

EXPLAINING THE NOVEL APPROACH OF “UNDERSTANDING PHENOMENOLOGY”; ITS COMPARISON WITH PHENOMENOLOGY OF BEING AND COUNTING THE RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS IN EDUCATION FIELD

***Hadi Kohandel and Seid Mehdi Sajadi**

Tarbiat Modares University, Humanities Faculty

**Author for Correspondence*

ABSTRACT

The understanding phenomenology approach, in its loftiest horizon, strives to understand the manner of conception occurrence as well as the quality of perception improvement. Two types of perception are known: existential understanding which is based on our absorption of our being to absolute being; in this type, the belonging of our knowledge is being which is improved by our being proportionate to individual's knowledge from his/her spirit and being; the second type our knowledge belongs to perception and this type of knowledge composes of entities (not being). We can view perception as partial wisdom and existential understanding as general wisdom, so partial wisdom will prove its real efficiency in the path of knowledge related to general wisdom. The necessity of introducing a novel idea is that any type of perception, even the perception of being itself has its roots in understanding the nature of perception; thus, it is mandatory to discuss the phenomenology of spirit prior to gaining any cognition on being. Implication of understanding phenomenology in education field can be acquired both in the field of teaching methods invention and in education arena.

Keywords: *Phenomenology, Perception (Existential and Conceptual), Becoming, Dialectic, Education*

INTRODUCTION

The term “phenomenology” means “what is revealed” or “what represents itself”. In other words, phenomenology describes various methods in which things can appear. In phenomenology view, phenomena are the methods in which things can be. The way things appear is a part of their being. The things are as they appear, and they appear as they are. What matters in this subject is that animals have a different method in being appeared from what plants do; this is true about other types of creatures (Sakalovski, 2009).

If we stay limited to the word root, everyone studies the emergence and appearance, so one who describes the appearance of a given object, has performed a job in phenomenology (Dartig, 2010). But according to Husserl's view, phenomenology deals with description, discovery, and analysis of phenomena. Phenomenology does not merely intend to achieve the reality of mental phenomena, but it aims to know their relationship with sensory and physical organism and environmental factors. In fact, phenomenology is both the explanation of mind and explanation of content and subject of mind, whether the subject really exists in accordance with physical world or it does not exist (Miller and Brewer, 2003).

In “phenomenology of spirit”, Hegel conclusively introduces the phenomenon term into the philosophy tradition due to constant usage; it may be stated that he is the first one who uses phenomenon in this sense which is not a distant apparition separated from essence. Like Plato, Hegel considers the cognition of beings possible, and on the other hand, he follows Kant and Hume in not viewing the essence separate from mind, but he views them in the scope of this world. As Hegel opines, phenomenon is not a curtain or a mask concealing the sight, but each phenomenon reveals a particular aspect of this sight. Husserl agrees with him in this view (reaching from phenomenon to view of essence (Jomadi, 2006).

Also, Kant has set forth discussions on phenomenon cognition and its contrast with thing in itself from which many of his successors such as Hegel and Fichte have been influenced- mostly from its nugatory aspect. Kant often mentions transcendental idealism as a doctrine which states we merely possess a previous knowledge of appearances, not objects as they are (things in itself) (Scruton, 2009).

Research Article

However, it is not phenomenology of Kant and Hegel which continued as an intellectual movement in 20th century, but its real founder was Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) which revived this obsolete structure. After him, it was his student Heidegger which directed the phenomenology in a new way with focus on being, not on consciousness, as Husserl intended. Merleau-Ponty, a phenomenologist philosopher, focused on embodiment of consciousness. But what we demand from phenomenology approach is essentially different from the three aforementioned views, since our focus on understanding phenomenology, not phenomenology of being and mind. In other words, understanding the nature of “perception” is the foundation of any type of cognition, even the cognition of being itself. So, we have to address the understanding phenomenology initially, not the phenomenology of being or any other object (in order to perceive it). But we are required to elaborate the prevalent approaches which have come to exist in the context of aforementioned approach and then make our way to explain novel phenomenology approach to reveal the differentials between novel approach and the previously mentioned ones. Generally, Husserl’s views and after him Heidegger’s as the foundation of two major types of phenomenology (Ashworth and Young, 2006). Based on this, there are two approaches to phenomenology: existential or hermeneutic phenomenology attributed to Heidegger, and empirical, transcendental or psychological phenomenology attributed to Husserl (Mustakas, 1994); but here we aim at discussing another approach in phenomenology which is more genuine and earlier than mentioned approaches, in the phenomenological view to being.

Husserl’s Transcendental Phenomenology

Edmund Husserl became acquainted with what was called intentionality in the philosophy of scholars. The intentionality theory is Brentano’s most fundamental thought which is widely known as the main elements of Husserl’s phenomenology. Brentano himself was not the originator of this theory, but he revived it. In fact, the roots of this theory are attributed to Aristotle. Aristotle believed that when confronting a thing, an appearance of it with a material identity shapes in our mind, and mind discovers it by its similarity with reality; but Aquinas moderated Aristotle’s view and believed that the form is perceived without real material of external entity and revealing it takes place by intentionality, not collation. Phenomenology, including phenomenology of Husserl and Brentano attempted to remove the mask placed between Aristotle and other philosopher, between subject and object, and this veil was the sensory data (Zakhtareh, 2010). The distinction which Brentano made between mental and physical phenomena is pertaining to the intentionality of mental phenomena, not to their local extension. In his view, mental phenomena are about a thing, but physical phenomena are not related to or about anything. Seeing and hearing occur in relation to a thing, but sound and color do not (same reference). According to intentionality theory, mind is not like a mirror which merely reflects external objects, but what mind perceives is solely the partial sensible objects, but is mind or consciousness which implies the meaning of which external phenomena do not possess them per se. Also, predicate and proposition formed by mind does not exist in the outer world. Therefore, external forms leave the outside world to itself once they emerge in consciousness. It can even be said that their emergence is subject to consciousness and consciousness is related only to emergence. Here, these forms are not the external forms anymore, but they are intentional objects (Jomadi, 2006).

As Husserl asserts, phenomenology is the study of affairs which are directly revealed to us. But what is directly revealed to us is nothing except the consciousness zone. So, phenomenology is a method for describing the structures of consciousness in the aspect we experience them. The ultimate purpose of this method is a move toward the things themselves or to suspend all previous theoretical presumptions and frameworks. In general, in Husserl’s intellectual perspective, this move is regressive directed at origin of experience; Husserl calls this move “Epoche” (reduction). In fact, phenomenology aims at basing our knowledge to the world on our existential experience in consciousness field (Zamaniha, 2010).

Martin Heidegger

Heidegger was acquainted with a Brentano’s dissertation on multiple meanings of being in Aristotle’s philosophy. Studying this dissertation influenced his course of life and philosophical intellect

Research Article

fundamentally. Heidegger (1972) himself stated on the effect of this book: “it was the first aid I had in my philosophical efforts in order to enter philosophy arena”.

Phenomenology

Heidegger’s interpretation of the concept of phenomenology commences with some kind of lingual interpretation, since in Heidegger’s view, language is essentially a type of being emergence and one of the existential reflections of Dasein. So, this lingual analysis and discovery of historical roots of words is a part of Heidegger’s phenomenology to achieve what reflects itself. Following conceptual analysis of “phenomenon” and “logos”, Heidegger defines phenomenology: “giving the opportunity for the thing showing itself to be seen” (Heidegger, 2010). The phenomenology issue is not merely the question of quiddity, but it is the manner and way of giving opportunity to the things to represent themselves. Actually, phenomenology is a movement toward the things itself, not their appearance or representation. That is why phenomenology is completely different from Kant’s phenomenon, since according to the conventional interpretation, there is something beyond Kantian’s phenomenon which this phenomenon is its representation. In fact, Kantian’s phenomenon shows that hidden item (noumenon), while as Husserl and Heidegger insist, there is no noumenon beyond the phenomenology. The main disagreement between Husserl and Heidegger begins here; what is the thing which shows itself and is being studied in phenomenology method? As Husserl states, phenomenology and what manifests itself is the area of consciousness and its structures; according to Heidegger, what manifests itself is nothing except the being of existents. Heidegger believes that the ultimate goal of phenomenological description is not to discover structures of consciousness, but is to describe identity of being. Thus, while Husserl includes everything such as being (except essence) in Epoche to reach the essence of objects or ideas, Heidegger uses the very same method to comprehend the being. In Heidegger’s view, what manifests itself in every emergence is the being; but Husserl believes that intentionality of consciousness phenomena on which Husserl insists is based on a deeper relationship of which Husserl is not aware, and that is the relationship of Dasein with being which is the foundation of early understanding of being (Zamaniha, 2010).

In his interpretation on man, Heidegger criticizes the common perception and interpretation of man, the subjectivist interpretation. He has avoided using any terms about man such as subject, etc. which is derived from tradition of which he is critical, using Dasein instead. Word by word translation of Dasein here is being (in the world).

Since the being of Dasein is nothing other than having a perception of being, so Heidegger analyzes the being of Dasein to achieve the secret of being. Fundamental ontology of which all branches of ontology arise should be investigated in Dasein existential analysis (Khatami, 2008).

Previous forfeiture of things is realized only in the zone which man or Dasein protects it. Thus, this is man’s existential manner which allows objects to manifest themselves as they are. According to Heidegger, since man’s knowledge ability is originated from man’s existential manner, each of them protects the emergence of creatures in its own special way. In other words, man’s mind is not like a board or mirror in which some form of objects is drawn, but man’s mind, or more precisely, being is the arena of development. In principle, Heidegger is not an ontological scholar in its prevalent sense, but his main concern is to question the earlier foundations of knowledge. In Heidegger’s interpretation of knowledge, man’s knowledge is not the foundation of man’s openness to the universe, but the knowledge itself roots in man’s existential structure as being in the universe. Heidegger view man’s being as a manner of being which arises outside itself. Where is “outside itself”? In “time and being”, this transcendence is the same as being in the universe, but in Heidegger’s later works, it implies that the “being” rises in the emergence of truth.

Perception

In Merleau-Ponty’s intellectual framework, perception is not treated in the same way as mystery, but it is seen as a secret and he opines that phenomenology should be applied to unveil this secret: “the duty of phenomenology is to uncover the secret of the universe and wisdom (Karmen, 2011). The perception priority theory is much more considered than his other theories and understanding phenomenology is the focal point of his philosophy. This priority merely indicates that perception is the ground for any form of

Research Article

knowledge and studying it should precede all other layers such as layers of cultural world, especially science layer (Spiegelberg).

In other words, the gravity center of Merleau-Ponty's philosophical contemplations is that perception is a physical (bodily) phenomenon, not a mental event which occurs at the end of a chain of physical causes and effects, as Descartes imagined. It's the body, not the mind, which perceives. So, Merleau-Ponty's thoughts are originated from the fact that body and mind are not like the mere knowledge of issues to be able to be solved, but are the origin of items which arises when we are striving to contemplate them (same reference).

In Merleau-Ponty's view, body and consciousness are the same and consciousness is not a separate element of the body, so we do not need to discover the manner of their association. It means that we face the conscious body. This body is not Cartesian and machine-wise, but each of us possesses a conscious body. That is, consciousness emerges physically and does not have a non-bodily form. According to Merleau-Ponty, consciousness cannot be considered without body, that is, aspects of body are reflected in consciousness (Khatami, 2008).

Explaining "Understanding Phenomenology" Approach

Understanding phenomenology composed of two different types of understanding: existential understanding and conceptual (acquirable) understanding. Acquired knowledge, which is obtained by our contact with the universe, essentially belongs to entities which are acquired by inherent delivery. This type of understanding is blended with mental conceptualizations and cannot be separated from these mental concepts and forms. The novel approach views the nature of conceptual (acquirable) understanding as a type of projection, stating that this type of understanding is like a monster which is constantly hunting for a new knowledge-related prey (either made by view or mind) and feeds itself to extend its being. In other words, "knowledge is self-exhibitor and craves to grow in nature" (Soroush, 2009). Since the phenomenon of understanding is a comprehensive truth, so when facing the new phenomenon, has a cognition about its quiddity, that is, sensory, imaginative and intellectual perception which are requirements of this type of understanding have been integrated briefly and ambiguously in the context of "understanding"). Now, we intend to deepen this ambiguous understanding of novel approach by applying phenomenology method to it.

After creating a concept (mental form) of identification in our mind, we will try to discover the nature of concept. Now, we raise some questions addressing two different types about consciousness (phenomenon) in order to explore the perceptive nature. These questions can be summarized and be presented in two main questions:

1. What is "perceptive phenomenon"?
2. What is its existential philosophy?

The first question asks about the quiddity of aforementioned phenomenon. This question aims at describing this phenomenon. The second question addresses the cause of the phenomenon. This question demands an explanation about the phenomenon embodied in the discussion on its existential philosophy.

These descriptive steps are taken to discover the nature of phenomenon. What should be noted under the "nature of phenomenon" is the distinction of this concept in Husserl's view with the approach of understanding phenomenology: while Husserl acquires the nature of phenomenon by the filter of modification (cleansing) and through the description of core (inseparable part), we achieve that (nature) through the description (inherent delivery) and explanation of phenomenon (existential delivery) simultaneously, since each being does not possess existential truth per se, and it is only the being which gives the light of being to it. In other words, each being is based on being.

Another type of understanding is existential understanding. In this type, the belonging of knowledge is not entities, but merely the being (including particular types of being). This type of knowledge is free from all mental conceptualizations. Existential understanding is originated from man's existence which possesses a dependent being on absolute being, so that the more man's existence (which is absorbed in being) projects itself to absolute being and its nearness, the more man's (existential) understanding will develop in the direction of absolute understanding; and if man's being held aloof from absolute being, his

Research Article

understanding will be associated with negative becoming. On the relationship between existential understanding and conceptual (acquirable) understanding, it should be noted that there is a servitude relationship between the two concepts; since existential understanding finds the opportunity to emerge in a pre-contemplative way, it is counted as the foundation of any kind of understanding of the world; from another viewpoint, we can assert that until existential understanding is on the course of development and becoming, the conceptual (acquirable) understanding of this progressive course is strengthened; if existential understanding subsides because of neglecting oneself and absolute being, the mission of conceptual (acquirable) understanding is to intensify man's existential and conceptual detachment.

The different types of cognition can be divided from another viewpoint: acquired knowledge can be considered in the category of science (as the ancients used to believe), and existential science can be viewed as a type of knowledge. In this sense, self-knowledge is essentially different from science of spirit which studies the functions of spirit. Seyed Hussein Nasr in his remarks on holy knowledge considers such difference between partial wisdom which is in the brain, and general wisdom in the heart. He opines that general wisdom has never been segregated from faith. Internal knowledge is always consistent with love. When this type of knowledge comes to the mental level (reasoning intellect) and in case of its detachment from general wisdom, it will lose its insight. "In fact, man's wisdom in its perfect stance includes both the accurate function of internal wisdom and mental wisdom. The first one is intuitive and the second one is argumentative. Their dual function with each other leads to understanding, clarity, formation and finally gives way to connection to the truth" (Nasr, 2001).

The Difference between Phenomenology in New Approach with Phenomenology in the View of Husserl, Heidegger, and Merleau-Ponty

Husserl places the universe in Epoche and only attention to the consciousness zone, while we, such as Heidegger, observe man's presence in the universe as his most fundamental quality, thus we cannot neglect the universe even for a moment. In other words, as Sadra has mentioned, we are submerged in being and this existential relationship is the foundation of all types of cognitions and other manners. In Heidegger's interpretation of knowledge, human knowledge does not imply man's openness to the universe, but the knowledge itself has roots in the very existential structure of man, which is being in the universe. According to Sadra, any kind of knowledge-oriented relationship is a type of existential relationship, so we cannot consider man apart from universe. Meanwhile, Sadra believed in man's knowledge to the universe. So, defining the knowledge-oriented relationship (in contrast with existential relationship) as the foundation for any kind of man's confrontation with universe and comprehending and absorbing all phenomena in consciousness in Husserl's view which brings nothing except self-isolation, is one of the most significant discrepancies of new approach with his viewpoint; one of differentials between understanding phenomenology approach and Heidegger's view is his focus on phenomenology of being as the ultimate goal of philosophy and phenomenology, while we focus on "understanding" phenomenology which is the essence of being; in other words, Heidegger applies the phenomenology method for emergence of being; but we use the aforementioned method to reveal the understanding phenomenology included in and originated from "being"; better say, we have two different types of understanding: the first one is conceptual and acquired understanding, and the second one is existential understanding which is a pre-contemplative understanding, devoid of concepts, while Heidegger only considers the existential understanding which has a practical aspect as genuine. The known of our existential understanding is qua being which is only achievable by internal intuition and the known of our conceptual (acquirable) understanding is the universe with all its phenomena which can be acquired by conceptual science and mental conceptualization. Heidegger considers being as a temporal item which can be observed only in the context of history and historical emergence, while such as Sadra, we consider the beings as something transcendental outside of time zone. But when it is stated that the conception of the reality of truth is not possible by our mind, the meaning is that man is not able to achieve the essence of reality of being. But that does not mean that understanding of being is not impossible (Ibrahimi Dinani, 2006). As Sadra states, being in man's mind is such as embodiment of being and is always flowing; we live in being and feel comfortable with it, but cannot access to its essence; while Merleau-Ponty's main

Research Article

concern is the quality of perception occurrence, we use all our efforts in the path of “quiddity of understanding” or discovering the nature of understanding. As it was mentioned, Merleau-Ponty submerges the consciousness in the body, in contrast with Husserl who plunges the body in the consciousness, or in other words, embodies the consciousness, while we opine that consciousness, such as spirit, is the embodiment of occurrence and spirit of survival based on substantial motion. In other words, the consciousness depends on body in its identity and emergence, but not in its essence. Consciousness is created with body in terms of existence and passes through several physical steps after completing its substantial motion to be purified. So, the consciousness does not enter the body from some external source. According to Sadra, consciousness is not woven into the body, but it is nothing except the material which is improved and promoted due to substantial motion. But that does not mean that consciousness is the product of body and one of its effects. Consciousness is originated and produced from substantial motion and is not solely derived by material (Khatami, 2007).

Becoming

Three types of becoming are known: change of size, change of appearance structure, and enhancement of understanding; enhancement of understanding is categorized under the field of existential becoming. In all existents (except solids, which are not considered to include being), becoming is realized, both in size and appearance. But becoming of understanding in its real sense is only realized in man and animals and plants which possess a spark of understanding, embody the stream of understanding in their existence. [Man’s] understanding, is such a particle which its essence have been blended with becoming, or in another interpretation, in this type of becoming, the becoming is not happening in the particle, but in fact is its essence, while becoming is a step higher than the phenomenon in other types of becoming.

Plato is the first scholar which has discussed the conscious analysis and application of dialectic. According to him, dialectic is the real art of a philosopher and the one who exercises this art, comprehends the concept and essence of thing (Zamiran, 2007).

Dialectic is derived from “dia” (that means through) and “legin” (means discussion). It indicates the occurrence of questions and the facts and results achieved by it. In its platonic context, dialectic is the art of making proper questions and guiding the course of questions due to insufficiency of respondent’s answer for achieving the stable truth. Gadamer accepts the art of questioning in the course of experiences from Plato, and agrees with him on the idea that says any kind of understanding can be obtained through a question and answer-based dialectic. But in contrast with Plato who sees the perception of stable truth (idea) as dialectic ultimate goal, and Hegel, who defines self-knowledge as its ultimate, Gadamer believes that the extremity of experience is not the cognition, but is the experience itself, that is, becoming experienced: “the perfection of experience dialectic is not in conclusive cognition, but is in the openness to the experience which is realized and allowed by the experience itself” (Touran, 2010). We also observe and direct the experience from its incessant openness, but opposite to Gadamer which depicts its extremity merely in incessant openness to new experiences, we consider its ultimate experience and openness course as the provider of understanding material and a contribution to becoming of understanding occurrence; in other words, Gadamer considers the openness toward new experiences as the ultimate experience, but we see this convoluted openness as a means. The difference between Hegelian dialectic and the aforementioned one is that while Hegel limits the ultimate experience to self-knowledge, we always delay this extremity by projection in innumerable and unclear horizons, which is in fact the course of eternal becoming of understanding; another difference between the two views is that while Hegelian dialectic is based on contradiction, new dialectic is created on agreement and concord.

Dialectic between God and Phenomena (not their Monologue)

On this subject, we claim that the dialectic of phenomena with one another is created by the fight of power and a hostile relationship exists among them per se. Even the phenomenon itself suffers from these complicated non-homonymous loads (reciprocal forces) within it. So, these fighting forces require a coordinator and moderator superpower to maintain their sustainability by which the system of being continues its existence in its destined path. If the phenomena is deprived of this favor (dialectic) for only one moment, not only the force between the phenomena will destroy them, but also the phenomena will

Research Article

be detached and annihilated internally due to the lack of affectionate relationship between elements and their constituents. So, God's dialectic with phenomena (that is, God's favor associated with His mercy, and creatures' worshipping associated with servitude) is seen as the pillar of any type of dialectic. Although the improper dialectic among phenomena can obliterate the being and understanding of any phenomenon, but God's favor (dialectic) to them not only hinders this occurrence, but directs the dialectics in the existential transcendental path.

The Transcendental Categories of New Approach and their (Metaphysical) Interpretation

The quality of embodiment of actions: anything that is originated from any body organ, in any form, with consciousness and will, is called "action". And the embodiment of actions means "embodying the non-material creatures such as opinions, morality, actions and works of man" (Javadi Amoli, 2002).

Baqeri (2012) opines that at least three essential bases can be inferred for man's actions: cognitive basis, tendency basis and voluntary basis. To attribute an action to man, it is required to find a cognitive image and perception to it, have a tendency for realizing it and concentrates his/her will and authority on it to realize it (Baqeri, 2012). Thus, feedback only is derived from an action which is originated from consciousness, so an unconscious or compulsory action does not receive any award or punishment.

Counting the Implications of "the Understanding Phenomenology" Approach in Education Field

Thus, the majority of implications pertain to new idea on understanding or its associated concepts, it is mandatory to clarify our perception of "understanding" term which has overshadowed all aspects of the present research prior to introducing the discussion on educational purports.

The Definition of Understanding in the Understanding Phenomenology Idea: Understanding, as an embodiment of reflections of being, is like an insatiable monster which constantly projects itself to the desert of being enthusiastically to feed itself with proper prey, proportionate to its existential extension in order to transcend its being.

Implications of Understanding Projection

One of the requirements of the approach based on becoming of man's understanding is the fact that since man's perception- and consequently his being- is blended with becoming, so man (and his understanding) is gradually achievable. Therefore, an existent man is a temporal case and is moving in the context of time: and since the becoming stream of understanding is in a constant flow, so we cannot claim that (actually we are not allowed to present such a claim based on "becoming of understanding" principles which implies the perpetual defect of man's perception) his/her stream of consciousness is abolished upon his/her death; but until this temporal cycle is active and the local territory is becoming vaster, this ardor is flowing toward the understanding of universe [by conceptual (acquirable) understanding] and highest level of understanding [the Creator]. What should be informed about is that we are not talking about changing everything, but we intend to state that our understanding about everything is constantly changing in every attention experience. An epistemologist can never claim that everything is changing, or the reality is a relative subject (this statement is compositional and is pertaining to first degree of knowledge). At its most, he can claim that all types of first degree of knowledge are in evolution- this is an informative statement, implying the becoming of understanding (Soroush, 2000). The implication of aforementioned quote about the becoming of understanding in education field is that the learner one's understanding is naturally extending and expanding, so the acquaintance of participants of educational fields with educational psychology in order to become aware of acquirers' cognitive development considering their individual differences is effective in fulfilling the significant goals of education. Moreover, providing a rich and flexible environment in terms of educational facilities is one of the purports of becoming of understanding idea in education arena.

On man's existential understanding and trait which guides him toward the being because of his submergence in being, we have to state that since man is the only being is absorbed to and submerged in absolute being (belonging being), it is able to have different stages and degrade his being to the lowest level, the beast levels, or elevate himself to the loftiest stages of being; in other words, man's enthusiasm to perfection is induced by man's belonged being [to absolute being]; now our mission (in the aforementioned context) is such as duty of participants in education field which direct the learner whose

Research Article

major existential capabilities are unveiled in a way in order for him to exercise his/her innumerable competencies.

One of other implications of man's belonged being is that man does tend to God and absolute perfection innately. So, all perfectionist traits, such as worshipping, seeking for knowledge, seeking for prosperity, etc. are created in man's essence and educator's duty is to direct this stream or prevent from any kind of distortion in man's innate traits.

Other Implications of New Idea

According to the aforementioned quotes, the inspirational understanding of the phenomena- which determines their only possible becoming- is an inclusive understanding caused by absolute spirit and since God has placed the tool for achieving new understanding in man-as the most creative recognizer-, man can achieve the secret understanding of being; since both of them (understanding tool in man and inclusive understanding of nature of phenomena have been created and applied by God, so all possible (potential) understandings in man's relationship with phenomena have been present, but covered, in God's exercising knowledge. Therefore, God possesses absolute understanding over all phenomena, including man and other creatures. In other words, it can be claimed that real science (not ignorance) are fully available and acquirable in presence of God's wisdom, and man's mission is not to create the non-existent, but to reveal the known facts (science) proportionate to his/her existential rank. What can be understood from the aforementioned perspective is that science, because of it is "science", is merely divine, and there is no non-divine science. The other point is that real knowledge (not the one blended with ignorance) will be acquired not only by mental arguing, but by means of the light (knowledge) shed on the heart of the conscious and merited individuals. Educational purport originated from inclusiveness of God's knowledge over all types of knowledge and science is that: since God possesses an absolute understanding to all phenomena in all times and places, and since he is the exemplification of goodness, so He is aware of our being, good and evil, deeds and thoughts and fate, and because no evil is originated from Him, so we have to establish all of our deeds and thoughts based on roadmap which God has drawn (including prophets and their holy books) and implement their instructions in our life. In other words, any kind of plan in educational fields, especially about man's most ultimate goals should be realized with the aid of the Creator's instruction, the wisest and the most merciful.

Another discussion which has been set forth under the subject of dialectic was God's dialectic with His creatures. As it was mentioned, dialectic (emotional and cognitive) among creatures is defined based on power relationship, and only God's dialectic with them causes their sustainability and survival, and their mutual affection. So, one this dialectic is interrupted, the whole universe will be ruined. On this basis, we can conclude that the whole universe is under its Creator's command and it is only the man which has been created with free choice. The notable point is that the creation rule is uniform in the whole universe, so if God's dialectic disrupts with the phenomena for an instance, their demise will be certain. In the same way, man's detachment from God will lead to the same disaster, but since human's decadence takes place within himself, so it will not be obviously observed such as other phenomena will be. This detachment of character will result in the very destination of other phenomena from which God's favor has been refused. But this existential annihilation will happen gradually and perpetually. The educational point derived from the aforementioned fact is that we- as humankind- should constantly reinforce our dialectic (emotional and cognitive) with God by prayer, etc.

One of other related topics to dialectic is the subject of quality of action and reaction of ontics with being: the absolute spirit has the absolute action over being. Animals and plants are in the absolute reactive stance to the being, since they are totally obedient to being and are merely influenced by their stimulus. Human being, as the most creative ontic, tends to be active other than reactive because of the power of his will. In other words, man can dominate the being due to his wisdom and will, but he is incapable of completely conquering the being for his own benefit, that is, man's will sometimes does not have the necessary function under certain conditions and becomes obedient to the circumstances. The purport of aforementioned statements is that all affairs are under God's absolute authority and other wills are subsequent to God's. Moreover, although man's will-besides his faith- are very powerful indeed, his

Research Article

power is limited. For instance, we can examine this arguing in human's affectability of friends and relatives under the education subject; this means that man is inevitably and constantly being affected by the environment (and people around). So, resigning oneself to God's will (since He is the omnipotent), selecting proper environment, reliable friends and having an eye for group and participative activities and nourishing it by one's friends effects are the requirements induced by man's reaction rate to the being. Also, since human being cannot fulfill all his demands, so it is inevitable to apply compromise principles regarding man's behaviors.

Implications Derived by Accompaniment of Understanding and Action, Based on Faith and Will

One of the discussions which were set forth under the subject of new idea was the effect of faith-based deeds associated with genuine and conscious understanding on the elevation of man's existential level. In other words, if we exercise anything we have learned, we have a superior rank in comparison to the time when we strive to inclusively comprehend all affairs, devoid of implementing the experiences. "There is nothing for man except what he has harvested through his own efforts" (Quran, Najm Surah, verse 39).

Considering the fact that there is equality between knowledge and being and their various levels, the purport of this implies that the educators should offer training courses and educational plans proportionate to the student's perceptual level. For example, teaching rational ideas during teenage years only leads to the excessive development of imagination; and considering other personal differences is one of the requirements of the idea.

Implication Originated from the Understanding Multi-Rank

The implication of this quote, that any individual (or even phenomenon) can comprehend God proportionate to the rank of his understanding and level, and since men are completely different in the two aforementioned aspects, so any two person cannot hold the same perception of God (truth). Also, God will be observed as the level of our understanding (either in the mundane world or in the afterlife) and we will not understand Him as He really is. In other words, knowledge has different ranks and levels; and from the same piece of truth, different understanding in various levels can be inferred. These different understanding are so that will cause different positions. So, one of the most important things to learn and teach is that we have to believe in different ranks of inference of truth, both theoretically and practically. "Believing in this matter includes compromising with other people's beliefs" (Soroush, 2009). This compromise is the vital prescription which postmodernist scholars recommend against the various modern meta-narratives imposed on the minority groups of people.

Conclusion

Since any kind of understanding, including understanding of the being is based on perception of understanding quiddity, so we are required to discuss the phenomenology of understanding prior to cognition of being. Thus, we intended to clarify and explain the very meaning of understanding as a rank of man's rank. In other words, any existent including understanding is based on the truth of being for its emergence, but understanding the "being" is subject to understanding the "understanding". Our task is to promote the individuals' consciousness to the very subject of understanding, and then to the being, ontics, and consequently to ourselves by applying effective phenomenological strategies.

The relationship between conceptual (acquirable) understanding and existential understanding is a servitude-type relationship (that is, conceptual understanding serves the existential one). As it was previously mentioned, man is able to comprehend the universe phenomena in conceptual understanding proportionate to his range of understanding. This is in contrast with transmigration-oriented approach to knowledge. In existential understanding, each individual is able to understand the being proportionate to his existential capacity and capability (self-knowledge).

To summarize, the aforementioned view asserts that becoming serves the understanding. One of other points of this subject is that the intentionality of the conceptual understanding which is targeted at a phenomenon outside itself is based on man's openness and his submergence in existence. Conceptual understanding can be viewed as partial intellect or dialectic wisdom, and existential understanding is considered as infelt wisdom. Partial wisdom will not lead to its ultimate desired purpose, understanding the real knowledge which is blended with faith.

Research Article

REFERENCES

- Ibrahimi Dinani GH (2006).** *The History of Philosophical Thought in Islamic World*, **3**, 3rd edition, (Tarh-e No Publication, Tehran).
- Spiegelberg H (2009).** *Phenomenology Movement: a Historical Incipit*, translated by Masoud Olya, **2**, 1st edition, (Minooye Kherad, Tehran).
- Scruton R (2009).** *Kant*, translated by Ali Paya, 3rd edition, (Tarh-e No Publication, Tehran).
- Baqeri K (2012).** *Empirical Religion-Oriented Science (An Epistemological Look at Relationship between Religious and Human Science)*, 1st edition, the committee of supporting theorizing seat, (Organization of Publication, Tehran).
- Touran E (2010).** *Historicity of Understanding in Hermeneutics*, 1st edition, (Basirat Publication, Tehran).
- Javadi Amoli A (2002).** *Thematic Interpretation of Quran. Resurrection in Quran*, **5**, (Asra Publication, Qom).
- Jomadi S (2006).** *Context of Phenomenology*, 1st edition, (Qoqnus Publication, Tehran).
- Khatami M (2007).** *Sadra-Related Query*, translated by Masoud Seif *et al.*, 1st edition, (Elm Publication, Tehran).
- Khatami, M (2008).** *World in Heidegger's View*, 3rd edition, (Contemporary Knowledge and thought Institution Publication).
- Khatami M (2008).** *Philosophy of Mind*, by Maryam Sadat, 1st edition, (Elm Publication, Tehran).
- Dartig A (2010).** *What is Phenomenology?* 5th edition, (Samt Publication, Tehran).
- Sakalovsky R (2009).** *An Introduction to Phenomenology*, translated by Muhammad Reza Qorbani, 2nd edition, (Gaam-e No, Tehran).
- Soroush A (2000).** *Extending the Religious Law Theoretically (the Theory of Religious Knowledge Evolution)*, 7th edition, (Serat Publication, Tehran).
- Soroush A (No date).** *What is Science, What is Philosophy?* 17th edition, (Serat Cultural Institution, Tehran).
- Zamiran M (2007).** *Jacques Derrida and metaphysics of Presence*, 1st edition, (Hermes Publication, Tehran).
- Nasr SH (2001).** *Knowledge and Holy Thing*, translated by Farzad Haji Mirzaee, 1st edition, (Farzan Rooz Publication and Research, Tehran).
- Heidegger M (2010).** *Time and Being*, translated by Abdolkarim Rashidian, 1st edition, (Ney Publication, Tehran).
- Zamaniha H (2010).** Existential explanation of knowledge in thoughts of Heidegger and Sadra. Ph.D. dissertation advised by Dr. Reza Akbarian, Philosophy Major, Tarbiat-e Modarres University, Tehran.
- Zakhtareh M (2010).** A research on Brentano's intentionality and adapting it to Fakhr ad-Din ar-Razi's theory. *Quarterly of Adaptive Theology* **4** 39-52.
- Heidegger M (1972).** *What is Called Thinking?* Translated by Fred D. Wieck and J glenn gray. (New York: Harper and Row).
- Ashworth P & Chung M (2006).** *Phenomenology and Psychological Science: Historical and Philosophical Perspectives* Springer Science + Business Media' LLC.
- Ashworth P and Chung M (2006).** *Phenomenology and Psychological Science: Historical and philosophical perspectives.* New York. Springer.
- Miller LR & Brewer JD (2003).** *The A-Z of Social Research: A Dictionary of Key Social Science Research Concepts*, (London: Sage).
- Moustacas CE (1994).** *Phenomenological Research Methods*, (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications).