



Article Type: Original Research

Page Numbers: 113-129

Received: 28 March 2022

Accepted: 10 June 2023

Published: 14 September 2024

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.22034/cls.2024.63171>

Author Details:

1. Department of English
Literature, Karaj Branch, Islamic
Azad University, Karaj, Iran

s_moosavi2000@yahoo.com

2. Professor, Department of
English Literature, Kharazmi
University, Karaj, Iran.
(Corresponding Author)

asadi@khu.ac.ir

Love and Redemption of Modern Man: Deleuzian and Sadraian “Becoming in Love”

Seyedeh Solmaz Moosavi¹; Fazel Asadi Amjad^{2*}

Abstract: Modern Man, engaging the predicament of “identity” and “self”, seeks “love” as a redeeming power to reach affirmation of life and reconciliation. To discuss the issue, the concept of “becoming” as an innate motion and transformation in the process of love has been scrutinized from Gilles Deleuze and Molla Sadra Shirazi’s perspective. The concept of “becoming” in Deleuze corresponds with Molla Sadra’s “substantial motion” in the notion of “love”, both carrying out the phenomenon of perception and transformation. The concept of “love” in Deleuze’s theory appears as a rhizomatic experience of “expression of the other” and different possibilities with no message and centrality, just to reach a kind of individual and unique “affect”, and this singular affect is sufficient to generate transformation. Sadra, on the other hand, presents love as the seed corn of all being, leading to a hierarchical motion through “systematic ambiguity of existence” towards a kind of cosmic unity and reconciliation. The theories of Deleuzian “becoming in love” and Sadraian “substantial motion and love” have been applied to scrutinize the practicality and confrontation of the notions in the case of redeeming modern man from nihilism, sense of alienation, distress, and bewilderment.

Keywords: Love; Becoming; Substantial Motion; Identity; Unity.

Citation: Seyedeh Solmaz Moosavi; Fazel Asadi Amjad. "Love and Redemption of Modern Man: Deleuzian and Sadraian “Becoming in Love”". *Critical Literary Studies*, 6, 2, 2024, -. doi: 10.22034/cls.2024.63171

1. Introduction

The predicament of identity and the modern man (as an individual in modern contemporary human condition) has raised some controversial issues about human beings, such as self and essence, interrelated with love, by different philosophers, psychologists, authors and critics. The ideas of movement, being vs becoming, becoming, and being bring different theories to the mind, which have been considered helpful for this bewildering situation of humans. Love and becoming, remarkable coincidences caused by evoked desires, and the multiple factors affecting the process of becoming in love, as viewed by different western and eastern philosophers, Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) and Molla Sadra Shirazi (1572-1640), are investigated in this article to find out their view on the modern man's process and path of life in terms of identity, self, and existence. This issue is embedded in the concordance or discordance between western and eastern points of view and the practicability of the notions of the mentioned philosophers to present a resolution to modern man's frustration, perplexity, alienation, despair, and lack.

Considering Deleuze and Sadra's different contexts and mentalities, there are several traits with diverse and mutual attitudes that can be depicted to elaborate on their philosophy, including desire, becoming, identity, diversity vs. unity, and transcendence. The controversial act of “becoming” in Deleuze accords with “substantial motion” in Sadra, defining the concept of “love.” They both generate the possibility to perceive and transform. However, Deleuze presents love as an experience of different possibilities of the being in a rhizomatic way; that would not turn out to any moral or sublime messages, but would bring about transformation through a sort of irreplaceable “affect” (Colebrook 22-23). On the other hand, Sadra's love, and the perception it creates, lead through a hierarchical motion to a kind of cosmic unity, sublimity, and reconciliation (Rizvi 27). However, considering their similarities and differences, what has brought them to the researcher's mind to be applied to elaborate on the matter of “becoming through love” is their stance on the love issue and its influence on modern man; similarly, how modern theories of philosophers such as Deleuze who define becoming in love and criticize the structuralism and conventional system of the modern world would help the human in case of redemption from nihilism, futility, and despair, and bewilderment, as a result, whether the love presented by philosophers from previous centuries, such as Molla Sadra, can save modern man from this deep and drowning sense of alienation and lack will be scrutinized.

To carry on the purpose, the major and fundamental definitions and theories of these two philosophers will be presented and compared in order to challenge some of Deleuzian and Sadraian viewpoints and represent the resolution in their perspectives towards the matter of self and existence through love in modern man's state of alienation and despair. Although these two philosophers belong to thoroughly different eras, they theorize moving issues about love and self, and considering the predicament of modern man's identity, it would be challenging to see if the theory from 17th century presented by Sadra would be more effectual, while Deleuze as a post-structuralist, living in the modern context, criticizes the structuralist definition of human's identity. Although Deleuze's notions are novel definitions of the events occurring in human perception through love, it does not mention any issues about redemption and reconciliation, and this is the very point which necessitates scrutinizing Sadra's notions as well.

There are some books, essays, and writers that have discussed the fundamental issues related to Deleuze, and Sadra, such as *Deleuzism* (2000), in which Ian Buchanan gives a way of reading Deleuze and as Gene Holland in the Editorial Reviews of the book declares, "Buchanan's book" is a ground-breaking, comprehensive examination of the thought of Gilles Deleuze work that ranges widely across Deleuze's solo and co-authored works as well as popular music, architecture, and film, and raises important new questions about the relations of Deleuzism to dialectics, utopian thought, and cultural studies. It is sure to be an essential point of reference for further Deleuze studies" (102). Eugene Holland's *Baudelaire and Schizoanalysis* (1993) applies Deleuze's principles of socio-analysis to literary history and cultural studies and scrutinizes Deleuz's definitions of becoming and difference. Radek Przedpelski and Stephen Eliot Wilmer's *Deleuze and Guattari and The Art of Multiplicity* elaborates on the series of philosophical engagements with the concept of multiplicity and the potentialities for social change; in this book, the authors explain how Deleuze and Guattari try to decolonialize our thinking by redefining some concepts such as perception, becoming, difference, and love. Hannah Stark in her article, "Deleuze and Love," discusses Deleuzian love comprehensively and examines Deleuze's scattered references to love to expose how Deleuzian love can undermine identity as a momentary congealing in time.

On the other hand, Sadra's notions are investigated by different contemporary authors in their books and articles, including Seid Jalal-Al-Deen Ashtiani's *Sadra's Philosophy*, Askar Dirbaz's *Practicality of Sadra's Philosophy in Science*, Sharif Lakzaiee's *Sadra's Political Philosophy*. He has also been compared by other eastern philosophers such as Avicenna, Farabi, and Shekh Toosi. Mohamad Hosein Khalili has worked on the philosophical basis of love in Sadra and has compared it with Avicenna's ideas. *Restless*

Identity of Universe, written by Abd-Al-Karim Soroush, gives a deep study on Sadra's substantial motion and his becoming. Fazlur Rahman, in his book, *The Philosophy of Mulla Sadra*, presents a perspective that corrects a classical view held in the West that mysticism and Islamic philosophy constituted a passing phenomenon; it provides a scholarly introduction to Sadra's notions towards existence, substantial motion, and love. Although Deleuzian and Sadraian becoming and love have been discussed in a lot of scholarly articles and books, which were really useful for the present article, the novelty of this article is scrutinizing the act of becoming through love and its practicality for human's life in the modern era. Moreover, the comparison of an eastern and a western philosopher, Sadra and Deleuze, in a common field, becoming and love, is quite challenging and novel, which has not been investigated before.

2. The Act of Becoming and Love through Perception and Difference

In order to elaborate love and its rhizomatic construction, Gilles Deleuze presents transcendental repetition and difference. This concept helps him to welcome desire with its immanent structure to break out of the borders of identity, and this nonconformity through “becoming imperceptible” evokes love. His definition of love creates the context of infinite possibilities for experience and perception, but the structure he presents for love does not eventuate in any redeeming concept or meaning for human existence. To get the idea of becoming, Deleuze brings in his model of repetition. In his model, he decentralizes the common meanings of difference and repetition and maneuvers the act of “transformation.” He believes a repeated word may look the same, but in fact, it transforms with its context and effect. Therefore, the matter of difference does not have anything to do with appearance but the effect. You think this word is repeated, but in fact it is different here, since it makes a different sense and has a different affect, since its context and history are different from previous experiences now (Colebrook 116). Then he casts the idea of the repetition of a word to the repetition of every event. Imagine the repetition of the French Revolution; if it happens again, it will not result in the same way. Thus, there is no second time or repetition, but each time a different beginning of that word or event (Colebrook 120). Transformation is the result of transcendental repetition, a convention that seeks to transform rather than maintain it. Based on what Deleuze states, the repetition of this experience is always a different beginning of that event and renovating its context, though there is no transcendental aim or message beyond it. Just the “affect” is adequate, and this process itself is transcendental. In this repetition, the only repeated thing is difference. Therefore, the act of life is difference and repetition, it is becoming and every incident changes the whole life repeatedly and differently (Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition* 281).

Perception occurs with whatever which is possible to happen, whatever from a kind of complicated flow of pure differences. The relation between perception and pure difference in Deleuze is elaborated through the definition of “singularities” as the events from which the state of difference flows, and life is only this pulsation of singularities that a person comes to perceive as an actual world. There are virtual possibilities for all creatures that can turn into actualized. Thus, there is always more than the actual beings to be seen; Deleuze emphasizes “actual expanded by the virtual and the virtual dimensions are at the heart of actual perception” (Colebrook 126). The whole of life and the world is in flux of becoming, and becoming occurs in the context of difference and perception. The perceived world is made of virtual desires; what we perceive can be different from the others’ perceptions. Therefore, these possibilities make the world and perception more than the actual ones and contractions of becoming. Deleuze’s becoming is not something waiting to be done, yet it is endless actions, transformations, perceptions, and so on, which organize beings; it is becoming which is valued not the end or human norm. Structuralism tries to impose rules and norms on life; however, Deleuze’s becoming rejects any imposed norm and welcomes novelty. Good and bad, or morality, in this regard, will not be fixed or determined; it can just limit life and becoming. Moreover, what becoming emerges for Deleuze stands against Freud’s universally accepted view toward human’s lack and trauma, which tries to trace back all becomings to some origin (Colebrook 140-142). Deleuze rejects originality and humans’ desire to achieve unity. He presents singularities instead; he believes there are some events from which you can find the difference of time flows which is far from the perception defined based on organized coherence and order of the world and time; he considers life as a pulsation of singularities which can be perceived through actual world and can be manifested through art, and this process which is the presentation of singularities, far from the state and mechanism of language, might be called “becoming imperceptible” by Deleuze. Consequently, becoming imperceptible is “the challenge of transforming the perceived image of thought from which we judge and order life” (Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense* 189). In this respect, he opposes the accepted schema of western psychology and philosophy, theorised by Freud, by which humans desire what they lack, and the lack of a lost origin makes them move toward others and unity (Colebrook 142). He rejects the presence of the external cause, a lost origin, for movements, actions, variations, and becoming; however, there is an internal power of affects: the images themselves are desirable, not the belief behind them or their representations. Moreover, the image does not symbolise an original scene, or desire is

not for what a person lacks. Desire is a tendency toward becoming different and the image is another form of becoming or perception rather than a signifier of a human figure. Perception of the image leads to perceive differently, which is not detached from infinite possibilities in the human point of view any more (Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus* 53).

Deleuze takes a positive attitude toward desire; he views it as a tendency to change or become different rather than unifying or regaining something lost. As a matter of fact, he tries to correct the definition of desire based on lack and regulated by Oedipal law. Unlike most theories on desire, which direct it toward something beyond life, such a view sees desire as the development of life through conversion and production. On the other hand, he adds another aspect to desire; in psychoanalytic theories, desire is considered an individual force, while Deleuze regards it as a social force that forms connections. Therefore, desire and life do not begin from what Freud calls “ego,” but from free flows of becoming; it is an alternation in each action with no goal or outside end. In this regard, replication becomes repeating the sense, not the action. He believes that desire has been misunderstood under the shadow of introduced internal lack and quest of pleasure. He defines desire as a construction flowing through a plane of immanence and as a kind of continuous and on-going process. Deleuze describes a plane of immanence as a surface upon which all occurrences take place and are understood as chance, as productive interactions between forces of all sorts; in this way, it displays the field of becoming, the state consisting of all possibilities intrinsic in forces. On this plane, all possible events are brought together with novel connections between them, which will continuously be dissolved. He insists that desire is not a mere order of lack or pleasure, but a productive process of trial on a plane of immanence, which makes it a social force owning the ability to form connections. He claims “reality (as well as identity) is a process of becoming, which involves pure differences that cannot be represented” (Parr 124). Therefore, identity as a fixed definition, grasping the matter of representation which represses the process of becoming in our existence, takes us away from reality. Human must be free to experience multiple possibilities which can be completely different or far-removed from pre-defined reality and identity (Colebrook 107-108).

When the person breaks out of the borders of identity based on representations and pre-defined concepts, a new event gets provoked as “love” and symbolically creates a novel body. It is a form of desire and an echo of the virtual in the actual world to experiment with the virtual to create a novel body. In *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and

Guattari present love as an act of depersonalization with no organism and territory, which occurs through refusing acknowledgment and cancelling the apparent coherence of identity stations, which result in experiencing others as multiplicities. Acknowledging subjects with varying and polyhedral desires, making them incoherent and complex, is the result of devaluation against identity (Deleuze & Guattari 39-40). This love dissolves subject and individuality. It presents the “most intense discernibility in the instantaneous apprehension of the multiplicities belonging to him or her and to which he or she belongs” (Deleuze & Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* 40). Love experience, different forms of desire and love and becoming can occur by shattering love and by cancelling restricted notions of love (Deleuze & Parnet 46). This theme is connected closely to subjective acknowledgment and to the quiddity of perception within the classes of identity. The process of becoming and the virtual determine the condition of interaction and communication between beloved and lover, originated in their novelty and unknowability (Stark 11). Such relations between individuals are not considered harmonious and Deleuze does not “presuppose any kind of harmonious connection between self and world, and self and others”; this is in concord with both his appreciation of discord and his notion of a “new harmony” on the ground of disharmony as a state of breaking the norms and pre-defined values (Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense* 121). Rejecting the common theory of the Oedipus complex, presented by Freud, They (Deleuze and Guattari) assert in *Anti-Oedipus*: “Sexuality and love do not live in the bedroom of Oedipus, they dream instead of wide-open spaces, and cause strange flows to circulate...” (Deleuze & Guattari 116); such love is able to operate when it is no longer the realm of merely hetero-normative families and pairs. In *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari mention the life itself can create novelty and difference through available materials and love accomplishes a cosmological domain; “Why not walk on your head, sing with your sinuses, see through your skin, breathe with your belly: the simple Thing, the Entity, the full Body, the stationary Voyage, Anorexia, cutaneous Vision, Yoga, Krishna, Experimentation” (Deleuze & Guattari 151).

Deleuze’s love takes two forms, paranoid (Oedipal) and schizophrenizing (revolutionary); one is desire because of fear and a capitalist axiomatic approach, and the other, appreciated by Deleuze, is an unconscious derive to quest for whatever is forbidden. In Oedipal form, one desires the norm introduced by authority or hegemony in order not to be different or seen as a black sheep. Oedipal love characteristics are being personal, representational, familial, stable in meaning, totally differentiated and guilt-ridden. As Deleuze and Guattari assert in *A Thousand Plateaus*, Oedipal love – or as

they call, “sick desire”, is “a desire to be loved, and worse, a snivelling desire to have been loved...” (Deleuze & Guattari 334). On the other hand, schizophrenizing love’s characteristics are introduced in *Anti-Oedipus* against Oedipal love features; it is multiple (not personal), material (not representational) and social (not familial). The traditional perspective toward love, tied to unity, merging and acknowledgment, is shattered by Deleuze’s idea of love, tied to novelty. Such love entails depersonalisation, which eliminates the subject, while holding both subjective experience and subjectivity systems. Deleuze’s work multiplies the potentials for subjectivities, which cannot be recognised, as they are further than our existing identitarian systems for meaning formation and evaluation. Rejecting the stability of subjectivity and the ultimate or significance of identity enables us to produce new points of association and consequently new assemblages, subjectivities and bodies become probable.

Consequently, according to Deleuze, lack is not the reason for one’s quest for the others; if one is questing for the others, it does not mean they find a reflection of themselves in the others, or a system of mutual acknowledgment, or a structure of identifications. This attitude undermines identity and identitarian systems; Deleuze’s ontology of difference and repetition is based on the repetitive creation of difference and rejection of identity rhizomatically. As being upon recognition of identity is prevented in this ontology, the subject is exposed to difference in an essential sense. Therefore, love is the explication of alteration through the creation of difference, that means the only tool that enables the subject to negotiate with the others and experience difference inclusively is identity refusal and abandoning any recognisable thing about both the self and others; this is the outcome of love, which Deleuze draws for us. However, such provision does not restrict the capability of human relations, politics, and ethics; instead, they become situations that enable the comprehension of the probability of love. The Deleuzian rhizomatic theory of love essentially rearranges the ethical connection and the probability of relationship beyond identity (Stark 13). In *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Gattari explain the term “rhizome” as a concept that “maps a process of networked, relational, and transversal thought and a way of being without tracing the construction of that map as a fixed entity” (Deleuze & Guattari 12); Deleuze considers love in such structure and function as a rhizomatic movement that “contributes to the formation of a plateau through its lines of becoming, which form aggregate connections” (Deleuze & Guattari 11). Thus, the rhizomatic love is attributed to any networked contact of things with each other for novel impacts, innovative concepts, different bodies and opinions. Considering the rhizomatic definition of love through a plane of immanence, this novel

affect brings about no redeeming meaning or view towards human existence. What Deleuze defines as love through becoming resembles the concept of love as the events of perception and transformation defined by Sadra, while Sadra presents all individuals in eternal motion and flux through the innate tendency to a higher sublime position to reach unity and reconciliation, which stands against the Deleuzian rhizomatic formation of love. The definition Deleuze presents for love guides to no meaning behind human existence and no sense of redemption, whereas Sadra's "substantial motion" directs to the unity of existence that can bring hope for humans in the modern age.

3. Love as the Substantial Power towards Unity of Existence

Molla Sadra (1572-1640), also called Sadr al-Din al-Shirazi, is a revolutionary Iranian philosopher and one of the most important and influential philosophers in the Muslim world. Many critics consider him the leader of the Iranian Cultural Renaissance in the seventeenth century, the master of the Illuminationist (Ishraqi) school of philosophy, and the founder of Transcendent theosophy. Molla Sadra is frequently regarded as a metaphysical revolutionary for his outstandingly postulated doctrine of existence as reality, systematic ambiguity of existence (*tashkik al-wujud*), substantial motion (*haraka jawhariyya*), truth, and love, which are still novel and controversial. Sadra does not obviously offer a solution for the anxiety of modern man in his theories, but the perspective and insight he presents towards human existence, substantial motion, and love can function as a solution for such despair and anxiety since it pivots around meaning, hope, and a goal for human existence. Although Deleuze suggests love as the endless experience and expression of all possibilities and potentialities through becoming and perception that leads to transformation (just like what Sadra claims), this rhizomatic perception and transformation comes to no further sublimity or dignity and brings no hope for humans, while Molla Sadra solves this problem by introducing his theory of "systematic ambiguity of existence" through love.

Sadra analyzes the matter of existence through the ontological discrepancy between the "principle and the contingent." God or the Principle is defined as a pure existence with no essence, quality or belongings, and does not undertake or endure any change or motion. The contingent is expressed as an existent in which the events are relied upon and intensified through their "essence". Therefore, contingents are abstractly containing existence, the reality and the fact they are; and essence, packs of belongings which express what they are (Molla Sadra, *Asfar* 289–92). And eventually because contingents stem the existence from the Principle, ontologically existence is preceding to essence. As

a simple concept, existence is perceived in the mind instantly and innately, thus, it does not necessitate definition (tarif) or description (rasm) of any type (Molla Sadra 45-6). All the things are discrete in quality and quantity but they all contain the term “existence,” homonymously “Mahmul Mushtarak” (Molla Sadra, *Kitâb al-Mashâ’ir* 40). Molla Sadra elaborates this homonymy by presenting the term “systematic ambiguity of existence” (tashkik al-wujud), which is the discrepancy among existents based on “precedence and priority,” that is “being more prior and more intense” (Molla Sadra, *Kitâb al-Mashâ’ir* 42-3). In this way Molla Sadra introduces existence as the foundation of unity and of difference and dissimilarity among all beings, since existence is the source of individuation of being beside its essence. He asserts, “Existence is ontologically prior, a unified reality graded in degrees of intensity, and an elusive reality that cannot be fully grasped.” “Any attempt to conceptualize existence falsifies it through reification that determines an essence grasped in the mind” (Molla Sadra, *Asfar* 6). A conceptualized, immobile, and unchallengeable identity cannot define the nature of existence, since it is mutable and dynamic. As a matter of fact, existence is a single reality, and the impressive experience of existence as multiple is unreal and illusive. Therefore, diverse existents are dissimilar intense grades of a single whole. Consequently, there is a kind of vertical and horizontal system of hierarchy of existence which is associated with and engaged in the whole sequence of existence. Therefore, existence is simultaneously singular and manifold. The principle of the systematic ambiguity of existence, on the one hand, presents the justification for the nature of metaphysical hierarchies and the diverse capabilities of people, and on the other hand, asserts the eventual singularity of human existence. As a result, existents are socially and ontologically equal (containing humanity, animals, etc.), while there are spiritual and intellectual hierarchy and inequality, as Molla Sadra declares: “Existence is a single, simple reality having neither genus nor differentia, nor a definition or a demonstration. It only admits of degrees by perfection and deficiency (bi-l-kamal wa-l-naqs), by priority and posteriority (al-taqaddum wa-l-ta’akhkhur) and by independence and dependence (bi-l-ghina wa-l-haja)” (Molla Sadra, *Kitâb al-Mashâ’ir* 68-9).

This system of gradation as “systematic ambiguity of existence” directs to the doctrine of “substantial motion” (haraka jawhariyya), which presents all individuals in existence in everlasting motion and flux. It displays Sadra minds becoming over immobile, static being. This is significant to differentiate “substantial motion” from “substances being in motion” (Rahman 95-108). An existent is not a steady substance fixed in time, in which alteration takes place as an accident, like a young being getting

aged; it is, in fact, a structure of dynamic and unfolding occurrences of existence. Thus, the young being is factually different from the old one, for the change in it is both existential and substantial. Therefore, at each moment every existent gets renewed, and in consequence, presents a resolution to the ancient problem of creation and time while the world is generated in time, and all existence is novel in time, at each instant.

Sadra believes that love, in all its aspects and levels of being, as the intrinsic tendency to a higher sublime position in order to reach unity and perfection, which causes this substantial motion. In Journey III of the *Four Journeys (Asfar)* discusses the cosmological and ontological proofs to the reason why human inclines to sublimity in details. He asserts the reality of existence (haqiqat al-wujud), by virtue of its being a simple thing (amran basitan), not possessing an essence or a constituent property or a means of being defined, is identical to the Necessary, requiring the most complete perfection that is infinitely intense, because every other degree of existence, which is weaker in intensity is not the pure reality of existence. Rather, it is existence with deficiency since the deficiency of everything is other than that thing necessarily. The deficiency of existence is not existence itself but rather its privation and this privation is merely attached to existence concomitantly and not the foundation of existence, due to its actuality in a subsequent degree of existence and what comes after that (Molla Sadra 17-8).

This argument for the existence of the Necessary (God) as the Other perfect one, on one hand, describes the relationship between the One and the multiple, and on the other hand, justifies the human tendency and love to the perfection and unity according to the concept of the “simple reality.” In this sense Molla Sadra shares the same notions as Plotinus in *Enneads*: “For there must be something prior to all things which is simple, and this must be different from all that comes after it, being by itself, not mixed with those that come after it, yet being able to be present in the others in a different way, being truly one, and not something else which is then one” (Dillon 5-15).

Like the totality of existence, the soul and intellect are singular realities in company with different levels of intensity, thus there is a close association among the soul, existence, the intellect, and all psychic traits of being. According to Molla Sadra, all existents are perceptive creatures that desire to be “more intense” than they are, and tend to reach ontologically to a higher degree, and that is the way love functions. All beings that exist possess consciousness. As all grades of intellect are connected, “knowledge is an existential association of identity and the cognition of certainty in which the intellecting subject becomes identified with the intellected object (ittihad al-‘aql wa-l-ma’qul)” (Rizvi 27). The phenomenon of love drives this integrity, and manifests and flourishes this innate desire to get more intense and unified.

Molla Sadra introduces the “soul” as a perpetual and autonomous non-physical substance that is “detached from the body but attached to it” and stands as the right carrier of identity (Molla Sadra, *Al-Šawāhed al-robubiya* 467). As it is mentioned in the definition of substantial motion, the soul is moving towards unity and simplicity on the course of perfection; it is on the path of return to its origin, to the One. The soul is per se timeless, incorruptible, and immortal, it lives beyond the body, “it (the soul) reverts to its origins with the One” (Molla Sadra, *Al-Šawāhed al-robubiya* 515), and this innate enthusiasm on this way is love, which can be represented or reified even in mundane form. To complete his discussion about soul and love, and their worldly representation, Sadra expresses the characteristics of the body-soul relationship and explains the birth of the soul and the process of its connection to the body based on its progression to the hereafter in the *Wisdom of the Throne*. He describes the soul as “corporeal in its origination and spiritual (or incorporeal) in its survival (jismaniyyat al-huduth wa-ruhaniyyat al-baqa)” (Morris 126). The human soul has many positions and degrees from the commencement of its generation to the end of its goal, and it has definite essential states and modes of existence. First, in its state of attachment to the body it is a corporeal substance; therefore, it progresses steadily in intensity and develops through stages of its creation until it comes to be self-subsistent and separates from this world to the next and returns to the One. (Morris 126-127). Thus, Sadra has a hierarchical perspective toward human motion and becoming (unlike Deleuze, who has a rhizomatic outlook on love and becoming). In Sadra’s perspective, based on “creatures” quiddity, no one can be independent from its origin, since dependency and quest are their reality and truth, while Deleuze insists on individuation and the act of individuating without connection to any origins; therefore, considering Molla Sadra’s notion, seeking and quest of something eternal, indelible, and immortal through love resides in everyone’s interior side (Abyaneh 112). This is the very point that makes Deleuze and Sadra’s theory deviated from each other.

4. Redeeming Love

The role of love experience and its effect on humans’ evolution and transformation has been confirmed by both theorists, Deleuze and Molla Sadra, as well as their positive attitude towards lack and desire. They both believe in the deficiency of philosophy in expressing reality, and there are some affinities between the Deleuzian terms “difference and becoming” and the Sadraian “substantial motion and intuitive knowledge,” but how the experience of love defined along with these terms can assist or transform the modern man’s dangling situation and bewilderment, and basically how much these two

philosophers have a redeeming view towards love, makes a fundamental discrepancy between Deleuze and Sadra's notions.

Deleuze considers identity opposed to multiplicity, which is limitless and uncountable; thus, if anything is supposed to be defined as a collection of identifiable concepts, they all must be represented through some untrue images of reality; they are false images since all things exist in multiplicity of possibilities, which is the boundless process of becoming, not a fixed, limited, and identifiable essence (Parr 124-125). Therefore, there are always some unidentifiable processes behind the represented concepts that make identity; otherwise, there is no real identity without untimely differences to support the illusive appearance of the systematically structured identity, which is leading to suppress the process of becoming. Deleuze advocates multiplicity as a multifaceted structure that does not lead to a prior or original unity; therefore, he rejects multiplicities as parts of a larger whole which have gotten fragmented or as multifarious expression of a unified and transcendent concept (Przedpelski 52). Consequently, the same attitude can be found in Deleuze's view of love. He claims any event, affair, or state is built of various multiplicities that compose a sort of ensemble devoid of becoming a whole; then love can never direct you to a kind of transcendent unity; it just reveals the experience of different multiplicities and becoming the other, and any alteration to multiplicity in the process of love means a thorough change and evolution in its nature; thus, there cannot be any essence of multiplicities that residues unaffected by experiencing the other; thus, there can be no essence there. In this way, Deleuze not only rejects the concept of multiplicity in relation to a transcendent love and unity in the world, but he also stamps the sense of lack, alienation, and fragmentation as something permanent in humans, even though this multiplicity makes the continuing motion and change possible through rhizomatic becoming. Hence, the redeeming concept of love through becoming is not accepted by Deleuze.

Although Molla Sadra as Deleuze declares identity is alterable and dynamic, and defining it as something conceptualized, steady, and immutable cannot be accepted since it does not present the true nature of existence, he considers existence and the identity stemmed from it as a singular reality, through which the multiple experience of identity and existence is illusory. Existence as the basis for harmony and unity, and also for alteration and dissimilarity in all existents, alongside the essence, shares the same features with identity as the source of uniqueness in creatures. According to Sadra, existence is a prior state containing different grades of intensity as a unified whole, and reality cannot be thoroughly reified or conceptualized. Therefore, all existents innately

desire to become more intense in order to attain a higher grade of unity, and this innate desire is called “love,” which pushes for integrity with a sort of intrinsic hope to be a single whole (Khalili 102). The Sadraian soul actualizes the redeeming role of love; this is the soul, which carries essence and identity, both attached to and detached from the body; that is why love can even be displayed through worldliness and materiality. According to the theory of substantial motion, soul moves towards singularity and unity via love, which is enthusiasm towards perfection and becoming one. This transcendent position of love in Sadra’s theory gives direction and aim to all human’s lack, sense of alienation, and fragmentation, and delivers all those experiences to a redeeming destination.

According to the “systematic ambiguity of existence” (Tashkik al-wujud) and consequently the principle of “substantial motion” (haraka jawhariyya) Sadra considers becoming much more valuable and determining than a static and fixed being. In this sense Sadra’s notion corresponds to Deleuze’s; however, Sadra goes further and discusses all existents are already in eternal flux and motion through the innate love to reach unity, not waiting for untimely becoming and transformation accidentally occur to them, since this alteration and transformation are both existential and substantial. Thus, love can renew every existent at each moment and as a result, grants a solution and vividness to the previous difficulties and problems of life while the creation is generated and gotten renewed in time, instantaneously; and this is the redeeming position of love that can save modern man from this sense of nihilism and alienation.

5. Conclusion

Deleuze sharply criticizes the structural and conventional system of modern society that prevents the experience of becoming and the perception of other possibilities for the human self. Nevertheless, there is no space for human reconciliation and peace of mind in Deleuze’s theory, and there is no goal or meaning in the experience of love as he defines it, exactly the things the modern man deeply needs in order to redeem and relieve this deep sense of loneliness, alienation, detachment, and nihilism. The Sadraian sense of cosmic unity and harmony with nature through becoming in love, with positive attitude towards lack and desire seems more comprehensive and leading to state of affirmation of life and consequently reconciliation and hope. Theory of Deleuze encourages the modern man to break out of the structures of identity defined by a systematic and conventional order while it seems what Deleuze defines as the rhizomatic “expression of other possibilities of the self” through a non-identitarian definition does

not present a definite perception from human's self to release her/him from the sense of perplexity and bewilderment. The experience of the Deleuzian difference may bring a sort of transformation but it is not something to settle peace and redemption. Although both theorists have some issues common in sense of confirmation of love as the event of transformation, it seems this is Sadraian substantial motion that leads to a kind of hierarchical innate love experience towards perception of existence and reconciliation under the sense of unity with all beings, the experience out of the pre-defined order of the modern system but in a cosmic harmony with the motion of universe.

Acknowledgements

The authors deeply wish to acknowledge their gratitude to Dr. Javad Yaghoobi who generously dedicated his greatest support to us in order to edit this article, share ideas, and aid in precisising our perspectives.

Funding:

No funding has been received for conducting this research.

Conflict of Interests:

There is no conflict of interest to disclose.

References

- Abyaneh, Fereshteh. *The Influence of Ibn Arabi on Transcendent Theosophy*. Iran Sadra Islamic Philosophy Research Institute (S.I. R.In), 2007.
- Colebrook, Claire. *Gilles Deleuze*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Felix. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Parnet, Claire. (2007). *Dialogues II: European Perspectives: A Series in Social Thought and Cultural Criticism*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson. Columbia: Columbia University Press, 2007.
- Deleuze, Gilles. And Guattari, Felix. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. B. Massumi, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Difference and Repetition*, trans. P. Patton, New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *The Logic of Sense*. Trans. M. Lester, ed. C. V. Boundas. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.
- Dillon John. *Plotinus: The Enneads*. UK: Penguin books, 1991.
- Kamal, Muhammad. *Mulla Sadra's Transcendent Philosophy*. United Kingdom: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd, 2006.
- Khalili, Mohammad Hossein. *The Philosophical Axioms of Love from the Viewpoints of Ibn Sina and Mulla Sadra*. Iran: Bustane Ketab, 2009.
- Molla Sadra. *Al-Šawāhed al-robubiya fi manāhej al-solukiya*. ed. S. M. Moḥaqqueq Damad, Tehran: Bonyad-e- Hekmat-e- Eslami-e- Sadra, 2004.
- Molla Sadra. *Asfar*. Tehran: Mowla Publishing, 2005.
- Molla Sadra. *Kitāb al-Mashā'ir*. Ed, Mohammad-Jafar Lahiji. Iran: Boustane Ketab, 2007.
- Morris, James Winston. *The Wisdom of the Throne: An Introduction to the philosophy of Mulla Sadra*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- Parr, Adrian. *The Deleuze Dictionary*. Edinburgh University Press, 2005.
- Przedpelski, Radek and Wilmer, Stephen Eliot. *Deleuze and Guattari and The Art of Multiplicity*. Edinburgh University Press, 2020.

- Rahman, Fazlur. *The Philosophy of Mulla Sadra*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1975.
- Rizvi, Sajjad. *Mulla Sadra Shirazi: His Life, and Works, and The Sources for The Safavid Philosophy*. Uk: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Stark, Hannah. "Deleuze and Love", *Angelaki*, Vol. 17, No. 1, 2012, pp. 99-113.