UDC 1 (091).
KBT 87.3

Naser Forouhi [*]
Abdullah Hosseini Eskandian[**]
(Iran)

University of Tabriz

Reviewing and Comparing the
Philosophical Thoughts of Mulla Sadra
and Leibniz about the Problem of Evil

Annotation

The problem of evil is one of the topics that has always been debated in philosophy and theology for centuries and has raised questions and doubts about the divine attributes and the goodness of this world by the followers of the Abrahamic religions. Mulla Sadra and Leibniz, as two philosophers committed to the Abrahamic religions of Islam and Christianity, in their works have tried to solve the problem of evil and show it compatible with the attributes of justice, wisdom and absolute benevolence of God and on the other hand the good system. Examining and comparing the thoughts of Mulla Sadra and Leibniz on the problem of evil is something that can reveal their differences and intellectual similarities in spite of differences in religion, thought and school, and on the other hand, get acquainted with their reports and views in this regard. In this article, a descriptive-analytical method examines the nature, types and solutions of evil from the perspective of

[*] Assistant Professor, University of Tabriz, Iran
    e-mail: forouhi-naser@yahoo.com
    https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7823-952X

[**] Master Student of Theology, University of Tabriz, Iran
    e-mail: hoseeinieskandianabdullah@gmail.com
    https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2318-022X

Mulla Sadra and Leibniz, and finally compares the thoughts of these two philosophers. Mulla Sadra and Leibniz have considered the existence of evil as a necessity for the material world, in the light of which many good deeds are manifested or can be achieved.

Key words: Evil, Mulla Sadra, Leibniz, Solution, Goodness, Existence of God

1. Introduction

The problem of evil is one of the most serious rational criticisms of the denial of the existence of God, the Wise, Just and Absolute Benevolent, worshiped in the Abrahamic religions, which has always been a source of doubt and skepticism about this issue and that is why it is called *"refuge of atheism"*.

The problem of evil has a long history and has always been the subject of debate and reflection and has always been studied and pondered since the time of ancient Greek philosophy. The oldest sources in which the existence of evil and the discussion about it are considered can be considered Rig Veda, Avesta, Torah,Bible and the Holy Quran. Also in Greek philosophy, philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle and Xenon have commented about the problem of evil.

In modern times, the problem of evil has provided the most serious rational critique of the arguments for belief in God or the absoluteness of the attributes of the perfection of that sacred essence. The diversity of the debate has led many theologians, philosophers, and thinkers in the East and the West to address the issue. The existence of shortcomings, distortions, all kinds of disasters and injustices in the world of human evolution raises questions about the originality of these matters (Spinoza, 1997, 82).

In their works, Mulla Sadra and Leibniz have dealt with the problem of evil, as JL Maki and William Rowe have used it, given the importance of the issue, which can be used in denials of the existence of God. From Mulla Sadra's point of view, evil is a non-existent and relative thing that does not exist, and the non-existent thing cannot be considered as violating the existential thing [God]. On the other hand, he believes that it is the ignorance of the person who thinks that things are evil, and that evil arises from the lack of knowledge and precise awareness of a person who considers them evil by misinterpreting things. But Leibniz, contrary to Mulla Sadra, considers evil to be a minimal thing and considers their minimal role to be necessary in order to obtain good, and believes that without evil, many good deeds will remain unknown.

However, in the article "comparative study of the problem of evil in the philosophy of Mulla Sadra and Leibniz, written by Abuzar Nowrouzi and Reza Berenjkar", some attention has been paid to this discussion,but in this work, the aspects of the solutions and interpretations of this two philosophers in order to answer the problem of evil have been neglected. In other works, the nature of evil in the thought of Mulla Sadra and Leibniz has been considered specifically or in comparison with the thoughts of other thinkers and there is no comparative context in them that can be

used to "study the relationship between good and evil with the originality of existence from the perspective of Mulla Sadra, written by Hassan Batahi et al" or "study the problem of evil from the perspective of Leibniz and Swinburne, by Hamid Reza Eskandari Damneh and Abdullah Nasri". The initiative of this research is in the first place in a comprehensive study of the nature, types and solutions of the problem of evil in a comprehensive and specific way in the thought of Mulla Sadra and Leibniz, which has not been addressed in the research of Nowrouzi and Berenjkar,and in the second place, it is a specific and comparative study of the thoughts of Mulla Sadra and Leibniz about the evil, which has not been considered in other works, and an attempt is made to answer these questions by using reliable references and appropriate analyzes;

What is the definition of evil by Mulla Sadra and Leibniz? Is evil non-existent or existential? Can the existence of evil be disruptive of the good system? From the point of view of Mulla Sadra and Leibniz, can the existence of evil be in conflict with the existence of God and His attributes?What are the types of evil and what do each of them mean? What solutions did Mulla Sadra and Leibniz express in order to solve the problem of evil?What are the similarities and differences between the thoughts of Mulla Sadra and Leibniz about evil?

2. Definition and Nature of Evil

Mulla Sadra: In his various works, Mulla Sadra has expressed various discussions about evil and, as appropriate, has examined the nature of evil. The manifestation of the problem of evil and Mulla Sadra's answers and views in his various works are evidence of the importance of the problem of evil in Mulla Sadra's view.

The evil argument in Mulla Sadra's works is a philosophical argument, not a theological problem, and the difference between the two methods is that the theologian method is persuasive and controversial, and the philosopher also deals with rational reasoning. Therefore, the argument is based on the will of God, faith and Infidelity leads and misleads. In topics such as the quality of the entry of evil into divine judgment, he discusses how evil is compatible with the good system and also discusses the nature of evil. In continuation of the philosophical answer to the problem of evil, the question of the nature and origin and why of evil, its absoluteness and relativity and its relationship with the attributes of goodness and divine power such as absolute knowledge and absolute power, is of central importance (Sadat Madani, 2018, 6).

Mulla Sadra in the definition of evil states: *"Evil is the absence of the essence of a thing or the lack of perfection of the perfections to which the object belongs in the sense that it is the same object"* (Mulla Sadra,1928, 90).

Mulla Sadra considers any thing or object that has a lack of perfection as evil and considers the absence of goodness and perfection in the object as the reason for its evil. On the other hand, Mulla Sadra, like Ibn Sina and Al-Farabi, believes in the non-existence of evil and considers evil as non-existent. He believes that if evil is an existential thing, then it must be other than evil, and in this case it is a false

reflection and evil cannot be an existential thing, and since it does not exist, it is a non-existent thing.

From Mulla Sadra's point of view, since good is an aspiring thing and man wants it to reach it and thereby bring his existence and soul to a higher level of perfection, it is an existential thing and evil because it is hated by human beings and people consider it a moderator of their happiness, it is non-existent.

Mulla Sadra accepts the view of the sages as an indication of the non-existence of evil, and while denying the pure evil of foreign beings, considers their principles, which are the opposites of existence, as evil. He then refers to the existence of a perceptual evil such as suffering and considers them as a contradictory perception, and then asks how such a perception, which is an existential attribute, can be considered non-existent? In response to this question, Mulla Sadra believes that sometimes absence is absolute, in which case it can only be reported in a negative way, and sometimes absence is in itself an object for the object, but it has a form such as lack of knowledge and vision(Nasri and Etemadi Nia, 2013,128-129).

According to Mulla Sadra, the source of any darkness is its essence, which is the root of all evil and is non-existent. In his view, existence is always light, and this is related to all beings, and does not include only human beings, and darkness is related to non-existence, and evil is rooted in the non-existence of possibilities.

Mulla Sadra states: *"By reflecting and inferring from the meanings of evil, their condition and relation, it can be said that whatever is called evil is not out of two states; they are either pure non-existence or things that ultimately lead to non-existence"* (Mulla Sadra, 1928, Vol 7, 59).

Just as goodness is every gentle perfection that the object demands and chooses, so is the evil of every abomination from which the object escapes, and the source of its abstraction is the "perfect licking" or "incomplete licking" satellite. In philosophical analysis, then, the concept of evil is always inherently non-existent, since evil is the opposite of good and existence versus non-existence. When the result of proving the originality of existence is that good is an existential thing, the existence of pure good, on the contrary, we come to the conclusion that evil is non-existent (Batahi et al, 2014, 54).

Mulla Sadra believes that the type of opposition between good and evil is that evil is a special non-existence and is not an absolute non-existence, and not every lack of goodness is called evil. For example, not listening to a wall that does not have hearing is not considered evil because it does not have the capacity to exist, and because it does not, it is not considered evil for it.

Leibniz: Leibniz acknowledges the existence of evil, but argues that the evil that exists is the minimum necessary for the existence of good and far less than the existing good. Evil is therefore a cost that is paid for the many benefits of good. In this theory, it is assumed that good can exist only in opposition to evil, but what is true about phenomena that require opposite aspects, is not true about good and evil? (Eskandaridamaneh and Nasri, 2014, 47)

Leibniz states: *"The problem of evil is in fact the most important, the most difficult and the most stubborn problem that has always offended human thought and ultimately has not found a decisive and convincing answer"*. (Leibniz, 2005, 202).

According to Leibniz, the world system has an orderly and efficient mechanism, and the evils can not disrupt this complex and good system. He says: *"Since evil is necessary for the existence of greater goodness, God has given consent to their existence. God has never willed evil but has consented to its existence"* (Leibniz, 1985, 160).

Leibniz believes that evil arises from a kind of limitation because monads are all created and limited to the central monad, and that is why metaphysics is the limitation of evil, and other forms of evil that are moral and natural evil are somehow rooted in metaphysical evil. According to Leibniz, the existence of this limitation is necessary for the harmony and order of the world of creation.

According to Leibniz, anything created by God is good, and although we may consider them evil given our weak perceptions, their existence is necessary for the world, and this world has a true system and this world has a real system that cannot be considered crooked or wrong, because this real system is the best system.

According to Leibniz, God is able to create evil, but evil is never issued from Him. On the other hand, the good spirit of God must be considered obligatory. Thus the special possibility of existential propositions will ultimately be based on the premise that God's goodness is not necessary. According to Leibniz, the goodness of God focused His will on creating good, His knowledge revealed the best possible thing to Him, and His power enabled Him to create it (Russell, 2012, 82).

Leibniz believes that God is good and nothing but good comes from good, in the sense that there are many possible worlds for God, and since God encompasses all of them scientifically, the good and evil of each are same and so clear to God and since God is the absolute good, He can not choose except the best. After the absolute good, nothing but good is issued, and therefore God's choice has been the best. So this world is also the best possible world (Eskandaridamaneh and Nasri, 2014, 33).

According to Leibniz, God has done what is best for the world, and this universe is the best system that God has created in the most perfect and beautiful way, and there should be no small evil that is in fact the introduction of charity in the world and evil should not be considered in conflict with some divine attributes such as justice and benevolence.

Leibniz states: *"God has three attributes of goodness, knowledge and absolute power, and considering these three attributes, we conclude that God has done the best possible in the world, because, if otherwise He does not want to do His best and lacks good will, His goodness and benevolence will be limited ,and if He does not have the necessary knowledge to know and distinguish the best or has knowledge but does not have enough power to do it, His wisdom and power will be questioned; then the existing system is the best system"* (Leibniz, 1985, 190).

Murray states: "According to Leibniz, the fact that God created the best possible world does not mean that the world is absolutely perfect and there are no defects in

it. Although he speaks of the various perfections of this world, he is convinced that this world is only a part of absolute perfection benefits. In order to be a creature, this world must have a perfection less than the perfection of God, because otherwise it will not be different from God. That is why it considers metaphysical evil as the essence of every creature. However, according to Leibniz, although there are some evil in the world,but it is the best possible world. Different views have been expressed about Leibniz's criterion for the supremacy of this world; some consider the best world to be a world that has the maximum virtue for rational beings. Some have considered the existence of maximum nature as a criterion of superiority" (Murray, 2005, 28). Leibniz believes that according to the attributes of goodness, knowledge and divine power, the existence of evil can not be considered a defect for God, and this view does not contradict the divine attributes. In this regard, he says: *"From the attributes of goodness, knowledge and divine power we conclude that God has done the best possible thing, because otherwise if He does not want to do the best and lacks the will of goodness, His goodness and benevolence will be limited, and if He does not have the necessary knowledge to know and recognize the best, His wisdom and power will be questioned"* (Leibniz, 1985, 190).

Leibniz considers evil as an opportunity for a person to take advantage of goodness and recognize charity. In his view, the existence of some evil is the beginning of the descent of charity and the existence of evil in this regard is obvious and necessary. Leibniz, on the other hand, considers evil to be inherent in the world, and it is obvious that his statement is more focused on physical evil or natural evil.

3. Division of Evil

Mulla Sadra: Mulla Sadra in "Asfar Arbaeh" considers evils in these types; 1. Non-existent matters such as poverty and death 2. Perceptual evil such as compound ignorance and pain 3. Ugly acts such as murder and adultery 4. Principles of ugly acts such as lust, anger, stinginess, etc. (Mulla Sadra, 1928, Vol 1, 414).

Non-existent matters are like blindness, which is a kind of evil but non-existent; that is, there is no such thing as blindness, and what is called blindness is the dysfunction of the eye. In fact, the first type of the four types of evil that Mulla Sadra has expressed belongs to things that do not have an external existence and are expressed only in the form of words in order to get closer to the mind, otherwise no nature or essence is attributed to it.

Perceptual evil refers to the pain and suffering that a person suffers in the face of various factors such as watching events or hearing bad news or trauma to the body. This kind of pain is related to the human soul, because the soul realizes and is affected by their misfortune due to its dominance over the course of affairs. Therefore, any pain is accompanied by the perception of the opposite, and if this perception is not present, there will be no pain and suffering,and moral and natural evils return to this kind of evils because the physical pains and sufferings and other hardships caused by natural evils are perceived by the soul.

Ugly acts such as murder and adultery are the same as moral evil. Moral evil is evil that is the result of a person's voluntary action, whether it is conscious, such as lying,

adultery, slander, etc, or it is unconscious, such as using alcohol to lose focus and commit murder.

Mulla Sadra states: *"Some believe that the occurrence of moral evil or the sins originating from man is documented by divine destiny, and since God is just and merciful, He should not punish people for the moral evil from which they were urgently issued. However, the Holy Quran and hadiths explicitly speak of the torment promised by God about sins, and this apparently contradicts divine justice"* (Ibid 81).

Principles of ugly actions also refer to states that are related to the soul and can be sinister if it is exaggerated or deviated. For example, if the power of anger is exaggerated, man becomes arrogant, which is a moral evil, and if he suffers from excess, man becomes cowardly, which is also a moral evil, and it must be kept in balance, and the balance of the power of anger is the same courage that is one of the highest moral virtues.

Leibniz: Each type of evil in Leibniz's thought has its own nature and characteristics that make it different from other types of evil. Based on his specific philosophical thoughts as well as being inspired by the ideas of St. Augustine, he has divided and presented his views on the types of evil and divides the evil into three categories: metaphysical, physical and moral evil.

Although Leibniz divides evil into three categories, he considers them to be completely related to each other. Leibniz acknowledges that evil cannot be a real thing against God's goodness, but even if evil is nothing but a lack of goodness, it still seems to contradict God's perfection and needs to be explained (Eskandaridamaneh and Nasri, 2014, 31). Leibniz's answers generally consist of the Augustinian method, which consists of three parts;

  A. Evil as the absence of good;
  B. Human beings have the will and authority (justification of moral evil)
  C. God can remove good from the will of evil (Bahreini, 2011, 20).

One of the types of evil categorized by Leibniz is metaphysical evil. Metaphysical evil is actually the evil that lies at the root of people and objects and has a potential in them.

Metaphysical evil is the absence of absolute perfection, which is inherently devoid of it. Broad argues that it is metaphysically necessary that every created world must contain some kind of metaphysical evil, because in the created world there is a monad, and every monad has a degree of ambiguity and therefore a degree of metaphysical evil (Broad, 1975, 160). Metaphysical evil is a mere defect; that is, evil is a defect that requires a finite existence in itself. The existence of the creature is necessarily finite, and the finite being is necessarily imperfect, and this defect is the root of the possibility of error. Where should we look for the source of evil when we derive our whole being from God? The answer is that the source of evil must be found in the nature of the creature's soul, since this nature is contained in the eternal truths which are in the knowledge of God independent of His will, because we must note that there is an initial defect in the creature before committing sin. And what

creature is limited to its essence and as a result can not know everything and may be misled and make other mistakes (Nowrouzi and Berenjkar, 2014, 103- 104).

Metaphysical evil means the absence of absolute perfection that is woven into the mite of the whole possible world. Metaphysical evil is necessary for the creation of the universe of possibility. The evil that pervades the universe is the limitation and imperfection of the universe relative to the infinity of God.In other words, metaphysical evil is the evil with which all possible beings and creatures of God are affected and cannot be separated from them, and it means limitation and in Mulla Sadra's words "existential poverty" of all possible beings in front of God's infinite perfection. Because every limitation is considered a defect and weakness and every defect is considered as a kind of evil; therefore, limitations are poverty and the possibility of the existence of evil (Alizamani and Sadathashemi, 2014, 98). The metaphysical evil of the universe has occupied both possibility and matter, and the reason for this is the limitation of the universe to the infinite God. In Islamic philosophy, this evil is called absolute imperfection, which is like non-existent evil.

Physical evil is the same as the events of the world of nature, such as floods, earthquakes, storms, tsunamis, etc, which may always occur in different parts of the world and their existential roots go back to nature, although human manipulation should not be ignored in their creation.

Physical evil is one of the characteristics of the natural world that is always happening and happens many times in different places. It seems that this group of evils have an inseparable existence with the system that rules nature. Some believe that physical evil is the same It is a manifestation of metaphysical evil in the natural world.

Leibniz states: *"Concerning physical evil, it can be said that God sometimes intends it to punish sin and sometimes as a means to an end, that is, the source of greater evil or the attainment of greater good. Punishment is also a source of correction and lesson. Evil often makes us better understand good, and sometimes it contributes to the development of the person who endures it. It is a beautiful parable used by Christ himself"*. (Leibniz, 1985, 140).

Regarding natural evil, Leibniz believes that pain is a part of the natural system, and that in the whole natural system, natural good is much greater than natural evil; in addition, many natural evils are the result of human moral evil, and at the same time for achieving good ends is useful (Wall, 1991, 81). Leibniz says that natural good in the world is more than natural evil. In addition, natural pain is the result of moral evil and is a useful way to reach many ends, because they serve as a punishment for sins as well as a means to complete good. (Copleston, 2009, 417).

According to Leibniz, the last type of evil is moral evil, which is the source of the creation of a person who commits sin by following his whims and avoiding divine commands. In fact, moral evil is the same as man's obedience to it is the devil inside and out that causes evil among human beings.

According to Leibniz, moral evil depends on the will of human beings, and its emergence requires that a person will do evil, for example, lie, commit murder, or

commit any other evil. In fact, as long as one does not want to, no moral evil does not occur and the appearance or non-appearance of such evil depends on man and his action.

Leibniz, however, divides evils into three categories; in practice, he considers them to be quite related to each other. In his view, moral evil often causes physical evil, and many of the sufferings that are caused to man are due to selfishness and improper human actions. Like Augustine, he considers many natural disasters to be the result of man's sin and his disobedience to God almighty. Leibniz also believes that metaphysical evil is an unlikely cause of moral evil and therefore physical evil (Fathtaheri, 2010, 111).

On the other hand, sometimes some evil is a combination of physical and moral. For example, if we cut down trees, as a result, when it rains, the probability of flooding increases, or if an earthquake occurs due to rockets and the pressure to hit the ground, it can not be considered as a perfect example of phisical evil, but also the human factor has been involved in it and in fact it has been a combination of moral and physical evil.

Leibniz believes that the types of evil, despite their differences, are quite related to each other, because on the one hand metaphysical evil for moral evil is an unlikely cause that is related to man's relationship with God and potential affairs, and on the other hand the result evil is physical and natural.

4. Evil Problem Solving Solutions

Mulla Sadra: In order to show the evil compatible with the divine attributes and the good system, Mulla Sadra in his various works has expressed solutions and answers to solve the problem of the evil that is as follows;

Evil Is Non-Existen: This view seeks to disprove the duality rather than to solve the problem of evil; according to this view, because evil is non-existent, it does not need a creator, so because we have a kind of creator in the world who is also good, so only we have a creator, and the notion of doubt and dualism is false. (Motahhari,1988,154).

Mulla Sadra believes that human nature considers evil to be non-existent and man realizes by his nature that evil is non-existent and this is the good that exists and God has made the world full of it.

Mulla Sadra considers evil to be either pure non-existence or that which leads to non-existence. Although what leads to nothingness is not inherently evil and can be considered perfection, but because it leads to nothingness, it is considered evil. From Mulla Sadra's point of view, since evil is a non-existent thing, no existence and essence can be considered for it, and also whatever its return to non-existence is evil, and it cannot be considered for that existence. Considering the importance of the issue of existence in Mulla Sadra's philosophy, it seems that he tried to deny the duality and prove the oneness of God by proposing the non-existence of evil, and for this reason he stated other solutions to solve the problem of evil.

Evil Is the Result of Ignorance and Lack of Awareness: Some people believe that evil is the result of ignorance and lack of awareness of the reality of things,

otherwise if we look at the problem of evil with knowledge and awareness, there is no evil and it is the ignorance of people who imagine evil that deprives them of peace.

Meterling states: *"Whatever I think, I can not accept that a generous, just and wise God will satisfy to create in this world, imperfect or weak and miserable. No, the truth is other than what comes to our eyes, and it is impossible for the God we worship to be ignorant and insane, and certainly the subject matter is somewhere else that we have not realized and may not realize forever".* (Meterling, 2010, 56).

Mulla Sadra, referring to the limitations of human science and other creatures in knowing and acquiring knowledge, has stated that it is one of the solutions to solve the problem of evil: *"But there is no one who desires to be surrounded by the subtleties of his secrets and his grace and mercy on the world of the unseen and the kingdom, because the sciences of scientists are less than what the prophets and saints know and what they knew is very little about the angels and those who reached the position of the supreme. Therefore, the knowledge of all angels, jin and humans is so insignificant than the knowledge of God that it can not be called knowledge".* (Mulla Sadra, 1928, Vol 7, 147).

Evil Is Relative: Another solution to evil is to know it relativity. According to this theory, evil is relative and may be an evil phenomenon for some people and the same phenomenon may seem good to others, and we should note that relativity is against the truth. Also, the conditions and situation of time indicate that the evil is relative, because in a certain period, a phenomenon may be evil for a person, and in another period and time, the same phenomenon may appear as good. Although ignorance of evil solves the problem of many evils due to not attributing existence and aspect of existence, but still some natural evils such as floods, earthquakes, pains and the like remain and ignorance does not solve the problem of this group of evildoers, and the sages have acknowledged the relative nature of this evil group to solve its problem.

The reason why evil is relative is that if we consider a creature to be evil, it is either evil for itself or its cause or for others. If it is evil for itself, it must destroy itself, and such a thing will never exist. If it is evil for its cause, then it will not be in harmony with it, and this is contrary to the nature of cause and effect. If it is evil for non-self, it will repel it, and this is contrary to the premise; therefore, evil is evil for non-self, cause and effect (Javadi Amoli, 1996, Vol 3, 157)

Mulla Sadra about the relativity of evil states: *"How evil it is that one is good by comparing one person to another, such as lust and anger, because both of these are evil in comparison with the narcissistic soul, because the perfection of the narrator's soul is in taming the two, so that for the soul of the body and the form, the superiority of the body and its forces is achieved and is adorned with intellectual ornaments and gets rid of animal depravity, so both have been silent, good and perfect in comparison with other populations".* (Mulla Sadra, 1928,Vol 5, 470).

Evil Is Necessary for the Existence of Good: Many charities are obtained for us by evil. In other words, some evils are the prelude to the acquisition of charity, and it is

with the occurrence of that evil that we attain or realize the charities and strive more seriously to preserve those charities. For example, we do not realize the importance of health unless it is a disease, or we do not realize the importance of security and tranquility unless it threatens our danger and insecurity. Thus, although evil may seem detrimental in appearance, it will either direct us to charity to try to pay more attention to its preservation, or it will lead us to newer charities.

By experiencing evil, we discover the nature of good and know its full value. Good without evil is neither known nor its value will be known. This approach can also be called the theory of divine benevolent justice. By believing in this theory, theologians cling to the all-encompassing dimensions of the universe that they believe are truly good and they prove that these good deeds are conditional on the existence of some evil or that the realization of these good deeds requires some evil ones (Taliafro, 2003, 500).

Mulla Sadra, considering that the relativity of evil can not be the complete answer to solve the problem of evil, under the influence of Aristotle, places beings based on good and evil in five categories, which are;pure good, abundant good and little evil, equal good and evil equal, abundant evil and little good and pure evil. Mulla Sadra believes that in the meantime, only the first two cases are realized and the last three cases do not exist in the realm of existence. Pure good is God, and the great good and the little evil belong to the world of nature or the material world, and this little evil is necessary to achieve the great good in this world.

Evil Is Necessary for a Good System: Evil is necessary for contradiction and contradiction is necessary for movement and movement is necessary for the material world; therefore, evil is necessary for the material world. God has placed the system of the beings of the universe according to the natural and physical laws, and therefore operates the natural system according to his natural and internal system, but the possibility of natural evil is inherent in this natural system. The same water that quenches our thirst can overwhelm us and this is natural (Mohammadzadeh and Niroumand, 2010, 106-107).

The influence of material beings on each other and change and transformation and contradiction and antagonism are inherent features of the material world, so that if it were not for these features, there would be no such thing as the material world. In other words, the special causal system among material beings is an inherent system that is necessary for the type of material beings; therefore, either the material world must come into being with the same system or it must not come into being at all. As a result, the evils and defects of this world are an inseparable requirement of its causal system (Misbah Yazdi, 1995, Vol 2, 459).

Mulla Sadra believes that evil is necessary for the existence of this world and without the existence of evil this world can not be a good system and the goodness of this world is in the light of the existence of good and evil together, which is the maximum good and the minimum evil in this world.

There Is a Maximum of Good and a Little Evil: One of the most important arguments given by some thinkers as an answer to the problem of evil is the

dominance of the aspect of charity over evil in the world. According to this idea, although there are some evils in the world, and some of them, like earthquakes and floods, are the product of nature, and some, such as murder and slavery, are the result of human malice, but it should be noted that the world's charity is much greater than its evils and should not be unaware of many charities and simply consider evil as non-charities. This view was first put forward by St.Irenaeus and later developed by other thinkers.

Mulla Sadra believes that the evils of this world are very small and incomparable to its good deeds, and that this minimal aspect of evil has no contradiction with the good system, because few evils and many goods do not contradict each other, but complement each other and there is an inseparable link between these two things (Mulla Sadra, 1995, Vol 2, 265).

Leibniz: In dealing with the problem of evil, thinkers fall into two categories; some, such as Plato, Plotinus, Augustine, Leibniz and all Islamic philosophers, have tried to make the problem of evil a violation of attributes by recognizing the existing system and offering various solutions and arguments and tried to solve the evil problem. On the other hand, thinkers like J.L. Mackey and William Rowe, considering the evil as irrational, have stated it as a reason for denying the existence of God and have made the issue of evil a refuge for their atheism (Hosseini Eskandian and Rajabnezhadian, 2020, 117).

According to Leibniz, in his "Theodicy of Divine Justice", he has proposed four solutions to solve problem of evil;

Evil is Non-Existent: Leibniz's first solution to the problem of evil, which is based on the pre-Christian foundations and is rooted in Augustine's thoughts, is that evil is non-existent. According to this solution, there is no evil at all for which titles such as "disrupting the good system" or "violating the divine attributes" can be considered, and evil is a non-existent thing to which there is no existence.

Leibniz believes that evil is non-existent and without cause, because in his view, cause belongs to things that exist, and evil, since it is non-existent, does not exist so that it can have a cause and. The essence of the object returns that evil lacks the essence and existence to which the cause is based.

Leibniz, recognizing the necessity of metaphysical evil and basing it on physical and moral evil, concludes that evil and sin are purely negative and non-existent, because they arise from metaphysical evil, and this kind of evil is also non-existent (Broad, 1975, 159). Therefore, evil has no active cause and is a kind of loss (Leibniz, 1985, 222).

Knowing that evil is non-existent, rather than trying to solve the problem of evil, seeks to disprove the duality.

Copleston says: "According to Leibniz, God previously willed only good, but since imperfection is not related to divine will but to the nature of the creature's soul, it was not possible for God to create at all without creating imperfect beings. Nevertheless, God has created the best possible world, and if the issue itself is taken into account, the divine will wills only the good;but later, when the divine will for

the creation of the universe became certain, it wills the best possible; but it was not possible for God to will the best without the will of imperfect creatures; even in the best possible universe, there must be defects in beings" (Copleston, 2009, 416).

The Necessity of Evil to Achieve Good:This view has an ancient history among the philosophers of the West and the East like the Stoics. Adherents of this theory, by accepting and acknowledging the existence and establishment of evil in this world, consider it necessary and inseparable from the world, which includes many superior and many good things, to the extent that the small evil of the world was to be ignored. The creation of the principle of the existing universe must also be abandoned. Proponents of this solution cite examples to prove their claim. For example, the existence of fire, which no one doubts is good, sometimes causes a lot of harm and evil, yet no one objects to its existence. Therefore, God's main purpose in creating fire is its innumerable benefits, but the harms and evils that result from it are intended by God. This view is composed of the following three pillars and introductions;

> A. The multiplicity of good and the smallness of evil
> B. Do not separate evil from charity
> C. Equality of leaving many good with many evils (Swinburne, 2009, 101).

Leibniz's other solution to the problem of evil is that it is necessary to achieve good. In other words, the existence of some charity requires the existence of evil, and that charity cannot be achieved unless it is evil. From Leibniz's point of view, there is a lot of charity in evil, and when that evil occurs, we realize that charity.

Ross states: *"If it were not possible for sin to be overcome in the moral realm, our character would be weakened. In the realm of nature, too, the absence of calamities, sufferings, and hardships required such irregularities in causal laws that prevented the possibility of science and engineering; just as in the realm of aesthetics, the whole should not be judged by looking at a small part of it. Looking at a painting, it may seem that a bunch of colors are ugly and meaningless put together, and also in music, a particular instrument may be a scratch on its own, but its existence is necessary for the overall harmony"*. (Ross, 1984, 104).

Leibniz believes that the good of the world is much greater than its evil, but there are two reasons why human beings consider evil more than good;

1. Evil attracts our attention more while we do not pay so much attention to the existence of charity, and when we lose that charity, we realize their value. He states that evil attracts our attention more than good, and that is why that proves evil is rarer.

2. Man is a holistic being, and if he sees evil, he includes it in the whole universe, arguing that the whole universe is full of evil and misery, while carrying only its own difficulty and hardship over the whole universe (Leibniz, 1985, 43).

Leibniz believes that with a superficial view, we should not consider every seemingly evil thing to be harmful to us, because in its essence it may be full of goodness for us and we may be unaware of its nature. The same trend continues in the universe, and natural phenomena, although they may cause harm to us and to

nature itself, but the benefits of that natural evil far outweigh the harms to us humans and nature.

Eliminate Evil:Leibniz's third solution to the problem of evil is to eliminate evil in the universe and replace it with good. Leibniz's view has been criticized by some thinkers as very optimistic.

The most important critique of Leibniz's optimistic view is that the existing world could not be the best possible world, because figures such as Hitler and other prominent human beings have made the face of this world ugly. It is natural that God could have created a better world by eliminating evil. Why didn't God create kinder figures like Mother Teresa instead of creating Hitler? Here it is thought that figures like Hitler can be removed from the world without major change in the world. This means that this world can be the same without Hitler, but according to the above principles, it is impossible to remove Hitler from this world and replace him with a better person like Mother Teresa, because part of Mother Teresa's concept is that she dies 52 years after Hitler's death. Anyone who does not carry this burden will not be Mother Teresa. Therefore, if Hitler is somehow removed from this world, Mother Teresa will not be Mother Teresa, and from here a clear contradiction is needed, because Mother Teresa dies 52 years after Hitler's death. As a result, Hitler could not be removed from the world without being changed by Mother Teresa or anyone else. With the removal of Hitler, this world is neither the previous world nor Mother Teresa the same as Mother Teresa, and this is also true of any other person or event in this world (Fathtaheri, 2010, 122-123). Leibniz believes that with the elimination of evil, no major change will take place in the world, but it should be noted that the universe, despite this evil and its solidarity, is next to charity, which means and without them can not be many Charity was achieved.

Evil is Necessary for a Good System:Many thinkers believe that the evils in the world are not only a violation of the good system, but on the contrary are an integral feature of the current system. The world is in spite of evil, which forms the same good system, otherwise the world without evil was created by God before the creation of this world, and if this world was created without evil, there would be no better place for this world and the existence of evil. In this world, it is a kind of groundwork for the exaltation of man in the correlation between good and evil, so that he can be charitable despite this natural need and avoid creating evil.

The vast majority of Islamic thinkers and some Western scholars believe in their researcher of the "best system" and the best possible world, which means that all the worlds that God has created and the existing material world are the best possible worlds. In other words, the world we see, which consists of charity and evil, is one of the best products of the factory of divine creation, which is better than it can be imagined in terms of quantity and quality. The reason for the proponents of this view is summed up in the statement that since God is wise, omnipotent and absolutely benevolent, He has no claim or motive to create evil, and everything that is imparted from an infinite source is all good. But what we see from the evils and misfortunes in the mirror of the world are all the consequences of the movements and

contradictions of the material world, which, whether we like it or not, endanger the interests of some and cause the loss of others. But in order to study the innumerable benefits of this world, there is no escape from this evil (Swinburne, 2009, 112).

Leibniz says this in explaining the theory of the good system: "In fact, "A" alone can be possible, as can "B", but not all possible things can happen because not all of them are possible together. The set of possible ones together form a possible world, and infinite possible worlds can be assumed. But among them, God chooses only the world in which the greatest good is for most people, and this will be enough to make that world a reality. By definition, the world may be a world that does not contain contradictions. That is, there should be a possible relationship between its components, not a refusal relationship, and that world will be the best world in which the largest group of "possible" have gathered, because God has created as much as possible and created a world that to the fullest extent possible. Thus the present world is made up of the largest group of both possibilities"" (Russell, 1986, 184).

5. Conclusion

The problem of evil is one of the old topics in philosophy and theology, which has always been a place of discussion and differentiation of thought, and some of them have even used it to deny the existence of God and to restrict divine attributes and the imperfection of the system of good creation. This has led various theologians and thinkers who believe in the existence of God to stand in defense and show the existence of God and His attributes free from imperfection by evil. Mulla Sadra, who is one of the philosophers of Islamic thought, in his works, especially the exquisite book "Asfar Arbaeh", has dealt with the evil problem and has defended the goodness of this world and on the other hand the perfection of divine attributes. Leibniz, one of the recent Christian philosophers, has also paid attention to the problem of evil in his works and, like Mulla Sadra, has tried to defend the divine attributes and the good system against evil-based suspicions.

Mulla Sadra believes that evil is non-existent and does not exist, and that existence and nature cannot be imagined for evil. He believes that evil is the lack of the essence of a thing or the lack of perfection of the perfections to which the object belongs because it is the object. But unlike Mulla Sadra, who considers evil to be non-existent, Leibniz accepted the non-existence of evil in a minimal way and believed that there are minimal evil in the world. Although Mulla Sadra denies the existence of evil, he believes that some things that man consider evil but are not real evil are essentially minimal for this world, and despite them, many good deeds can be achieved. Both philosophers believe in the minimal aspect of evil, with the difference that Leibniz considers it as existential, but Mulla Sadra considers it as something that one considers evil but is not evil and is a factor in achieving good. Both philosophers believe that man instinctively seeks charity and hates evil, and that benevolence is human instincts. Both also believe that God is pure good and no evil is issued from Him, and because He is good, whatever is issued from Him is good, but because evil is not a good thing, therefore it cannot be attributed to God.

As for the goodness of the world of creation, both philosophers believe that evil can not be considered a violator of the goodness of this world and it should be considered a necessity of the world of creation.The difference here is that Mulla Sadra has stated that being good is an absolute attribute for the world of creation and has not limited it, but Leibniz has considered the goodness of the world among the possible possibilities and he believes that what God has done for this world was the best possible thing, but Mulla Sadra did not mention this and stated the absolute goodness of the world.

Mulla Sadra has considered evil in four types of non-existent matters such as poverty, death, perceptual evil such as pain and suffering, ugly actions or the same moral evil, and the principles of ugly actions such as anger and stinginess. Mulla Sadra did not mention natural evil like floods and earthquakes and did not express it. But Leibniz, unlike Mulla Sadra, considers evil to be unique in metaphysical, physical (natural) and moral evil. Leibniz's metaphysical evil is the absence of absolute perfection in the essence of the object, from which the object is inherently devoid, and in this respect it is similar to the non-existent evil mentioned by Mulla Sadra. Both philosophers believe in the existence of moral evil that man chooses voluntarily and consider it a clear example of man's sin. The principles of ugly deeds are also among the types of evil in Mulla Sadra's thought that Leibniz did not mention and does not seem to believe in, because he considers metaphysical evil as the unlikely cause of moral evil that human lust can be an example of it. But one of the most important aspects of evil thinking in Mulla Sadra's works is the expression of the perceptual evil that he expressed and later caused discussion and thought among thinkers and sages.

Perceptual evil refers to the pain and suffering that a person suffers in the face of various factors such as hearing of tragic events or trauma.

In expressing the solutions and answers given by both philosophers, it should be stated that both have expressed the necessity of evil for the existence of a good world and also the attainment of good from the solutions of the problem of evil. In fact, they believe that evil is an inseparable requirement of the nature of this world, which with its minimal accompaniment along with the maximum charity, which means that the world is good. Both philosophers also believe that many goods cannot be known or achieved without evil, and that attaining it can only be achieved in the light of evil, in other words, that evil is the prelude to attaining good. Mulla Sadra considers the absence of evil as one of the solutions to solve the problem of evil and reject duality, which Leibniz has accepted in a minimal way and considers as one of the solutions to the problem of evil. In his works, Leibniz did not mention the relativity of evil, while Mulla Sadra pointed to the variability of evil according to time and people, and stated that relativity is one of the main ways to solve the problem of evil. Elimination of evil is also one of Leibniz's solutions that has been criticized a lot and many consider it contrary to Leibniz's optimism of the world and believe that eliminating evil can not be considered as a logical solution to this problem. Ultimately, the goal of both philosophers was to defend the divine

attributes against intentions and doubts, as well as to optimize the world of creation, to which both have responded in different ways based on their religious and philosophical principles and this can not prevent Mulla Sadra and Leibniz's many intellectual commonalities about answering and solving the problem of evil.

References

1. Alizamani, A., Sadathashemi, F.,(2014). Augustine's Theory of Evil and Its Critique from Ibn Sina's Perspective,Bi-Quarterly Journal of Hekmat Sinavi, Year 19,No2
2. Bahreini, M.S., (2011). Evil from the Point of View of Swinburne, Master Thesis, Tehran, Allameh Tabatabai University
3. Batahi, H., Zamiri, M, Talebichari, M., (2014). A Study of the Relationship between Good and Evil and the Originality of Existence from the Perspective of Mulla Sadra,Journal of Religion of Wisdom, Year 6, Issue 21
4. Broad, C.D., (1975). Leibniz,Great Britian, Oxford, Oxford University Press
5. Copleston, F., (2009). History of Philosophy, Translated by Ebrahim Dadjoo, Tehran, Scientific and Cultural Publications,First Edition
6. Eskandaridamaneh, H, Nasri, A., (2014). A Study of the Problem of Evil from the Perspective of Leibniz and Swinburne, Comparative Theology, Issue 12, Year 5
7. Fathtaheri, A (2010). A Study of the Problem of Evil in Leibniz Thought, Philosophical Research, Year 53, No 216
8. Hosseini Eskandian, A., Rajab Nezhadian, Masoumeh (2020). Evil Thought and Its Approaches with an Emphasis on Swinburne Theodicy of Divine Justice,Metafizika Journal,3,No4
9. Javadi Amoli, A (1996). Rahiq Makhtoum, Qom, Esra Publishing, Second Edition
10. Leibniz, G (1985). Theodicy, Trans E.M.Huggard,Biblio Bazzar
11. Leibniz, G (2005). Confession Philosophie,Editor and Trandlators Daniel Garber and Robert C Sleigh,Jr,Yale University Press
12. Meterling, M (2010). The Great World and Man, Translated by Zabihullah Mansouri, Tehran, Einstein Publications,Second Edition
13. Misbah Yazdi, M (1995). Philosophy Education, Tehran, Islamic Propaganda Organization, First Edition
14. Mohammadzadeh, E, Niroumand, R (2010). Combined Approach in Solving the Problem of Evil, Qom University Scientific Research Quarterly, Eleventh Year, Third and Fourth Issues
15. Motahhari,M (1988). Divine Justice, Tehran, Sadra Publications, First Edition
16. Mulla Sadra,M (1928). Al-Hikmat Al-Motàalieh,Qom, The Scientific Printing, First Edition

17. Mulla Sadra, M (1995). Mafatíh Al-Gheib, Correction, Suspension and Introduction by Najafgholi Habibi, Tehran, Sadra Islamic Wisdom Foundation,Second Edition

18. Murray, M (2005). Leibniz on the Peoblem of Evil.In Stanford Encyclopedia

19. Nasri, A., Etemadi Nia, M (2013). Formulations of the Problem of Evil in the Works of Muslim Philosophers, Teachings of Islamic Philosophy, Razavi University of Islamic Sciences, No12

20. Nowrouzi, A., Berenjkar, R. (2014). A Comparative Study of the Problem of Evil in the Philosophy of Mulla Sadra and Leibniz, Essays on the Philosophy of Religion, Second Year, No. 2

21. Ross G, M (1984). Leibniz,Great Britian,Oxford,Oxford University Press

22. Russell, B (1984). A Critical Explanation of Leibniz Philosophy with Attachments,Translated by Iraj Qanuni, Tehran, Mehr Vista Publications, First Edition

23. Russell, B., (2012). History of Western Philosophy, Translated by Najaf Daryabandari, Tehran, Parvaz Publications, First Edition

24. Sadat Madani, Z (2017). Evil from the Point of View of Ibn Sina (Ontological View) and Mulla Sadra (Perceptual View), the First Conference on Research in Jurisprudence, Law and Islamic Sciences, September

25. Spinoza, B (1997). Ethics, Translated by Mohsen Jahangiri, Tehran, University Publishing Center, Second Edition

26. Swinburne, R (2009). The Problem of Evil, Translated by Mahmoud Yousef Thani, Tehran,Mah and Din ,First Edition

27. Taliafro, Ch (2003). Philosophy of Religion in the Twentieth Century, Translated by Insha'Allah Rahmati, Tehran, Suhrawardi Research and Publishing Office, First Edition

28. Wall, J (1991). Discussion in Metaphysics, Translated by Yahya Mahdavi et al., Tehran, Kharazmi Publications, First Edition

چکیده

دکتر ناصر فروهی
عبدالله حسینی اسکاندیان

بررسی و مقایسه افکار فلسفی ملاصدرا و لایب نیتس حول محور مبحث شرور

مسئله شرور از مباحثی است که همواره در قرون متمادی محل بحث در فلسفه و کلام بوده و سؤالات و شبهاتی را در مورد اوصاف الهی و احسن دانستن این جهان از سوی پیروان ادیان ابراهیمی فراهم آورده است. ملاصدرا و لایب نیتس به عنوان دو فیلسوف متعهد به ادیان ابراهیمی اسلام و مسیحیت، در آثار خود سعی در حل مسئله شرور و سازگار نشان دادن آن با اوصاف عدل، حکمت و خیرخواهی مطلق خداوند و از سوی دیگر نظام احسن کرده‌اند. بررسی و مقایسه افکار ملاصدرا و لایب نیتس در مورد مسئله شر امری است که می‌تواند تفاوت‌ها و شباهت‌های فکری آنان را به رغم تفاوت در مذهب، اندیشه و مکتب نمایان سازد و از سوی دیگر با تقریرات و دیدگاه‌های آنان در این‌باره آشنا کند. در این مقاله به روش توصیفی-تحلیلی به بررسی ماهیت، اقسام و راهکارهای شرور از دیدگاه ملاصدرا و لایب نیتس پرداخته

می‌شود و در نهایت به مقایسه افکار این دو فیلسوف ختم می‌شود. ملاصدرا و لایب نیتس وجود شرور را امری لازم برای جهان ماده دانسته‌اند که در پرتو آن است که بسیاری از خیرات جلوه می‌نمایانند یا می‌توان به آنها دست یافت.

واژگان کلیدی: شرور، ملاصدرا، لایب نیتس، راهکار، خیرکثیر، وجود خداوند

Annotasiya

Dr. Nasir Füruhi
Abdullah Hüseyni Eskandian
Sədrəddin Şirazi və Q.Leybnitsin fəlsəfi düşüncələrində şərr probleminin müqayisəli araşdırılması

Şər problemi, əsrlər boyu fəlsəfə və ilahiyyat sferasında həmişə mübahisəli və səmavi dinlərin ardıcılları tərəfindən ilahi atributlar və bu dünyanın mükəmməl olması haqqında suallar və şübhələr doğuran mövzulardan biri olmuşdur. S.Şirazi və Q.Leybnits, İslam və Xristianlıq kimi səmavi dinlərə bağlı olan iki filosof olaraq, əsərlərində şərr problemini Allahın mütləq xeyirxahlığı, ədalət, müdriklik və kainatın sistem olduğunu göstərərək həll etməyə çalışmışlar. S.Şirazi və Q.Leybnitsin şərr mövzusundakı düşüncələrini araşdırmaq və müqayisə etmək, din, düşüncə və məktəb fərqliliklərinə rəğmən baxmayaraq onların fərqlilikləri ilə yanaşı intellektual oxşarlıqlarını göstərəcək. Digər tərəfdən də onların bu problem haqqında interpretasiya və fikirləri tam məlum və aydın olacaq.

Bu məqalədə təsviri-analitik bir metodla şərr probleminin mahiyyət, növləri və strategiyalarını S.Şirazi və Q.Leybnits baxımından araşdırır və sonda bu iki filosofun düşüncələrini müqayisə eəcəyik. S.Şirazi və Q.Leybnits şərrin varlığını maddi aləm üçün bir zərurət hesab etmişlər, onlara görə məhz bunun işığında bir çox yaxşılıq və gözəlliklər təzahür edir və ya əldə edilə bilirlər.

Açar sözlər: Şərr problemi, Sədrəddin Şirazi, Qotfrid Leybnits, həlli yolları, çoxlu xeyir, Allahın varlığı

Аннотация

Др. Насер Форухи
Абдуллах Хусейни Эскандиан
Сравнительное исследование проблемы зла в философских мыслях Садраддина Ширази и Г.Лейбница

В сфере философии и теологии на протяжении веков проблема зла была одной из тем, среди последователей авраамических религий вызывающих вопросы и сомнения относительно божественных атрибутов и совершенства этого мира. С.Ширази и Г.Лейбниц, как два философа, приверженные небесным религиям, такими как ислам и христианство, пытались решить проблему зла в своих трудах, утверждая, что Бог - это абсолютное добро, справедливость, мудрость, а Вселенная - это система. Изучение и сравнение взглядов С.Ширази и Г.Лейбница на предмет зла выявит их интеллектуальные

сходства, а также различия, несмотря на противоречия в религии, мышлении и школе. С другой стороны, их интерпретации и взгляды по этому поводу будут полностью известны и ясны.

В этой статье мы исследуем сущность, типы и стратегии проблемы зла с точки зрения С.Ширази и Г.Лейбница описательно-аналитическим методом, и, в конце сравним взгляды этих двух философов. С.Ширази и Г.Лейбниц считали существование зла необходимостью материального мира, по их мнению, именно в этом свете проявляются или обретаются многие добра и красоты.

Ключевые слова: проблема зла, Садраддин Ширази, Готфрид Лейбниц, пути решения, много благословений, существование Бога.