

**Ontological Researches
semi-annual scientific
journal**

Vol. 8, No. 16
Autumn 2019 & Winter 2020
pages 1- 3

**A Contemplation on Divine Knowledge in
Avicenna's Peripatetic Philosophy**

Golam Hossein Ebrahimi Dinani¹
Mohammad Jafar Jamehbozorgi²

Abstract

The problem of divine knowledge with a subset of related issues, is one of the most difficult philosophical problems that sheikh al-Rais has been addressing and solving in its numerous works. The view of Avicenna, especially regarding the problem of divine knowledge, has been criticized and abused by many, and even charged with exaggeration by thinkers such as Ghazali. This paper seeks to refine the view of Avicenna in a reflection on the basis of the philosophical foundations of Avicenna. The most important basis for Avicenna is the metaphysical distinction between existence and quiddity. In this article, firstly, the design of the Sheikh's base and its difference with the Mu'tazilite view are discussed. Then, by examining his view of divine knowledge in the three stages of the knowledge of essence, the knowledge of other things and the knowledge of the details, the ultimate theory of the Sheikh with respect to his later works The most important of these is "Al-TALIQT". According to the final view, since God is the source, it is pure action and all things, its knowledge of itself and other things, as well as the details is the presential knowledge.

Keywords: Al-taliqat, Distinction between Existence and Quiddity, Divine Knowledge, Imprinted Form, Knowledge by Presence.

¹- Full Professor of University of Tehran, and Retired Faculty member of Research Institute of Iranian Hekmat and Philosophy

dinani@irip.ir

²- Assistant Professor and Academic Member of the Institute of Philosophy and theosophy of Iran, corresponding author

mj.jamebozorgi@gmail.com

Date of received: 09/02/2019

Date of acceptance: 05/11/2019

Problem Statement

The problem of divine knowledge with its related issues is one of the most difficult philosophical issues that Avicenna has addressed in his numerous works attempting to explain and solve its problem. Ibn-Sina's view, especially on the issue of divine knowledge about changing particulars, has raised many criticisms and challenges, and even he was accused by many thinkers such as Ghazali as atheist. In his book *Tahafut-al-falasafeh*, Ghazali, has criticized hardly Peripatetic philosophy in general and Avicenna's philosophy in particular. In this book he put forward 20 critiques and accused Avicenna on 17 of them as debauchery and on 3 of them as blasphemy. Ghazali considered divine knowledge as the most important one. An examination of the works of Avicenna reveals that the criticisms of thinkers like al-Ghazali and Fakhr Razi are in fact accusations and misunderstandings. Basically, al-Ghazali cannot think in the philosophical system of Sinai which is based on the distinction of existence and essence (Quiddity) and his theological assumptions and religious motives do not allow him to properly analyze Avicenna's philosophical principles and views and prevent them to have a sympathetic look.

In order to have a proper understanding regarding Avicenna's view on divine knowledge, it is necessary to distinguish the three following discipline:

divine self- knowledge, divine precreation knowledge and knowledge about particulars entities. There are philosophical in Avicenna's view without which it is impossible to perceive his view on divine knowledge properly.

These bases are the metaphysical distinction between existence and quiddity, the negation of quiddity for God's existence, and the theory emanation which itself is based on the principle of causality. Here, the main problem emerges. Avicenna's principles do not indicate that his theory on knowledge is based on the viewpoint of imprinted form and the general knowledge of the particulars. So the main questions are following: what would be the picture of divine knowledge in his fundamental principles? Why is this picture different from the famous picture? What is the role of the book of "Al-TAALIQT" in changing the state of this problem?

Method

In this article, we describe the divine knowledge in Avicenna's view through a descriptive-analytical method.

Avicenna proposes the metaphysical distinction between being and essence through the transition from the theory of "Substantive thing of non –Existent" that is the Mu'tazilite viewpoint. According to this basis, the quiddity which is answer to the question of what is this, implies the existential boundaries of beings which is excluded divine nature. Basically, God is for Ibn-e-Sina a supreme being, absolute and simple and unfolded being, and such being has knowledge by presence. The theory of Emanation emerges at this point where the divine knowledge is linked to the creation of beings. According to Ibn Sina, knowledge at its first appearance is the origin of plurality, although this plurality is conceptual. As he considers God as an unfolded being, therefore, by denying the views of theologians and Plato, considers the creatures to be the concomitants of essence. This is not just a term. These concomitants are observed by God at His essence level. These Objects can be studied in Avicenna's view from two perspectives: One for their connection with divine and the other for their Emanation. According to him these two aspects are identical. In other words, the two aspects of emanation and obtaining is identical, and therefore, for God for him and in him is a one reality, not more. If so, then divine knowledge is not only imprinted, rather by presence. It may be that Ibn Sina used the concept of imprinted more for a conceptual analysis of divine knowledge, but that such a concept would be plural, while the viewpoint of the Sheikh, according to his principles, is undoubtedly the union of the forms with essence. What is obtained from Ibn-e-Sina's words is that for the him, the essential divine knowledge indicates that objects in divine knowledge

are the manifestations of the essence, because the concomitants of essence are not of inferior to the essence and like the attributes are identical with the essence. Therefore, divine knowledge is at this stage by presence and illuminative, because these objects are not in divine essence, but are emanation from him. Anyway, the problem of divine knowledge about particulars is more difficult. He takes two steps. In the first step, he argued with two arguments that God has knowledge about particulars, and in the second step describes how this knowledge is. In this step, he takes advantage of God's pure actuality and predestination to prove knowledge of particulars.

Although on the basis of some of Avicenna's texts it is understood that he considers divine knowledge about things and particulars as acquired intrinsic knowledge and follows its implication, but he himself also knows that this argument is not sufficient argument to prove God's knowledge about particulars. Basically, from quiddity idea and Principle of "knowledge to Cause due to knowledge effect" cannot prove God's knowledge of detail fully. In the second step, the Sheikh uses Principle of "unfolded essence fulfill all the objects" shows that the theory of general knowledge is not a final idea, but God is all of the objects and therefore He observe the world by intellect by presence and illuminative relation.

Findings and Results

Divine knowledge to his objects in his essence is by presence and theory of imprinted form is in no conflicts with Unity idea, but with a precise view, the idea of unity is correct, and imprinted forms is a conceptual analysis.

Although Ibn Sina considers the knowledge of God to be general in detail, he shows in of *Al-TAALIQT*, because God is all objects, so his knowledge about particulars is by presence with all them.

Divine Activity Upgrade from to Agent- by- Fore knowledge to Agent- by- Agreement.

References

- Ibn Sina, (1984), *al-Shifa, al-ilahiyyat*, Corrected by Hasanzadeh Amoli, Qum. Maktabat Al-Eelam Al-Islami, Markaz Nashr. [In Arabic]
- _____, (1996), *Al-Isharat, Al-Tanbihat*, Qum. Al-Balaqe. [In Arabic]
- _____, (1984), *Al-Mabdaa, Al-Maad*, Tehran. Publications Institute of Islamic Studies of the Mag Gil University. [In Arabic]
- _____,(2000), *Al-Nijat*, University of Tehran. [In Arabic]
- _____, (2012 a), *Al-Taaliqat*, edited by Mousavian. Hossein, Iranian Institute of Philosophy.[In Arabic]
- Beheshti. Ahmad, (2006), *Tajrid*, description of Part IX *Al-Isharat, Al-Tanbihat*, bostan-e-ketabe,Qom. [In persian]