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Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to consider most critical issues of mystical epistemology in Rumi and Bonaventura once the views on subject, reality of the world, and the possibility of knowledge were expressed. This research referring works of Rumi and Bonaventura studies this issue through a descriptive-analytical method. Rumi and Bonaventura recognized three stages of human recognition realm including sensory, rational and illuminative recognitions. They both believe that achieving real knowledge and recognition requires revelation in addition to reason. In their perspective, the spirit is the unique intuitive and mystical knowledge tool such that Bonaventura extends its epistemology based on illumination referring this stage the supreme level, intuition and unity to God. At this stage, human being is not merely a definite subject rather an external phenomenon influencing knowledge trend. Rumi states that real treasure between God and world is only recognized by mysticism not through discussion and rational reasoning.
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1. Statement of the Problem

Knowledge means knowing (recognition), getting informed, figuring out the truth of something as well as the true understanding of the universe. The issue of knowledge is specially valued by scholars and mystics each widely and deeply commented on this according to own attitudes. Rumi and Bonaventura also paid attention to the issue of knowledge; Rumi sometimes referred “knowledge as the science” and sometimes in “general usage” (Masnavi, pp. 3564-3565/1). Rumi and Bonaventura started knowledge from sense; though, it is not adequate. Indeed, they were seeking for intuitive knowledge experienced after spiritual knowledge; lower level knowledge such as imitative reason and accidental reason are introductory to real knowledge. This paper tries to find the answer to the following questions that how to recognize in terms of Rumi and Bonaventura? What steps are proposed for recognition? Does knowledge acquired by sensing or reasoning or both? Is there a way or other ways to achieve the truth? Finding the answers to these questions may provide us a relatively comprehensive image of Rumi and Bonaventura epistemology theory.

1.1 Rumi’s Mystical Epistemology

Mystics considered several aspects of knowledge in their works. Mystical epistemology deals with mystical knowledge and experiences. Mystical knowledge is a typical recognition with a natural, spiritual origin and means of soul refinement and purification. Therefore, this knowledge is not a matter of principle rather is recognized as conscience and attending (personal) knowledge, which can be found (discovered); in spite of any proofing. Mystics regard knowledge origin in god recognition, which is based on discovery and purification.

The most well-known concept of knowledge is the absolute science, awareness and information. All issues of epistemology are around knowledge and science. The science and knowledge are different such that the former is general; while, the latter is a partial issue. Since science and knowledge are evident and conscience; it may be difficult to define them in absolute term. However, addend knowledge can be defined. Rumi expressed about a mystical discovery, which is a specific knowledge originated form nature and soul through a mystical knowledge by soul purification. Knowledge is ranked higher than science in Rumi’s perspective as recognition achieved by discovery and intuition. In other word, mystical knowledge may not obtain neither through discussion and
studying nor sense and experience; rather, it is only possible through conduct and inner purification; thus, it is considered as the highest rank knowledge and recognition. Rumi believes that human being reaches to the levels enabling him perceive many facts including divine attributes by heart through mental evolution and acquisition of spiritual virtues.

In spite of the five senses; the spiritual sense observes both worlds

(Masnavi, 3551/2)

1.2 Knowledge Means or Ways

Mystics and theologians almost agree on the issue of epistemology since they believe in the reality of the universe and its numen; they also believe in truth existence meaning that the universe is not only the reality but also it may overcome by human awareness and science; the universe is recognized and reality relevant perception is fixed and permanent. Scholars are divided in to two groups in term of recognition tools: mono-tool and poly-tools groups. Positivists believe that recognition tools merely contain sense and sensory data. Plato and peripatetic philosophers only rely upon reason; whereas, illumination philosophers consider the heart and soul as recognition tools. In Rumi’s opinion, revelation is a recognition tool, too. However, some mystics view the heart as the only mean of knowledge “the heart is the mean of god knowledge acquisition and divine secrets” (Afifi, 2001; 193). Senses, reason, heart and revelation are known as recognition means in Rumi’s attitude each requiring special consideration. The universe is divided into two worlds of command and creation in term of nature, each with its own characteristics. Senses and reason are the mean to recognize the creation world; whereas, the soul (heart) and revelation are the command world recognition means, each stated in Masnavi. However, the most comprehensive knowledge expressed as command world recognition, which is merely acquired through heart and revelation. Therefore, it is necessary here to explain these means in short.

1.3 Sensory Recognition and Knowledge

Sensory awareness and knowledge is incomplete and inadequate. Rumi stated that relying upon sense hinders achieving to real science; he believed that surface sense only perceives a limited part of the surface reality due to the existing constraints; in a simple analogy, it is like the hand touching the elephant in a dark room to imagine the elephant body. In this story, “elephant” is a metaphor of oversoul and “darkness” refers to this mortal world; further, “those touching the elephantine body” are metaphor of individuals seeking for the oversoul to be known by their narrow, inadequate experimental and intellectual scales; and finally, the “candle” represents the light of certitude and intuition such that whenever an individual is exposed to such shining the truth may be uncovered. The concept of this story reveals that people differences resulted from different attitudes and partially-oriented interpretation providing conflicting areas that is why mystics hate form and term. The visual, external sense only touches the appearances ignoring the truth root. Rumi thinks that the whole recognition and knowledge acquired if human senses are enlightened by God knowledge bright light.

You know how a clear sense felt
That is by the enlightened sense of God light

(Masnavi, 2634/1)

As Rumi states, sensory perceptions are similar to dirt and dust over the soul curtaining reason eyes such that the reason is unable to see the spirit (Masnavi, 1826/3).

Undoubtedly, external sense is the necessary mean of recognition, since there would no recognition obtained if human being lacks senses. Rumi is certainly aware of this case; however, he regards surface, external recognition inadequate. Rumi thinks that in the case of sensory recognition is beyond animal perception; it required being along with intuitive and rational reflection (Masnavi, 48/2).

Rumi also distinguished five other internal senses in addition to these five external senses, which are highly valued; he believes that external senses feed on darkness; whereas, internal ones live on the truth and reality (Masnavi, 49-53).

1.4 Reason

Reason is of a very special place in Rumi’s perspective, which is highly effective and efficient in understanding other concepts of his epistemology model. He defined a hierarchy for reason with predetermined boundaries. The reason, as Rumi believes, is to know the truth and to distinguish the right and wrong as far as this continues it may never be condemned rather it is realized as the necessary means of human life. Fundamentals of Rumi’s mystical idea are formed by knowing the levels of reason. According to some evidences, Rumi divided the reason in to two types: partial wisdom and total wisdom. In other word, Rumi separated two kinds of knowledge
including partial knowledge and total knowledge. Partial knowledge comes from senses and theoretical reason comparing to total knowledge, which is derived by intuition, soul purification and evolution.

1.4.1 Partial Reason

Partial reason is the very individual mind in all human beings limited to sense and imagination world (Masnavi; 3311-3315/4). Partial reason lacks the ability of understanding the reality mysteries and wonders since it is limited to tangible world. Rumi viewed partial reason indecent as it is superficial, self-thinking and captured by the passion (Masnavi; 119-120/6).

Partial reason is like a flash of lightening only illuminates a certain range of facts; while, this range is far from the absolute perception, which is interpreted as “Vakhsh” (Masnavi; 3319-3323/4). Rumi permanently emphasized on the negative aspect of partial reason, which is like a veil and limitation incapable of achieving divine truth (Masnavi, 463/5).

1.4.2 Total Reason

Total reason sees the internal and serves as god servant; further, it takes human to the peak. The total reason is the primary essence created by God “God initially created the reason” (Forouzanfar, 1982, p. 31).

The holy God initially created the reason more than anything else in the two worlds (Masnavi; 1936/6)

This world is a thought of total reason

The reason is the king and the forms are its messengers (Masnavi; 978/2)

In Rumi’s word, this world is a thought of the whole reason such that all creatures manifested through whole reason (Masnavi, 3259-3263/4).

The general wisdom is a divine gift bestowed upon to human being. As earlier mentioned, total reason is the world fundamental and all internal faces of human and the universe are manifestation of this mind. “In other word, the general reason is the total expressive wisdom surrounding all things and properly perceives all facts” (Homaie, 2014; 469). The total reason is like a broad and wide sea in which the forms and possibilities are floating like bowls. Rumi analogized the form to the bowl and the truth to the sea; as long as the bowl is not filled it stays on the surface; whereas, it is drowned whenever it is filled. Therefore, to get the truth it deserves to pass the forms and symbols (Masnavi; 1109-1112/1).

1.4.3 Faith Reason

In Rumi’s perspective, faithful reason is the justice city constable ruling and capturing the hearts and eliminates any uncertainties. It is analogized to a smart cat that the burglar is like a frightened rat hiding in the hole. The burglar is the very inspired nafs (an-nafs al-ammarah) unable to show off and flaunt in spite of the faith reason. Once the passion and erotic desires overcome the faith reason it leads to the knowledge and recognition by which the human being finds a way to God. However, if the human being lacks the faith reason, the inspired nafs will prevail hindering the real knowledge and recognition (Masnavi; 1086-1991/4).

1.5 Internal Intuition or the Way to the Heart

Rumi considers the issue of spirit as the reality intuition through inner purity “the inside is the road to the truth going through human; this road is characterized with honesty, purity and avoiding moral vices” (Ibrahimi-Dinani, 2010; p. 59). Rumi stated the conditions of knowledge achievement by heart as follows: patience on worship (Masnavi; 71/2), approaching to mortality and survival (Masnavi, 1474/2), leaving the passions (Masnavi, 3749/3), as well as attachment of partial soul to the total divine soul.

Once the partial soul is enriched by the whole soul

All the existences benefited (As the world serves as the corpse to the perfect human, and the perfect human is like its soul) (Masnavi; 1190/2)

The truth is human idealistic giving the seeking motivation to him; the philosopher tries to reach the truth through reasoning; whereas, the mystic attains the truth through intuition (Masnavi, 1357/4). In Rumi’s attitude, the heart is the divine occult quip embracing human truth (Masnavi, 3575-3577/1); he thinks that the pure, clear heart (soul) as a mirror reflecting all attributes of God; once the heart is rusted with velleity it avoids reflecting divine secrets and truths; whereas, the pure-hearted human manifests divine truths (Masnavi; 34/1) (Masnavi; 2909-2910/1). The pure heart is “the mean by which not only the knowledge of God and divine mysteries, but also knowledge of all embraced under the title of inside science may achieve” (Affi, 2001; p. 193).

Molana defined the real knowledge as intuitive or illumination-based and heart observation-based knowledge;
moreover, the best and most comprehensive recognition way is revelation. Revelation basically relies upon heart. Rumi’s intuitive knowledge is characterized with direct perception (Masnavi, 122/1), it cannot be compared to anything (Masnavi, 2812-2814/3), it is non-descriptive with universally and pervasively presence (Masnavi, 760-761/1) (Masnavi, 1552/5). According to Rumi, the critical mean of knowledge revelation and intuition as well as attaining heart knowledge is love; on the other side, love results from intuitive knowledge, too. This is the love supporting the wayfarer along the knowledge road; and of course, the love deepens in meeting each step (Masnavi; 2192/5) (Masnavi; 1532/2).

2. Revelation

Revelation is the word that is latent to human physical sense perceptions. Sometimes revelation is used in its general implication including revelation of heaven, bee, common people, and messengers. In the story of Abel and Cain, when Cain desperately wondering how to get rid of Abel bloody corpse, a crow, bestowed divine inspiration, sent to him by God so that to instruct him how to bury the dead body (Masnavi; 1304-1307/4). Mulavi repeatedly mentioned to the cases where God communicated to non-prophets such as uncovering Chinese prince secret explained in the sixth book:

Following much searching, finally the wised Sheikh discovered that secret

*The secretes were uncovered to him not through hearing and physical ear; rather, inspired by revelation*

(Masnavi; 3787-3788/6)

The most important revelation is assigned to the great prophets; it is not weighted and understood by physical (material) issues; further, it may never be described. According to Rumi, the words are unable to express it (Masnavi, 1775-1776/2).

In Mawlānā’s attitude, the followers must seek the instructors and conductors since it may not be possible to reach the destination without any direction and guidance as the conduct lacking total guidance is based on suspicion; whereas, the messengers are undoubtedly talented by God. Revelation is proofed and highly authentic as it is received by Allah (Masnavi, 4100-4105/6).

Revelation as one way of truth recognition is available to all human beings. Mawlānā believes that revealing the truth of revelation requires benefiting the revelation itself (Masnavi; 3258-3263/2).

3. Basics of Rumi’s Epistemology

Rumi’s epistemology regarded as a mystical epistemology. He stated that “partial knowledge are the product of senses and general, visual reason; whereas, the total knowledge resulted from intuition, nafs purification and mental evolution” (Jafari, 2008, p. 35).

Regarding to Rumi’s mystical epistemology, there is no certainty and truth imagined for partial (minor) phenomena; rather, the true knowledge is defined under the light of holistic view and linking the world components. Rumi attributed the difference in recognition to atomistic view and believed that these contradictions come from this truth that any individual perceives the universe as much as he figures out by its own insight and way (Masnavi, 2368-2370/4).

Of Rumi’s epistemological basics is the objects’ returning to God such that the objects return to the origin where they have come from.

*The components tend to the total like the lover who has the great affection for the beloved*

(Masnavi; 763/1)

*What goes from sea to sea, exactly destined to the original departure*

(Masnavi; 767/1)

The ultimate objective of Rumi in epistemology is to cross the surface into the inside, from the form to the meaning; he regards the inside science causes human prosperity. Its epistemology is based on Islamic principles such that he highly referred to koranic verses and traditions. Rumi stated that the real treasure of the relation between God and world is only recognized through theosophy and mysticism rather than through rational argument.

*All creatures belong to Him as if it is impossible to imagine no dependency*

*Everything is rooted in the separation and attachment (Masnavi; 3695-3696/4)*

Rumi calls God the world’s soul and spirit; in other word, God is attributed as the existence essence, the elegance, and the living treasure in the universe that always exists and survives; if anybody is attached to this prevalent
treasure, there would be no more concern of loss and benefit. This attitude basically constitutes the fundamentals of Rumi’s epistemology.

You are like the world spirit to me; why shall I concern for others
You are like a prevalent treasure to me; Am I supposed to think about any loss and benefit?

(Divān-e Šams; 162)

4. Mawlānā’s Epistemology Levels
Mawlānā also determined three levels of epistemology following mystics including religion, creed and truth; and expressed sub-principles for each category. In the fifth book introduction, he stated that “the religion enlightens the road like a candle. The way is not traversed unless by a candle; then, you are on the creed road. And finally, you approach to the destination, which is the very truth”. In Islamic mysticism this trio classification is another interpretation of the appearance and essence, which are longitudinal rather than phenomenal. Disregarding the longitudinal hierarchy of these three levels led to some difficulties in understanding Masnavi. According to Mawlānā’s mystical idea, these three realms may never be separated. In his attitude, observing the religion is a necessity for the follower such that the religion, creed and truth are the unitary verity that the prophets and great mystics including Rumi always interpreted and preached (Masnavi, 1394-1397/1). Rumi believes that recognizing universe requires drawing the surface curtains in order to approach to the essence (inside); in addition, he calls the universe inside as monotheism. Rumi’s world is the world of mystery, which is not easily uncovered; it requires an enlarged heart and soul as well as several knowledge efforts to be understood.

5. Bonaventura Mystical Epistemology
Bonaventura distinguishes three steps of recognition realm for human: sensory, rational and illuminative recognition. Bonaventura knows rational faculty as the dominant force in human being; furthermore, according to his view, the reason is not the adequate condition of recognition; rather, he believes that approaching to true recognition (knowledge) requires having revelation next to reason; moreover, he also focused on the central role of Christ and word of God in recognizing the truth. Bonaventura extends his epistemology in term of illumination and refers this step under the name of the supreme stage of intuition and union with God.

5.1 Sensory Knowledge
Bonaventura considers the sensory knowledge as the lowest level of recognition dependent on sensory perception; and the sensory perception is the act of breathing utilizing sensory organs as its means. “Breathing imposes its sensory functions through sensory organs as far as it grants life to body. Sensory recognition firstly contains an action imposed by an external object and influenced by a sensory organ” (Gilson, 2010, p. 473). Bonaventura believes that nafs owns some force (faculty) in which any force individually performs the particular epistemology. He also thinks that perception is both active and passive; external senses receive tangible data; whereas, internal senses (common senses, imagination and memory) link and judge them. Regarding Bonaventura opinion, innate ideas are abstracted from a sensible case. On the contrary to Plato he does not believe recollection theory in recognition issue; rather, recognition began by a tangible thing and nafs is analogized to a simple drawing prior to sensory recognition. However, it may not be true about God as it is pronounced as a totally innate idea. In Bonaventura point of view, human nafs is the essence exists perse and is a unitary and incorruptible thing in spite of keeping its material and form. Material in human nafs is a spiritual substance created along with a form; hence, since this is also a spiritual form, “nafs is also considered absolute living as a spiritual creature” (Quinn, 1973, p. 140). Regarding to the combination of material and form introduced by Bonaventura, it is necessary to mention that material is used for creatures not because of their physical existence; rather, as they are living beings. This is the only approach to figure out the well-known perspective of Bonaventura and Franciscian on the composition of matter-form of spiritual treasure. However, the material is a set of possibility conditions; for instance, it is always in a particular place, occurred at a particular time and always exposed to motion and rest. The material is never detached from its form; rather, the essence creates these distinctions. Thus, “once the material is viewed in term of its existence it will be always regarded as unified” (Pegis, 1983, p. 35). Bonaventura concluded that since the material is a passive, receptive force (faculty), it is necessary to place such material inside the nafs. Bonaventura began its epistemology by sense; however, the knowledge structure passes the evolution steps such that the human being initiates its knowledge with a partial sense and gradually activates the general (total) concept potentially existing in that sense. Accordingly, it also exists in the sensible forms of tangible objects; though, it may never be stopped at sense step. The surface senses (visual senses) are followed by common sense such that all senses approach to a common sense inside human being. Sensory knowledge is the primary knowledge only by which you get to
know the world; such knowing is fleeting, incomplete and with errors. The next step is the rational perception.

5.2 Rational Knowledge

Bonaventura like Aristotle maintained two forms for reason one is the Agent Intellect and the other is the Possible Intellect. According to Bonaventura, agent and possible intellects distinguished in term of reason function rather than in term of the essential differences. He never discriminates the reason; rather, he considers a unified, single essence for reason.

Indeed, human being has one reason representing two different aspects in term of act meaning that there is no substantial and existential discrimination made between agent intellect and possible intellect; on the contrary, it is differentiated based on epistemology i.e. the difference inspired by reason action aspect. “Since Aristotle values the agent higher than the possible and the origin predominates the matter. The active intellect embraces the reason related to passive intellect; however, this intellect essentially is non-passive.” (Davoudi, 2015; 99)

According to Bonaventura, no discrimination seen between active and passive intellect; indeed, both complement together such that an interaction seen, which leads to recognition and knowledge. “Passive intellect is given the power of abstraction and statements’ judgment by the aid of active intellect; moreover, the active intellect requires the passive intellect data to recognize” (Copleston, 1985, p. 284).

Bonaventura epistemology model states that the truth is an eternal, unchanging and constant phenomenon such that this truth is neither discovered in human nor the outside world. In order to obtain unchanging truth, the mind requires being infallible, which is evidently impossible for human mind. So, now what shall we do? How we may achieve the necessary and unchanging truth? The solution proposed by Bonaventura is taking the benefit of divine intellect and illumination. In this regard, Bonaventura rationality is illuminative; he considers the supreme right over the human being; acquiring the supreme right requires human being released flying toward real intellect.

5.3 Reason and Revelation

Bonaventura believes that the reason alone cannot provide a complete understanding of the world; rather, it needs to be accompanied by faith. He stated that our beliefs are indebted to authority and our perceptions owed to reason such that the beliefs achieved based on revelation and prophet tradition. In fact, “he insisted that no satisfactory philosophical and metaphysical system may be created unless the philosopher directed by the light of faith and sought for philosophy under the light of faith” (Copleston, 2011). In other word, Bonaventura agreed upon quote supremacy over reason and perception nature by faith; this is viewed as the best way of attaining absolute knowledge. Bonaventura expressed that real recognition is merely acquired through revelation and God illumination; further, no truth recognized without God realization. That is where Bonaventura introduced what transcendent wisdom and Islamic mystics seriously highlighted. Bonaventura offered several ways of getting the truth first of which are all verified; secondly, are consistent, and thirdly, they complement each other. Thus, according to this epistemology model, reason and revelation considered the two ways of truth and recognition achievement; they show harmony and relevance; in addition, no contradiction and inconsistency seen. Reason understands the religion and serves as a mirror reflecting God tradition. “God must be named as our instructor, since our mind perceives relying upon him. He is like the light source for our mind and is the principle by which any truth realized” (Lin, 2011). Augustine’s followers including Bonaventura believed that reason requires God assistance, which is released to him by revelation.

6. Recognition by Illumination

Bonaventura believes that “reason alone cannot recognize” (Hayes, 1987, p. 1013); therefore, he regards illumination as the highest level of recognition and extends its epistemology by this. Bonaventura referred this step as the supreme level of intuition and union with God. Such knowledge is not acquired; rather it is the presence, attending knowledge, which is received. At this level, Bonaventura introduces “the issue of God eternal wisdom or samples” (Kent, 1998, p. 833). The difference between illumination and former recognition steps is that the human being in this realm is not merely the identification subject; an outside, external thing influences the recognition trend. The divine light reveals the facts beyond intellectual human thoughts and leads to a direct encountering between human and those realities. Human being gets its recognition at illumination step where the reason is passive. Whereas, in “recollection theory, human reason is active acquiring the reality. However, illumination theory corresponds to Plato recollection theory” (Cullen, 2006, p. 78). Bonaventura introduces the conduct as the mean of truth achievement focused on approaching to God rather than its recognition. The illumination theory of Bonaventura must be interpreted under the shadow of two central perspectives including exemplarism and abstraction. Indeed, “Bonaventura defines a knowledge role for
illumination not a merely emotional role” (Cullen, 2006, p. 80). Bonaventura indicated that the constant, rational thing is only understood through abstraction; thus, we require God illumination. According to Bonaventura, objects’ truth may not be revealed unless they are enlightened. This divine light inspired by God, which gives light to the reason is the rational light brightening everything. Eternal truths rooted in God illuminated to human reason from a source beyond the reason. It is evident that in such attitude, truth realization may not be possible through mere reason as God does not belong to the thought and idea; rather, it is a will manifested in the revelation. He is the source of any recognition such that the reason is unable to recognize the truth lacking divine light. Bonaventura thinks that “mind directly forms its ideas in accordance to the ideas realized in God truth; therefore, they are acknowledged” (Schumacher, 2009, p. 19). Realities appeared within mind natural illumination process assigned to knowledge. Bonaventura says that recognition acquired when the human being is tended toward God, gets rid of sins and persistently keeps on.

Bonaventura leads knowledge toward “a mystical union with divine love” (Everton, 1988, p. 108). Furthermore, he mentioned that “any actual sentence deserves human thinking innate illumination to divine science (knowledge)” (Bonaventura, 1885). According to Bonaventura, the reality is born in human nafs by word of God such that ration and reason created by God and enlightened the way to be visible. Indeed, God serves as the owner of thought in mystical epistemology; all virtues and values born by the semen placed in human nafs by God, which is called the eternal wisdom in Bonaventura term. “In fact, our soul (nafs) must be embraced by God to cultivate the semen of virtues like knowledge seeds. He, the God, is the enlightening wisdom, pervasively surrounding me around, and he is as much closer as I am to myself (Gilson, 1987). Bonaventura in its epistemology model expressed that “anything in the world resembles God; each creature relates to God as a work, an image, and as a resemblance. A light is defined in this model, which directs anything to the highest rank” (Bonaventura, 1956).

7. Word of God

Regarding to Bonaventura, God-oriented understanding of the whole world is word of God; therefore, it is considered as truth origin. Indeed, this is word of God directing human being, giving light to its life; furthermore, the reason properly performs under the shadow of divine word and illumination. Bonaventura believed that creatures may not be known unless seen as forms of divine. Therefore, the absolute knowledge requires a totally unchanging, constant, and infallible light; such knowledge only comes from word of God. This perspective is consistent with mystical theology of Dionysius. “The central role of word in human knowledge as a principle indicates the existence and understandability of any living things” (Benson, 2004, p. 70).

Since human knowledge inspired by God, divine word issued from God and manifested in Christ who is omniscient. In this regard, the human being appeals to Christ to acquire recognition and knowledge as the truth, which is absolutely unchanging received by those united with God and obtained the ultimate knowledge of human perfection. Bonaventura considered “divine light manifestation” as a God granted gift by which he accomplishes recognition and wisdom. Bonaventura epistemology deals with the approach concentrated on achieving divine light. However, if knowledge is a function of proximity to divine light, righteousness must simultaneously increase by individual perception. Thus, by the virtue of hypostasis unity, it seems that “Christ human knowledge correspond divine knowledge since his soul is highly united to the word both as a word and as a model” (Scarpelli Cory, 2007, p. 79).

Bonaventura believes that there are two obstacles between human and divine light “the first barrier is its current life conditions, in which he only sees some part of reality. The practical way recommended by Bonaventura is that human being must actively create God image through grace of god in order to be more and more like him because as long as he is not perfectly matched with its mental image he would not be able to totally see him. The second obstacle caused by sin to the extent that separated man from God and destroyed wisdom. Once these deficiencies removed, the reason achieves total knowledge resulted from conformity to God glory” (Ibid; 80). In Bonaventura view, what hinders human from recognition and knowledge is the lack of union with God not its earthen feature.

8. Bonaventura Sampling-Oriented Theory

Sampling orientation is “the basic constituent of Bonaventura metaphysics” (Copleston, 1950, p. 258). Regarding to metaphysical ideas including Plato form and Bonaventura sample, they similarly contribute in physical world. They are the main model organizing reality. The significant difference between Plato form and Bonaventura sample is that Bonaventura sample is an idea of God thinking rooted in God thought. The other difference stated by Plato is that forms are eternal, perfect, unchanging and immortal; while, Bonaventura thinks that God is eternal, perfect, unchanging and immortal. In addition, in Bonaventura perspective God is the creator.
embracing the samples’ creator. He also added that “samples are in word of God” (Delio, 2003) and “divine idea is word of God” (Hayes, 2002 a; 227). According to Bonaventura “reality resembles a book, which initially registered in the form of written word at the time of God awareness” (Hayes, 2002b, p. 255).

Bonaventura said that “the world is like a book reflecting, representing and describing the creator. Trinity at three different levels is effect, image, and similarity. The effect can be found in any creature; the image seen in mental creatures or rational spirits; and similarity is only seen in individuals consistent with God. Human mind designed like a ladder gradually approaching to a supreme maxim that is God through these sequential levels” (Bonaventura, 1257, p. 104).

Bonaventura thinks that “nafs returns to God and thinks of him as the existence and good entering into mystical rapture and ecstasy” (Mizzoni, 2008, p. 82). Bonaventura claims that divine piety and the holy Book helped us to achieve the highest ascent of the soul toward God; it certainly aids us in our recognition and perception. Sample orientation portrayed basis of Bonaventura reflection about creatures as effects and images. In his works, including An interpretation to the beauty, showed in details how the creatures reflect God.

9. Conclusion

Mawlānā and Bonaventura are the two critical figures characterized with rich and original attitudes who established the fundamentals of a train of thought, which largely influenced the presented opinions in the area of Abrahamic religions inn terms of depth and range. Many similarities and commonalities can be seen in the thinking of these two scholars as their opinions and attitudes are filled with mystical and illuminative motifs. These two scholars were enriched by divine religion sources in the realm of mysticism. The mystical history (background) of these two mystics is such that they are comparable sharing many similarities as both fed by one, unitary source rooted in metaphysics. Therefore, it concluded as follows:

1) Mawlānā and Bonaventura expressed three steps to recognition: sensory recognition, rational recognition, and illuminative recognition.

2) Both consider the visual knowledge and awareness inadequate and incomplete; they claim that visual, surface sensing only perceives some part of reality due to its constraint.

3) Bonaventura divided reason into two classes of agent intellect and possible intellect. The agent intellect makes rational actions possible through enlightening potential intellect; and the possible intellect extracts rational contents from data collected by sense and forms the general concepts that later receives internally.

4) Mawlānā divides reason in to two partial and general (total) reasons. In other word, partial knowledge is resulted by senses and visual intellect; whereas, general (total) knowledge comes from intuition, nafs purification and mental evolution. In his attitude, thought is rooted in total reason and partial reason is just a light of total reason.

5) Mawlānā and Bonaventura believe that the reason gives only limited recognition and is unable to understand all issues; thus, it requires revelation next to reason. According to Mawlana, the revelation spirit is much hidden comparing reason since the soul is unseen from the metaphysics world; in other term, the soul of revelation is the highest and yet the most hidden level of existence.

6) Mawlānā and Bonaventura view mystical knowledge as the most perfect knowledge such that human being attains the place where he is able to see many facts through divine light and to achieve the truth as a result of soul evolution and acquired virtues.

7) Mawlānā and Bonaventura stated that human being attained illumination and intuitive recognition whenever he is purified of any sin and evilness such that it is enlightened by divine light.

8) Mawlānā and Bonaventura regard the pure, clear heart as the source of knowledge; the truth achieved by prayers, leaving the desires as well as joining to the divine soul.

9) Bonaventura’s recognition and knowledge trend is such that in which nafs moves step by step ended in holy trinity; whereas, Mawlānā rejects trinity as he believes in intuitive union and Bonaventura in trinity.

10) Bonaventura introduces Christ and word of divine as one way of recognition; while, Mawlānā offered the Messenger as the center of knowledge and real recognition. Bonaventura in his theory explains active and passive reasons; whereas, there seen no such classification in Mawlānā’s work.

11) According to trinity attitude of Bonaventura, the grace transmitted to human through soul leading him to deep, divine knowledge; whereas, in Mawlānā’s epistemology model, there is no room for the Holy Spirit. The Christians believe that it is the task of Holy Spirit to attract those belonging to the Christ, always
represent the Christ and to enlighten our intellects.

12) Mawlānā and Bonaventura epistemology are distinguished by the issue of sample orientation theory of Bonaventura, which is disregarded by Mawlānā. Bonaventura sample is an idea of God thinking and in his thinking. He believes that God is the creator of samples; and these samples are indeed the design used by God; in other word, samples are in word of God. In fact, Bonaventura claims that God knows external things through eternal samples; however, it may not be a precise idea as we are not supposed to determine God authority.
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