

Muhammad Hijāb, the Falāsifah, Mutafalsifah and Jahmiyyah: Laying the Foundations for the Dīn of the Philosophers and Jahmites

Part 4: A Chance to Rectify and Apologise



To Muhammad Hijāb:¹

In my three previous articles, I explained the errors you fell into in taking the argument of Ibn Sīnā of imkān and wujūb for proving Allāh's existence² to its **intended outcome** which is laying the foundation for **the rejection of Allāh's attributes** (dhātiyyah and shifātiyyah) and His 'uluww, and your use of language, within the

¹ I referred to you throughout my articles with your given name and did not resort to name-calling and name-twisting as you have done with me, by making a play of words with my surname in your tweet. However, these things do not concern me in the least and you are free to indulge in as much of this as entertains you and your audience. What concerns me is that you are laying down a path to misguidance and out of naṣīḥah to you and your followers, I am pointing out the precise nature of your errors. So it will become clear whether you are sincere or arrogant.

² In reality, it only proves something called "obligatory existence", which could then be interpreted or explained as anything, including the universe itself. The argument then needs to be augmented with further philosophical reasoning to point to a creator that is one. However, this is where the foundations are laid down for the rejection of the attributes if coherence and logical flow is to be maintained in the argument(s) then used to augment this proof, such as that of tarkīb (composition).

context of this argument, that necessarily follows in affirming His oneness upon the way of the Mutafalsifah and negators among the Mutakallimīn—that He is “not material, not parts, not composed”. I explained that this is not the language of Tawhīd that the Prophets and Messengers came with, and nor is it the language of the People of the Sunnah in affirming their creed with respect to Allāh.³ All of this is very clear in my articles, and the nature of my criticism is very clearly spelled out such that there is no ambiguity.

In response you put out two tweets and linked to an article in which you quoted a passage from Ibn Taymiyyah from page 61 of the tāḥqīq of Muḥammad al-Sa‘awiyy of Sharh al-Asbahāniyyah (Maktabah Dar al-Minhāj, 1430H).

At this stage, I will extend kindness to you, and assume the first of two things. That you have not correctly understood this subject and upon that, my criticism of your polemics in this subject area in which you are laying down the path of Ibn Sīnā, al-Rāzī and others from Mutafalsifah and Jahmiyyah for the negation of the attributes and the ‘uluww of Allāh. The second is arrogance and deliberate deception, but I will leave this conclusion, until you decide to confirm it wilfully, out of your own choice.

So assuming that you are ignorant and lack understanding, I request that you turn over to the next page in Sharh al-Asbahāniyyah, on pages 62 and 63, and read those ten lines. Then I request that you read all of my articles once more, properly. Then, I will give you some days to rectify the way in which you have mislead your followers and your audience, albeit, unintentionally, giving you

³ I also pointed out in Part 2 of this series, in point 3, that in some of their writings, when it is the context and field of detailed refutation, they may employ these words to separate out true meanings from false meanings and then affirm the proper legislative terms for those meanings.

the benefit of the doubt. When we are dealing with intricate issues like this, and there is unlikely to be many in your audience who will grasp them and follow what is going on, it becomes very easy to deceive them with diversionary responses, and misrepresenting the actual point of criticism in order to hide ones mistakes. However, I am assuming at this stage that you are merely ignorant and not being deceptive. To aid you, I have attached below the text from the two pages in question. Ibn Taymiyyah is discussing and evaluating the way in which al-Asbahānī is establishing Allāh's oneness after using the argument of imkān and wujūb.

فصل

فَلِمَا قَرَرَ إِثْبَاتَ الصَّانِعِ سَبْحَانَهُ^٥ أَخْذَ يُثْبِتُ وَحْدَانِيَّتَهُ؛ فَقَالَ:
 شَرَحَ دَبْلَلُ «وَالدَّلِيلُ عَلَى وَحْدَتِهِ أَنَّهُ لَا تَرْكِيبٌ فِيهِ بُوْجَهٍ، وَإِلَّا لِمَا كَانَ وَاجِبًا الْوُجُودَ
 الْأَصْبَاهَانِيُّ عَلَى لَذَّاتِهِ؛ ضَرُورَةً افْتِقارَهُ إِلَى مَا تَرَكَّبُ مِنْهُ، وَيُلَزِّمُ مِنْ ذَلِكَ أَنَّ لَا يَكُونُ مِنْ
 وَحْدَانَةِ الْخَالِقِ^٦ نُوعَهُ اثْنَانٌ؛ إِذْ لَوْ كَانَ لِزَمْنٍ^٧ وَجُودُ الْاثْنَيْنِ بِلَا اِمْتِيَازٍ وَهُوَ مَحَالٌ».

وَهُذَا الدَّلِيلُ أَخْذَهُ^٨ مِنْ كَلَامِ أَبِي عَبْدِ اللَّهِ الرَّازِيِّ، وَهُوَ سُلْكٌ فِيهِ مَتَابِعُ الْأَصْبَاهَانِيِّ
 مُسْلِكُ الْمُتَفَلِّسَةِ كَابِنِ سِينَا وَمَثَالِهِ، فَإِنْ هَذَا هُوَ عَمَدَتْهُمْ فِيمَا يَدْعُونَهُ
 لِلْمُتَفَلِّسَةِ فِي الْاسْنَدِ لِلْأَدَالَةِ عَلَى الْوَحْدَانَةِ بِنَفِيِّ
 مِنَ التَّوْحِيدِ، وَهُوَ حَجَّةٌ باطِلَّةٌ، وَمِقْصُودُهُمْ فِيمَا يَدْعُونَهُ نَفِيِّ
 التَّرْكِيبِ^٩، وَقَدْ بَيَّنَ عُلَمَاءُ الْمُسْلِمِينَ بِطْلَانَهَا^{١٠}؛ كَمَا بَيَّنَهُ أَبُو حَامِدُ
 الْغَزَالِيُّ^{١١} فِي «تَهَافُتِ الْفَلَاسِفَةِ»^{١٢} وَكَمَا قَدَحَ^{١٣} الرَّازِيُّ وَغَيْرُهُ فِي هَذِهِ
 الطَّرِيقَ^{١٤} فِي مَوَاضِعٍ أُخْرَى^{١٥}.

Translation:

“Chapter: After he corroborated the existence of the Maker, the Sublime, he began affirming His oneness. So he said: ‘And the evidence for His oneness is that there is no composition (tarkīb) in

Him in any way, otherwise He would not have been obligatory in existence in His essence, [due to] the necessity of His need for that which He is composed of. And binding from this is that there cannot be two of His type. If that were so, the existence of two without distinction [between them] would be binding, and that is impossible.'

[Ibn Taymiyyah]: He has taken this evidence⁴ from the speech of Abu ‘Abd Allāh al-Rāzī, and he [al-Rāzī] followed in this [matter] the way of the Mutafalsifah such as Ibn Sīnā and his likes. And this is what they depend upon in what they claim of [their understanding of] Tawhīd. **And it is a futile proof.** Their intent in what they claim is to reject the attributes. And the scholars of the Muslims have explained its futility, as was done by Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī in ‘Tahāfut al-Falāsifah’ and just as al-Rāzī and others criticised this method in other places.⁵ End of quote from Ibn Taymiyyah.

Given the above, I will kindly offer you **the chance to stop misleading your audience**, which I have assumed to have been done unintentionally at this stage, and I will give you the opportunity to get back on track. I criticised you for taking the arguments of the Mutafalsifah [also adopted by some of the Mutakallimīn]—in which there are aspects of truth as I already and clearly mentioned in previous parts—to their full logical outcomes, which necessitate a rejection of Allāh’s attributes, His ‘ulūww and His istiwā’, and that you fell victim, as did al-Rāzī and other Ash‘arites, to the designs of Ibn

⁴ Meaning this evidence of proving Allāh’s oneness through the argument of tarkīb (composition) and dependency, need (iftiqār) on parts, if He was composed, which would then contradict His obligatory existence, since what is in need can only have a possible existence. And this is what Muhammad Hijāb is upon, following Ibn Sīnā and those who fell for this trojan horse argument by which negation of the attributes and a false, philosophical Tawhīd is intended.

⁵ This is why I referred to al-Rāzī in previous parts as a “chameleon”, because he was all over the place, confused, in contradiction.

Sīnā in corrupting their proof. And that by using such an argument as intended by Ibn Sīnā, without much discernment, you are leading people down a path that was trodden by al-Ja‘d bin Dirham and al-Jahm bin Ṣafwān and the Mutafalsifah and negators among the Mutakallimīn.

As for your screenshot of Part 1 of my article, wherein you replace your name with the name of Ibn Taymiyyah, to make it appear to your audience that I have “accidentally refuted” Ibn Taymiyyah, then this further establishes your lack of comprehension. Rather, you have only displayed your ignorance in this. I explained that these types of philosophical proofs have aspects of truth but that they only establish a **wujūd mutlaq** (non-specific, abstract existence), and then they are injected with false principles in order to qualify that abstract existence into what appears to be a creator, but in reality, only lays down a path for the eventual rejection of that very creator, if followed through logically.

More can be said in outlining your ignorance in this field, but I will leave that for later inshā’Allāh.

In closing, I am extending kindness and giving you another chance to rectify this affair and to cease deceiving your audience. This will reveal whether you are genuine and sincere, or whether you are playing games. We ask Allāh for thabāt and ikhlāṣ.

Abu ‘Iyaad
@abuiyaadsp ◆ salaf.com
17 Shawwāl 1440 / 20 June 2019 v. 1.02