Biannual Journal Quran and Religious Enlightenment
VOl. 2, NO.1, Spring and Summer 2021
pp. 125-140

Epistemological Presuppositions of the School of Segregation

نقد و بررسی پیش فرض های معرفت شناختی دیدگاه مکتب تفکیک

Received: 2021/05/07
Accepted: 2021/07/08

Mohammad Mohammad-Rezayi[1]
Akram Rahimi[2]

Abstract

In the foundations of religious epistemology, the school of segregation on reason using is one of the sources of knowledge that presents a different image from the common images. The lack of clear logic in presenting opinions by the school of segregationists makes their views ambiguous. In the present article, first, the epistemological foundations of the segregation view are presented, which are: tools of knowledge, sources of knowledge, and the criterion of accuracy and correctness of cognition. Then, the claim of the believers in the school of segregation is that the intellect in the philosophical sense is not one of the tools of examined knowledge. According to this claim, the only role that man has in creating knowledge is the unequivocal acceptance of revelatory teachings. Hence, the concept intended by the segregationists about reason does not have the necessary conviction. The current article aims to prove that there must be a common criterion for distinguishing right from wrong. Therefore, by abandoning the tools of reason, a correct understanding of the revelation taught can't be achieved. Religious knowledge is the product of the measurement and interaction of both intellectual knowledge and narrative knowledge. Also the view of the school of segregation in this issue has been criticized and examined using an intra-religious and a critical-analytical method.

Keywords: *Segregation school, Reason (as a source of knowledge), Revelation (as a source of knowledge), Knowledge.*

1. Professor, Department of Philosophy and Religion, University of Tehran, Farabi Branch, Qom, Iran.(The Corresponding Author).
2. Assistant Professor, Payam-e Noor University, Tehran, Iran.

محمد محمد رضایی[۱]
اکرم رحیمی[۲]

چکیده

مکتب تفکیک در مبانی معرفت شناسانه دینی خود در به‌کارگیری «عقل» که از منابع معرفتی محسوب می‌گردد، تصویری متفاوت از تصویر شایع ارائه می‌دهد که فقدان منطق روشن در ارائه آراء، سبب مبهم بودن دیدگاه آنان می‌شود. در این مقاله نخست مبانی معرفت‌شناختی مکتب تفکیک ارائه شده است که عبارتند از: ابزار معرفت، منابع معرفت، معیار صحت و سقم شناخت. آن‌گاه مدعای مکتب تفکیک در این زمینه که عقل به معنای فلسفی از ابزار معرفت محسوب نمی‌شود و تنها نقشی که انسان در پدیدآوردن معرفت دارد، پذیرش بی‌چون و چرای تعالیم وحیانی است، مورد نقد قرار گرفته است. از این رو معنای مورد نظر اهل تفکیک در مورد عقل از اتقان لازم برخوردار نیست. این مقاله برآن است اثبات نماید، برای تشخیص اندیشه درست از نادرست می‌بایست معیار مشترک وجود داشته باشد و با کنار گذاردن ابزار عقل، برداشت صحیحی از تعالیم وحیانی حاصل نمی‌شود و معرفت دینی محصول سنجش و تعامل توأمان دانش عقلی و دانش نقلی است و نیز با روش درون دینی و با رویکردی انتقادی – تحلیلی دیدگاه مکتب تفکیک را در این مسأله مورد نقد و بررسی قرار دهد.

کلمات‌کلیدی: مکتب تفکیک، منبع عقل، منبع وحی، معرفت.

۱. استاد گروه فلسفه و دین دانشگاه تهران، پردیس فارابی، ایران.(نویسنده مسئول). mmrezai@ut.ac.ir
۲. استادیار دانشگاه پیام نور، تهران جنوب، تهران، ایران.
a.rahimi@damavand.tpnu.ac.ir

Introduction

There are various ways and means of acquiring knowledge, each, will lead to a different knowledge from the other. The view of most segregationists in presenting the intellectual model and its epistemological method is that they have distanced themselves from idiomatic wisdom and abandoned the philosophical policy. Their efforts are not only focused on the negation of philosophical reason but also try to show the interpretation of philosophy from reason contrary to the meaning of the Holy Qur'an, narration, and even custom (Morvarid, 1998: 8). Hence, in the religious epistemological foundations of segregation view, the image presented by wisdom is different from the common image. Because the companions of segregation believe in the existence of an independent being that is attached to the material existence of the soul to make it a learned. Such a view deviates from the common concept of "reason" in the terminology of religious texts. This claim has no room for doubt and dialogue. Anyone with a brief knowledge of Qur'anic studies or referring to the Qur'an realizes that religion must be understood through reason and research. Reason has also acknowledged revelation. But segregationists refer to reason in another sense. According to them, the intellect is the transcendent light that is not of the human soul. Therefore, gaining knowledge in them requires another tool and method. So, believers in the view of segregation suffer from exclusivism in the acquisition of knowledge. The monopoly of knowledge in one tool does not include comprehensive and complete knowledge. The present article first examines the theories of segregation view on the epistemological foundations in a problem-oriented and critical-analytical manner. Then, according to the assumptions and principles obtained, by presenting strong reasons, criticizes and examines the claim of segregation view.

The two main questions include:

1. Is it possible to have comprehensive and complete knowledge by monopolizing knowledge in an epistemological tool?
2. Is it possible to deny and criticize the claim of abandoning reason and correct understanding of revelation taught according to epistemological principles?

Answering the above questions, from the point of view of segregationists, depends on the analysis of the speech of this school on the epistemological foundations negatively or positively. The present article examines and critiques the views of the segregationists, especially Mirza Mehdi Isfahani.

1.Epistemological foundations of the school of segregation

1-1. Knowledge tools

Human consciousness of the outside world, objects, history, beliefs, and in short, what is called science and knowledge, can be obtained in four ways: senses, authentic narration, conduct, and intellect. The human senses are divided into two categories, external and esoteric. The external senses include 5 senses of taste, sight, hearing, smell, and taste. The esoteric senses also contain knowledge about the human soul, actions, interactions, and states. The human senses give him many cognitions, but they also have limitations: these senses have access only to the appearance of objects and their sensory properties; have time and space limitations; they belong only to

matters that are in the realm of the human senses. And, of course, they have no judgment on transcendental matters.

Much of our knowledge comes from being informed by others or our testimony. News or testimony refers to quoting the words or writings of others. For example, our information about the height of Damavand and Himalayas, the birthday of the Prophet (PBUH), the Mongol invasion, the conquest of Mecca, Einstein's theory of relativity, and most of the knowledge related to geography, history, literature, and others, is obtained through news by others. News narration is divided into two categories, religious and non-religious. Religious narration is the result of expressing the words and phrases of the Infallibles (AS), which is one of the important sources in various religions, including Islam. Most of the Islāmīc jurisprudence system has been obtained through religious narration.

Another tool of knowledge is mystical journey and behavior, as a result of which intuitions and revelations occur for human beings. Intuition means receiving reality as it is and without the mediation of concepts. There is no error in mystical revelations. Because concepts are understood realistically and without mediation. Of course, a person can make a mistake in interpreting and reporting it through sentences and propositions. Usually, this category of intuitive and mystical knowledge requires austerity and is not available to the general public. The most fundamental human perceptions are obtained through reason; because the senses are limited to time and place and are dedicated to personal affairs and the effects of objects. The quotation is also the transmitter (not the producer) of knowledge. Also, mystical intuition is not possible for everyone. The most important functions of the Reason are:

- Making general concepts: The intellect makes general concepts into sensory concepts. The intellect achieves general concepts through abstraction or generalization, which are discussed in the books of logic.

- Verdict: The difference between a proposition and some words together is that in a proposition, there is a verdict between the subject and the predicate. This task is the responsibility of the intellect.

- Argument and inference: From the combination of at least two theorems, an argument is obtained. The most important function of reason is reasoning, which is used to add new cases to human epistemology (Khosropanah, 2013: 123-124).

Proponents of the view of segregation, consider "senses" to be invalid among the means and ways of acquiring knowledge, including the senses, intellect, transference, and conduct. In his view, "philosophical reason" is completely rejected. Some of them accept "conduct" and others consider it invalid. They also pay enough attention to "quotation" to understand revelation. Hence, believers in the segregation view, considering the realm of each of the means of cognition, recognize narration as the only means of acquiring knowledge. They do not value philosophical reason as a tool of knowledge. To clarify the discussion, it is necessary to examine the epistemological sources that are presented below:

1-2. Cognitive Resources

From the perspective of epistemologists, sources of knowledge and cognition have been used in

different meanings: for example, the causes of the emergence of knowledge (Jawādī Āmulī, 1390: 320 and 92), belonging to knowledge (Hosseinzadeh, 2007: 12). Here, the ways and means of acquiring knowledge are considered as the cause of the origin of knowledge.

There are four fundamental sources for understanding in the first stages of thought:

1. Rational source,
2. Revelation source,
3. Experimental source,

and 4. Intuitive source.

From the point of view of the Companions of Segregationists, the Qur'an and hadiths have a special value in discovering knowledge. But they believe that the knowledge of ordinary people does not reach the understanding of the Qur'an and Muslims need the Ahl-al-Bayt to understand the Qur'an. In their view, the language of the Qur'an is the code language and the addressees of the Qur'an are only the Ahl-al-Bayt. So our understanding of the Qur'an is invalid. For this reason, among the segregationists, contemplation has no place in the verses of the Qur'an, and in interpretation, they pay more attention to interpretive narrations (Qur'anic researches, 1997: 9 and 10; refer to Ayat al-Aqeed (Commentary lessons by Seyedan)). Therefore, in their view, the Qur'anic meaning is valid if a narration confirms it. The criterion for the validity of the Qur'an is narrations. Because in their view, the addressees of the Qur'an are only the Ahl al-Bayt (as), and what we understand from the appearance of the Qur'an may be different from the understanding of its true addressees. Therefore, according to the school of segregation, the Holy Qur'an is completely removed from epistemological sources and its validity will be only in the shadow of narration.

Also, according to the school of segregation, the tool of "sense" in acquiring knowledge is worthless. In fact, according to him, human findings and revelatory teachings should not be combined to discover the truth.

The approach of the sectarians to the tools of "discovery and intuition" and the journey to acquire knowledge is of two types: For example, Mirza Isfahani documents many of his claims to intuition (Isfahani, 1999: Chapter 16: 321-325). Due to this view of Mirza, Allameh Tabataba'i, in a reference to the profession of Mirza and some of his students, considers it "the result of the path of Sufism and the Akhbārīs" (Tabataba'i, 1417: 5/262). Ayatollah Khamenei considers it "Semi-theological-Semi-mystical" (Khamenei, 1986: 27). There is a second look at people like the late Agha Sheikh Mujtabā Qazwīnī. He had no mystical background. Intuition is very insignificant, especially among new segregationists. Their emphasis is on referring to verses and hadiths and they consider the method of Sufism to be invalid (Seyedan, 1939: 18 and 11-10; Vakili, 2014: 123-125).

The tool of reason and the source of reason can be mentioned as the other sources of knowledge and understanding. In the intellectual model and epistemological method of the general segregationists, the intellect is insignificant. Also, they have abandoned the philosophical policy. Moreover, in the range of theorizing, they have fallen into the eclecticism of Akhbārīsm and Ash'arism. Is reason an instrument and source of knowledge in the view of segregationists?

In that view, it is emphasized that "intellect" (in its philosophical sense) is not a tool and source of knowledge.

1-3. Accuracy and correctness criteria for cognition

According to that view, to examine the correctness of cognition, especially the source of reason, if another concept and meaning contrary to its philosophical concept are taken from reason, "reason" is one of the sources of knowledge and is the exclusive source of knowledge. It has "innate authority" and is always infallible intrinsic authority for a reason and the knowledge that arises from it eliminates questions and whys. What deserves the title of "authority and proof" is the knowledge derived from this "intellect". As in the verses of the Qur'an and the noble narrations, the meaning of argument and proof is the same "knowledge and intellect" whose source of truth is the same (Ershadinia, 1997: 31-32) It should be mentioned that rationalism is accepted by segregationists. But their meaning is different from philosophy's understanding of reason. Therefore, it must be explained that the rationalism they accept conflicts with the policy of Akhbārīsm and also philosophy.

Akhbārīsm rightly denies reason. They deny the same meaning of reason according to which the fundamentalists have considered reason as one of the four arguments (Morvarid, 1998: 100). As for the intellect, what the Akhbarions deny is that the intellect is not in the true sense of the law. Akhbarions' perception of the reason is another concept. They think that reason means what they have understood. While they are deluded. What they deny, from the point of view of the school of segregation, is acceptable to the extent that it does not lead to the absolute negation of reason. Therefore, the controversy of the school of segregation with the Akhbārīs is basically that the Akhbārīs generally reject the absolute of reason (according to the meaning that this view offers for it). Otherwise, if the Akhbārīs deny reason in its philosophical sense, it will have the approval and support of the view of segregation. In the view of the school of segregation, to deny Akhbārīs, it is recommended to refer to the interpretations of the Holy Qur'an and the narrations related to the dignity of reason. We certainly gave the Book to Moses, but differences arose therein: had it not been that a word had gone forth before from thy Lord, the matter would have been decided between them, but they are in suspicious doubt concerning it (12:110).

Segregationists have not only focused on the negation of philosophical reason, but also tried to show the interpretation of philosophy from reason, contrary to the meaning of the Holy Qur'an and narration and even custom (Morvarid, 1998: 80).

Segregationists believe that philosophers' view of reason is that: reason is the soul with its four levels (Ibid. 11)

They believe that the four levels of reason cannot be denied. But what is important is that the truth of reason, with which the rationales are understood, and the truth of science, with which information is received (and which the Book and Sunnah call proof and needs) are alien to all this. In the view of the school of segregation, the intellect is neither one of the powers of the soul nor forms the truth of man (ibid. 11).

Therefore, the philosophical concept of reason, that is, the perceptual force of man with which generalities are understood, has nothing to do with its meaning in verses and hadiths. From the segregationists' point of view, the intellect is a "Transcendent Light".

"The truth of the mind by which the sensible is perceived and the reality of the science by which the information is perceived ... is the transcendent Light." (Morvarid, 1998: 33). The truth of reason, with which reason is perceived, and the truth of science, with which information is perceived, is the transcendent light. There is a remarkable point about the reason that is accepted by segregationists: They believe that no creature is abstract from matter. So, their soul is also material. On the other hand, existing intellect and science are enlightened and abstract. Therefore, the soul and the intellect are contradictory and not in harmony with each other. Since the soul is material and the intellect is enlightened, the soul becomes rational (and becomes a scientist) when it reaches that enlightened truth. That is, an attribute is created in the soul which is called conscience (Ibid. 240). In the view of the school of segregation, the words "conscience" and "property" are keywords that are widely used in the discussion of epistemology and ontology. Therefore, without understanding those, one should not expect to understand and solve the problems (Ershadinia, 2007: 38). Therefore, the characteristics of reason in the view of the school of segregation should be examined to clarify their approach to the method of acquiring knowledge.

1-4. Lectures of the school of segregation from reason

- The true essence of reason and science is the same. Their difference is related to their belongings. If it belongs to science, inherent goodness, and ugliness, it is called intellect (Isfahani, 2017: 5; Morvarid, 1998: 26).

- They are considered as independent external facts (Halabī, Nd: A/4; Qazwīnī, 1991: 1/57).

- Their truth is immaterial and luminous. Among creatures, only they are like that (Morvarid, 1998: 30).

- Their inherent status is discovery and emergence, and the emergence of other objects is through them (Isfahani, 1438: 7; Morvarid, 1998: 15; Tehrani, 1995: 49; Qazwīnī, 1991: J 1/58; Isfahani, 2017: 109)

- They have inherent authority. Therefore, they are always following reality (Qazwīnī, 1991: 1/59).

- They are simple and uncomplicated facts (Morvarid, 1998: 30).

- These facts are contrary to reason, information, and concepts (Tehrani, 1995: 49; Qazwīnī, 1998: 1/57).

- These facts contradict the human soul and body (Qazwīnī, 1998: 1/60).

- These facts can't be defined and described to anything else, except through effects or conscience (Isfahani, 2017: 4)

According to the above issues, it can be understood that the school of segregationists considers the union of the wise, the intellect, and the rational as invalid. It also distinguishes between the intellect and the soul (Halabī, Nd A: 4). The soul truth and naming and its four levels as "science or reason" are just terms (Morvarid, 1998: 15). Therefore, the truth of science and reason corresponds to what the book and tradition call reason (Qazwīnī, 1991: J 1/60)

Therefore, according to the believers in the school of segregation, the philosophers' understanding of reason leads to the disappearance and cancellation of the revelation and the persuasion of the argument for God. It also convinces the physical resurrection. Moreover, according to

this view, there is no reason to consider reason as specific to the perception of universals. But also the dignity of the reason is the perception of details. The basis of this statement is narrations similar to this narration which have been included in the description of reason: “By reason, truth is known to God, which reason acknowledges and reason denies the liar” (Morvarid, 1998: 24).

2. Drawbacks:

- The segregationists have presented a different image for reason than the common one.
- From their perspective, Knowledge is divided into two inseparable categories: human knowledge and divine knowledge, each of which is in the other width.
- Philosophy and mysticism are considered useless in the field of religious knowledge due to arbitrary interpretations of religious texts and unjustified application of religion.
- Knowledge is reminder and reminder, not learning and acquisition. Acquire is neither effective nor useful, but a hindrance at any level and scale.
- Acquiring knowledge is "God-centered." Human beings have no role in creating knowledge. Teaching and learning and the prophets are all only involved as reminders.
- Faith and submission take precedence over awareness and cognition. Therefore, the only role of man in creating knowledge is his voluntary submission.

3. Analyzing the view of the school of segregation regarding the acquisition of knowledge

According to segregationists, human knowledge is different from the basis of divine knowledge. According to them, human knowledge is derived from conceptual or present sciences. Also, the basis of divine sciences and knowledge is based on "Reminder". On the other hand, they completely deny the nature of human and divine knowledge and consider them contradictory. Considering the above, it becomes clear to what extent one can speak of the relationship between reason and revelation in this view.

3-1. The first drawback: presenting a different image of reason

In the critique of the segregationists' epistemological point of view, their views on reason must be taken into account. Because the image they present of the reason is different from the common image.

1. They consider the use of reason by philosophers to be extreme. Likewise, non-reference to reason by the Akhbarions is considered a waste. From a philosophical point of view, the reason is one of the levels of "soul". But in the view of the school of segregation, the reason is contrary to the truth of the soul. In their view, the intellect and the soul are contradictory, because the intellect is abstract light and the soul is material and dark. This view has been misunderstood in the concept of "Intellect".

They do not consider "intellect" in its usual meaning. They consider their way of thinking different from the superficialities and the Akhbarions. Throughout history, different conflicts and interpretations of reason, between different thinkers (theologians, philosophers and mystics, Akhbarions and principled), have not been following the concept of Shari'a of reason. The reason for this notion is the common word reason in religious texts. It sometimes refers to immaterial

beings (angels) and sometimes to the perceptual power of human intellect. This view merely considers reason to mean an external being that, along with the soul, causes human perception and does not consider it applicable to angels. (Ershadinia, 2007, 104). The segregationists' view of "Reason" is both at odds with that of other thinkers and odds with religion. The reason is as follows:

2. First, it is not correct for philosophers to confine reason to the concept of the power of understanding generalities and one of the four perceptual levels of the soul. The word reason in philosophical culture is a word that refers to the common denominator of multiple meanings. Lack of consideration of these meanings has weakened the opinion of segregationists in this regard.

Second, the characteristics that this view enumerates for reason indicate an unusual interpretation of religious texts and the inconsistency of this claim with the content of religion. The fact that the independent intellect is attached to the material soul to make it knowledgeable is a deviation from the common concept of "intellect" in the terminology of religious texts.

These attributes in religious texts are for beings who are called angels according to the Shari'a and intellect according to the philosophy. These beings are the mediators of grace between the divine world and the natural world. But the segregationists' conception is that these attributes are for a being who is outside of human existence and is attached to man only to become knowledgeable.

Third: It is not clear why the segregationists 'interpretation of the word reason should be correct, but the philosophers' interpretation is wrong? And why do they claim that reason in philosophical terms contradicts verses and hadiths?

It should be noted that the texts cited to prove the special meaning of reason by segregationists are accepted by them. Because the divine philosophers, inspired by these texts, such as: "The first creation of God is the intellect", they have attributed the same role of mediation of grace to these beings in the scene. And in the scene of science, the same beings are considered to be the mediators of divine grace. Quotes such as "Indeed, the intellect in the heart is like a lamp in the middle of the house" are the attributes of such beings. But the segregationists have fragmented the narrations and cited only some of its sentences. The segregationists have eliminated the mediation of the grace of these beings and considered them as the meaning of their desired intellect, which, by attaching to the material truth of the soul, causes human perception. In any case, such an interpretation is inconsistent with the text of the narrations.

3. Some of the attacks of this view on philosophy are due to the misunderstanding of the divine philosophers' meaning of "science and reason". For example, reason alone is not limited to understanding general cases. But the understanding of details is also done by the intellect. (Ershadinia, 2007, 109-111)

4. Undoubtedly, all verses and narrations are messages that call the intellect to listen and obey. It is expected that humans, as wise beings, will respond to those messages. Such ability must exist in a human before revelation, so mankind could receive the message. Does that revelation or

reason need to be proven? What does "intellect" mean?

If reason does not mean perceptual ability embedded in human beings, does it mean abstract and error-free transcendental ability? What about humans who encounter revelation in the beginning? If all human beings have intellect from birth, then why do some human beings, having intellect, deny revelation?

Hence, the meaning of reason is the ability of general understanding that deals with various rational arguments and has its logic. Otherwise, if all human beings, their intellect, conforms to the definition of segregationists, that is, the same intellect, has come down from above and caused them to become wise. So, what is the need for the revelatory messages of the prophets? The problem, on the other hand, is that segregationists do not consider the benefit of such a reason to be universal. They believe that primitive and novice human beings are deprived of this kind of intellect and only educated and gifted people have knowledge and faith. But even such a claim does not correspond to reality. Because which religious text indicates the allocation of reason to a specific group to understand the revelation and address them? (Ershadinia, 2007: 111-112).

5. The concordance of the segregationist claim with reality has come close to transformation. They do not consider knowledge to be a contribution to philosophical reason. So how can one benefit from the arguments of the Qur'an, which deals with proof in the form of analogy, and gain knowledge? It is unlikely that the closure of reason and rational knowledge was issued by a serious speaker. It is more like a play on words and entertainment than reality. Which rational or religious principle is compatible with ruling on the pretext that human beings do not deserve to not appear and remain in the rank of animals? If the door to faith is open, then why is the door to the knowledge of God closed? Indeed, religion must be understood through reason and research.

6. Those who have interpreted the verses of the Qur'an with the help of philosophy and mysticism and have benefited from the achievements of their definite intellect and heart in inference have all acted on the basis that revelation has considered the intellect as an esoteric argument. Reason confirms revelation. The intellect gains truth with the help of revelation. Is it possible to deny this process under the pretext of interpretation?! (Ibid: 115-116)

The second drawback: Lack of intervention in creating knowledge

From the point of view of segregation, nothing is involved in the creation of knowledge. Neither obedience helps nor does sin hinder. Because knowledge is the creation of God and no one has a role in it. Even the Prophet, as a teacher, has not the slightest role in knowledge. Absolute divine providence grants mercy to whomever He wills. Grace may also reach sinful servants. If possible, the righteous will be withheld. The absolute authority of God requires such a thing (Morvarid, 1998: 43). Such a claim is in clear contradiction with other segregationists' views. Including:

1. Gaining knowledge has stages. Among them is the denial of the spiritual veil and the removal of obstacles. The transgression of the acquired and present sciences and the negation of philosophy and mysticism have been done on this basis. Because

they have been considered as a spiritual veil and a barrier to knowledge. So you have to regain your position and remove the obstacles. Obstacle means creating the right environment and talent for knowledge. This statement contradicts the purely God-centered position that even God gives knowledge and knowledge to the disobedient and that there is no need for obedience and self-improvement.

2. Another thing that contradicts it, is that in such a view deep knowledge is fully attainable and the impossibility of attaining deep knowledge is false. But is acquiring this knowledge universal? The answer is no. Such kind of knowledge is a degree of perfection that is only for the pure. Those who attain intuition through self-improvement and purification can also attain such a degree of perfection. (Ibid., 69)

Why is divine grace not withheld from the disobedient, but this kind of perfect knowledge is not available to all? Do humans need to try and act on their own? Why, in some cases, nothing is obstructive and effective, but in other cases, there is the opposite, and the grace of knowledge must pass through a special channel to descend to the potential field?

3. Another thing that contradicts this view is the involvement of obedience and rebellion in the rise and fall of all beings.

All the differences in the worlds of bodies, from the first initial changes in water to the last changes that cannot be counted, are all due to differences resulting from obedience and rebellion. Thus, through worship, the degrees of perfection increase. Also, insofar as it is God's will, he might rebel in the perceptions of loss and destruction. (Ibid. 164)

4. Is not divine grace prevailing in this regard? Does benevolence depend on the degree of obedience and rebellion?! Another issue related to the internal incompatibility of theories in this view is the different stance on the necessity of the resurrection of the prophets with this position. In that article, it is said that since simple knowledge is the lowest level of knowledge and cannot achieve the purpose of creation, prophets must be sent to combine the knowledge. (Ibid., 100)

But in this matter, there is no need to shut down knowledge to transgress the rational sciences, philosophy, mysticism, and to argue with the corrupt consequences of this opinion. Human beings have not only received simple knowledge but even if they remain dumb like animals, they have been bestowed with the best of divine mercy and grace. Because they have been saved from the consequences of torment and duty (Ershadinia, 2007: 107-108).

According to this view, all science and knowledge is transmitted directly, from the outside. Moreover, no correspondence between the human soul and science is necessary. Although the soul is material and dark, it is not in conflict with abstract and enlightened knowledge. However, how can it be justified that information has an export uprising against the soul?! (Morvarid, 1998: 42)

This view considers logical certainties to arise from darkness and ignorance. It also denies "reasoning" and "logic." Therefore, this view is derived from one of the following two methods: or those who believe in it, use other argumentative forms to prove their claims; Or they have obtained information that is not accessible to

others by receiving it directly from the source of knowledge and the "light of the heavens and the earth." That is very thought-provoking!

The third Drawback: Alienation

Alienation is a sign of the segregation of philosophical sciences from divine and Islamic sciences. The geographical field of the origin and growth of philosophy is separate from the field of the origin of Islam. It is thought that the introduction of these sciences among Muslims is rooted in political motives (diverting people's attention from the Ahl al-Bayt) and has no scientific benefit. Therefore, knowledge is not obtained from these sciences.

However, the role of rulers and personal interests in translating philosophical principles cannot be denied. But it must be said that if someone abuses, it will not cause the transmission of defects and bad motivation. Theology is a set of rational arguments that result in the proof of the obstacle and the proof of monotheism and other principles of belief. These principles are first proved by reason. Then, based on their proof, the details of the book and tradition are proved. Using theology does not mean completing religion, nor does it mean abandoning it. Philosophical principles and rules are a tool for the optimal use of religion and knowledge. Of course, the philosophical thoughts and methods of Islamic philosophers are closer to the method of the Imams than all theological schools (Ershadinia, 2007: 118-117).

4. Examining and evaluating the epistemological perspective of the school of segregation

4-1. Limiting the use of knowledge and cognition tools

According to the tools of knowledge and cognition (i.e., the senses, authentic narration, conduct and intellect), the segregationists are exclusive in the source and tools of human knowledge. In other words, the claim of being limited to reason or revelation and not needing another source is an extreme claim that draws human attention to one source of knowledge and deprives it of another source of knowledge. Segregationists consider "narration" as a source of knowledge. Therefore, the companions consider the separation of knowledge acquisition from one source (narration) as valid.

Assessment

Given the claims of this view, it can be concluded that their view on the monopoly of the use of knowledge acquisition tools is not acceptable because:

1.The monopoly of knowledge, in an epistemological tool, does not include comprehensive and complete knowledge.

2.Ignoring other means of acquiring knowledge will lead to the closure of knowledge.

3.Not paying attention to other means of acquiring knowledge, that is, ignoring the cases that are the cause of the emergence of knowledge, either confirm it or are the basis of knowledge.

4.In this regard, it will be useful to recall the inherent goodness and ugliness of actions. Reason necessarily dictates that some actions are inherently good and some actions are inherently bad. That is why the deniers of the heavenly religions judge whether actions are good or bad. On the other hand, if the goodness and ugliness of reason are eliminated, the goodness and ugliness of the Shari'a will also be eliminated, because if the rational ruling is eliminated, the lie that is spread by the Shari’a will not be ugly. If the good and ugliness of things are

not inherent, then Sharia and religion will not be proven. (Sobhani, 2003: 88)

5.Recalling the verses of the Qur'an and narrations regarding the authenticity of the intellect in evaluating segregationists: "Indeed Allah enjoins justice and kindness, and generosity towards relatives, and He forbids indecency, wrongdoing, and aggression. He advises you, so that you may take admonition (16:90)".

In the above verse, two things are mentioned that make clear the error of the segregationists' view of reason. The first is that the same deeds that are known to all and justice and goodness, or evil and disgusting, are subject to divine command and prohibition. Secondly, it is mentioned in the verse that enjoining justice and benevolence and forbidding evil is a reminder, not an instruction because man understands them based on his intellect.

6. Failure to provide a convincing and reasoned reason for the accepted meaning of the intellect: Segregationists consider the intellect to be an abstract and enlightened truth that is contrary to the soul and the body. In evaluating this view, it can be said that: according to the levels of intellect (monstrous, queen, actual, used, active and holy), the human species ends up at the limit of used intellect and reaches its peak. The soul has the talent to accept the impulses of the active intellect only. The holy intellect is the highest level of intellect. Not all people reach this level. The segregationists believe that the "levels of reason" accepted by philosophers cannot be considered for human reason. That is the four stages of intellect, from the monster to the used. On the other hand, they believe that the intellect is an abstract and enlightened truth. If they say that we do not mean any of the intellects accepted by philosophers, then what do they mean by reason? At the heart of their words can be inferred that they mean the intellect, the holy intellect. However, their words do not say so. The holy intellect is not separate from man and his soul. Holy intellect is the highest level of intellect, which is for those for whom such power is created due to the purity of soul and heart. In any case, it must be said that "intellect" is the essence that creates the ability of understanding humans. Therefore, it cannot be ignored. Because it is the prelude to receiving the divine message. So, it cannot be separated from revelation. Thus, the view of the segregationists is violated.

4-3. Epistemological valuation

Another important point in examining the views of the school of segregation is epistemic evaluation. That is, evaluating the truth and conformity of their views from an epistemological point of view. Segregationists divide knowledge into pure and mixed knowledge without providing a reason (Hakimi, 1996: 48). The criterion for the truthfulness of knowledge and conformity with reality is that reason should be set aside (Islāmī, 1999: 144-146). This means that pure knowledge is knowledge in which reason is useless. The criterion of sincerity in segregationists is that reason is useless in pure knowledge.

Assessment

1. In the epistemological evaluation of the segregationists' point of view, it can be said that since they eliminate the intellect in acquiring knowledge, so they cannot provide us with definite, definite, general, and revelatory knowledge.

2. Pure revelation cannot be achieved by abandoning reason.

3. Word of Revelation; The Qur'an is the most honest words." and who is more truthful in speech than Allah? (4:87)" To understand the divine message, the existence of intellect is essential. Because the existence of such a perception in human beings proves to us the validity of the Shari'a. If rational propositions are not proven, then the Shari'a will not be proven. So, if the intellect has no authority, then the Shari'a also has no authority. Because the authority of the intellect is inherent and it is not necessary to obtain its authority from another source.

4. Other arguments are understood through reason. Imāmī scholars and theologians believe that the goodness and ugliness of things are inherent. Because if goodness and ugliness are not inherent, then Sharia and religion will not be proven.

5. Leaving aside reason, in the epistemological evaluation of segregated opinions, it is not possible to make a correct evaluation of pure and impure knowledge as well as definite knowledge. Therefore, their vote will not be accepted. Because if rational thinking and reasoning are invalid in discovering the truth, then there are no common criteria for distinguishing right from wrong.

6. The acquisition of knowledge is achieved by the simultaneous use of all valid sources of knowledge. Reason and narration can only together represent the propositions and teachings of Islam as well as the religious authority of the Abrahamic religion. Religious knowledge is the product of the measurement and interaction of both intellectual knowledge and narrative knowledge.

4-4. Acquisition of knowledge

According to the segregationists, the acquisition of knowledge is only through "reminders and reminders". Gaining and opinion are by no means effective and useful, but they hinder the acquisition of knowledge. Also, human beings have no role in such regard. The human being's role in gaining knowledge is restricted to their voluntary submission. In addition, in the view of segregationists, knowledge is divided into two inseparable categories: human knowledge and divine knowledge.

Assessment

Segregationists, especially Mirza Mehdi Esfahani, rule out the role of man in acquiring knowledge. They know human knowledge as opposed to divine knowledge. In a way, they make a general contrast between divine and human knowledge. Their view is not acceptable. Because the result of this view is the closure of the acquisition of science. While the verses of the Qur'an call for learning science, and human knowledge is in line with divine knowledge, not its opposites. Because the divine knowledge must be understood with this human understanding.

Presenting a different image of "intellect"(self-based religious intellect)

The image of reason presented by the segregationists is not the usual meaning of reason. They believe that outside of religion, they do not need reason. It is also believed that the intellect means an external being that, along with the soul, causes human perception. They do not consider reason to apply to angels. Segregationists do not consider any of the meanings given by philosophers about the reason.

Assessment

1.They do not offer a clear argument and description that the intellect is an external being and, along with the soul, causes human perception. It is not clear whether this external being is constantly with the human soul or not? Also, is there an external being for every human being or not, is there a general external being for all human beings? Therefore, such a view is ambiguous and does not have the necessary conviction.

2. The segregationists' approach to self-founded religious reason must be examined. In a highly extremist approach, Mirza Mehdi Esfahani considers "Intellect" meaning "thinking and acquired science" to be generally invalid in discovering the truth. New segregationists believe that intellect is of two types: intrinsic (innate) and non-intrinsic (non-innate) intellect. According to him, in knowing the truth, the former is valuable and the latter is invalid. But in Hakimi's view, the rational reason (obvious argument) is both forms of the argument are the first form and the material of certain and obvious preconditions is without the need for proof (Hakimi, 2001: 41). It should be mentioned that the concepts presented by Hakimi, are not religious. Any interpretation of the obvious argument means accepting the authority of reason in religious matters. The segregationists speak of "reason itself being the foundation of religion" (Hakimi, 2001: 9) and claim that they do not need reason outside of religion. In fact, with such claim, they are similar to Ḥanbali and Ẓāhirīyah.

3. The segregationists of the third period, including Mr. Hakimi, place great emphasis on the fallibility of reason. One has to ask, where did they get to the fallibility of reason? The answer to this question indicates that they used reason itself to judge reason. Closing the mind because of its fallibility is like closing our eyes completely because of a visual error! Just as we do not order the closure of the senses because of such errors, so it is with reason. If the intellect makes a mistake, it realizes that itself and corrects it, and it is the so-called corrector.

The reason is the counterpart of narration, not the counterpart of revelation. According to the correct view in Islam, if the intellect (whether experimental or scientific intellect or abstract or philosophical intellect) presents a reasoned and reasoned verdict, along with narration, it is considered as one of the epistemological sources of religion. In other words, reason is the counterpart of narration, not the revelation (Jawādī Āmulī, 2007: 34). It is a big mistake to contrast scientific reason or philosophical reason with religion. Because the intellect and narration that give certain and clear knowledge have the same validity in Islam, and both are the epistemological wings of the religion. It should be noted that the intellectual and narrative sciences are both associated with errors and mistakes. While divine revelation is free from error (Ibid.: 35). So according to the correct and moderate view, the intellect, along with narration, are both sources of knowledge of religion and tools for understanding revelation (Arab Salehi, 2014: 313).

CONCLUSION

Acquisition of knowledge will be achieved through various epistemological tools (intellect, sense, revelation, intuition). In the religious epistemological foundations of the

school of segregation, the image presented by reason is different from the common image. In the view of the school of segregation, reason is contrary to the truth of the soul. The contradiction between reason and the soul is based on the idea that the intellect is immaterial light and the soul is material and dark. This claim of segregationists has led them to have a vague view of reason. Hence, in some cases, philosophers have objected to the view of reason because they have not understood the philosophers' concept of reason. On the other hand, the contradiction between the claims of segregationists about epistemology has led to their views not being strong and reasoned. Not paying attention to the intellect means not paying attention to the epistemological tool that plays a role in the emergence of knowledge or confirms it, or is its cause. In fact, the acquisition of knowledge is a multifaceted truth, which the segregationists have summarized in only one dimension. Paying attention to one dimension and neglecting the other dimensions does not lead to a real result.

References

The Holy Qur'an

Esfahani, Mirza Mehdi; (1999); Abwāb al-Huda; with the Introduction by Hassan Jamshidi's research, and commentary by Hossein Mufīd, Tehran: Munīr Cultural Center.

Isfahani, Mirza Mehdi; (2017). Ma'aref al-Qur'an. Qom: Ahl al-Bayt (as) Institute of Education.

Isfahani, Mirza Mehdi (1438 AH). The Qur'an and Furqān in the face of the miracle (Miracle letter), Qom: Ahl al-Bayt Education Institute.

Ershadinia, Mohammad Reza (2007); From Ma'aref School to Hojjatieh Association and Segregation School; Qom: Book Garden.

Ershadinia, Mohammad Reza (2010); Pure wisdom; Qom: Book Garden.

Islāmī, Hassan; (2008); The Dream of Sincerity; Qom: Book Garden.

Tehrani, Mirza Javad; (1995); Mizan al-Muṭallib; with the biography of the author by Ali Akbar Elahi Khorasani; Qom: In the right way institute.

Jawādī Āmulī, Abdullah; (1390); Epistemology in the Qur'an; Qom: Isrā'' Publishing.

Jawādī Āmulī, Abdullah; (2007); the status of reason in religious knowledge; Research by: Ahmad Va'ezi; Qom: Isrā'.

Hosseinzadeh, Mohammad; (2007); Exploring the depths of epistemology, sources of knowledge; Qom: Imam Khomeini Educational-Research Institute.

Halabī, Sheikh Mahmoud; (Nd); Al-Tawhid Wal-Adl; Mashhad: Documents Center of Astan Quds Razavi.

Halabī, Sheikh Mahmoud; (Nd); lectures; Mashhad: Astān Quds Razavi Center.

Hakimi, Mohammad Reza; (1996); School of Segregation; Tehran; Islamic Culture Publishing Office.

Hakimi, Mohammad Reza and a group of writers; (2015); Reviver of Khorasan Islamic School; Tehran: Afagh.

Hakimi, Mohammad Reza; (2001); Physical resurrection in transcendent wisdom; Qom: Our reason.

Khosrow Panah, Abdolhossein; (2013); Islamic Anthropology, Qom: Maʿaref Publishing Office.

Khamenei, Seyyed Ali (1986); a report on the historical background and current situation of the seminary of Mashhad; Mashhad: World Congress of Hazrat Reza (PBUH).

Seydan, Seyyed Ja'far (1939); Cognition rate; Mashhad: Toos.

Sobhani Tabrizi, Ja'far; (1383); Culture of Islamic beliefs and religions; Qom: Imam Ṣādiq (AS) Institute.

Sobhani Tabrizi, Ja'far (1425 AH); Essays and Articles; Qom: Al-Imam Al-Sadiq Institute

Tabatabai, Sayyid Muhammad Hussein (1417 AH); Al-Mizan Fi Tafsir Al-Qur'an; Volume 5; Tehran: Islamic Publishing.

Arab Salehi, Mohammad; (2014); Modern Isolation Currents, Collection of Articles on Current Isolation and Critique of Modern Isolation; Tehran: Islamic Culture and Thought Research Institute Publications.

Qazwīnī, Sheikh Mujtabā; (1991 AH); Bayan al-Furqān; Volume 1; Mashhad: Nd.

Qazwīnī, Sheikh Mojtaba (1371 AH); Bayan al-Furqān; Volume 2; Tehran: Islamic Library.

Qazwīnī, Sheikh Mujtabā; (1373 AH); Bayan al-Furqān; Volume 3; Tehran: Islamic Education Society.

Qazwīnī Khorasani, Sheikh Mujtabā and Rahimian Ferdowsi, Mohammad Ali; (2003); Qur'anic theology; Qom: Our reason.

Morvarid, Hassan Ali (1998) Cautions about principle and repetition, Volume 4; Mashhad: Islamic Research Foundation.

Vakili, Mohammad Hassan; (2014); History and Critique of the School of Segregation; Tehran: Young Thought Center Publication.