

Study about the place of epistemology of observation in personal and attainment knowledge

Seyed Morteza Hosseini Shahroudi, Ahmad Nasiri Mahalati

Abstract— Knowledge is divided in two category of personal and attainment sciences according to being mediate or absence of mediate for achievement. In fact attainment sciences are such science which needs some mediates. But personal science is knowledge about things without need to mediate. According to above definitions, it seems that the role of observation in creation of attainment sciences is more than its place in personal science. But various inferences such as induction, revocable, etc. in practical philosophy imply that observation by no means can be a base for achievement in practical science. At the same time, base for personal science is according to observation (if there is no error) can be a factor to reach to the truth without mediate.

Index Terms— Personal Science, Observation, Induction, Revocable, Observation, Intuition, Revelation.

1 INTRODUCTION

FIRST division which can be considered for knowledge and science is accomplished according to way for attaining of the science. It means, science either without mediate to known's essence is obtained and real objective existence is known for knower, or its external existence cannot be observed by knower, but he/she uses another thing to get knowledge about such thing which has term of 'mental concept'. First type is known as personal science and second Type is known as attainment science (Mesbah Yazdi, Mohammad Taqi, p170-178).

In the other word, attainment science is a knowledge which indirectly or with some mediate to a certain object is obtained; whereas personal knowledge is a direct knowledge without any scientific mediates. (Shirvani, Translation of Bedayatlo lhekma (elementary for Islamic philosophy, p240-250).

Since both objects have two aspects, the nature and the existence, it can be said that knowledge about something is just in two ways. Knowledge is obtained by knowing either its nature or its existence. In first form, our knowledge about an the thing is attainment but in the second type it is personal (Shirvani, Ali, translation of Bedayeto lhekma, p22-34).

According to above definition, it is clear that attainment and personal sciences have different place of knowledge and in fact, definition and the place of observation are completely different.

Current context tries, while present a definition of observation, to explain its place in personal and attainment sciences and it tries to define its epistemology role and then makes some comparisons between them.

2 STUDY ABOUT THE PLACE OF OBSERVATION IN PERSONAL SCIENCES

Since Fransis Baken, in his book (New Organ) which mentions

observation as the most prime tool for knowing the world and the base for modern sciences, The first steps for induction bases in new sciences has been made and this observation-ism has proceed so as some people consider the world confined to the observable events. (Chalmerz, Alen, Alf p13-32). Although, later it was proved by such practical sciences that being observable cannot be a criteria for whole the world. But, according to the place of observation in construction of new science, three modern philosophy in the science world has been formed (Okasha, Samir, p83-77).

a- Observing as an ascertainable factor in theories

This theorem which is also known as induction believes that science originated from observation and then observation reaches to generalizing (rules and theories) and prediction. Scientific starts by various and accurate observations, then he/she reaches to generalized result by gathering data of these observations (Gilis, Danald, p 19-35).

According to this, uniform principle rules on all world events, it means changes trends in the world follow the same and uniform rules, Therefore it is possible to obtain uniform rule of world changes by numerous observations and science is the same as rules which is obtained by observations and its generalization.

Although this uniform principle of the world in fact is a result of an induction for observing the upheavals, and this clearly leads to (philosophic) circle and concatenation, but many philosophers (such as Russel, and Vein members) based their knowledge according to induction of observations and placed the observation as unique maker tool for the science (Larry, John, P 111-173). It is obviously clear that increase of the number of observations by no means can reduce possibility of occurrence some items in imperfect observations. It means that even after thousand observations it is not possible to be sure that there is no next observation which negates the previous ones. Therefore observation cannot be a base for science production.

b- Observing as revocable factor in theories

According to the clear weak points in belief about induction

• Professor of philosophy Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran.
• Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, International Campus, Mashhad, Iran. (Corresponding Author)

observation, the first one who made a quake on the body of sciences based on observation was Carl Reymond Popper. He believes that there is no observation without any first presupposition and any scientific who wants to observe a particular subject, at first he/she raises some suppositions in his mind and then he/she for accepting or denying the subject, tries observation and experiment. (Popper, Carl, Reymond. P 63-94).

But, since there is numerous observations which confirms a single theory cannot reduce possibility of occurrence of contrast observation, Popper believes that observation just can be a revocable factor for of theories(not an ascertainable factor for them).He says that, a theorem or a guess at first without relying on observation get alive in scientist's mind and it is not related to observation and then mentioned scientist tries to test it by practical experiment and if it succeed in numerous observations then it can get required strength to become as scientific principle. But there is no permanent safe umbrella for any induction theory and it is possible that there is some theory which completely deny it. (Popper, Carl, Raymond).

In fact, in Popper's viewpoint observation is not a construction or proof factor but it is a revocable factor and a scientific theory is true and reliable until it is not revoked by an observation (Popper Carl, Raymond, p63-64).

c- Observation as a proof factor and no as revocable factor

But observation is not ended here. In the second half of twentieth century, Duem and Kevin obviously explained that a presenting fate observation which can prove or revoke a theorem for ever is not possible (Lazzy, John, p111-173).

They showed by many and justifiable example that due to few observation it cannot be stopped on proof or revocation of a theorem. In criticism of induction, impossibility of proof theory by numerous experiments was clarified. But even revocable belief of theorems by observations is not possible, since while designing a practical experiment (observation) of a theorem in which observation contradicts with experiment, how it is possible to be sure that this observation was completely true and had no errors so, how it is possible to revoke the theorem? How it is shown that observation had no error? Maybe observation had some errors or tools for observation was not perfect or may they had some degree of errors and so such observations cannot be used for revocation or ascertaining of a scientific theorem. In fact, designing a fate and sure theorem, without error is impossible (Lazi, John, P111-173).

3 PLACE OF OBSERVATION IN PERSONAL SCIENCE

As it was said that personal science is knowledge about existence of a thing without mediate. Therefore in personal knowledge, observation gives its place to reveal. Reveal means intuition and it is the same as seeing. Term 'reveal' (In Islamic philosophy, Shohud), often refers to attendance and in categorizing of science it refers to personal science. Reveal in theosophy means something than attendance and theosophy reveal menas observation, seeing and evidence ant its place is in heart which its result is a type of sure knowledge which is known in Islamic philosophy as Einol Yaqin(means eye of sure). Intuition and discovery both are ways for getting the knowledge. But the difference is that discovery related to the

meanings but intuition related to essences (Sabri, Jamshid, and Intuition in Hekmat e Motealyieh)

In viewpoint of Hekmate e Motealyieh(it means Holy Philosophy ,it is a viewpoint which was at first presented by Mulla Sadra ,an Iranian philosopher who combined philosophy, Islam context and theosophy together to reach the truth - translator) intuition is higher than wisdom and ration according to the knowledge of the truth. Higher means that we should not stop in wisdom limits and we should not be contented by it, but it is possible to reach the higher area of knowledge and it is possible to get intuition knowledge (Yazdan Panah, Seyed Yadollah, p111-113).

Sadrol Motalehin (another Mulla sadra's label) precisely explains about place of observation in personal and attainment science:'Therefore, knowledge about beings is either by personal observation or by inductions through their effects ,and by the latter just a weak knowledge is obtained' (mulla sadra, Shirazi, Asfar, volume 1, p53).

Although there are some errors can be imagined for intuition and observation, but in errorless and right observation, there is no error and the only way to reach the truth of the objects is just intuition and observation which leads to personal science.

4 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

As it is explained, contrary to the public thoughts, observation and experiment by no means can be a base for getting attainment science. Because, neither in induction logic (ascertainable), nor in Popper's viewpoint (revocable), observation cannot be a base for production of science and Duem's and Keviin's explanation clearly shows that, practical science has no observation base . But, what is known as attainment science is just some suppositions which can be discreetly and by doubt cited until they are not revoked by some experiment and observation(although unreliable and non-fate ones) and therefore observation by no means has no proof or negate base.

In contrast, personal science which relies on heart and soul worlds, are grounded on a strong base, namely intuition. And if it be true and right, then without any doubt, it can produce knowledge on truth of anything. Therefore observation (Theosophy intuition) in personal science has a strong and proof place. In contrary of which exists in attainment science which observation has no proof or revoke place.

REFERENCES

- [1] Chalmers, Alan A. (2000), nature, science, publishing side.
- [2] Gylys, Donald, (2012), philosophy of science in the twentieth century, the publication, quarters G. , 1390.
- [3] Lazy, John, (2011), Historical Introduction to the Philosophy of Science, samt publication.
- [4] Mesbah Yazdi, M, (2013), Education of Philosophy, Printing and Publishing International.
- [5] Mulla Sadra Shirazi, Asfar, Volume 1.
- [6] Okasha, Semireya, (2000), philosophy, science, contemporary culture.
- [7] Popper, Karl, (1993), Logic of Scientific Discovery, Soroush Press.
- [8] Shirvani, Ali, (2012), translation and commentary Bedayh Alhekmeh, garden books.

- [9] Shirvani, Ali, (2013), translation and commentary *Nehayh Alhekmeh*, garden books.
- [10] Shirvani, Ali, (2012), translation and commentary *Bedayh Alhekmeh*, garden books.
- [11] Yazdanpanah, Yadollah, (2013), *Foundations and theoretical Sufism*, Imam Khomeini Educational and Research Institute.