [universal concepts] from a **higher level** and labor (practical intellect) by which he apply

[the intellectual actions] to a **lower level**” (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1360SH: 199).

However, some sentences in Mullā Ṣadrā's literature cover the metaphor more obviously:

- تلك العقول القدسية أنوار قاهرة مؤثرة فيما تحتها من النفوس و الأجرام.

Those holy intellects are the **conqueror** (*qāhir*) lights that **affect** things in **lower level** like souls and bodies (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1354SH: 125).

- الله سبحانه وراء الجميع و فوق الكل و هو القاهر فوق عبادِهِ.

God is beyond and **above** all of them [creatures]. He is the **conqueror** (*qāhir*) that is **above** of his **servants** (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1360SH:150).

- هي الفاعلة للأمر المتأخرة السافلة بالمقدمة العالية و... أما السفلية فكل منها انقياد للعالي و خضوع و إطاعة لما هو أشرف منها.

They [intellects] are the creators of the **low** existents (*Sāfil*) through the **high** existents (*ālī*). Each **low** existent is **obedient** (*Muṭīr*) and **humble** (*khāḍī*) for **high** existent (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 2: 274-275).

Mullā Ṣadrā uses the terms the conqueror (*qāhir*) to describe the cause and the terms the servant, the obedient (*Muṭīr*) and the humble (*khāḍī*) to describe the effect. The conqueror is in up level, whereas the obedient is in down level. The attributes of conqueror and obedient obviously associate with the mentioned conceptual metaphor,

that is, conqueror that literally means a person who controls something by force, is up and obedient that means a person who is be under the control of something else, is down.

Good Is Up; Bad Is Down

Mullā Ṣadrā uses the derivatives of the roots such as «*Sh-r-f*» (to be noble), «*Kh-s-s*» (to be vile), «*Kh-y-r*» (good), «*Sh-r-r*» (bad, evil), «*f-ḍ-l*» (to be excellent), and «*r-dh-l*» (to be vile) for metaphysical explanations. These terms have moral meanings; the derivatives of the «*Sh-r-f*», «*Kh-y-r*» and «*f-ḍ-l*» roots used to describe the good attributes and the derivatives of the «*Kh-s-s*», «*Sh-r-r*» and «*r-dh-l*» roots used to describe the bad attributes. Now, we can ask what are the metaphysical meanings of these words in Mullā Ṣadrā literature? According to the author's review, it seems that Mullā Ṣadrā has never tried to give an ontological interpretation of these terms. Here one can argue that the metaphysical explanations done by the moral terms are justifiable in the framework of conceptual metaphors. Nevertheless, what is important in this paper is the relation between these concepts and the spatial orientations. Based on “Good Is Up and Bad Is Down” metaphor, «*Sh-r-f*», «*Kh-y-r*» and «*f-ḍ-l*» are up, and «*Kh-s-s*», «*Sh-r-r*» and «*r-dh-l*» are down. The moral instances of this metaphor mentioned in the previous sections of the paper. However, it can be argued that this metaphor is also visible in the realm of Mullā Ṣadrā's ontology:

- بين أجزاء العالم علاقة ذاتية لأنها حاصلة على الترتيب العلى و المعلولى و هى مترتبة بالأشرف فالأشرف إلى الأخص فالأخص و من الأعلى فالأعلى إلى الأدنى فالأدنى.

There are causal relations between the parts of the universe, which ordered hierarchically from the most **noble** (*Sharīf*) to the least **noble** (*Sharīf*) or, from least **vile** (*Khasīs*) to the most **vile** (*Khasīs*) or, from **highest** to **lowest** continuously (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 7: 113).

similarity to God (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 6:235).

Mullā Ṣadrā repeatedly uses comparative adjectives of the more noble (*āshraf*) and higher (*ā'lā*) together in one sentence (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 1:77, vol. 2:67 & 279, vol. 3: 304 & 333, vol. 5: 203&210&265&301) For instance:

- هي الفاعلة للأمر المتأخرة السافلة بالمقدمة العالمة و للخسيسة بالشريفة.

They [intellect] are makers of **low** existents through **high** existents and makers of **vile** existents (*khasīs*) through **noble** existents (*sharīf*) (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 2 : 274-275).

- طبائع الحيوان التي هناك مثل طبائع هذه الحيوانات إلا أن الطبيعة هناك أعلى و أشرف من هذه الطبيعة لأنها عقلية.

The natures of the animals in there [the world of abstract ideas] resemble the natures of animals in here [the material world], but the natures in there are **higher** (*ā'lā*) and more **noble** (*āshraf*) than these natures in here because they are intellectual. (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 2:66).

- فلا يزال يترقى الوجود في الصعود إلى قرب المعبود من الأردل إلى الأفضل حتى ينتهي الأفضل الذي لا أفضل منه في هذه السلسلة الصعودية.

In the arc of **ascent** (*qaws al-su'ud*) toward God, existence continuously rises from more **vile** existent to more **excellent** existent as far as this chain ends up in the most **excellent** existent (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 7: 107).

According to these evidences, one can claim that in Mullā Ṣadrā's view, ontological nobility is conceptualized with up spatial orientation and ontological vileness is conceptualized with down spatial orientation.

More Is Up; Less Is Down

In Mullā Ṣadrā's philosophical system, the revised version of this metaphor is seen: "More Perfect Is Up; Less Perfect Is Down". This revised version is based on the metaphysical fact that the increase in defects and imperfects is indeed a kind of reduction. For example, more weakness is actually less power. In the framework of this metaphor, evolution is a gradational process. Each level of perfection is higher than previous level. This metaphor distinguishes from the "Good

- كان البارى . . . ذلك بمعنى أشرف و أفضل و أعلى بحيث لا يناسبه فى إتيته و لا يشاكله - و لا يشبهه شىء حقيقة.

God is more **noble** (*sharīf*) and more **excellent** (*faḍil*) and **higher** than other beings that have no

Is Up; Bad Is Down” metaphor in two aspects:

(1) The “Good Is Up; Bad Is Down” metaphor compares two opposite attributes orientationally: good versus bad; noble versus vile. In this metaphor, *nobility* as a good attribute is up and vileness as a bad attribute is down. But the “More Perfect Is Up; Less Perfect Is Down” metaphor compares the different grades and levels of one attribute. For instance, *nobility* has different levels. In the framework of this metaphor, more noble is upper than less noble.

(2) The “Good Is Up and Bad Is Down” metaphor is not gradational while the “More Perfect Is Up and Less Perfect Is Down” metaphor is based on gradational levels. Even if good and bad are assumed as something that does not have different levels, the “Good Is Up and Bad Is Down” metaphor can be used to explain these good and bad, But without the assumption of gradational levels in an attribute, one cannot use the “More Perfect Is Up and Less Perfect Is Down” metaphor to describe that attribute.

Mullā Ṣadrā applies this metaphor to different contexts. He explicitly says,

- فكل ما وجوده أتم و أكمل فخيريته أشد و أعلى مما هو دونه

“Every existent that is **more perfect**, then its **goodness** is **more** and **higher** than **less perfect** existent” (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 1:341).

This sentence implies that the more perfect existent is higher than the less perfect existent. He also says:

- كلما تحقق شيء من الكمالات الوجودية في موجود من الموجودات فلا بد أن يوجد أصل ذلك الكمال في علته على وجه أعلى و أكمل.

Whenever an existential perfection is found in an existent, **more complete and higher level** of this **perfection** should be in its cause (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 6:269).

- مرتبة العلة في الكمال فوق مرتبة المعلول كما أن نور الشمس أشد من النور الشعاعي الذي هو معلوله.

The level of cause in the gradation of the **perfection** is **upper** than level of its effect such as the sunlight is more intense than radial light (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 1:253).

The two above-mentioned statements, explain the relationship between causation and perfection; the cause is upper and more perfect than the effect. These sentences indicate that more perfect is upper than less perfect.

Mullā Ṣadrā also emphasizes that it is impossible to imagine a being is higher than God:

- لأنه بحسب ذاته تام و فوق التمام و بحسب صفاته الذاتية فاضل- و فوق الفضيلة لأنه غير متناهي القوة و الشدة لا يمكن فرض كمال فوق كماله الذي بحسب أصل ذاته و لا يتصور فضيلة وراء فضيلته.

God, in terms of His nature, is complete and **above** complete; In terms of His essential attributes, He is excellent and **above** excellent, because the strength and intensity of His existence is infinite. Therefore, it is utterly impossible to assume a perfect

being **upper** than Him (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 2:305).

Mullā Ṣadrā's argument in this phrase summarized as follows:

Premise (1): If there is an upper existent than God, then it will be more perfect than Him.

Premise (2): But there is no more perfect existent than God

Therefore:

Result (3): There is no upper existent than God

In order to prove (2) Mullā Ṣadrā says:

Premise (4): God's perfections is infinite

Premise (5): There is nothing more than infinite

Therefore:

Result (6): there is no more perfect existent than God

The (6) is the same as the premise (2). The premise (1), in fact, represents the "More Perfect Is Up; Less Perfect Is Down" metaphor. In (1), there is a correspondence between the perfection and up orientation; so that each upper being is more perfect than lower one.

Mullā Ṣadrā also says:

- فالعالم كله كجوهره واحده ذات طبقات متدرجه في اللطافة و النورية فكل ما هو أعلى فهو أظف و أنور و كل ما هو أدنى فهو أكتف و أكدر- حتى ينتهي في أحد الجانبين إلى نور الأنوار و في الجانب الآخر إلى أسفل السافلين- و الكل منازل و مراحل إلى الله و بوجه آخر مراتب علمه و بوجه مظاهر صفاته و آيات جماله و جلاله.

the whole universe is as a unified substance with different levels and degrees of Subtlety and lightness. So whatever is **higher**, it's more **subtle** and **light**, and whatever is **lower**, it is **denser**

and **darker**. These levels end on one side to strongest light and another side to **lowest** thing. In other respects, these levels are the same levels of knowledge. In other respects, these levels are same levels of manifestations of Divine attributes such as Divine glory and beauty (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 6: 305).

The beginning of the above statement, Mullā Ṣadrā states that the subtlety and lightness intensify upwards. Therefore, any higher entity will be more subtle and light. In the next sentences, he extends this characteristic to the other positive and perfectional attributes such as knowledge, beauty and glory. Hence, any upper entity has the higher degree of such attributes.

At first glance, it may seem that a part of the above phrase contradicts the metaphor. Mullā Ṣadrā claims that: "whatever is lower, it is denser and darker". Apparently, on the basis of this statement, in the case of some attributes, it can be said that each lower existent has a more perfect degree of those attributes such as darkness and density. However, the contradiction will disappear if we know that these attributes are negative and represent the deficiency and imperfection, while the metaphor emphasizes on positive attribute and perfections; more perfect being is upper than less perfect being. The mentioned sentence should be rewritten: "whatever is lower, it is less light and subtle". Unlike darkness and density, Lightness and Subtlety are positive attribute in Mullā Ṣadrā's philosophy. Therefore, we should not consider this sentence as a counterexample of the metaphor.

Arcs of Ascent and Descent

In order to describe a large part of his philosophical system, Mullā Ṣadrā uses

frequently arc of ascent (*qaws al-ṣu'ūd*) and arc of descent (*qaws al-nuzūl*). *ṣu'ūd* from «*ṣ-'d*» root means ascent and upward movement. *Nuzūl* form «*N-z-l*» root means descent and downward movement. The arc of descent describes the process of creating universe by God and the arc of ascent describe the process of moving the creatures toward God.

In explaining the arc of descent, Mullā Ṣadrā says:

- فيفيض عن ذاته بذاته وجود الأشياء وإذا فاضت عنه ترتب مراتبها ... ، فيبتدى من أشرفها وجودا وأتمها جوهرية وهو العقول العالية والجواهر المتخلصة عن المواد بالكلية ثم يتلوه في الوجود ما يتلوه في الكمال والشرف كالنفوس المجردة الفلكية... ثم الصور المنطبعة السماوية، ثم الطبيعة العنصرية، ثم الجسمية إلى أن ينتهي إلى الوجود الذي لا أخس منه ولا أنقص، وهو الهيولى الأولى. فينقطع هذه السلسلة النزولية عندها.

All creatures come from God, and whenever they come into existence, this happens hierarchically. Therefore, the process of creation begins from the **noblest** being, the intellects, and then it comes to the astronomical soul and then it comes to astronomical bodies and then it comes to physical nature. This hierarchy end with the most **vile** and **imperfect** being, prime matter. The arc of **descent** cuts off in this level (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1354SH: 205-206).

Mullā Ṣadrā says elsewhere that:

- وأشرف النظام فيبتدى من أشرفها وجودا كالعقول الفعالة ثم يتلوه ما هو أنقص منه قليلا كالنفوس الفلكية ثم صورها المنطبعة وهكذا متدرجا إلى أن ينتهي إلى

أنقص الموجودات و أدونها فيقطع سلسلة الأبداع في النزول عنده.

The noblest system begins form the **noblest** being, the active intellects, and then it comes to less perfect being like the astronomical souls. This hierarchy ends to the **lowest** and most **imperfect** level. Arc of **descent** cuts off in this level (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 7:107).

Two metaphors “Having Control Or Force Is Up, Being Subject To Control or Force Is Down” and “More Perfect Is Up and Less Perfect Is Down” are applied in both above statements. In Arc of descent, the higher level a being is located, the greater the causal force it has, so that the highest being is the first cause. As well as, the higher level a being is located, the more perfect it is. Along with descending in this arc, the deficiency and imperfect also increase. Therefore descent in this hierarchy is accompanied by descent in causal force and perfection. In the interpretation of the religious belief about the fall of man from the paradise to the earth, Mullā Ṣadrā says:

- إن سقوط النفس عبارة عن صدورها عن سببها الأصلي ونزولها عن أبيها المقدس العقلي.

The **fall** of soul is same as emanation from his original **cause** and his intellectual holy father” (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 8: 358).

In this sentence, Mullā Ṣadrā implicitly uses the “Having Control Or Force Is Up, Being Subject To Control or Force Is Down” metaphor to give a philosophical explanation about fall of man from the paradise onto the earth. This interpretation is in accordance

with the Mullā Ṣadrā's view about the arc of descent.

Mullā Ṣadrā says somewhere:

- المجيء إلى الدنيا من الجنة، هو النزول من الكمال إلى
التقص، . . . و لا محالة صدور الخلق من الخالق ليس
إلا على هذا الطريق.

The **fall** of man from the paradise onto the earth is same as **descent** from **perfection** into **defect**. **Creation** of universe by God only is in this way (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1354 SH: 434).

In this phrase, he interprets the fall of man as movement from perfection into defect and creation of universe by God. Movement from perfection into defect is compatible with "More Perfect Is Up and Less Perfect Is Down" metaphor and creation universe by God is compatible with "Having Control Or Force Is Up, Being Subject To Control or Force Is Down" metaphor.

Mullā Ṣadrā introduces the arc of ascent as movement toward absolute perfect entity. He says:

- فلا يزال يترقى الوجود في الصعود إلى قرب المعبود
من الأردل إلى الأفضل حتى ينتهي الأفضل الذي لا
أفضل منه في هذه السلسلة الصعودية.

Hierarchy of existents, in the arc of **ascent**, rise from the more **vile** existent to the more **excellent** existent, insofar as this hierarchy end up to the most **excellent** existent (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 7: 107).

The arc of ascent involves "More Perfect Is Up and Less Perfect Is Down" metaphor. Therefore, ascending motion is same as the movement toward perfection from the lowest level to the highest level.

The arc of ascent and arc of descent are different in terms of using orientational metaphors. Arc of descent is conceptualized through the "Having Control Or Force Is Up, Being Subject To Control or Force Is Down" and "More Perfect Is Up and Less Perfect Is Down" metaphors. In contrast, Arc of ascent is conceptualized only through the "More Perfect Is Up and Less Perfect Is Down" metaphor. The reason for the difference is that causal relation is a one-way relationship from cause to effect, namely, the cause makes the effect and not vice versa. Therefore, causal relation through "Having Control Is Up, Being Subject To Control Is Down" metaphor is used only in the Arc of descent to understand the downward motion. But there is a two-way relation between perfection and imperfection. The arc of descent is a process from perfection toward imperfection, and the arc of ascent is a process from imperfection to perfection. Therefore, both arcs share the use of "More Perfect Is Up and Less Perfect Is Down" metaphor.

Combination of Orientational Metaphors

Mullā Ṣadrā's philosophy is an integrated and consistent system that has benefited from a number of orientational metaphors for understanding and explaining philosophical theories; The "Having Control Is Up, Being Subject To Control Is Down" metaphor provides the ground for understanding the causal relation based on spatial up-down orientation. In the framework of this metaphor, causality is an up-to-down relation and the cause is always upper than the effect. The "Good Is Up and Bad Is Down" allows us to understand that in Mullā Ṣadrā's philosophy all good attributes located in the high levels and bad attributes located in the low levels. Also, the "More Perfect Is

Up and Less Perfect Is Down” metaphor allows us to understand the existential gradation among the all beings, so that the upper degrees of beings is more perfect than the lower degrees. This hierarchy from one side, ends up to the most perfect and the highest degree of being, and from the other side, it ends up to the most imperfect and the lowest one.

Combining these orientational metaphors in a coherent and systematic way causes Mullā Ṣadrā’s philosophical system uses up-down orientations coherently and consistently. Therefore, God, as the cause of universe, the most perfect being, the owner of good attributes and the empty of bad attribute, is placed at the highest degree of universe. According to this view, prime matter is the lowest degree of universe, because it is the only effect of other things and is not the cause of anything. Also, prime matter is the source of defects and bad attributes (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 5: 115). As well as, it is most imperfect being because it is pure potential and empty of actuality.

However, in a few cases, the use of different orientational metaphors in Mullā Ṣadrā’s system makes inconsistency. For instance, in the framework of “Good Is Up and Bad Is Down” metaphor, contrast between up and down is used to understand the contrast between good and bad. In this metaphor, contrast between good and bad is strong. All the perfections and good things are originated from high and immaterial world, while the low and material world is the source of bad things. There is a serious boundary between good and bad things

But the “More Perfect Is Up and Less Perfect Is Down” metaphor does not accept strong contrast between good and bad things. In the framework of this metaphor, perfection and imperfection are considered as gradational

things. In the gradational hierarchy of universe, every being is more perfect than lower being and is less perfect than higher being. As the perfection is gradual, the defect is gradual. According to this metaphor, it seems that the material world is not the only source of imperfect and bad things, but deficiencies exist in all creatures in terms of their existential degrees. However, with the descent in the hierarchy of beings, the imperfections increase and the perfections decrease, we cannot claim that a part of the universe, like the material world, lack any perfection. In fact, this metaphor supports the idea that perfectional attributes exist in all beings even minimally.

One of the most important contradictions between these two metaphors is made in the problem of all beings consciousness. Some of the Mullā Ṣadrā’s words emphasize that only immaterial substances are conscious, but material essences lack knowledge (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 6: 150 & 167; vol. 7: 234; vol. 8: 186; 1363b SH : 110; 1363a SH :50), while some of his other words signify that all beings in universe are conscious (Mullā Ṣadrā, 1981, vol. 1:118-119; vol. 2: 235-239; 1363a SH :41, 1375a SH : 137-138, 1375b SH: 298 & 313). We can justify each of these two opposite claims through a particular orientational metaphor. Knowledge and consciousness in Mullā Ṣadrā’s perspective is an existential perfection. Based on the “More Perfect Is Up and Less Perfect Is Down” metaphor, knowledge is a gradational attribute; as far as we go up in the hierarchy of beings, knowledge increases, and as far as we go down in the hierarchy of beings, knowledge decreases. According to this metaphor, knowledge is not removed from any level of the universe.

But, based on the “Good Is Up and Bad Is Down” metaphor, the answer is different.

Unconsciousness is a bad attribute. Therefore it must be concluded that at least the lowest degree of beings lacks consciousness. Thus, it can be argued that the inconsistency in Mullā Şadrā's words about this problem is affected by the inconsistency between the two orientational metaphors used in his perspective.

Conclusion

Lakoff and Johnson, in the cognitive theory of metaphor, claim that conceptual metaphors are an integral part of human thought. According to this theory, abstract concepts and relations can be understood through concrete concepts and relations. Orientational metaphors are a part of the conceptual metaphors introduced by Lakoff and Johnson. The up-down orientational metaphors signify the fact that many human perceptions and acts are conceptualized in terms of up-down spatial orientations. They provided a list of up-down orientational metaphors in the realm of English language. Nevertheless, one can see a large part of the list in other languages, such as Persian or Arabic. Seeing the common orientational metaphors in different languages and cultures suggests that these metaphors are not arbitrary, but they are rooted in the structure of human cognitive system or in the fundamental human experiences.

A part of the orientational metaphors announced by Lakoff and Johnson can be

found in the works of Muslim philosophers, especially Mullā Şadrā. The "Having Control Or Force Is Up, Being Subject To Control or Force Is Down" metaphor has been used in Mullā Şadrā's philosophy to describe the causal relation. Within the framework of this metaphor, the influence of the cause on the effect is always from up toward down level. Therefore, the cause is upper and more powerful than effect. The "Good Is Up and Bad Is Down" metaphor provides grounds for the Mullā Şadrā's opinion that non-physical and higher world is the source of good things, and material and lower world is the source of bad things. "More Perfect Is Up and Less Perfect Is Down" metaphor must be considered as a modified version of "More Is Up and Less Is Down" metaphor. Gradational hierarchy of beings in Mullā Şadrā's philosophy can be understood through this metaphor. In the gradational hierarchy, each upper degree of beings is more perfect than lower degree. This metaphor has made the gradational hierarchy of beings to be understood as a vertical order rather than horizontal.

The conceptual metaphors in Mullā Şadrā's philosophy presented here are not necessarily exclusive and this number may increase. The main focus of this paper was to show that up-down orientational metaphors exist in Mullā Şadrā's works; though we did not explore all aspects of the use of these metaphors in his philosophy.

References

- [1] Afrashi, A. & T. Hesami & B. C. Salas (2013). "A Comparative Survey of Orientational Conceptual Metaphors in Spanish and Persian", *Comparative Language and Literature Research*, Vol.3, No.4
- [2] Chun, Lan (1996). "A Cognitive Approach to Up/Down Metaphors in English and Shang/Xia Metaphors in Chinese" In *Lexis in Contrast*, Edited by: Bengt Altenberg and Sylviane Granger, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- [3] Davidson, D., (1978). "What Metaphors Mean", *Critical Inquiry*, v. 5, no. 1: 31-47
- [4] Jäkel, Olaf (2002). "Hypothesis Revisited: The Cognitive Theory of Metaphor Applied to Religious Texts". metaphorik.de

- [5] Lackoff, G., (1993). "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor", in *Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Andrew Ortony, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [6] Lackoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live by*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press
- [7] Lackoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh*, New York: Basic Books
- [8] Lakoff G. & Nunez R., (2001). *Where Mathematics Comes from: How the Embodied Mind Brings Mathematics into Being*, New York: Basic Books
- [9] Mullā Ṣadrā (1981). *Al-Ḥikmat al-Muta'aliyah fi al-Asfār Al-'aqliyah al-Arba'eh*, Beirut: Dār Iḥya al-Turāth al-Arabi
- [10] Mullā Ṣadrā (1354). *Al- Mabda' va al-Ma'ād*, Āshtīānī (ed.) Tehran: Anjuman-i hikmat va falsafi-yi Iran
- [11] Mullā Ṣadrā (1360). *Al-Shawahid al-Rubūbih*, Āshtīānī (ed.), Mashhad: al-Markaz al- Jāme'i lil-Nashr
- [12] Mullā Ṣadrā (1363a). *Al- Mashā'ir*, Henry Corbin (ed.), Tehran: Kitābkhāni Ṭahūrī
- [13] Mullā Ṣadrā (1363b). *Mafātiḥ al-Ghayb*, Khājūy (ed.), Tehran: Taḥghīghāt Farhangī
- [14] Mullā Ṣadrā (1375a). "Ujūbah al-Masā'il al-Kāshānīih", in *Majmū' Rasā'el Falsafī Sadr al-Mota'lihīn*, Nāji Esfihānī (ed.), Tehran: Hikmat Publication
- [15] Mullā Ṣadrā (1375b). "Shawahid al-Rubūbih", in *Majmū' Rasā'el Falsafī Sadr al-Mota'lihīn*, Nāji Esfihānī (ed.), Tehran: Hikmat Publication
- [16] Rorty, R., (1989). *Contingency, Irony and Solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University



بررسی استعاره های جهتی بالا - پایین در نظام فلسفی ملاصدرا

وحید خادمزاده^۱

تاریخ دریافت: ۱۳۹۷/۱۱/۲۷ تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۳۹۸/۱۰/۱۲

چکیده

براساس نظریه شناختی استعاره، استعاره های مفهومی بخش جدایی ناپذیری از ذهن و اندیشه انسان هستند بگونه ای که در تمام ادراکات و آثار انسانی حضور این استعاره ها قابل مشاهده است. بخشی از این استعاره ها مبتنی بر جهات فضایی بالا-پایین شکل گرفته است. براساس استعاره های جهتی مذکور، در فهم انسان از بسیاری از مفاهیم و پدیده های انتزاعی، جهات فضایی نقش قابل توجهی دارند. این استعاره های جهتی در زبان متعارف و عرفی، و همچنین در متون تخصصی و علمی قابل مشاهده هستند. در این مقاله نشان داده می شود که بخشی از این استعاره های جهتی بالا-پایین در آثار ملاصدرا نیز بکار گرفته شده است: استعاره «اعمال نیرو بالا و تحت فشار بودن پایین است» برای فهم رابطه علیت مورد استفاده قرار گرفته است. استعاره «خوب بالا و بد پایین است» استقرار صفات خوب در عالم مجردات و بالا و استقرار صفات بد در عالم ماده و پایین را قابل فهم می سازد. استعاره «کامل تر بالاتر و ناقص تر پایین تر است» جهت فهم تشکیک طولی در سلسله مراتب موجودات هستی بکار گرفته شده است.

واژه های کلیدی: استعاره مفهومی، لیکاف، ملاصدرا، بالا، پایین، علیت

پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی

۱. استادیار گروه فلسفه و حکمت اسلامی، دانشگاه فردوسی مشهد، ایران. v.khademzadeh@um.ac.ir