

Bodily Resurrection from Sadrol Motalehin Point of View and its Evaluation it with Chapters of Quran

Habiballah Danesh Shahraki and Mahin Keramatifard
Faculty of Theology, Qom University, Qom, Iran

Abstract: Bodily resurrection is from problems which has special complications and there are different theories in its quality and reason that Molasadra is someone who tried to determine bodily resurrection as if is compatible with texts and appearances of Quran and narration and solve the doubts on it and mean while remove the philosophical gap about bodily resurrection. In this study, after pointing different views about bodily resurrection and variety confers which were taken from Sadrol Motalehin view it was tried to determine research and final view about bodily resurrection and clarify its compatibility with bodily resurrection in Quran.

Key words: Bodily resurrection, Quran bodily resurrection, elemental body, exemplar body, futurity body

INTRODUCTION

Bodily resurrection or recurrence of spirits is regarded from necessity of religion, although, determination of its manner is regarded as verbal and philosophical complicated discussions as if sometime the nobles excommunicated it Sadrol Motalehin says in Asfar: the philosophers and the believers agreed on fact of resurrection and recurrence world but there is difference about quality and manner of resurrection and returning spirit into body. Then, he criticized and discussed different views about it. Some group regarded humans as material and body only and believed that death if end of identity and fact because by closing death, material body which forms fact of human, disintegrate and convert into another facets. Then, it is not possible to resurrect (Sadodin, 1991). Another doubt in fact of human and human self on resurrection because they have doubt that human spirit is temperament which is lost with death and there is not resurrection or human spirit is single thing which is survival after death and his resurrection will be realized. Ebn-e-Sina cites resurrection as spiritual in his philosophical view and regarded all pleasure and torment which are cited in Quran in order to comprehend the public, at same time, he is written that bodily resurrection is not acceptable by mind but we accept it since we shall confirm words of prophets: we shall know that bodily resurrection means to stimulate bodily corpse and the prophet confirmed it, thus, it is acceptable although the mind has not efficiency on it. Eshragi sages regarded limbo and exemplar for human spirit and said, the spirit entered into exemplar after removal from body. Some of speakers said hereafter body is material and same as world body not

same as it. But Sadrol Motalehin rejected it and tried to offer logical view by bodily resurrection that fill the philosophical gap and determines accurate concept of bodily resurrection as if respond the doubts and doesn't opposite with the appearances. He regarded the success in solving difficulty of resurrection from sacred success and self-purification and recourse to Ali.

STATEMENT

The main problems in this study is to discuss existing views about manner of stimulation of human in hereafter-bodily or spiritual and ultimate discussion of Sadrol Motalehin and its comparison with Quran bodily resurrection. From his theory, resurrection is grand step in Islam and great problem in philosophy which its recognition belongs to Quran (Molasadra, 1984). What is cited as necessity of religion and ensured power of resurrection is briefly belief on recurrence spirit into body in order to investigate to be good or bad punishment and reward but respond to questions like will be the shape of body resurrected? Will body same elemental body without changes or with changes? Is hereafter body is same as bodily or similar it? Is hereafter body material or exemplar? Is not ensured and the differences between interpretations shall not be resulted to excommunication but it is surprised that Sadrol Motalehin who has been excommunicated by others excommunicated persons who did not regard recurrence body. In this study, the ultimate view about accept and rejection of Sadrol Motalehin about bodily resurrection will be determined, thus, firstly, different views will be offered and then ultimate view will be followed and at last as for resurrection chapters, he final placement will be evaluated.

DIFFERENT VIEWS ABOUT BODILY RESURRECTION

View of Imam Mohammad Ghazali: He believed that hereafter body is material but instead of bodily one, it means God creates new body to belong spirit. He said in *Tahfatol-Falasefh*: resurrection is return spirit into body whether body that is first or instead of it or it was created by new material. But the body is vice-esteem not because of his body and the fact of human depends on it.

View of speakers and jurists and narrations: This group believed that the same elemental body is returned in resurrection. Khajeh Nasireddin Toosi regarded stimulation of the dead as necessity of God's wisdom and regarded bodily resurrection as necessities of Islam. In order to prove to hold out Quran (Yaseen Chapter 81). Allmeh Helli accelerated in description of his word that mean of resurrection is to collect all parts of body at hereafter and also fulfil a promise and wisdom of God is necessity of stimulation of humans in hereafter and regarded it as possibility from Prophet point of view (Helli, 1978) and believed that stimulation in resurrection is same bodily corpse and someone who doesn't believe it, it is pagan.

Ebn-e-Sina philosophical view: Ebn-e-Sina did not cite about bodily resurrection and the points which have been cited by him are summarized as following: bodily resurrection is narrated by verdict, legacy of Islam is peace and adversity pertain to body, good and bad of body, calmness and torment, pleasure and suffer of body is evident and doesn't need explanation. Ebn-e-Sina notes about status of ego that perfect ego is attached into mind but imperfect ego is remaining on imaginary limbo and their peace and adversity are imaginary .

Seyedjaleddin Ashtiyani believe: He believed that Sheikh Eshragh is from believers' resurrection into exemplar body (Jaleddin, 2002). On Sheikh Eshragh point of view, the egos have more eagerness into sacred light than bodily ones, don't belong to another body after their corruption because of their light origin but another group are from peace and adversity that the learned doesn't regard mind for them and don't attach into body. In order to realize punishment about persons which be obtained by imagination, it needs exemplar body that its appearance is Planetarium. The body has form and value and some of specifications of body and lacks material. Sheikh Eshragh is named tis world as single one between four worlds that resurrect of corps and prophets will be realized by it.

Sadrol motalehin view: In some of Sadrol Motalehin words, it is conferred that ego has rank of body forever and hereafter body lacks material same as bodily one and nothing transfers to it but at same time, all specifications and parts will be created same as it. Of course, Sadra cited about stimulation of the dead from the graves and emphasized that we shall not determine appearance of Quran and accept same view of Muslims about resurrection. Someone who signifies text about news about hereafter and resurrection instead of its mean and supposes that the affairs pertain to resurrection are imaginary is ignorant or regarded as ignorant. They he says: paradise and hell and other hereafter modes are correct as is if many jurists believed on it and it is same as fact. Of course, this is not research theory of Sadr, so that the words and narrations are same as bodily resurrection.

Allameh Rafee Qazvinin point of view: He believed that the spirit belongs to corpse after death to be ready for eternal life. After that the elemental soil is reached to level to make hereafter body and by emergence bodily resurrection, hereafter body belongs to world body, finally, spirit has two bodies and it is not problem since these two bodies are not their width but are as longitudinal. This is right word and based on light and it is not opposition reason pattern (Rafeeqazvini, 1997). Establishment hereafter body is from soil material like wheat grain which is produced from seed. It is evident that wheat grain is corrupted on soil and grown in branch and the wheat is formed .

ULTIMATE VIEW OF SADROL MOTALEHIN ABOUT RESURRECTION

Some of researchers said about philosophy that Sadrol Motalehin has two theories about resurrection one is perfect and other is most perfect. First is same which based on appearance of book and tradition and accepted as perfect theory and second which was cited in Asfar and its mean is sound bodily resurrection lacking material. (Morvarid, discussion about resurrection in presence of Ayatollah Javadi Amoli and Professor Seydan, pp 83). But apparently, these are contrast and it is not possible to correct twins which mean can we sum between bodily resurrections with sound resurrection? Sadrol Motalehin as will be cited opposite with theory of speakers in his words severely, then, how did he accept theory of speakers as perfect theory, although, their theory is so correct. Thus, others believed that Sadrol Motalehin has two views about bodily resurrection: one is philosophical and other is spiritual and the final view is approach into Quran resurrection and it was cited that Sadrol Motalehin

believed that since ego will be issued by worldly body and ego will be stimulated by this body and its punishment and reward will be it (first view) but in explanation of origin and resurrection, he tried to signify type of bodily resurrection against Masha and Eshragh philosophers but they concluded that bodily resurrection which is meant in Quran is different from mean of philosophy (second view). But the right is Sadrol Motalehin regarded his philosophical work in regard to Quran comprehension not its opposition and refereed details of content into Asfar in resurrection and origin and did not point to reasonable and philosophical view about bodily resurrection, what is cited by him in ninth volume of Asfar is to pay attention to Quran chapters and interpretation and their realization and it is not that neglected appearances of chapter and separated between philosophical and Quran resurrection, so that questioned Fakhr Razi about his theory on resurrection by collecting parts of body into soil and charged him to false interpretation of Quran. Sadra regarded view of Fakhr Razi as the lowest rank of belief in resurrection because Razi says: resurrection is collection dispersed parts of body and did not think the resurrection is occurred in world not hereafter and this view opens Transmogrification. In addition, God says in Quran: it is not hidden on person that hereafter world is another type of world which is contrast with soil and water world and resurrection is returning into God not recurrence into material and soil world. And then, he criticized and discussed the chapter which have used by Fakhr Razi in order to interpret for his view and charged him into falseness, since he did not understand accurate mean of chapters so that the aim of God is giving attention into fat of resurrection and direct into hidden world not recurrence into material world. Molasadra says about chapter (Haj/7) that emphasized on exit from soil and stimulation from grave says the mean of grave is corps and bodies not soil grave and these are spirits grave, natural bodies. He cited it more clearly in Hashr thesis: Sensual graves are imaginary forms which are spirits for them and imaginary graves are reasonable facets. Then, stimulation of natural bodies is into hereafter bodies and stimulation of hereafter bodies is into God. He classified believers into resurrection as four groups in Asfar: first group is Muslims who suppose that all hereafter worlds (torment of grave, snake and scorpion and Nakir and Monker) are sensual affairs and are seen by naked eye but since we are on natural mode, they are not seen. Second group which Ebn-e-Sina tolerated them regarded hereafter affairs like imaginary one in which human sleeps and there is not exemplar and imaginary one. Third group believed that hereafter affair is reasonable material facet which exist in world and fourth group is firm on reason and wisdom

and regarded on hereafter facet which was recited in Sharia and believed that some of reasonable facet-pertain to paradise are adducant and other are sensual but not in material world, also, they are sensual and seen by eye and other are sensual not natural senses. Molasadra rejected view of second and third group and noted about first group that this narration is protected from damages but view of fourth group is accepted which is same view of reason. Since, Sadra emphasizes upon subjectivity of hereafter body and worldly body and it is imagined that perhaps he emphasized upon elemental body, whereas, firstly, he did not point to elemental body but showed contrast between hereafter and worldly body and if he emphasized upon chapters pertain to resurrection, his mean is bodily resurrection is cited against spiritual resurrection merely, so he says in origin and resurrection: someone who narrates texts on news of hereafter instead of its appearance and supposed that the affairs pertain to resurrection is reasonable or imaginary merely, he is ignorant. Meanwhile, he says in explanation of Hedayah: recurrence of ego like worldly body is happened at hereafter as if it is seen in narrations of Quran and it is possible. Thus, it is imperative to confirm it and it is regarded as necessity of religion and its denial is apparent disbelief. His word is not seen as elemental bodily resurrection because body is instead of soil element on his view and if his mean is elemental body as he cited it, thus scientific honesty and fair caused to remove necessities which are seen in Asfar and other books as if he cited in Asfar that elemental body is not real body of human: real body is body in which light is native not width and its rate is like as radiation to sun and if this dead elemental body has living capability, never die.

Similarly says in Hidden Mafateh: recognition of body to ego belongs to it because ego is perfect facet of body. Organism recognition like hand and finger is like it since their identity is dependent on ego.

And then says: what is recurred in resurrection is same as person from body and ego, although, the body specifications are without change. Then, after belief in stimulation of ego and their belong to hereafter body, no one say this body is instead of body which is dead and doesn't say this body is like it that means they are same each other and contrast. And continues: worldly body are happening gradually but hereafter bodies are happening immediate. Then, his view is opposite from speaker's view about hereafter body.

QURAN REASONS OF ELEMENTAL BODY

There are chapters in Quran which cause on recourse of elemental body. Some of chapters are on possibility and others are about its occurrence that summarises them.

QURAN REASON FOR POSSIBILITY OF BODILY RESURRECTION

The chapters which implicated on exit of the dead from soil or grave in the time of hereafter (Adiyat/9, Haj/5, Eraf/24, Taha/55), the chapters simplify resuscitate of the dead in the revival in this world like as story Prophet or Ermia (Baghareh 259), resuscitate slain of Bani Israeli (baghareh 72,73), revival of the dead by order of Ebrahim 9baghareh 260), chapters implicate on revival of corrupted bones in resurrection (Yas/78) are cases for implications of the dead. These chapters implicate on recurrence of elemental body in resurrection, the chapters prove resuscitate of the dead and recourse of the organs and dispersed parts (bagherh 26). The chapters implicate on resurrection of human thorough world (like chapters of Shams, Takvir, Zelzal, Ghareh, the chapters simplify resurrection as resuscitate of land after death (Eraf 57). Allameh Tabatabaee regarded this verse as reason for possibility of revival the dead because revival of land and the dead is unit and it is similar as exemplar verdict that means the plants are rotten in autumn and winter and the vegetal spirit is main between them and their root is remained without growth. Human ego is remained after death although. The bodies changed (Tabtabaee, Mizan in Interpretation of Quran, volume 8, pp 160, 161). Of course as verdict of examples is true about human ego, it is true about body too and this shows the resurrection is possible with elemental body. Verses 5-7 of chapter Haj gave an example in order to remove doubt from stimulation and possibility of movement of dry land into verdure and removed transmutation of doubt by phenomenon which is occurred continuously. There are another chapters like chapter 32-44 Yas, 39 Foselat, 11 Zakhraf, 3-5 Jasiyeh, 2-11 Gh, 60-67 Vagheh, 17-42 Abath, 19 and 50 Rom and Fater implicated on similarity of revival of the dead on elemental body.

Quran implications for elemental resurrection: The chapters simplify resurrection as first creatures: these chapters are: chapters 47 and 48 of Kahf, the similar aspect is about to be naked of human. Of course, some of narrations rejected the naked in Hashr and implicated on Hashr with shroud and implicated on Hashr with shroud as if God renovate rotten shrouds as if revive bodies. In each of narrations implicate on elemental body and cover creation on soil because one of the world living specifications is to create and growth from soil which pointed in verse 17 of Nouh chapter. There are two interpretations about creation from soil. Some regarded land as combination of human from his soil elements. Others, interpreted the roots of human from land (Naser,

1995), the reason for this similarity is between resurrection and first creation is regarded as community of attachment in terms of frothy days raining in the time of recourse, thus, these chapters are implications on occurrence of bodily resurrection. Other chapters implicate on similarity of resurrection to first creation in which resurrection is regarded as elemental body. These chapters are Eraf 29, Anbiyah 104, Haj 5-7, Ankabout 20, Akghaf 33, Vagheh 60-67, Giyamat 40-3, Taregh 10-5.

The chapters reject denial of elemental resurrection: In fifth chapter of Rad, it is about denial about recourse from soil that body will be converted into it after death. This rejection means realization and occurrence of elemental body and this chapter doesn't implicate because although denial doesn't reject negation but tries to negate it and the above chapter tries to cite its occurrence. From other chapters reject denial of elemental body is chapters 48-52 of Asra. The pagans try to deny resurrection by denial worship and stimulation of rotten bone that God rejected improbability by citation stone, iron or any creation will be returned. At last, we can say that other chapters reject the improbability and the chapter disqualify disintegration of body organs and not compatible with spiritual resurrection. Other chapters show elemental body and reject it. These are: Asra 97-99, Momenoun 33-38, Naml 67-72, Sojdeh 10-11, Gh 11-2, Saba 7-9, Safat 15-24,, 21-35, Giyamat 13-3, Nazeat 14-1.

The chapters implicate on exit from ground or grave: Chapters 24, 25 of Eraf verse cited that this organ has not proportionate with elemental body and it is not compatible with spiritual resurrection. Although, it is pointed to Adam and Havva and their children but seed of human is sharing with it. Another chapter implicate on exit from ground of grave and recite its reason. These chapters are Maryam 66-68, Momenoun 33-38, Yas 51-54, Taha 55, Gh 41-44, Gamar 6-8, Moraaj 42-44, Nouh 17-18, Abath 17-42, Enshagh 19-1, Zelzeleh 8-1, Adiyat 11-9.

QURAN IMPLICATION AGAINST ELEMENTAL RESURRECTION

From chapters he will be hold out by the denier recourse of elemental body is chapter 48 of Ebrahim is implicated on world and hereafter. Molasadra view is that it is impossible to carry same action which is proportionate with requirements.

Verse 61 of chapter Vagheh is implicated on lacking knowledge to hereafter. For example, Ebn-e-Arabi concluded with lacking knowledge in hereafter that recourse of spirit will not be happened. Molasadra by

using above verse reasoned that second drunkenness has contrast and doesn't consist of mixed material from soil, water and clay and resurrection is not material and dark creation but death and stimulation is commence of movement and recourse into God.

Also, it is documented to verse 29 of Araf chapter that implicated on similarity of recourse of human with onset of creation and Molasadra and others emphasized on similarity between recourse in hereafter and world and thus, hereafter recourse is not similar as world creation.

From another implication is about deniers of elemental resurrection and it is genesis between action and punishment which is derived from religious texts (Yunis, 52, Yas 54, Tour 16 and these chapters implicate that punishment, ultimate actions and sound of actions are same as action. Of course, this relation is not due to relation between action and intent. As result, hereafter is not like as bodily material that occurred on ego but there, spirit, failure and trees and rivers and ego are same as.

CONCLUSION

Sadrol Motalehin tried to coordinate between mind and spirit neither prove bodily resurrection and another type of it and the contents which have been cited by many researchers and other books did not implicate by it because mean of hereafter body and corps is subjective body and this theory is cited against someone who deny bodily resurrection generally and regarded all affairs as imaginary. Based on Sadra, imagination faculty is abstract and will be found as sense faculty after death of body and thus it is able to create and observe it without material.

Molasadra compared his theory with chapters and narrations in Asfar and did not differ between his sayings with mean of Quran. Performance of Sadrol Motalehin is realization into appearance to consciousness. He performed more discussions about appearance and consciousness of chapters. He regarded supposition of speakers based on recourse of body in hereafter as irrational and said if the body is stimulated as elemental body it is necessary to belong to body in mortal world but this denial is for resurrection with elemental body not its prove.

Subjective of hereafter body is not recourse of material element from Molasadra point of view but it means hereafter body is same as world body from corpse point of view not from material and mass, worldly body is neither real body of human nor human in hereafter and doesn't need it (Molasadra, 1984). Although, discussions showed that this theory has many points but is not empty from weakness and ambiguous.

Finally, it shall be said that research and final view of Sadrol Motalehin about resurrection is same sound bodily

resurrection not imaginary facets which shall be imagined. Although, it is possible this theory is compatible with some of chapters but in evaluation with Quran implications it shall be said that although verses of Ebrhim and Vagheh implicated on contrast between elemental body resurrection and hereafter but this permission will not be comparison with chapters that implicate on elemental resurrection, but as said before, many narrations and chapters implicate on recourse of elemental body. Verse 29 of Eraf chapter doesn't have implication about recourse of elemental material but the narrations regarded the similarity as Reorientation. The final verses that are implication on spiritual resurrection but it not mean denial of elemental resurrection and it is obtained by another implication.

Appearance of the chapters pertain to sound bodily resurrection is not compatible with Quran chapters, then, we can ensure about appearance of chapters and say that this elemental body will be returned by changes in hereafter or explicate research theory of Sadrol Motalehin and cite that ego makes same worldly body in hereafter by appearance that means this hereafter body has not relation-material and mass-with elemental body but face. Now question is here, how can compare chapters that show elemental resurrection with exemplar and sensual resurrection of Molasadra?

In responding to question in which Ebrhaim wanted God shows revival of the dead if God says in resurrection dispersed organs of human will not be returned but it will be created perfect to belong spirits to it and live with peace and adversity, what did difficulty emerge? And why Ebrahim was selected as agent for kill the bird to show him the recourse of dispersed organs of body and says: see the ass and know how to recourse the bones, meat and skin into first manner and then emphasizes that we revive the dead.

At last, we shall say with Shahid Motahhari: he persons like Molasadra said resurrection is bodily but all brought bodily resurrection into their spirit and ghost world, that they said these bodily characteristics exist in ghost world... but did not colve the problem, that means we cannot compare it with Quran chapters, so that it is so good and will be emphasized with scientific implications, but it cannot be signified Quran resurrection with it, since Quran resurrection is not human only but it is on all. Accordingly, Quran discusses about material world nit human only (Morteza, 1995).

REFERENCES

- Helli, A., 1978. Discovery of Intent in Abstraction of Belief. Mostafavi School Press, Qom, Iran, Pages: 246.

- Jaleddin, A.S., 2002. Explanation on Seed of Traveller. Park Publishers, Qom, Iran, Pages: 71.
- Morteza, M., 1995. Collection of Works. Sadra Press, Qom, Iran, Pages: 729.
- Naser, M.S., 1995. Nemouneh Interpretation. Islamic School Press, Tehran, Iran, Pages: 77.
- Rafeeqazvini, A., 1997. Collection of Thesis and Philosophical Articles. Sepehr Press, Tehran, Iran, Pages: 82.
- Sadodin, T., 1991. Purposeful Explanation. Sharif Razi Publisher, Qom, Iran, Pages: 85.