



## Explaining the Components of the Mutual Relationship Between Social Factors and Types of Knowledge; A Comparative Study of Max Scheler's and Tabatabai's Viewpoints

Mohammad Soltanieh<sup>1</sup> , Mohammad Rafiq<sup>2</sup> 

1. Assistant Professor, Department of Social Sciences, Razavi University of Islamic Sciences, Mashhad, Iran. Email:

[m.soltanieh@razavi.ac.ir](mailto:m.soltanieh@razavi.ac.ir)

2. Assistant Professor, Al-Mustafa International University, Qom, Iran (Corresponding Author). Email: [m\\_rafigh@miu.ac.ir](mailto:m_rafigh@miu.ac.ir)

Article Info	ABSTRACT
<p><b>Article type:</b> Research Article</p> <p><b>Article history:</b> Received: 05 February 2023 Received in revised form: 08 April 2024 Accepted: 28 April 2024 Published online: 22 September 2024</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> <i>Determination, knowledge, Max Scheler, Social factors, Tabatabai.</i></p>	<p>The problem of mutual relationship between social factors and types of knowledge, which is called "social determination of knowledge", is the external objectivity of knowledge from a social point of view or the impression and identification that different types of human knowledge receive from social factors. The components of this mutual relationship include depth, degree, level, dominant factor and subject. Muhammad Husayn Tabatabai believes that apart from obvious, present, general theoretical knowledge and some general practical knowledge, the rest of knowledge is under the influence of biological, environmental, unseen and social cultural factors that this effect is contingent and does not even reach the stage of causation. The main focus of these epistemological developments is the credibility, especially the post-social credibility, which is completely socially determined. Max Scheler proposed the form and content of knowledge, which considers the content immune from social determination and considers only the form of knowledge to be socially determined. Of course, Tabatabai and Scheler both believe that there is no causality between the community and knowledge and the influence of the community is only to the extent necessary. According to Scheler's opinion, spiritual and real factors jointly determine knowledge. Of course, only the three forms of knowledge of religion, philosophy and science are targeted for determination. Therefore, the extract of Tabatabai's theory goes back to the discussion of validity and Scheler's theory of the form and content of knowledge.</p>

**Cite this article:** Soltanieh, M.; Rafiq, M. (2024). Explaining the Components of the Mutual Relationship Between Social Factors and Types of Knowledge; A Comparative Study of Max Scheler's and Tabatabai's Viewpoints. *Journal of Social Theories of Muslim Thinkers*, 14(3): 37 - 53.

<https://doi.org/10.22059/jstmt.2024.371216.1688>



© The Author(s).

Publisher: University of Tehran Press.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22059/jstmt.2024.371216.1688>

## 1. Introduction

Social determination of knowledge means the impact and identification that different human knowledge receives from social factors. The issue of "social determination of knowledge" is the basic discussion and the main theme of sociology of knowledge, and even the definition of sociology of knowledge is dependent on the determination of the concept of "determination", "society" and "knowledge". In this research, the dimensions of depth, degree, level, dominant factor, belonging or subject of the problem of social determination have been investigated. In explaining the issue, it should be said that Tabatabai considers "knowledge" and "society" to be two independent entities, each of which has its own "originality" and existence. Max Scheler rejects the associative work of memory in the way that Hume, Locke and Mill have said and considers the idea that the difference between humans and animals is considered to be associative and rational memory incorrect.

## 2. Methodology

According to the presented question, it is clear that the current research is a descriptive and critical type that describes and interprets the existing conditions and relationships and studies and then criticizes the current state of the phenomenon or subject. Therefore, the article does not have a specific hypothesis. In the present study, an attempt has been made to conduct a basic research using the exploratory method and descriptive-analytical approach, with direct reference to first-hand documents and references. By describing the data and documents and analyzing and comparing them, an attempt has been made to present a desirable and acceptable result.

## 3. Findings

Tabatabai's and Max Scheler's views have commonalities in some of the five components of the mutual relationship between social factors and types of knowledge.

1. In the depth of determination, both thinkers believe that science and knowledge have objectivity and have a realistic task
2. To a certain degree, both thinkers believe that there is no causality between the community of knowledge and the influence of the community is only to the extent necessary.
3. In the component of the level of determination, the dominant factor of determination, belonging or sign of determination do not share the theory.

## Discussion and Conclusion

Tabatabai's and Max Scheller's views have differences in all the five components of the mutual relationship between social factors and types of knowledge, some of which are briefly mentioned:

1. In the depth of determination, before knowledge, there is a desire for knowledge and value. But Tabatabai raised the issue of credibility about which of the knowledges have social determination, and the credibility after society is completely socially determined.
2. In the degree of determinism, according to Tabatabai, this condition exists only in the credits after the community. But in Scheler's form of knowledge, this condition exists.
3. At the level of determination, Tabatabai, present knowledge, real acquisition and general credit acquisition before the community, are always based on the individual and have never found a collective state. But Scheler does not consider knowledge to be exclusive to a specific level, but can be applied at the level of the individual, society, and between, and of course, this is the form of knowledge such as religion, philosophy, science, technology, and ideology, which can be different at different levels. Not its content.

4. In the dominant determining factor, Tabatabai believes it is one of the four categories of transcendental, individual, environmental and social determining factors, the main and dominant factor in determining, nature and love of nature. But Scheler believes that various factors can dominate human thoughts; According to him, the dominant factor is variable.
5. In the belonging or definite sign, Tabatabai says all special credits are more or less influenced by the society, although the credits after the society are more strongly under this influence. But Scheler's are only the form of the three knowledges of religion, philosophy and science, which belong to determination.

Therefore, in relation to the discussion of social determination of knowledge, the essence and spirit of Tabatabai's ideas goes back to the discussion of validity and Scheler's ideas about the form and content of knowledge.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Ethical Considerations:** Complied with.

**Data Availability Statement:** Not applicable.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- Alizadeh, Abdolreza, Azhdarizadeh, Hossein, Kafi, Majid (2019), *Sociology of Knowledge: A Study in Explaining the Relationship between Construction and Social Action and Human Knowledge*, Qom, Hohza Research Center and University.
- Azhdarizadeh, Hossein (2012), *Social determination of the revealed knowledge of Allameh Tabatabai*, Hozva and University, year 9, number 35.
- Merton, Robert (1973), *the Sociology of Science*, The University of Chicago Press, london.
- Motahari, Morteza (1992), *collection of works*, Tehran, Sadra Publishing House, 9th edition.
- Scheler, Max (1974), *Max Scheler (1874-1928) Centennial Essays*, Edi. By Manfred S. Frings, The Hague, Martinus Nijhof.
- Scheler, Max (1992), *On Feeling, Knowing, and Valuing*, edited and with an introduction by Harold J. Bershady, University of Chicago Press.
- Scheler, Max (1980), *Problems of sociology of knowledge*, London, The University of Chicago Press.
- Scheler, Max (1972), *Sociology of Knowledge*, International Phenomenological Society.
- Scheler, Max (2009), *The Human Place in the Cosmos*, Trans. By Manfred S. Frings, Evanston, Northwestern University Press.
- Scheler, Max (2017), *The Nature of Sympathy*, Trans. By Peter Heath, New York, Routledge.
- Tabatabai, Seyyed Mohammad Hossein (2013), *Al-Mizan fi Tafsir al-Qur'an*, Beirut, Al-Alami Institute.
- Tabatabai, Seyyed Mohammad Hossein (1989), *The principles of philosophy and the method of realism*, Tehran, Sadra.