Metaphorical Analysis of Causation in Islamic Philosophy

Vahid Khademzadeh[1], Mohammad Saeedimehr[2]

Abstract

Unlike Aristotle, Lakoff considers metaphor as an integral part of the process of human thinking and believes that humans often automatically and unconsciously learn and use a wide range of conceptual metaphors. A large part of our scientific and philosophical literature is full of conceptual metaphors. According to Lakoff, like other abstract concepts, causation is made of a small literal part which is extended by various kinds of conceptual metaphors in several directions. The current paper shows that a large part of the metaphors introduced by Lakoff, has been used by Muslim philosophers to describe causation. Ibn Sina (Avicenna) and Mulla Sadra are two of the most significant Islamic philosophers. According to Ibn Sina, causation is based on 'Causation is Transfer of Possessions' metaphor. This metaphor depicts causation as a three-component relation in which the boundaries are very strong and sharp. According to Mulla Sadra, causation is based on 'Causation is Motion out' metaphor. This metaphor makes causation to have two components and decreases the strength of boundaries between the components of the relation.

Keywords: Conceptual Metaphor, Lakoff, Causation, Mulla Sadra, Ibn Sina.

1. Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran. Email: v.khademzadeh@ferdowsi.um.ac.ir (Corresponding Author).

2. Professor, Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran. Email: saeedi@modares.ac.ir.

Introduction

Aristotle regarded metaphor as a kind of rhetorical device that is suitable for poetry and lecture. Therefore, he despised using metaphors in ordinary speech and scientific texts. Lakoff and Johnson, however, by introducing the cognitive theory of metaphor claimed that metaphor is not merely a matter of language or a specific feature of words and expressions. Instead, the whole thinking process in human mind is vastly metaphoric and, in other words, the conceptual structure of human mind is based on metaphors. The existence of metaphors in linguistic form is possible because the conceptual structure of human mind is metaphorical. To be sure, what is meant here by "metaphor" is nothing but the conceptual metaphor.

According to this view, the conceptual metaphor is a systematic mapping between the conceptual domains, a domain that is made of the human experience, i.e. the source domain, is mapped on another domain which is generally more abstract, i.e. the target domain. The linguistic metaphors are mostly the representation of conceptual metaphors in language.

For instance, love as an abstract concept is usually conceptualized by metaphors such as 'Love is a Journey', ' Love is Madness', 'Love is Wealth', 'Love is War' , 'Love is a Magic' and ' Love is a Physical Force':

- I don't think this relationship is going anywhere (Love is a Journey).

- They are uncontrollably attracted to each other (Love is a Physical Force).

- This relationship is valuable for him (Love is Wealth).

- 1'm crazy about her (Love is Madness).

- I'm charmed by her (Love is Magic).

- He is fighting for his mistress (Love is War).

It is worth noting that only a part of a concept, and not total, is understood by another conceptual metaphor. Because, if a conceptual metaphor represents the total of another concept, one concept would actually be the other, not merely be understood in terms of it.

On the other hand, the same system and structure that let us understand an aspect of a concept through another one (for example, to understand one aspect of love through the concept of journey) necessarily conceals other aspects of the concept. By focusing our attention on an aspect of a concept (just understanding the aspect of love which is like a journey), a metaphorical concept deviates our attention from focusing on other aspects that are not consistent with the metaphor.

Therefore, linguistic metaphor is not an exceptional matter of poetic creativity or excessive rhetoric, but conventional metaphors are vastly used in ordinary language and scientific discourses. Within the framework of this theory, a metaphor cannot be reduced to a non-metaphorical paraphrase without losing an aspect of its meaning

A Metaphorical Analysis of Causation

Our scientific and ordinary language is abundant with causal concepts. Whenever we talk about the effect of an object or phenomenon on another object or phenomenon, we deal with a causal

relation. Causation is also one of the oldest and the most extensive subjects in philosophy. Now it can be asked as what is the relation between the concepts of 'causation' in sentences such as "God is the cause of the universe", " increase in money supply is the cause of increase in inflation", "gravity is the cause of falling of objects"? Is there any relation between the various usages of "cause" in daily conversations, scientific texts and philosophical issues? Is the shared word of 'cause' in the above sentences just univocal or homonymic? Seemingly, none of these two descriptions can explain properly the status of this word in these sentences. On one hand, it seems that this word does not have exactly the same meaning in these sentences, but on the other hand, some kind of relation between different forms of this word cannot be denied. Apparently, traditional linguistics cannot accurately describe the status of the word.

Lackoff does not accept the traditional categorization of concepts in which categories are conceptualized as abstract containers. Instead, he believes that the categorization of concepts is only possible through two instruments of prototype and family resemblance. In this view, the concept of causation, like other concepts, has a radial structure. This radial structure has several layers. The literal meaning and the prototype are placed in the center of this structure. This radial structure is extended by various metaphorical expansions in several directions. Various causal metaphors have family resemblance. The expansions lead to the formation of several types of causation.

The radial classification of different types of causation has the following structure:

- There is a real (literal) skeleton: 'The determining factor in creating a situation'. This holds for all types of causations.

- The prototype of causation is placed at the center of this categorization: 'Direct and intentional application of physical force on an object which makes some changes in it'. Moving a ball with hand movement can be seen as one of the clearest images of the concept of causality in our minds.

- Literal extension of the prototype using (A) Forced movement of an object by another one (billiards causation), (B) Indirect causation, (C) Causation through an intermediary factor, etc.

- Metaphorical extension of the prototype (in which, the physical force is highlighted) to cases in which, the abstract causation is conceptualized in a metaphorical way based on physical forces through the 'Causes are Forces' metaphor.

Lakoff and Johnson introduced numerous metaphors to explain the causation. By mentioning numerous examples in English, they depicted broad and often unconscious application of these metaphors in the English linguistic community. They believed that a significant part of these metaphors is rooted in our bio-physical structure and also in the fundamental experiences that every human being gains in his early years of the life. Therefore, these metaphors may be seen in other communities and societies too. A large part of these metaphors can be

regarded as various forms of the two metaphors: 'Causes are Forces' and 'Causation is Forced Movement'. As various forms of force and movement exist around us, various metaphors are formed to explain the causation.

In what follows, we will show that Muslim philosophers have also benefited from using these metaphors to describe and explain the causality in their philosophical systems. Since most of the philosophical texts of Muslims are written in Arabic, extraction and analysis of these metaphors needs accurate study of Arabic words which Muslim philosophers have chosen to describe causality.

Causal Metaphors in the Works of Muslim Philosophers
In this article, our attention focuses on the works of Ibn Sina and Mulla Sadra, the two most significant Islamic Philosophers. Ibn Sina is the leader of the Peripatetic School in the Islamic world and Mull Sadra is the founder of the Transcendent Philosophy.

'Causation is Motion out' Metaphor
This complex metaphor requires a kind of essentialism. It is based on the simple metaphor 'Essence is a Container'. So, the cause is conceptualized as a container and the effect moves toward the outside of this container. These are follows:
- Causation is Motion out
- Effect is Thing Moving out
- Cause is Original Container

For example: The chaos in Eastern Europe emerged from the end of the cold war. These metaphors have been widely used in Arabic philosophical texts too. Muslim philosophers have abundantly

benefited from these metaphors. All the words formed from the roots «ṣ-d-r» , «n-sh'», «f-y-ḍ» , «r-sh-ḥ» , «ẓ-h-r» and «j-l-y» contain this metaphor. The following sentences are examples of using this metaphor:
- "Whenever the **issuance** of the effect from the cause is not necessary, the effect will not exist."
- "When the bodies are ready, **effusion** of existence of the soul from the immaterial causes becomes necessary."
- "The necessary-by-itself is the most beautiful and complete thing, because every beauty and perfection is an **effusion**, **leak** and **shadow** of His beauty and perfection."
- "Therefore, whenever [a specific perfection] is actualized in the effect, its actualization in the cause is necessary, because the effect is an **effusion** and **leak** of the cause."
- "All beings in terms of their existence are **effusions** and **leaks** of the divine existence and **manifestations** and features of God."

In the above Arabic sentences, derivatives of «f-y-ḍ» , «ṣ-d-r» and «r-sh-ḥ» roots are accompanied by two spatial prepositions namely «*min*» and *« 'an »* . The prototype of these prepositions refers to the source the movement begins from. In this metaphor, the cause is the source of the movement. In other words, the cause is a container that the effect moves from it towards outside.

'Causes are Sources' Mmetaphor
In numerous causal metaphors, causation is conceptualized as a kind of movement.

Our experiences indicate that all movements start from a source. These experiences become a base for forming of the metaphor, 'Causes are Sources'. In many cases, this metaphor is used along with other metaphors. In the 'Causation is Motion out' metaphor, the cause is assumed as a source for movement. However, the 'Causes are Sources' metaphor is also used alone. For example:

- She got rich from investments

- I'm tired of working all day

In Arabic texts, the words derived from the root «b-d-'», have been used to describe cause by Muslim philosophers. These words include the 'Causes are Sources' metaphor.

- "He [God] truly is the first **origin** which gives realization and fixity to all actual things."

- "Metaphysicians call the **origin** and giver of existence the efficient cause and natural scientists call the **origin** of stimulation the efficient cause."

- "Existence is the reality issued from the **origin** and the quiddity is united with it and predicated on it."

- "The existence is the **origin** of effects and **source** of all the existents."

The mentioned metaphor can also be seen in the use of «*min*» preposition in describing causality:

- "Definition of cause: Every essence that the actual existence of another essence is **originated** from its actual

existence and its actual existence is not **originated** from the other one."

'Causation is Motion in' Metaphor

Contrary to the aforementioned metaphors, this has not been mentioned by Lakoff. However, this metaphor can be seen as one of the natural causation metaphors which are based on essentialism. Essentialists believe that each thing has an essence. The essence of a thing is conceptualized as a container that includes the essential parts of the thing. The essential parts of a thing can also be considered as (inner) causes of the thing.

The two metaphors of 'Causation is Motion out' and 'Causation is Motion in' seem to be in contrary to each other, but each of which, actually has a special view towards causation. 'Causation is a Motion out' metaphor conceptualizes causation focusing on the cause. And, 'Causation is Motion in' looks at causation from the effect's position. Since, causation is a unidirectional relation from cause to effect; the impression leaves the agent of impression and enters to the essence of the impressed. The words derived from «'- th-r» root; contain 'Causation is a Motion in' metaphor:

- "The **influence** of agent, in anything that is derived from it, is existence not the quiddity."

- "The agent **influence**s object's existence by its own existence."

The word «'- th-r» is accompanied with «*fi*» preposition in many cases. This is a spatial preposition and is used in this metaphor to refer to the effect. Using this preposition, the nature of the impressed is

conceptualized as a container that the impression enters to it.

'Causation is Transfer of Possessions' Metaphor

In this metaphor, states and properties of things are conceptualized as a kind of possession which are given or taken. Here, causation is the transfer of possessions.

- The noise gave me a headache

- The aspirin took away my headache

In the above-mentioned examples, headache is considered as a kind of possession. In the first example, the noise is the cause of transferring headache to the person and in the second example; aspirin is the cause of moving headache out of that person.

Muslim philosophers have abundantly used Arabic words derived from the roots «'-ṭ-w», «ḥ-ṣ-l», «w-h-b» and « f-y-d » to describe causation. These words contain the 'Causation is Transfer of Possessions' metaphor.

- "He [i.e. God] is the first origin who **gives** every real thing his realization and fixity."

- "The efficient cause **gives** the existence which is separate from His own nature."

- "The origin called cause that its existence has become completed by its own nature or through others, and then the existence of another thing is **obtained** from it."

- "So whenever it obtains the required capacity, **receives** the form from the **giver** of forms."

'Causing is Making' Metaphor

Causation in this metaphor is conceptualized as making. Whenever we make a thing, we apply a direct force to it and convert it into a new thing with a new application. For example, we say: 'he made a chair from timbers'.

When we conceptualize causation as making, we realize that there has been a causal force which has been applied on a person or a situation to convert it to different object. This mapping is as follows:

- Causation is making.
- Effects are objects made.

The followings are some examples of application of this metaphor:
- I made him steal the money
- The DNA tests made it clear that he committed the murder

In Arabic, the words derived from «j-'-l» and «ṣ-n-'» roots mean making. Muslim philosophers have used these words to explain the causation:

- "Existence is the basic element issued from **maker** and quiddity is subordinated to the existence."

- "Belonging of effect to other is not for its quiddity because it is not **made** and not for preceding non-existence because the agent is not **maker** of it."

Various Logics of Causation Metaphors

It may seem that the words used in the aforementioned metaphors to explain the causation are in fact different names for

the same concept, and there is not a significant difference between these words. But a little more consideration reveals that each of these metaphors and the related words have slightly different logics.

Causation is formed in the realm of plurality because every relation needs at least two components. Obviously, the causation cannot be conceptualized without plurality. Each of metaphors and associated words require a specific kind of plurality. In each of these metaphors, plurality is determined based on two factors: A) The number of components of the relation, B) The intensity of boundaries between the components. Daily and common application of each of the words that are used in these metaphors is the criterion to decide the intensity of plurality in these metaphors. In other words, the requirements of each of these words are extended from the field of everyday life to the field of philosophy and abstract thinking.

Causal metaphors can be ordered in a spectrum in a way that from the center to one end the plurality in metaphors increases and from the center to another the plurality in metaphors decreases. It seems that plurality in the 'Causation is Transfer of Possessions' metaphor has the highest intensity. The prototype of transfer of possessions, the source domain of the metaphor, which is rooted in the daily and common application of this word, at least has 3 components: *al-muʿṭá minh* (Giver), *al-ʿaṭīe* (What is given) and *al-muʿṭá lah* (What something is given to, receiver). Boundaries between these three components are also strong and sharp.

This property makes the metaphor appropriate to describe the Avicennan causation. According to Ibn Sina, a contingent being is made up of two components: the existence and quiddity. Ibn Sina believes that the efficient cause in physics is the giver of form to matter and in metaphysics the giver of existence to quiddity.

In the philosophy of Ibn Sina, there is a strong boundary between *al-muʿṭá minh*, *al-ʿaṭīe* and *al-muʿṭá lah*. The distinctions between matter (*al-muʿṭá lah*) and form (*al-ʿaṭīe*) in physics and the distinction between existence (*al-ʿaṭīe*) and quiddity (*al-muʿṭá lah*) in metaphysics are emphasized. According to the Avicennan views, existence is not considered as constituents of the quiddity, it is an unnecessary accident of it.

He also notes that the efficient cause gives the existence which is separate from his own nature .Therefore, he emphasizes on the strong boundaries between the efficient cause (*al-muʿṭá minh*) and existence (*al-ʿaṭīe)*.

According to the Avicennan view, the causation especially in the efficient cause has three separate components among which the boundaries are strong. Therefore, the inference patterns of 'Causation is Transfer of Possessions' metaphor is mapped on the Avicennan causation − in the efficient cause. The mapping occurs as follows:

- *Al-muʿṭá minh* gives the *al-ʿaṭīe* to *al-muʿṭá lah*.

- The efficient cause gives existence (or form) to the quiddity (or matter).

The second metaphor in this spectrum is the 'Causing is Making' metaphor. According to our common experience, the act of making includes combining some things to create a new thing. Building a house by a mason and making a chair by a carpenter are famous examples in this area. Words derived from «j-'-l» root to describe causation are rarely used in Ibn Sina's philosophy. But Mulla Sadra dedicated a special chapter to address the *al-ja'l* (making) topic in his book entitled *Al-Ḥikmat Al-Mutaʿaliyah fī Al-Asfār Al-ʿaqlīah Al-Arbaʿih*. Although the issue of *al-ja'l* is a subsidiary to the principle of causation, this topic is being discussed in an independent chapter before the topic of causation. Now, we can ask that how using the word « j-'-l» can help the topics of this chapter that made Mulla Sadra to use this word instead of other common words such as «ṣ-d-r», «f-y-ḍ» and the like to describe causation.

At the beginning of this chapter, Mulla Sadra names two kinds of *al-ja'l* (making): simple making and composite making. The simple making is effusion of the thing itself and the composite making has an effect that has two components: *al-majʿūl* (something made) and *al-majʿūl ilayh* (what something is made of). There is a kind of relation between *al-majʿūl* and *al-majʿūl ilayh* which can be of becoming, attribution and alike. This division has its roots more in linguistics than in philosophy. In other words, the verb derived from «j-'-l» is used with both single object and two objects in ordinary Arabic.

The main question raised by the issue of *al-ja'l* in the Islamic philosophy is that, concerning the nature of the causal relation, what aspect of the effect is really made by the cause? Mulla Sadra poses three possibilities to answer this question: 1) the quiddity's becoming an existent (the view attributed to peripatetic Muslim philosophers); 2) the quiddity itself (the view attributed to the Illuminationists); 3) the very existence of the effect (Mulla Sadra's favorite view). Mulla Sadra tries to deny the first two possibilities and prove the third one. Therefore, in order to state the problem, He should use a general term (i.e, «ja'l») to represent all three possibilities.

The composite making is a prerequisite for presentation of the first possibility. According to Mulla Sadra, in the composite making, the relation between *al-majʿūl* and *al-majʿūl ilayh* is of becoming, attribution or alike. In the first possibility, the two words of 'becoming' and 'attribution' are used to explain the relation between quiddity and existence. According to the Peripatetics, the real effect of the cause is nothing but 'the quiddity's becoming an existent'. But in the second and third possibilities, the composite making is left out and the simple making is emphasized more.

However, there is also another difference between the second and the third possibilities. If we say that *al-majʿūl* is quiddity, boundaries between *al-majʿūl* and *al-jāʿil* (the maker, the cause) are stronger, and when *al-majʿūl* is considered to be existence, the boundaries are weaker. This difference is because of our metaphorical view towards 'existence' and 'quiddity'. Quiddity is conceptualized in our philosophical tradition as being solid. But in Mulla Sadra's philosophy, existence is conceptualized as being fluid. The most important difference between a solid thing and a fluid flow is in their boundaries.

Every solid thing has sharp and strong boundaries. A solid thing is less flexible. But a fluid flow does not have determined and stable boundaries, and is highly flexible. So the difference between two quiddities is clear and obvious, but the difference between two existences is less clear, so the Arabic root «j-'-l» is the most appropriate word to state the *al-ja'l* problem regarding the three possibilities.

One of the natural causal metaphors that are formed by focusing on the effect is the 'Causation is Motion in' metaphor. So the word « '- th-r» is abundantly used in *al-ja'l* problem.

The 'Causation is Motion out' metaphor is one of the most frequently used causal metaphors in our philosophical tradition. This metaphor is based on an essentialist view and its focus is on the cause. The plurality in this metaphor is decreasing. The image that this metaphor depicts the causation form includes two components: a container which is the source for movement and an object that moves out of this container. This property makes the metaphor appropriate to describe the causation in Mulla Sadra's philosophy. According to Sadra, effect is pure connection to the cause, not something that is in connection with the cause. So, dependency effect to the cause incredibly increases, and effect does not have any reality but connection to the cause.

There are some differences even among the words that represent the 'Causation is Motion out' metaphor. While the boundaries between cause and effect become weaker in this kind of words and the dependency of effect to cause increases, but in some of these words, boundaries between cause and effect are stronger and some others of these words are weaker.

The strongest boundaries of these words may be in the word «ṣ-d-r». So often, this word is used to describe the rule of the unique (*Qā'ide al-Wāḥid*). This rule is described based on the boundaries between the cause and the effect and also between effects themselves. According to our common experience, the word «ṣ-d-r» indicates the departure of a solid thing from a container.

The word «f-y-ḍ» is placed at the next level. Its boundaries are weaker than that of the word «ṣ-d-r». Where the meaning of «ṣ-d-r» is moving out, the meaning of «f-y-ḍ» is overflowing. There are two properties of the word «f-y-ḍ» which weakens the boundaries between the cause and the effect compared to the word «ṣ-d-r»; first, in conventional applications, the fluidity of the object moving out of the container is emphasized. Fluidity leads to the weakness of boundaries. Second, the container getting full is the reason for the overflow of the liquid. It means that the level of the liquid is as high as possible. Therefore, the distance between the liquid in the container and the liquid out of the container is the least. These two properties lead to the weakness of boundaries between the cause and the effect.

The word «r-sh-ḥ» is placed at the next level. The boundaries between the cause and the effect are weaker in «r-sh-ḥ» compared to «f-y-ḍ». In common application, both of these words indicate liquid's moving out of the container. If we take the meaning of «f-y-ḍ» as overflowing, «r-sh-ḥ» would mean leaking. As stated before, the fluidity of

effect shows weakening in boundaries and conceptualizes higher dependency of the effect to the cause. But the difference between these two words depends on the amount of liquid moving out of the container; in common language application, more amounts of liquid moves out of container in «f-y-ḍ» compared to «r-sh-ḥ». Higher amount of liquid is in direct correspondence with the effect's independency from the cause. The less liquid moves out of the container, the will be less different and strength of boundaries between the cause and the effect.

The words «j-l-y» and «ẓ-h-r» are placed in the next level. Boundaries between cause and effect in this word are weaker than that of «f-y-ḍ» and «r-sh-ḥ». In common application, « j-l-y» and «ẓ-h-r» are also used in the meaning of revealing and manifesting. It is like to be a veil over the cause and the face of the cause is shown by removing the veil. This face is the effect. So, whatever goes out of the container is a light that transmits the face. Light is faster than liquid and has vague boundaries with its environment. Light also has an inseparable link to its source. This means that by disconnecting the light's link from its source, the light itself dies.

Most of the time, Mulla Sadra uses the words «r-sh-ḥ», « j-l-y» and «ẓ-h-r» to describe God's relationship with His creatures. Since, contingent existences have the highest dependency on and the lowest independency from the necessary existence, using the words «r-sh-ḥ» , «j-l-y» and «ẓ-h-r» seems suitable to describe the relationship between the Creator and creatures.

Conclusion

Assuming the acceptance of the theory proposed by Lakoff, many of the conceptual metaphors introduced by him can be found in Muslim philosophers for descriptions of the causation: 'Causation is Motion out', 'Causation is Transfer of Possessions', 'Causation is Motion in', 'Causing is Making', and 'Causes are Sources'.

Ibn Sina and Mulla Sadra use almost all of the introduced metaphors to describe the causation. However, 'Causation is the 'Transfer of Possessions' metaphor in Ibn Sina's philosophy and the 'Causation is Motion out' metaphor in Mulla Sadra's philosophy play central role in their philosophical systems.

Based on the metaphor, 'Causation is Transfer of Possessions', Ibn Sina depicts a three-component relationship for causation: giver, what is given, receiver. In this metaphor, the boundaries between the three components are very strong. Words derived from the roots «'- ṭ-w», «ḥ-ṣ-l», «w-h-b» and «f-y-d» in the metaphor's framework are used to describe causation.

The causation in Mulla Sadra's philosophy is formed based on the 'Causation is Motion out' metaphor. This metaphor depicts a two-component image of causation: the causal source and the thing moving out of it. Reducing the number of the components causation in Mulla Sadra's view compared to Ibn Sina's view, reduces the separation and strength of boundaries among existents and lets introducing theory of the unity of being (Pantheism).

The 'Causation is Motion out' metaphor includes a variety of words, each of which has its own logic. According to our common experience, «ṣ-d-r» indicates moving a solid thing out of a container.

Since, solid things have sharp and strong boundaries with their environment, this words maintains the highest level of plurality in the 'Causation is Motion out' metaphor, this word is the most appropriate word to describe the rule of the unique

The words derived from the roots «f-y-ḍ» and «r-sh-ḥ» conceptualize causation as moving a liquid out of its container. In «f-y-ḍ» and «r-sh-'» plurality is decreasing compared to «ṣ-d-r» since boundaries and separation of a liquid from its environment are weaker than that of a solid object.

The words derived from the roots «ẓ-h-r» and «j-l-y» depict the causation as moving light rays from a container. According to our common experience, the strength of boundaries between and separation of the light source and the light emitted from it are far less than that of between container of a liquid and the liquid moved out of it. So «ẓ-h-r» and «j-l-y» reduce the separation of the cause and the effect to its lowest possible degree. So, this words is the most appropriate to describe the relationship between God and His creatures in the Mulla Sadra's philosophy.

References

[1] Ibn Sina, (1989). *Al- Ḥudūd* [in Arabic]. Cairo: Al-Hī'at al-Miṣrīah.

[2] -----------, (2001). *Al-Nijāh* [in Arabic]. Tehran: Tehran University Press.

[3] -----------, (1984). *Al-Shafā* [in Arabic]. Qom: Mar'ashī Publication.

[4] Jäkel, Olaf, (2002). "Hypothesis Revisited: The Cognitive Theory of Metaphor Applied to Religious Texts." Metaphorik.de.

[5] Lakoff, G., (1993). "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor." In *Metaphor and Thought*, Edited by Andrew Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[6] -----------, (1987). *Woman, Fire and Dangerous Thing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

[7] Lakoff, G., and M. Johnson, (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

[8] Lakoff, G., M. Johnson, (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh*. New York: Basic Books.

[9] Mulla Sadra (1981). *Al-Ḥikmat al-Muta'aliyah fī al-Asfār Al-'Aqlīah al-Arba'ih* [in Arabic]. Beirut: Dār aḥya Al-Turāth.

[10] -----------, (1981). *Al-Shawahid al-Rubūbīh* [in Arabic]. Mashhad: Central Publication.

[11] Tusi, (1996). *Sharh al-Isharāt wa al-Tanbīhat* [in Arabic]. Vol. 3, Qom: Balaghah Publication.

تحلیل استعاری علیت در فلسفه اسلامی

وحید خادم‌زاده¹، محمد سعیدی‌مهر²

چکیده

لیکاف بر خلاف ارسطو، استعاره را بخش جدایی ناپذیری از فرایند تفکر در انسان می داند و معتقد است انسان ها غالبا به صورت خودکار و ناآگاهانه طیف وسیعی از استعاره های مفهومی را می آموزند و در زندگی به کار می گیرند. بخش بزرگی از متون علمی و فلسفی ما آکنده از استعاره های مفهومی است. در دیدگاه لیکاف، مفهوم علیت همانند مفاهیم انتزاعی دیگر از یک بخش نحیف تحت اللفظی شکل یافته است که توسط انواع مختلفی از استعاره های مفهومی در جهات مختلف بسط یافته است. در این مقاله نشان داده خواهد شد که بخش بزرگی از استعاره هایی که لیکاف معرفی کرده است، توسط حکمای مسلمان جهت توصیف رابطه علیت به کار گرفته می شود. رابطه علیت در ابن سینا مبتنی بر استعاره «علیت انتقال دارایی ها است» است. این استعاره، رابطه علیت را به مثابه ی یک رابطه سه جزیی به تصویر می کشد که مرزبندی میان اجزایش شدید و پر رنگ است و علیت در ملاصدرا مبتنی بر استعاره «علیت حرکت به سمت خارج است» فهم می شود؛ این استعاره رابطه علیت را دو جزیی کرده و مرزبندی میان اجزای رابطه را نیز کاهش می دهد.

واژه‌های کلیدی: استعاره مفهومی، لیکاف، علیت، ملاصدرا، ابن سینا

۱. استادیار گروه فلسفه دانشگاه فردوسی، مشهد، ایران. v.khademzadeh@ferdowsi.um.ac.ir (نویسندهٔ مسئول).

۲. استاد گروه فلسفه دانشگاه تربیت مدرس، تهران، ایران.