

**Ontological Researches
semi-annual scientific
journal**

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

**The Role of Hypothetical Syllogism in the Semantics of
Divine Knowledge on Avicenna`s View**

Mahdi Nosratian ahoor¹

Abstract

Explaining the quality of God's knowledge with respect to beings according to Ibn Sina and the role played by hypothetical syllogism in it is the focus of the present writing. This research is conducted through descriptive - analytic method and the goal is reached by applying some semantic rule. Applying the hypothetical syllogism in the semantics of Divine knowledge, may reach to the conclusion that the well-known understanding of Ibn Sina's theory is not right; rather, Ibn Sina is one of those who consider God's knowledge with respect to beings as knowledge by presence; and, for this reason, he may be deemed as the first among philosophers who has demonstrated God's knowledge regarding being as knowledge by presence. This new revision about Avicenna's view regarding Divine knowledge with respect to beings, teleological agency would be understood and its consistency with Ibn Sina's philosophical principles would be clearly seen. In his books, he defines divine grace as being the wise, self-lover and benevolence and the emanation of good from God is considered as the result of such grace. The emission of the world by God does not cause any change in God's essence as its emanation is not based on any divine intention beyond or external to His essence.

Keywords: Creative Hypothetical Syllogism, Ibn Sina.

¹- Assistant Prof of the University of Quran and Hadith: Qom
Date of received: 29/04/2019

Mehdi.nosratian@gmail.com
Date of acceptance: 21/01/2020

Problem Statement

One of the most important and influential issues in philosophy and theology is to explain the quality of divine foreknowledge to beings. This has caused divisions among thinkers. Sheikh Eshraq and his followers deny the existence of such science. They prove two kinds of science for God: self - knowledge by presence and knowledge by presence to being. The reason for this exclusive division about Divine knowledge in the two above-mentioned categories is the definition of knowledge in term of presence, and God have self- knowledge due to self - manifestation. God knows other things because they are manifested before God. As a matter of fact, Sheikh Eshraq confined Divine knowledge into two terms or kinds: self-knowledge and foreknowledge to other beings and he refute God` s foreknowledge to other beings.

But there are two other philosophical school in Muslim world that explain divine knowledge in term of three kind: the first, Divine self- knowledge , second Divine foreknowledge to other beings and the third Divine post - creation knowledge to other beings. From the viewpoints of these two schools, it is possible to discern the differences between the two creatures in divine foreknowledge. As an explanation, the differences between the Transcendent Wisdom School and the Wisdom of Peripatetic on the issue of the Divine foreknowledge, it is hold that the former explain God` s knowledge by presence and the latter explain in term of knowledge by acquaintance.

The origins of this understanding are seen in some quotes and texts of the scholars who belong to the peripatetic school. They insist emphatically in giving explanation of Divine knowledge that Divine knowledge to particulars is not in detail as it cause change in divine essence. But still God does fail to know them and is not ignorant about them and He knows them by forms. These forms, according to peripatetic philosophers while are the cause of existence of other being are, at the same time the as a means that God knows the particulars by them.

In the present article, we seek to evaluate Avicenna`s theory on Divine knowledge and the different approaches presented by other scholars on Divine foreknowledge by applying the categorical syllogism in the form of creative syllogism

The reason for applying the hypothetical creative syllogism to Ibn Sina's theory is the multiplicity and the explicit references in his book and the existence of substantiating proofs contrary to the popular notion of the peripatetic school.

Method

The research method in this paper is analytical and on the basis of this method the categorical syllogism is applied. This analysis first needs to describe Ibn Sina's views on the problem of divine science and then to establish a connection between different texts, that is to say, the formation of a textual family in order to allow a comprehensive analysis of his view in the light of this textual family.

Findings and Results

Avicenna used the following sentences: "forms of beings imprinted in God`s essence". At the first glance this sentence is understood that "the forms of being" is its subject and "imprinted" is its object and the phrase "in God`s essence" is considered as an adverb. Such understanding, naturally, at beginning may result in the view that the forms of being are imprinted in God`s essence but conclusive consideration of Avicenna`s work display that such interpretation is contradicted and is untrue. He explicitly stated that the forms are not produced in God`s essence contrary to human beings that they are produced by human reason. For whenever we conceive anything our mind produce its notion within it called as form.

Justification of the theory of Divine efficient cause by grace is considered as conclusion in this research. Avicenna hold in his works that divine grace as being the wise, self -lover and benevolence and the emanation of good from God is considered as the result of such grace.

The emission of the world by God does not cause any change in God's essence as its emanation is not based on any divine intention beyond or external to His essence.

Another consequence of Ibn Sina's new understanding regarding Divine foreknowledge is that the Divine intellection is aboriginal in the sense that there is a relation of cause and effect between divine essence and divine intellection and that there is no temporal priority or superiority between cause and effect. Of course in Avicenna's view cause has natural priority over effect. On the other hand, as it was proved, these forms are incorporeal (free of material character) and they are considered as the cause of corporeal being(material being).Hence they are free of time and are aboriginal and God is considered as everlasting creator and His grace is forever.

References

- Ibn Sīnā, Ḥusayn ibn ʿAbdillāh, (1992), *al mobahasat*, commentary by Ḥusayn bidarfar , qom, Publishers bidar. [In Arabic]
- Ibn Sīnā, Ḥusayn ibn ʿAbdillāh, (1984a), *al talighat*, beyrout, maktabat al elam al eslami. [In Arabic]
- Ibn Sīnā, Ḥusayn ibn ʿAbdillāh, (1980), *rasayil*, qom, Publishers bidar. [In Arabic]
- Ibn Sīnā, Ḥusayn ibn ʿAbdillāh, (١٩٨٤b), *al sheaf*, qom, maktabat al marashi. [In Arabic]
- Bahmanyār ibn Marzubān, (١٩٩٤), *al tehsil*, motahari, Tehran, uni tehran. [In Arabic]
- Sabzavari, Hadi, (1990), *sharh al manzome*, tehran, Publishers nab. [In Arabic]
- Suhrawardī, Shahāb ad-Dīn Yahya, (1994), *hekmat al eshraq*, hanri korban, Tehran, Cultural Studies. [In Arabic]
- Shīrāzī, Ṣadr ad-Dīn Muḥammad, (1885), *majmoat al raseal al tesa*, Tehran. [In Arabic]
- , (1975), *Al-Mabda' wa l-ma'ad*, ashtiyani, Tehran, Institute for Research in Philosophy. [In Arabic]
- , (1998a), *asrar al ayat*, Tehran, Institute for Research in Philosophy. [In Arabic]