IMÓM SUYÕÙÔ'S ORIGINAL THOUGHT

by Mufti Ali

IMĀM SUYŪṬĪ'S ORIGINAL THOUGHT ON THE OPPOSITION TO (GREEK) LOGIC AND THEOLOGY IN *ṢAWN AL-MANṬIQ WA'L-KALĀM 'AN FANNAY AL-MANṬIQ WA'L-KALĀM**

DR. MUFTI ALI
State Islamic University (UIN)
Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten, Indonesia,
Head of LP2M UIN Banten,
JL, Jenederal Sudirman No. 30, Serang-Banten 42118,
Indonesia.
e-mail: mufti.ali@uninbanten.ac.id

The transmission of Greek philosophy and sciences to the Islamic world through the translation movement in the eighth and ninth centuries played a major role in accelerating the Hellenizing process of that world. The emergence of scholastic theology (*kalām*) and Islamic Aristotelianism and Neo-Platonism (*falsafah*) in the Islamic world is considered, in Madjid's opinions, as the direct cultural influence of it.[1]

This whole marvellous process of cultural transmission which led to the emergence of a rationalist movement in the Islamic world was not a matter of chance. History tells us of the systematic attempt by al-Mā'mūn (d. 216/833), who was fascinated by the practical use of Greek philosopy and sciences, and issued an explicit state policy to promote adoption of 'the foreign culture'. According to Fakhry, al-Mā'mūn himself, the seventh 'Abbāsid Caliph, was influenced by Greek philosophy and, composed several treatises on theological questions in a speculative spirit. The speculative tendency in his theology promoted popular interest

_____

in scholastic theology and it supported the cause of the Mu'tazilites who sought to apply Greek categories to Muslim dogma.[2]

As a result of the explicit state policy and a core of learned individuals, popular interest in learning 'new culture' culminated in the translation into Arabic of a great many Greek treatises and books of philosophy and science, along with commentaries. Al-Mā'mūn and his proponents, who exemplified what Van Koningsveld called 'the Ma'mūn cycle',[3] represented the Muslims with the inclusive cultural perception that it was necessary to enlist the assistance of other cultures in pursuing epistemology. Thus, they represented the group of Muslims who regarded their culture insufficient and sought to learn from the outside world.

According to Von Grunebaum, this cultural perception paved the way for Muslims to develop (a) "rational forms of thought and systematisation," (b) "logical procedures," (c) "methods of generalization and abstraction" and, (d) "principles of classification."[4]

This inclusive attitude towards a foreign culture drew fervent criticism from those Muslims who regarded their cultural achievements as self-sufficient and those who needed to learn nothing from the outside world.[5] To borrow Van Koningsveld's term, these groups who were hostile to 'things foreign' were represented by 'the Umar cycle'.[6]

Since then history has witnessed consecutive disputes between those with an inclusive attitude toward foreign cultures and those who regarded Islamic culture as self-sufficient. If the inclusionists were represented by rationalist groups, the most extreme of which was the Mu'tazilite group, then the exclusionists were represented by the traditionalists, the most extreme of which were the *Ahl al-Ḥadīth*, to borrow Abrahamov's classification.[7] The ongoing dispute culminated in the event known as the *mihna*, the Inquisition by the Caliph al-Mā'mūn. This dispute led Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, who did not recognize the createdness of the Qur'ān, to risk his life by challenging a major doctrine of the Mu'tazilite's creed.[8]

Therefore, it can be said that the 'fruit' of Hellenism, i.e. scholastic theology (*kalām*) and Islamic Aristotelianism and Neo-Platonism (*falsafah*) met with opposition from a great number of Muslims when they were introduced into the Islamic World in the eighth and ninth centuries. The inclusion of logical concepts into juridical works, such as the theory of

definition (*al-ḥadd*) and of demonstration (*al-burhān*), which were included by al-Ghazālī in *al-Mustaṣfā*, his legal theory, is an obvious example of a Muslim scholar's effort to protect himself from the threat of *Traditionalists*.[9] The incineration of a great number of Muslim philosophers' works is further evidence of the *Traditionalists'* fervent opposition to *falsafah*.

Like Islamic Aristotelianism and Neo-Platonism (*falsafah*), scholastic theology (*kalām*) was considered as a part of the Hellenistic tradition and it too became the target of *Traditionalists* who prohibited against engaging in it by breaking off relations with, and banishing the *Mutakallimūn* and by refuting *Mutakallimūn*'s tenets.[10] The fervour of the hostility of Muslims towards *kalām* can be seen in al-Suyūṭī's discussion in *Ṣawn al-Manṭiq wa 'l-Kalām* (forthwith called: SM), which comprises more than 200 printed pages.

SM revolves around the history and origin of logic, its introduction into the Muslim world, the reaction of leading Muslim scholars against it, its connection to theology and the reaction of Muslim scholars against theology and the refutation against one who introduced logic into grammar. Delving into the content of this work (i.e. SM), one is led to know that al-Suyūṭī adopts the persona of a systematic historian drawing our attention to the fact that logic and theology were opposed by Muslims of various generations and even from the earliest period of Islamic history. In his discussion of the Muslim opposition to logic, al-Suyūṭī, for instance, systematically arranges his topic as follows: First he deals with the community of Islam; furthermore he discusses the historical connection between the books of *uṣūl al-fiqh* and *uṣūl al-dīn* to logic and the beginning of its spread among later scholars. Finally, he enumerates chronologically the scholars who opposed logic, beginning with al-Shāfiʿī (d. 203/820) and ending with Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 729/1329). The same pattern holds true, when dealing with the Muslim opposition to *kalām*.

The significance of SM is represented, for instance, by al-Nashshār's reference to it as the most complete encyclopaedia dealing with the criticism of Greek logic. Accordingly he asserts '… *wa hādha 'l-kitāb yuʿtabar awsaʿ mawḍūʿat fima fi maw-ūʿ naqd al-manṭiq al-yūnanī*.[11]

In what follows, I have translated only the introductory part of SM, namely pages thirty-three to sixty-seven in the printed edition of al-Nashshār. These passages contain the original thought of its author.

The rest of the pages are merely al-Suyūṭī's summarizing of more than twelve works of his predecessors who dealt with the censure of *kalām*. I hope that the translation helps us to understand the context of the religious dispute that drives al-Suyūṭī's composition of SM.

The Translation of SM.[12]

To Defend [Islamic] Logic and Theology against the Art of [Greek] Logic and Theology

Introduction

The Reason for Composing this Book [p. 33].

Praise be to God and Peace be upon His worshippers whom He has chosen. Long ago, in the year 867 or 868 [H] I composed a book on the prohibition against being occupied by the art of logic, which I named *"Al-Qawl al-Mushriq."*[13] I included in it statements of the learned men of Islam condemning and prohibiting the art of logic. I related in it that the *Shaykh al-Islām,* one of the scholars who has reached the degree of *ijtihād* Taqiy al-Dīn ibn Taymiyyah composed a book to undo logic's foundations, a book which I had not found at that time. Twenty years passed without my finding it. Then when this year came, and I told of what God had endowed upon me in attaining the rank of independent legal investigation,[14] someone mentioned that one of the conditions for legal investigation is the knowledge of the art of logic, claiming that this condition was lacking in me. The poor fellow[15] did not understand that I knew logic better than those who claim to know it and defend it. I know the principles of its foundations, and on that basis [p. 34]. I derived there from the insights as well as the knowledge rendered by the leading logicians of the day, with the exception only of our very learned teacher Muḥyi al-Dīn al-Kafyajī.[16] Thus I searched for Ibn Taymiyyah's book until I found it. I saw that he had entitled it *Naṣīḥah Ahl al-Īmān fī al-Radd 'alā Manṭiq al-Yūnān.* In it, he expressed excellently his intention to undo the foundations of logic one by one and explain the corruption of its principles. So I summarized it in a little composition which I entitled *Jahd al-Qarīḥa fī Tajrīd al-Naṣīḥah.*[17] Then, many of the charlatans, who are far from real scholarship, eagerly said: What is the argument to prohibit it? On what

sources did Ibn b. Ṣalāḥ rely in his legal decision to that effect? And other expressions of a similar nature. Surprisingly, they defend logic but they are not mastering it, and they are busying themselves with it but they do not use it in their inquiries. They go at random in it like the weak-sighted she-camel that beats the ground with her forefeet, and they only follow the right direction in discussion and deduction blindly.

Some of those who spent their life [in studying] logic met me. When one of them saw the statement of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ in his legal opinions: *Wa laysa al-ishtighāl bi ta‘allumih wa ta‘līmih mimmā abāḥah al-shāri‘ wa lā ‘stibāḥah aḥad min al-Ṣaḥabah wa’l-tābī‘īn wa’l-ā’immah al-mujtahidīn wa’l-salaf al-ṣāliḥīn*, [studying and teaching logic is not allowed by the Law-giver, by the *Companions,* the Followers and by the leading scholars who are qualified to undertake *ijtihād,* nor by the Pious Ancestors], he said: This is a testimony to the contrary, which is not accepted [p. 35]. Thus, I said: By God, you neither followed the course of the scholars of the religious law nor relied upon that of the logicians! As for the scholars of the religious law, they say that if *argumentum e contrario* originates from the scholars of complete deduction, it is accepted and to be relied upon. This idea was also held by scholars of *Tradition,* law and Arabic, in language, grammar and syntax, rhetoricians – specialized in *ma‘ānī*,[18] *bayān*[19] and *badī‘*[20] and prosodists in a number of questions which are too long to be put forward.

As for the logicians, they say that the general negative premise can be undone only by the particular positive one, viz. that it is said that it was permitted by a specific *Companion,* Follower of a *Companion* or Independent Legal Investigator. Thereby the argument of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ would be undone. But this is more difficult to find on the authority of one of the groups mentioned than for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle.

As for *al-dāfi‘ bi al-Ṣadr* [the way of argumentation entitled in logic], *al-dāfi‘ bi al-Ṣadr* viz. plainly asserts something, i.e. to assert what is right or where it was taken from, this is not the manner used by anyone, be he a juridical scholar or a philosopher.

Thus, I decided to compose an elaborate book [to prohibit it][21] following the course of a comprehensive independent legal investigation and deduction to reveal the truth, in which I explain the correctness of

what Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ claimed in relating the negation of permission [of being occupied by logic] to the people mentioned.

When I had begun [to compose the book], and was obliged to mention the statements of the leading scholars in prohibiting the study of theology, because of the intricate connection between the two [p. 36], I entitled the book *awn al-Manṭiq wa'l-Kalām 'an Fannay al-Manṭiq wa'l-Kalām* (To Defend [Islamic] Logic and Theology against the Art of [Greek] Logic and Theology); but only God enables us to reach our goal.

The Beginning of the Foundation of Logic and the Beginning of its Passing into the Religious Community of Islam and the Beginning of Those Who Connected the Books of *Uṣūl* [*Uṣūl al-fiqh* and *Uṣūl al-dīn*] to Logic and the Beginning of its Spread among Later [Scholars].

The first who founded the art of logic was Aristotle,[22] an inhabitant of Istakhr[23] in the period of Azdashir ibn Dara,[24] as it is mentioned by al-Sahrastāni[25] in *al-Milal wa'l-Niḥal,* by Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ,[26] by al-Nawawī[27] in *al-Ṭabaqāt,* al-Kindi[28] and Ibn Zūlāq in *Tārīkh Miṣr*[29] and others [p. 37]. It is clearly indicated in the words of someone who said:[30]

We cut our friendship with those stricken by the malady of *Kitāb al-Shifā'*.[31]

They died as adherents of the religion of Aristotle, while we died in the religion of the Chosen.[32]

Ibn Taymiyyah said in his quoted books: Another [scholar] said: If you are joined in an affair by an evil person, do not feel ashamed or embarrassed:[33]

Aristotle and the rapacious dog necessarily participate among animals.

Aristotle was mentioned specifically because he was the founder of logic in which he confirmed that every kind possesses a portion of its species, and that the human shares animality with the dog and the other animals. Ibn Taymiyyah said in his mentioned book: Aristotle, the founder of logic was a Greek and the first who asserted the sempiternality of the universe. He said: The Greeks were infidel polytheists worshipping the

planets and idols; they were much worse than the Jews and the Christians after they had abrogated and altered [the true religion]; they lived more than 300 years B.C. [p. 38].

When the Christ was sent to them, they stuck to his religion. Then, when the religion of the Christ had been altered, they entered upon a religion which was a combination of *ḥanifiyya* and polytheism. Some of it was true and some of it was false. It was better than the religion which was followed by their ancestors. (End of quotation).

In another part of this book, he said: The Greeks were polytheists worshipping idols and they were preoccupied by magic as is related on the authority of Aristotle and others. Satans led them astray and by them their magic was performed. However, they did not know that [the magic] was caused by the Satans. May be they did not believe in the Satans, but asserted that all that was caused by the force of the soul, by natural matters or by a celestial power. Because, according to them [the Greeks], Avicenna and his followers, these three forces were the causes of the marvels of the universe; but they were ignorant of the other acts of the Satans which have greater impact in spreading evil in the world than all this.[34]

In another place [of this book] he said: The foundation of logic was initially derived from geometry. They made it in figures similar to the figures of geometry. They named them limits (*ḥudūd*) because of the limits of those figures, in order that they were able to shift from a sensibly perceived form to an intellectual form. He said that this was due to the weakness of their intellect and their inability to know them except by using a far-fetched method. But God paved the way for Muslims to obtain such a degree of knowledge, eloquence, good deeds and faith that they excel by it all kinds of the species of man. Praise be to God the Lord of the Universe. (End of quotation!)[35]

[p. 39] As for the beginning of its passing into the religious community of Islam, al-Shaykh Naṣr al-Maqdisī who is one of the leading scholars among our friends, said in his book *al-Ḥujja 'alā Tārik al-Mahajja*[36] [the Argument Against One Who Abandons the *Mahajja* (the Proved Way): Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allah ibn al-Walīd ibn Sa'd al-Anṣārī told me: I heard that Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allah ibn Abī Zayd the Malikite jurist in Qayrawān[37] said: May God regard the Umayyads with mercy. There has never been among them a Caliph who introduced innovations

in Islam. Most of their governors and officials were Arabs. But when the caliphate was removed from them and fell to the 'Abbāsids, their dynasty was based on the support and the rule of the Persians. In the hearts of most of their rulers lay infidelity and hatred towards the Arabs and the dynasty of Islam. They created innovations in Islam which formed a mortal danger for Islam. If there had been no promise of God to the Prophet (ﷺ) that his religion and its adherents would be victorious till Doomsday, the Persians would have annihilated Islam, but they have broken it and marred its pillars. But God will keep His promise, if He wishes!

The first of the innovations created by them was the importation of the books of Greekdom to the world of Islam. They were translated into Arabic, and thus became widespread among the Muslims. The man responsible for the importation of the books from Byzantium into the Lands of Islam was Yaḥyā ibn Khālid ibn Barmak.[38] There were Greek books in Byzantium; the King of Byzantium feared that if the Byzantines would study the books of Greekdom, they would leave Christianity behind and return to the religion of Greekdom [p. 40]. Thus, they would start to quarrel and their unity would be broken up. Therefore, he collected the books in a place on which he built a construction covered by stones and gypsum so no one had access to it.

When the command of the dynasty of the 'Abbāsids fell to Yaḥyā ibn Khālid, who was an atheist, he got tidings of the books in the edifice in Byzantium. So he bribed the King of the Byzantines with presents, without asking anything in return. When he sent him many presents, the King of Byzantium collected his patriarchs saying: This man, the servant of the Arab has given me a lot of presents, but without asking anything from me in return. But I am convinced that he does want something. I fear that his need will bring me into difficulties. Thus, I became worried. Then, when Yaḥyā's envoy came to him, he asked him: Tell your friend that if he has a need, he should say what it is. When the envoy told Yaḥyā, he answered him: What I need is that the books under the building be sent to me. I will take from them some of those I need, and send them back to him. When the King of Byzantium had read his [Yaḥyā's] letter, he danced with joy. Then he gathered the patriarchs, the bishops and the monks declaring before them: I have told you that the servant of the Arab did indeed have a need. He has expressed it and it

is very trivial for me. I have an idea. Please listen. If you acquiesce I will do it; if you have a different view, we will consult together until we share the same opinion. They asked [the King] : What is it? He answered: He wants to have the Greek books. He will take what he likes and then return them. Then they said: What do you think? He said: I know that our ancestor only constructed the building because he feared that if they fall into the hands of the Christians, who would read them, this would lead to the corruption of their religion and the demolition of their unity. So I propose to send them to him and ask him not to send them back so they will be afflicted by them, while we will be rid of their evil! [p. 41] I am afraid that someone after me will dare to diffuse them among the people, so that they [the Christians] fall from what frightens them. Then they said: Yes we agree, King! Please, execute it!

Thus he sent the books to Yaḥyā ibn Khālid. When the books came to him, he gathered all the heretics and philosophers. When he took out the book *ḥadd al-Manṭiq* [on the definition of logic], Abū Muḥammad ibn Abī Zayd said: There were few who read this book, but were saved from heresy. He said: Then Yaḥyā organized discussions and debates in his house concerning inappropriate subjects. Every adherent of a religion spoke about his belief and discussed it while his [personal] safety was secured.

I say the implication of these words is that it took place in the Caliphate of al-Rashīd,[39] as al-Barmaki was his minister. During his life, he fell out of favour. He was murdered in 187 [H].

Al-Ṣalāḥ, al-Ṣafadī[40] in his *Sharḥ Lāmiyyat al-ʿAjam* said: It is told that al-Māʾmūn, when he had concluded a truce with a Christian king – I think he was king of the island of Cyprus – wrote a letter asking from him the library of the Greeks. They were collected there in a house to which no one could enter. The king gathered his advisers and consulted them about it. All of them, except for one patriarch, advised him not to supply the books. He [viz. King of island of Cyprus] said: Supply the books to them, these sciences have not entered any religious state without destroying it and ensnaring its scholars.

A reliable man told me that *al-Shaykh* Taqiy al-Dīn ibn Aḥmad ibn Taymiyyah – may God have mercy upon him – used to state: I do not think that God will overlook [the sins of] al-Maʾmūn [p. 42]. He certainly will retribute him for what he has committed to this community due to

his introduction of these philosophical sciences among its people. Or words to that effect.

Then al-Safadī said: Actually, al-Mā'mūn was not the first to translate and arabize [foreign books], but there have been many [scholars] who translated them before him. Thus, Yaḥyā ibn Khālid arabized a lot of Persian books, like *Kalīla wa-Dimna* and for his sake, the *Almagest,* one of the books of the Greeks,[41] was arabized.[42]

It is generally known that the first to translate the books of the Greeks was Khālid ibn Yazīd ibn Mu'āwiyah since he was enthusiastically fond of the books of chemistry.

The translators followed two methods of translating: The first was the method of Yūḥannā ibn al-Biṭrīq,[43] Ibn al-Nā'ima al-Ḥimṣī[44] and others, namely that one had to look at every single Greek word and its meaning, and then bring a single Arabic word synonymous in meaning with the Greek one and thereby explain it. Then he moved to the next word and did the same, until he completed what he wanted to translate. This method is bad for two reasons: The first is that, one cannot find an Arabic synonym for each and every Greek word. Hence, it often happens that Greek words have been rendered by Arabic ones signifying the opposite. Secondly, the peculiarities of [Arabic] construction and syntax do not always match their correlative in another language. Besides, many mistakes may occur when metaphors are used, which in all languages is frequently the case.

The second method of translation is the method of Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq,[45] al-Jawharī[46] and others, namely that one had to look at a sentence and understand its meaning [p. 43]. One would then express its meaning in a correlative sentence from the other language, regardless of whether or not the words correspond exactly or differ. This method is more appropriate. Because of this, books of Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq need no revision except [his works] on mathematics, because he did not master [this field], contrary to the works of medicine, logic, physics and theology. The works he translated in those fields do not need correction. As for *Euclid,*[47] it was revised by Thābit ibn Qurra al-Ḥarrānī,[48] and so were the *Almajest* and the intermediate works between the two.[49]

Then he said: There has been a continuous controversy in this community since the Prophet (ﷺ) passed away concerning his death, burial, the question of his succession, legacy, the question of killing those

who refused to pay the *zakāt,* etcetera, and even concerning his illness – may God bless him and grant him peace – when he said: give me an ink-well and a piece of writing material in order that I write for you a letter so that you will not go astray after me.

Anas ibn Mālik narrated that [the Prophet (ﷺ)] said: The Banū Isrā'īl have split into seventy-one sects, while my religious community will split into seventy-two sects [p. 44]. All these sects are put in Hell, except one, namely *al-Jamā'a.*[50] He [the Prophet (ﷺ)] was the true and reliable one who does not talk falsely. He related that the community will split; once they have split, they will oppose each other. When they oppose each other, they will rely on confusions and argumentations. Every sect will dispute those who oppose it, the door of debate will be opened. Hence, everyone needs to argue in favour of his school and its statements using either rational or traditional arguments or a combination of both.

Therefore, this matter had not been safeguarded before al-Mā'mūn. On the contrary, it became worse and more harmful and by it the arguments of the Mu'tazilites and others became strengthened. The adherents of heresies, the opponents of the *Sunnah*, adopted rational preliminary axioms from the philosophers and introduced them into their studies. Thereby they broke open the confinements of their debate and built on them the foundations of their innovations. So the hole [of the garment] widened before the sewer, and the lighthouse of the single truth almost resembled the tripod cooking-pot and the traces of wasteland. This is the end of the words of al-Safadī.

In the history of Ibn Kathīr,[51] in the biography of Khālid ibn Yazīd ibn Amīr al-Mu'minīn Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, it is [stated] that he was a scholar and a poet to whom some expertise in chemistry as well as physics was attributed, and that he died in the year 90 of the Hijra.

The conclusion to be drawn from all these facts is that the sciences of the ancients had reached the Muslims in the first century when they had conquered the lands of the non-Arabs [p. 45]. But the sciences had not spread among them widely and had not become generally known among them since the ancestors had prohibited them from becoming engrossed in them. However, [the Greek sciences] became popular in al-Barmakī's period, while their spread increased in the period of

al-Mā'mūn because of the innovations he stimulated and the occupation with the sciences of the ancients as well as the extinguishing of the *Sunnah* he promoted.

In *The History of Islam*,[52] it is [stated] that the first who introduced philosophy into al-Andalus a was Prince of al-Andalus, 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ḥakam ibn Hishām ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Mu'āwiyah ibn Hishām ibn 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān al-Umawī. He resembled al-Mā'mūn al-'Abbāsī in searching for philosophical books, and al-Walīd ibn 'Abd al-Malik in his tyranny. He was the first Umayyad who magnified the kingdom in al-Andalus and clad it with the most superb magnificence. He introduced into al-Andalus the wearing of embroidered cloths and the minting of *dirhams,* while there had existed no mint-house since its conquest by the Arabs. He died in 229 [H].

Al-Ghazālī said in his *Iḥyā*: Philosophy is not a separate science, but it comprises, four parts: The first is geometry and calculation; the second is logic; the third is theology; and the fourth is physics. We will provide a detailed explanation of these words below.

The First Who Mixed the Books of *Uṣūl* with Logic

Concerning the first who mixed the books of *uṣūl*[53] with it, Ibn Taymiyyah states in his book: "Never had anyone of the Muslim thinkers paid attention to the method of the logicians. Nay, the Ash'arites, the Mu'tazilites, the Karamites, the Shī'ites and the other denominations condemned logic and asserted its corruption. The first who mixed logic with the *uṣūl* of the Muslims was Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī. Muslim scholars disputed with him, so frequently that it would take too long to enumerate them all here [p. 46].

As for the beginning of its spread among the later scholars, al-Ḥāfiẓ 'Imād al-Dīn ibn Kathīr said in his book of history [under the events concerning] the year 687 [H]: "One year after the Tatars had occupied Baghdad, al-Khwājāh Naṣīr al-Ṭūsī made the astronomical laboratory, and he [also] made a House of Wisdom in which there were philosophers. Each of them earned three *dirhams* per day. There was also a House of Medicine for the medical doctors, who earned two *dirhams*. To each *Muḥaddith* who worked in *Dār al-Ḥadīth,* half a *dirham* was paid per day. From that time, the occupation with philosophical

sciences became widespread and prominent. [In earlier times,] people were only occupied by the philosophical sciences covertly. [However, now] instead of the recitation of the Qur'ān, Baghdad became filled by songs, melodies and the recitation of poems. Even after the recitation of Prophetic *Traditions,* [the people] studied Greek philosophy, the methods of theology and the Qarmatian interpretations.[54] Religious jurists were replaced by philosophers; instead of the 'Abbāsid Caliphs, there came the worst and most stupid rulers; instead of leadership and intelligence there came vileness and stupidity; instead of dilligent students, there came the stupid and the scoundrels; the occupation with different kinds of sciences such as exegesis, *Tradition,* jurisprudence and the interpretation of dreams was replaced by the *zajal, muwashshaḥ, dūbayt* and *mawālī.*[55] They were only occupied by these because of their sins. But God has never done injustice to His worshippers! These are the words of Ibn Kathīr.

The Leading Scholars of the Muslims Who Condemned or Prohibited Logic Explicitly

There is no doubt that a scholar who reached the degree of *ijtihād* is prohibited from fabricating a statement never expressed by any scholar before, or creating an opinion which has not been expressed before [p. 47]. Hence, one of the conditions for an independent legal investigation (*ijtihād*) is the knowledge of the statements – both unequivocal and controversial – of scholars from among the *Companions* ( ) and those after them. In order not to undermine the agreement concerning the view he chooses, he is obliged to mention the sayings of the scholars which are relevant to this subject before establishing the proof, so that the book is composed following the method of *ijtihād.*

Therefore I say: As for the *Companions* ( ) the Followers, and their Followers, there has not reached us any declaration of any sort concerning them because it did not exist in their time. It only started in the end of the second century, as mentioned before. In that time, *al-Imām* al-Shāfiʿī – with whom God may be well-pleased – was alive, so he discussed it. He was the oldest of those who expressed a depreciatory view concerning it.

The Statement of al-Imām al-Shāfiʿī on the Prohibition of Logic

In this regard Abū al-Ḥasan ibn Mahdī said: Muḥammad ibn Hārūn related to us that Hamīm ibn Humām related to us that Ḥarmalah told us saying: I heard al-Shāfiʿī saying: the ignorance of the people and their controversies are only caused by their leaving the language of the Arabs and their inclination to the language of Aristotle [p. 48]. This statement was quoted with this chain of transmittors by the *Qāḍī al-Muslimīn al-Ḥāfiẓ* ʿlzz al-Dīn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn *Qāḍī al-Quḍāt* Badr al-Dīn ibn Jamaʿa[56] in his *Tadhkirah*.

Al-Shāfiʿī pointed by this to what had happened in the period of al-Māʾmūn viz. the proclamation of the createdness of the Qurʾān, the negation of the [Divine] vision and other innovations. [He said that] the cause of this was to be found in the ignorance of Arabic and its rhetoric which comprises *al-maʿānī*, *al-bayān*, and *al-badīʿ*. His words "the language of the Arabs" comprise all these aspects. The texts of the Qurʾān and the *Sunnah* which are given in [that language], comprise all these aspects. [A second cause was that the rendering of [the Arabic texts] in accord with the language of the Greeks and the logic of Aristotle follows a system which is different from the language of the Arabs. The Qurʾān was only revealed and the *Sunnah* only came by using the terminology of the Arabs, their ways of discussion, communication, argumentation and deduction, which is not the same as the terminology of the Greeks. Each people has its language and conventional terminology. The Exalted God said:

> "We never sent any messenger but with the speech of his people, that he might make (things) clear to them."[57]

Whoever shifts from the tongue of religion to another tongue and renders the existing religious texts in accordance with it, is ignorant and goes astray.[58] He will never reach his goal. Therefore we see many logicians discussing a juridical question and wanting to render it according to their scientific principles, making mistakes and missing what the jurists have said, without following their [juridical] principles. People know what has happened between our *shaykh* mentioned in the preface [of this

book][59] and the Ḥanafite jurists viz. the many debates and controversies concerning *fatwās,* and their attribution to him of the fact that [those *fatwās*] did not follow the rules of jurisprudence. This was merely caused by the fact that he rendered them according to the principles of logical deduction. But the *Sharī'ah* possesses other principles, according to which the jurisprudence is formulated exclusively. Whoever leaves them and departs from them will not attain the goal of jurisprudence. [I say this], notwithstanding the fact that the *Shaykh* – with whom God may be well-pleased – is my teacher whose sandal is my crown. But this is the inescapable truth! He asked me several times to agree with his legal opinions related to the endowments but I did not agree with him concerning them at all [p. 49].

The aim of this discussion is the explanation of the statement of al-Shāfi'ī – with whom God may be well-pleased – namely stating that whoever renders the Qur'ān, the *Sunnah* and the *Sharī'ah* according to the requirement of the principles of logic, will not attain the cases and will err, while if the rendering is undertaken to solve the principle question, it will be ascribed to innovation. This is the weightiest argument to prohibit this art that it is the cause of fabrication and innovation contrary to the *Sunnah* as well as the aim of the legislator. It suffices [us] thereby as proof, derived from the words of al-Shāfi'ī – may God be pleased with him!

Corresponding to [the above-mentioned prohibition] is the prohibition against speculating about the ambiguous [passages] of the Qur'ān out of fear of distortion and dissension. The two *Shaykh*s and others related from 'Ā'ishah (g) that she said: the Messenger of God (ﷺ) recited this verse: "He it is Who hath sent down to thee the Book has included in it clearly formulated verses; these are the essence of the Book; other (verses) are ambiguous. Now for those whose hearts are inclined to fall away, they follow the ambiguous part of it, out of desire for dissension while seeking explanation, though no one knows its explanation except Allah: No one takes warning but those of insight."[60] He said: If you see the ones who follow up the ambiguous passages of [the Qur'ān], [then know that] those are the ones whom God named, and beware of them!

Al-Ṭabarānī narrated in *al-Kabīr* from Abū Mālik al-Ash'arī (d) that he had heard the Messenger of God (ﷺ) saying: I only fear for my community three characteristics, viz. that they will abound in property

and [hence] will envy one another and kill one another; that the book will be opened to them, and a believer will take it with him seeking its interpretation, but "no one knows its explanation except Allah" [p. 50].[61]

The First Who Asked About the Ambiguous Passages of the Qur'ān was 'Abd Allāh ibn Ṣabīgh

Al-Dārimī produced in his *Musnād* on the authority of Sulaymān ibn Yasār that a man called Ṣabīgh arrived at Madīnah and began to ask about the ambiguous passages of the Qur'ān. So 'Umar (d) (the II Caliph) sent for him. He had prepared for him datestalks and asked [him]: Who are you? He answered: I am 'Abd Allāh ibn Ṣabīgh. Then he took one of those datestalks and hit him with it until his head bled. In [another] narration on his authority, [it is stated that] he hit him with a palm branch until he felt grave pain. Then he left him until he recovered. Then he again hit him and left him until he recovered. Then, when he called him to come back [again], he said: If you want to kill me, kill me nicely! Then he permitted him to return to his country and wrote a letter to Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī (d) [asking him] not to let any Muslim befriend him.

Ibn 'Asākir in his *Tārīkh*[62] narrated on the authority of Anas that 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb lashed Ṣabīgh al-Kūfī because of a question [posed by him] concerning a variant reading (*ḥarf*)[63] of the Qur'ān till the blood flew from his back.

Naṣr al-Maqdisī in *al-Ḥujja* and Ibn 'Asākir narrated on the authority of al-Sā'ib ibn Yazīd that a man said to 'Umar b. Khaṭṭāb (d): I passed by a man asking about (some) difficult passage of the Qur'ān [p. 51]. Then 'Umar (d) said: "O God, enable me to meet him. Indeed, one day the man came to 'Umar (d) asking him [about it]. Then 'Umar stood and rolled up his sleeves and began to lash him. Then he said: "Clothe him in breeches, place him on a camel's saddle and then send him to his [own] clan! Then let a preacher standup and say: Ṣabīgh sought knowledge, but failed to gain it. Thus, he is still ignoble among his people after having been a chief among them.

Naṣr al-Maqdisī and Ibn 'Asākir narrated on the authority of Abū

'Uthmān al-Nahdī that 'Umar (d) wrote a letter to the people of Basra [asking them] not to befriend Ṣabīgh. He said: Would he have come, we would certainly have split, even if we had been a hundred [people].

Ibn 'Asākir narrated on the authority of Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn, saying that 'Umar b. Khaṭṭāb (d) wrote to Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī (d) [the governor asking him] not to befriend Ṣabīgh and to stop his payment and sustenance.

Naṣr in *al-Ḥujja* and Ibn 'Asākir narrated on the authority of Zur'a, saying: I saw Ṣabīgh ibn 'Asal in Baṣra where he looked like a scabby camel. He came to a group of people and sat down where they did not know him. Then the other group called them: By order of the Commander of the Faithful, 'Umar (d)! Then they stood up and called for him. Shaykh Naṣr al-Maqdisī narrated in *al-ḥujja* on the authority of Abū Isḥāq that 'Umar (d) wrote to Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī: Al-Aṣbagh has exerted himself sufficiently and lost what he had power over. If this letter of mine comes, do not give him a pledge of allegiance; if he is ill, do not visit him; and if he dies, do not attend [his burial].

Naṣr also narrated on the authority of Abū Ḥurayrah, saying: When we were with 'Umar ibn Khaṭṭāb (d), suddenly a man came to him asking about the Qur'ān, viz. whether it is created or not. Then 'Alī said: This is a word which will bear fruit! If I were invested with your authority, I would cut off his head!

The Prohibition of al-Shāfi'ī to Study Theology

For this very reason, al-Shāfi'ī - may God be pleased with him – prohibited the study of theology [p. 52]. Al-Harawī produced in his book, Condemnation of Theology (*Kitāb Dhamm al-Kalām*): It was narrated concerning the theologians and 'Umar's verdict on Ṣabīgh that this [verdict] from him indicates that the effective cause for him to prohibit the study of theology was fear for its stimulation of confusions and its leading to innovations. Thus he forbade it, based on an analogy with the prohibition of speculating about the ambiguous passages of the Qur'ān. This analogy is sound.

This very effective cause is in fact found in logic as well, as mentioned by al-Shāfi'ī. So the evidence for the prohibition of the study of it is deducted by analogy from the original case to which theology was

compared, namely the ambiguous [verses of the Qur'ān] which it is explicitly forbidden to speculate about. This is a valid analogy which is weakened neither by a contradiction nor an objection. Maybe the opponent [of this kind of analogy] refutes the existence of the effective cause mentioned in logic, but this kind of refutation is [a kind of] contention. No attention should be paid to it, because induction and deduction invalidate it.

Al-Dhahabī said in *al-Mīzān* in the biography of Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Zagūnī, the Ḥanbalite jurist. He has a number of writings containing elements of the explanations of the Mu'tazila. He attributed him therewith because he supported them. But this is not one of his characteristics. However, it is rare that someone who studies theology is not led by his investigation to contradict the domain of the *Sunnah.*

On this ground, the scholars of the ancient generation condemned studying the science of the ancients [asserting] that theology has its origin in the science of the materialist philosophers [p. 53]. Whoever wants to combine skillfully the science of the Prophets (عليهم السلام) and that of the philosophers will inevitably contradict both of them. But whoever gives up and walks behind the message released by the messengers (عليهم السلام), without being pedantic or extreme – may God bless them for releasing their messages without going too far! follows the course of the pious ancestors. This religion and belief are blameless. We ask God for the blamelessness of our religion. (End of quotation).

It may also be claimed that this particular form, viz the prohibition of the study of logic falls under the general scope of the texts which denote explicitly the prohibition of anything which stimulates corruption or anything from which dissension may be feared. So the prohibition would be deduced from the general meaning of the texts and not from the specific result of the deduction by analogy. The deductionist has to make use of both matters, so that both arguments support one another, while the peculiar result of the analogical deduction matches the general meaning of the texts.

The Qur'ān Uses the Way of Thinking of the Arabs and Their Conventional Terminology

A remark: The comments of one of the scholars of the rational

[sciences] on God's saying "If there were any gods in the two of them except Allah, there would have been confusion in both…"[64] [that scholar] testifies to the soundness of what al-Shāfi'ī referred to. He said: This is a convincing argument, because He aimed at rendering it following the principles of logical deduction. But the Qur'ān follows the way of thinking of the Arabs and their conventional terminology in the argumentation. The leading rhetoricians have classified the expression (*īrād*) of this Qur'ānic passage into the prosodic kind of [expression], which is called by later scholars as a theological matter and [a kind of] speculative argumentation; while the Arabs and the Muslims after them to whom the Qur'ān was revealed said that this verse is one of the weightiest arguments for the unity of God [p. 54]. If a human being is ashamed before God, he will not speak about [this verse] with such words. I do not aim by this as derogation (*al-ḥaṭ*) of the mentioned man, but as explanation that logic does not lead [us] to anything good. Whoever pays attention to it, is far away from grasping the objectives of the *Sharī'ah*. Thus there is a grave distance between him and religious truths. Corresponding to this is what also befell the mentioned man when he was [interpreting] the words of the Exalted God: "They will ask thee about the new moons …" until the end of the verse.[65] He said: They asked about the crescent which did not appear in a thin form, then it increased gradually till it was full. So they were answered by explaining the underlying reason for it! And he turned away from answering what they asked about, because they were not among those who are investigating easily the details of astronomy. This saying comprises some distinct fallacies: The first is that the Occasions of the Revelation indicate that they asked about the underlying reason not about what he mentioned. Secondly, it is unworthy to suspect that the *Companions* (f) who had a deeper comprehension than all non-Arabs and than the whole *ummah* did not belong to those who investigate the details of astronomy easily, while individuals of the later non-Arab [scholars] have investigated them. Third, that it was beyond Divine omnipotence to convey this to their minds through an expression which they could comprehend. Fourth, the *Companions* (f) have studied many details of religious jurisprudence, difficult parts of the laws of inheritance, as well as of the acts of the hearts. What is the science of astronomy in comparison to that? It is

more despicable and contemptible, even if it is based on a principle that deserves to be taken into consideration. Most of the science is baseless and not supported by any argument [p. 55]. In contrast, arguments derived from the Prophetic *Traditions* and reports point to the contrary, as I explained in a separate composition. The author of this treatise was encouraged to compose it and the like by his striving [to study] the philosophical sciences and his being excited by intellectual abstruseness, with the result that he even thought that it was only easy for him and for his equals and that is impossible for anyone [else] to reach them easily, even the *Companions*! But to Allah we belong, and to Him is our return! Al-Quṭb al-Rāzī asked the *Shaykh* Taqiy al-Dīn al-Subkī about the prophetic *Tradition* [stating]: "Every child is born in the original disposition," and cast doubts on it derived from logic. The *Shaykh* Taqiy al-Dīn answered that the accident (*al-maḥūl fih*) in it was equal to its substance (*al-mawḍū*) and not more specific than it. He argued for this similarity by a Divine light [springing from the one] who was strengthened by prophecy.

Then he carried a long discussion in which he finally said: It is not possible to relate this Prophetic *Tradition* to it, but had this occurred in the words of someone other than the Prophet (ﷺ) – may God bless him and grant him peace – it would have been possible to do so. Then al-Quṭb al-Rāzī repeated the discussion about it saying: You negated the possibility of relating this *Tradition* to it, while you confirmed the possibility of relating the words of any one else to it; what is the difference? Then al-Subkī answered him that the person who says this is either insane or sealed-hearted so that he cannot differentiate between the speech of a prophet (عليه السلام) and that of others.

The Reason for the Innovation is Ignorance of the Language of the Arabs

I found that the ancestors before al-Shāfiʿī have indicated what he indicated, viz. that the reason for the innovation is ignorance of the language of the Arabs. Al-Bayhaqī narrated concerning *al-baʿth*,[66] on the authority of al-Aṣmaʿī: ʿAmr ibn ʿUbayd came to Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlā to discuss with him [the issue of] the necessity of the punishment

for the disobedient: He told him: O ye Abū ‘Amr. Does God break His promise? He answered: God will never break His promise. Then ‘Amr said: But [God] said: … and he then mentioned the verse of *wa‘īd* [threat].[67] Abū ‘Ubayd then said: You have a non-Arab background! The threat is not a promise (*al-ī‘ād*), then he recited a passage of a poem:

> "And verily, whether I threaten him or promise him, I fail to perform my threat, but fulfil my promise."

Al-Bukhārī narrated in his *Great History* on the authority of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī that he said: The only thing destroying them was their lack of having Arabic!

Ibn Qutaybah in his Book on the Interpretation of the Difficult Passages of the Qur’ān

Ibn Qutaybah in his book *Ta’wīl Mushkil al-Qur’ān* said: The only person who knows the excellence of the Qur’ān is the one who studies it often and has a broad knowledge [of it] and understands the ways of expression of the Arabs, the influence on the styles [of expressions] and [the points by which] God has distinguished the language of the Arabs above all the [other] languages. Certainly, there is not a single community to which eloquence as well as variety of expressions was given like those given by God specifically to the Arabs. Thus God made his knowledge, like He made the knowledge of every prophet among the messengers most similar to the things that exist in the era in which he was sent. Thus, to Mūsā (علیه السلام) belonged [the power to] split the sea, the hand, the cane as well as the eruption of the sea of Tīh as well as the other signs in the period of magic. To ‘Īsa (علیه السلام) belonged [the capability to] revive the dead, create birds from clay, cure leprosy, and other signs in the period of medicine. To Muḥammad (ﷺ) belonged the Qur’ān, the like of which could not be produced by the whole of mankind and genii, even if they were to gather together to do so and even if they would back up each other with help and support and the other signs in the period of *al-hayān*.

The preacher of the Arabs when he extemporized a speech at a wedding, a *taḥdīd*, a truce, etc. did not express it in one rhythm (*wād*)

but would fluctuate, sometimes abridging it for moderation, sometimes prolonging it with the purpose of making it better understood. Sometimes he would repeat it with the purpose of assertion, while concealing some of its meanings so they became obscure for most of the audience.

He might reveal some of it in order that some of the non-Arabs could understand it; he might allude to something and mention it metonymically [p. 58]. His attention to the speech would be in accordance with the condition and the consideration of the gathering, the quantity of the congregation as well as the nobility of the position. Moreover, he would not bring a completely corrected and purified speech, but one that was mixed, denoting the abundant with the deficient, the thick with the thin. All poetical metres into one metre, its goodness *la baḥasahu bahā'uhu wa la salabahu mā'uhu*. It is like a flame of the live coal which you take out to kindle; like two planets coming close, the two lights diminish and the cloud is strung with *yāqūt*, *marjān*, *'aqīq* and *'uqbān*. He does not make all of it of one kind, viz the noble with the high-priced and the valuable with the preserved.

The words of the Arabs are based on 28 letters. They are the utmost limits of the tongue, while the words of all the [other] communities are less than 28 letters. I can not find in any of their speeches a letter which is not found in our letters unless deviating a little in its pronunciation, like the intermediate letter uttered between the utterance of *qāf* and *kāf,* and the intermediate letter which is uttered between the utterance of *bā'* and *fā'*. This is the way the Arabs construct their words. To them belong the desinential inflection (*al-i'rāb*) which God created as a means to express them and as a power to order them and as a distinction in some conditions between two similar speeches and two different meanings*,* like the subject and the object. There is no difference between the two if the conditions of both of them are the same, viz when it is possible that the verb belongs to both of them, except by [using] its desinential inflection.

Thus, when someone says: *Hādhā qatīlun akhī* with *tanwīn;* while the other says:

> *Hādhā qatīlun akhī* with the prefixing, the *tanwīn* certainly denotes that he did not kill him while the omission of *tanwīn* denotes that he in fact killed him.

And when someone reads *falā yaḥzunka qawluhum innā naʿlam ma yusirruna wa mā yuʿlinūn,* (so let not what they say grieve thee; verily We know what they keep secret and what they say publicly) with the *fatḥ* and departs from the rule of being inchoative by [reading it] *anna* [instead of *innā*], and he made *al-qawl* in it to work as *nasb,* following the school of those who pronounce the *alif* of *anna* with *nasb* after *al-qawl,* like they pronounce it [*anna*] after *al-ẓann,* he turns the meaning certainly away from its [right] direction and shifts it from its course, he makes the Prophet (ﷺ) become sad because of their saying: "Verily God knows what they hide as well as what they disclose."[68] This is a form of unbelief from the part of him who does so deliberately and a sort of grammatical mistake, which is not allowed to expressed during the prayer, and worshippers are not allowed to tolerate it [p. 59].

The Messenger of God (ﷺ) said: "*Lā yuqtal quraysh sabran baʿd al-yawm,*"Quraysh is not allowed to be killed after this day. Whoever pronounces it in the apocopate form (viz. *lāyuqtal*), implies as the apparent meaning that the Qurayshite is neither to be killed if he apostatized, nor to be afflicted by the retaliation (*qiṣāṣ*) if he has killed. Whoever pronounces the final consonant with u (*rafʿ*) it as *rafʿ,* shifts the interpretation to the predicate of Quraysh, namely is that he does not like one of them [the Qurayshes] to withdraw from Islam, thus deserving to be killed. As you see, the desinential inflection is how one differentiates between these two meanings.

The two meanings differ by one letter by [using] the *haraka al-bināʾ,* by saying for instance: a man is cursed (*luʿna*) if the people curse him; but if he used to curse the people they say he is a curse (*laʿna*), by vocalizing *ʿayn* with a *fathā.* And a man is insulted if the people insult him. But if he used to insult himself, they say that a man insulted him. The same is true of *huzʿat* [one who is mocked] and *huzaat* (one who mocks) *ḍahika* (laughing at), *khudaʿa* (one who deceives), *khadʿa* (delusion).

Two close meanings sometimes differ by changing a single letter so that the similarity between the two words is like the similarity between the two meanings [p. 60]. This is the case when they call salted water, which is drunk only in a state of emergency, *sharūb,* while it is called *sharīb* when [there is less salt] so the water can be drunk. Thus they

call a drop of urine falling on a cloth, if it is as small as the heads of a needle, *nuṣḥ*, so it is valid. One is to sprinkle water on it, the sprinkling serving in lieu of washing. If there is more than that, then it is called *nuḍh* (to sprinkle). This can only be compensated by washing. Similarly, they call the act of holding with the fingers *qabḍ* (to grasp), the same word used for holding in the palm of the hand. To eat with the utmost parts of the teeth is *qadm* (to crunch), and to eat with the whole of the mouth is *khaḍm*.

Something that rises from the earth is called *ḥazn* (rugged and hard ground), but if it stands out a little more it is called *ḥazm* (elevated ground). The person who suffers from cold is [called] *khaṣir* (a man feeling cold in his extremities); if this is mixed with hunger, it is called *khirṣ* (hungry and cold). A flame that becomes extinguished is called *ḥāmida* (in a state of extinction), but if its flame ceases while something of its coal still exists it is called *ḥādida*. A camel standing is *sā'im* (standing upon its four legs) but if it attenuated because of being bruised it is called *ṣāfin* (standing upon three legs and the extremity of the hoof of the fourth leg). *'Atā* (to give) is first called *shakl,* but if it is a compensation then it is called *shakm* (recompense). Committing a single mistake in speech is called *ghalṭah* (a mistake), but if it is for calculation, it is called *ghalaṭ* (committing error). The straightness in the eye is called *khawas* (narrow eyes), thus it is said *khuwiṣat 'aynuh takhuṣu khawṣā, wa rajulun akhwaṣ wa 'mra'atun khawṣa'u.* The likes can also be called *al-khawṣ* (narrowness or contraction of the outer angle of the eye) [p. 61]. The origin of *al-ḥawṣ* is *al-ḥawṣ* which stands for enclosing the eye (*ḥiyāṭa al-'ayn*), but if it is in its end, it is called *ḥaws* (to sew up).

One thing may comprise many meanings, so from each meaning is derived the name of such a thing, like the derivation of *mubṭīn* from *al-baṭn al-khamīs* (empty belly); one who is big in the belly is called *khalqat al-baṭīn;* but if it is because of much eating, it is called *mibṭān* (big or large in the belly in consequence of much eating). The insatiable is called *baṭn* while belly sickness is called *mabṭūn* (having a complaint of the belly).

They say: *wajadta al-ḍālla* and *wajadta fi al-qaṣab, wa wajadta fi'l-ḥuzn wa wajadta fi 'l-istighnā.* All are attributed by *fatḥ,* and then they make substantive (*al-ism*) in *al-ḍālat wujūdan* and *wujdānan* [viz

wajadta wujud or wujdān al-ḍālat], and in *al-ḥuzn wujdan* [viz *wajadta fi'l-ḥujn wujdān*], in *al-ghaḍab mawjuda* [viz *wajadta fi'l-ghaḍab mawjidatan*], and in *al-istighrā'i wajdan* [viz *wajadta fī'l-istighnā" wujdan*] stand for many things.

To the Arabs belong the metaphors in their speech. Their meaning is the method of the saying and its source of derivation. So some of them are *al-isti'ārah, al-tamthīl, al-qalb, al-taqdīm, al-ta'ḥīr, hādḥf, al-tikrār, al-ikhfā, nuzhār, al-ta'rīd, al-ifsaḥ, al-kināya, al-idāḥ, mukhāṭabat al-wāhid, mukhātabat al-jamī*. All communicate the one with the other; the groups speak with both. The objective is that the particular word stands for the general meaning and the general word stands for particular meaning. You will see many things in the chapter on *al-majāz* (metaphor), If Allah wills.

The Qur'ān was revealed in accordance with all these rules [p. 62]. Therefore no one of the translators is able to translate it into any of the languages like the Bible was translated from the Syriac language to Abyssinian and Greek. The Torah, the Book of Psalms and all the books of God – the Exalted and the Eternal – were translated into Arabic because the metaphors of the non-Arabs are not of the same extensive range as those of the Arabs. Do you not see yourself that if you want to translate His words: *"wa imma takhāfanna min qawmin khiyānatan fa 'nbidh ilayhim 'alā sawā;"* "if you fear treachery at all from any people throw back to them (their covenant) equally."[69] You cannot have these words derived directly from a meaning which you put down so that you encompass the whole of it and understand their contexts and show their hidden meanings.

Thus we can say: If there is a truce and a covenant between you and a people, and you worry for their unfaithfulness and that they might break it, tell them that you broke what you stipulated to them, and let them wage war in order that you and they know the breaking equally. The same holds for His word: *"faḍarabnā 'ala Ādhānihim fi 'l-kahf sinīna 'adada:"*[70] "So we sealed up their ears in the cave for a number of years." If you translate this literally, the person to whom it is translated will not understand it. If you say: "We have made them dead for years," you are a translator of the meaning and not of the actual words. This also holds true for the words of the

Exalted and the Eternal "*wa'l-ladhīnā idhā dhukkiru bi āyāti rabbihim lam yakhirru 'alayhā ṣumman wa 'umyānā*," (Those who, when they are admonished with the Signs of their Lord, droop not down at them as if they were deaf or blind).[71] If you translate this literally, it can not be understood. But if you say *lam yataghaffalū* (they neglected not) you have provided the meaning by using another. The book of God has been opposed with criticism by the impugners of religion.

They talk nonsense about it, left it, and followed its ambiguous passages by wishing dissension and allegorical interpretation, making use of dull understandings, poor sights and far-fetched speculation [p. 63]. So they took words out of context, and shifted them from their courses. Then they judged them to be contradictory, an impossibility, an error, a corruption in *naẓm* and in controversy. Then they provided argument that might convince the weak and the inexperienced. So they spread the confusion in the hearts and put doubts in the minds. Even though their inclination depends on their own consideration and interpretation, he who continues to be the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) already criticized this providing of proof from the Qur'ān against him, thus turning it to science because of his prophecy, and to the proof of his trustworthiness, challenging him, passage after passage, to bring a *sūrah* similar to it. Nevertheless, they are scholars of eloquence, rhetoricians, preachers, poets, and some of human kind who are characterized by sharp tongues and strong opposition in dispute together with mind, intelligence, and accuracy of opinion. God has described them thereby in several places of the Book. Sometimes they used to say the words are magic, poetry, and the words of *kāhins,* and sometimes they say they are myths of the ancients.

But the Holy Qur'ān did not tell [us] about them. Neither did any of the narrations convey to us that they would attack it from the side of the critics. Thus, I wished to draw good advice from the book of God, and to support it with clear arguments and evidences, and reveal to the people what they want. So I composed this book, to comprehend the interpretation of the ambiguous passages of the Qur'ān, deriving this from the exegesis with additional explanations. It comprises [information] about which I do not know any treatise by a scholar enjoying authority for his expertise in the languages of the Arabs. [By composing this book, I want] to show the obstinate, the place of faithlessness and the way of potentiality without deciding the matter by an opinion or judging it by an interpretation [p. 64].

According to al-Shāfiʿī, the Reason for the Prohibition of Theology is to be Found in Logic

(There is no command to [make use of] it which can be found in the Qurʾān and the *Sunnah*).

Al-Shāfiʿī indicated another reason concerning [the prohibition] of theology. It can be found in logic. Al-Nawawī condemned theology on the authority of al-Karābisī[72] who said: I saw al-Shāfiʿī, while Bishr al-Marīsī came to see him. He said to Bishr: Tell me what you are propagating. Is it [studying] an eloquent and rational book, a binding obligation and an established prophetic *Tradition* about which you found that the ancestors studied and questioned it? Then Bishr answered: *Lā illā annahu lā yasaʿunā khilāfuhu* (It is only that we cannot stand for its contention). Then al-Shāfiʿī said: You confessed yourself that you made a mistake. What is the use of disputation in jurisprudence and Prophetic *Traditions*? When he left, al-Shāfiʿī said: He is not happy.

This statement denotes that the reason for the prohibition against studying theology is that there is no command [to make use of] it to be found in the Qurʾān and the *Sunnah*. No discussion about it can be found among the ancestors. This is also the case with logic, namely that there is no command [to make use of] it to be found in the Qurʾān and the *Sunnah*. There is no discussion held by the ancestors about it, contrary to the study of Arabic which is commanded in the *Tradition*. Discussion about this can be found among the ancestors. This is the reason upon which Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ relied, when he decided to prohibit logic, saying: Being occupied by learning and teaching it is not allowed by the Law-giver nor by any of the *Companions* (R.A.), Followers, and leading scholars who reached the degree of *ijtihād*. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ seems to have deduced this reason from the reasoning by al-Shāfiʿī about theology [p. 65].

According to al-Shāfiʿī, Another Reason for the Prohibition of Theology can be Found in Logic

(The fact that its style is different from that of the Qurʾān and the *Sunnah*).

Al-Shāfiʿī has indicated a third reason to prohibit theology found

in logic. Al-Harawī also produced [argument based on the authority of] Abū Thawr,[73] who said: I heard al-Shāfiʿī say: My judgment of theologians is that they should be hit by a palm-branch, put on a camel and shown around the communities and tribes. This is the punishment for those who have neglected the Qurʾān and the *Sunnah* and approached theology.

By the authority of al-Shāfiʿī, he said: My way of dealing with the theologians is to strike their heads with whips and drive them away from their lands. This statement denotes that the reason for the prohibition of the speculation in theology is identified in the fact that its style is different from the Qurʾān and the *Sunnah*. Or it is because of neglecting the Qurʾān and the *Sunnah* and forgetting them. This reason also pertains to logic.

Indication of the Prohibition of the Philosophical Sciences: Statement of al-Shāfiʿī

In condemning theology, al-Harawī said: Ghālib ibn ʿAlī told us that Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn related to us that al-Ḥasan ibn Rashiq told us that Saʿīd ibn Aḥmad ibn Zakariyā al-Lahmī told us that Yunūs ibn ʿAbd al-Aʿlā related to us that he said: I heard al-Shāfiʿī saying: If I hear a man calling a name for the unnamed and a thing nothing, then testify against him that he is a heretic!

The Statement of Abū Ḥanīfah in Condemning the Philosophical Sciences

A statement on the authority of Abū Ḥanīfah – may God be pleased with him – was mentioned explicitly for condemning the philosophical sciences. In condemning theology, al-Harawī said: Tayyib ibn Aḥmad told me that Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn told us that Abū al-Qāsim ibn Matawayh told us that Ḥamīd ibn Rustam related to us that al-Ḥasan ibn al-Muṭīʿ that Ibrāhīm ibn Rustam said on the authority of ... : I said to Abū Ḥanīfah: What are your comments on the disputes people innovated about the forms and bodies? Then he said: [These are] the utterances of the philosophers. You have to follow the *Tradition* and the course of

the ancestors and beware of any novelties because they are innovations. This was produced by al-Muẓaffar ibn al-Samʿānī in *Kitāb al-Intiṣār,* who said: A reliable man from among our friends related to us that al-Shaykh Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī related to us that Abū al-Qāsim ibn Matawayh told it to us.

Kalām was also explicitly prohibited following the principles of the rest of the founders of the schools. They argued this prohibition on the basis of the content of logic. For this reason later scholars of their adherents prohibited it explicitly, applying their principles.

By the authority of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī al-Harawī said: I came to see Mālik to whom a man was asking a question. He said: Maybe you are one of ʿAmr ibn ʿUbayd's adherents. God has cursed ʿAmr, because he fabricated the innovations of theology. If theology were a [real] science, the *Companions* and the Followers would have discussed it, as they have discussed the religious rules and laws.

This statement from Mālik who states clearly the reason for the prohibition of theology, like [the argument] on the authority of al-Shāfiʿī, mentioned earlier, and relying on Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ concerning logic. Likewise, all the leading Muslim scholars who explicitly prohibited theology also identified its *ʿillā* in [the fact] that the ancestors did not discuss it. Thus [also] the prohibition of logic was produced following their principles because of the existence of this *ʿillā* in it. Therefore it is necessary that we trace statements of the leading scholars concerning the prohibition of theology and their words about that. Consequently, we will continue dealing with the subject-matter at hand.

Notes and References

1.   Madjid, Nurcholish, *Ibn Taymiyya in 'Kalam' and 'Falsafa' (A Problem of Reason and Revelation in Islam*), Michigan, UMI Dissertation Services, 1997, p. 221.
2.   Fakhry, Majid, *A History of Islamic Philosophy*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1983, 2nd Edn., pp. 10-11.
3.   Van Koningsveld, P.S., "Greek Manuscripts in the Early Abbāsid Empire: Fiction

and Facts about their Origin, Translation and Destruction," in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, LV no. 3/4, Mei-August, 1998, pp. 345-370.

4. Von Grunebaum, G.E., "Islam and Hellenism," in *Logic in Classical Islamic Culture* (Ed.) G.E. von Grunebaum, Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1970, p. 25.

5. Gibb, Sir. H.A., "The Influence of Islamic Culture on Medieval Europe," in *Bulletin of the John Ryland's Library*, Manchester, 38, 1955, pp. 82-98.

6. The 'umar cycle refers to the group of Muslim scholars who were hostile to 'things foreign', including the sciences of the Greek. This cycle are the proponent of the policy of the Caliph 'Umar ibn Khaṭṭāb (d) who issued an order to Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ (d) for the destruction of Persian books during the Muslim conquest. They upheld the truth of a notorious legend 'according to which Caliph 'Umar had ordered his general 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ (d) to destroy the famous ancient library of Alexandria, after the conquest of the city by the Muslim army.' Van Koningsveld *op. cit.*, pp. 362-365.

7. Abrahamov, Binyamin, *Islamic Theology: Traditionalism and Rationalism,* Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1998, vol. ii-x, pp. 1-12.

8. It is plausible that Aḥmad rejected the concept of the createdness of the Qur'ān, for, according to Wensinck, the doctrine was understood by Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal as 'the very heart of the question of the qualities. We [viz Wensinck] may suppose, therefore, that his rigorous defence of the eternity of the Qur'ān had its root in the feeling that this dogma followed from the unique nature of the Holy Book, whereas the Mu'tazilite view in his eyes tended to lower the position of the words of Allah.' See Wensinck, A.J., *The Muslim Creed, Its Genesis and Historical Development*, New Delhi, Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1979, 2nd Edn., p. 86.

9. Al-Ghazālī's attempt to disguise his adoption of Aristotelian logic by including it in his books on legal theory drew fervent criticism from a number of scholars of the traditionalist group, such as Abū Isḥāq al-Marjinānī (d. 513/1119), al-Qushayrī, al-Turtūshī (d. 520), al-Mazīrī, Ibn al-Salāḥ and al-Nawawī. See Al-Nashshār, 'Ali Sāmi, *Manāhij al-Baḥth 'inda Mufākkiri al-Islām,* Cairo, Dār al-Ma'arif, 1978, pp. 143-144.

10. Abrahamov *op. cit.*, p. 27.

11. Al-Nashshār *op. cit.*, p. 224.

12. The printed edition of *Sawn al-Manṭiq* that I rely on in this translation was edited by 'Alī Shāmi al-Nashshār and Su'āda 'Alī 'Abd al-Rāziq, Cairo, Dār al-Nashr wa'l-Tibā'a, 1970.

13. In this work al-Suyūṭī discusses either explicitly or incidentally the opposition of more than 40 leading scholars of various law schools against logic by referring to more than 28 works which deal either explicitly or incidentally with the same issue.

14. *Ḥādhihī muqaddimat al-'ulūm kulliha wā man lā yuḥīṭu bihī falā thiqata lahū bi'ulūmih aṣlan.* [Logic] is the introduction to all sciences. One who is not well versed in it, his authority in the sciences is not reliable at all.' The first who heralds this – generally claimed – is al-Ghazālī, in the introduction of *Al-Mustasfā fi Uṣūl al-Fiqh,* Cairo, al-Matba'a al-Amiriyya, 1322/1904, I, 10.

15. This refers to one of al-Suyūṭī's chief opponents, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Mun‘im al-Jawjarī, one of al-Suyūṭī's rivals ever since they were in the Ḥijaz together as students in 869/1464-5. According to Sartain al-Jawjarī called a meeting for a formal debate in the presence of the sultan, emirs and other notables. In response to the calling, al-Suyūṭī requested the presence of two other *mujtahid*s besides himself, one to debate with him and one to referee, since he could not debate with any individual of inferior status. See, Sartain, E.M., *Jal‘āl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī: Biography and Background,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1975, p. 59.

16. Muḥyi al-Dīn Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Kafyajī the Ḥanafite": Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān ibn Sa‘d ibn Mas‘ūd al-Rūmī al-Barghamī to whom was given surname al-Kafijī because of his being occupied much by the book *al-Kāfiyah* on grammar. He was one of the teachers of al-Suyūṭī to whom he had drawn attention *Isagoge*, an Introduction to Logic by Porpyry. He was born in 788/1387 and died in 879/1475. See, al-Suyūṭī, *Kitāb al-Taḥadduth bi Ni'mati 'llāh,* Cairo, al-Matba‘a al-‘Arabiyya al-Haditha, Ed. E.M. Sartain, pp. 29-124.

17. The abridgement of Ibn Taymiyyah's *Naṣiḥah Ahl al-Īmān fī al-Radd ‘alā Manṭiq al-Yūnān.*

18. A part of rhetoric dealing with verbal expression of concepts and content. See, Ruhī al-Ba‘albākī, *al-Mawrid, Arabic English Dictionary*, Beirut, Dār al-‘Ilm li 'l-Malāyinī, 1988.

19. Branch of Arabic rhetoric, dealing with metaphorical language and rhetorical art of the Arabs generally. *Ibid.*

20. A part of rhetoric dealing with figures of speech and the art of beautiful style generally. *Ibid.*

21. The original sentence is cut off here. Perhaps it is *fī taḥrīmih* [to prohibit it].

22. Aristotle was the son of Nicomachus, the son of Asclepius. His mother, Phaestics, descended from one of the colonists who led the Greek settlers from Chalcis to Stagira. He was born ca. 384 B.C. during the archonship of Diotrephes (384-383 B.C.). He died in 322 B.C. at the age of sixty-three. See Chroust, Anton-Herman, *Aristotle New Light on his Life and Some of His Lost Works,* London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973, I, p. 73.

23. Istakhr or Stagira (also Staegeiros or Stagiros) was a city assigned to either Macedonia or Thrace. Stagira was founded during the 31st Olympiad or in 656-652 B.C. It was a joint colony of Andros (the island of Aristotle's paternal ancestors) and Chalcis, the town of Aristotle's maternal ancestors. Stagira was a relatively poor and unimportant town, which was destroyed during the Chaldician War (349-348 B.C.). Chroust *op. cit.*, I, pp. 288, 11.

24. Perhaps Azdashīr ibn Dārā is identical with Diotrephes (384-383 B.C.). See, Chroust *op. cit.*, I, p. 73.

25. Al-Shahrastānī: Abū al-Fatḥ Muḥammad ibn Abī al-Qāsim, a thinker and historian of religious and philosophical doctrines who was born in Shahristān, Khurasān (currently in the Republic of Turkmenistan). His monumental work, *al-milal wa 'l-nihal* was written in 521/1127. He died in 548/1153. See, Monnot, G., ‘al-Shahrastānī,' EI2, IX, pp. 214-216.

26. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ was born in 577/1181 in Irbīl and died in Damascus in 643/1245.

His *Muqaddimat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ fi 'Ulūm al-Hadīth* was considered the standard work on the science of the *Tradition,* and who was considered by al-Suyūṭī himself as one of the most knowledgeable persons of his time in Exegesis, *Tradition* and Jurisprudence. See, al-Suyūṭī, TH, 500.

27. Muḥyi al-Dīn Abū Zakariyyā' Yaḥyā ibn Sharaf ibn Mira ibn Ḥasan ibn Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Jumʿa ibn Ḥizām al-Hizāmī al-Dimashqī, who was born in *Muḥarram* 631/October 1233 in Nawa south of Damascus and died on Wednesday, 24 *Rajab* 676/22 December 1277 in Nawa. Heffening, W., "al-Nawawi" in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, Leiden and New York, E.J. Brill, 1993, Ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al.*, vol. VII, pp. 1041-1042.

28. Abū Yūsuf Yaʿqūb ibn Isḥāq, well-known as "the philosopher of the Arabs" and the author of almost 225 treatises, was given several acknowledgements by several medieval Muslim scholars. Ibn al-Nadīm regards him as the closest to Aristotle among the Muslim philosophers. Al-Kindī, according to Ibn al-Juljul, was the one who has written an essay on *tawḥīd* according to the methods of the Logicians. Bayhaqī considered al-Kindī to have combined in his works the principles of the law and those of the rational sciences. Ibn al-Khaldūn, however, does not include him in his list of Islamic philosophers, despite frequent references to him. See, Jolivet, J & R. Rashed, "al-Kindī," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1986, Ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al.*, vol. V, pp. 122-123.

29. Ibn Zūlāq: Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan ibn Ibrāhīm al-Laythī who was born in 306/919 and died in 386/996 was an Egyptian historian, the author of a number of biographical, historical and topographical works on Egypt in the time of Ihsidid and the early Fāṭimids. See, Lewis, B. *et al.*, 'Ibn Zulaq,' in EI2, III, p. 979.

30. In *Jahd al-Qariḥa*, al-Suyūṭī identifies the poet with Ibn al-Qushayrī. See, Hallaq, W.B., *Ibn Taymiyya Against the Greek Logicians*, *Translation with an Introduction and Notes,* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993, p. 173.

31. *Kitāb al-Shifā'* (book of the healing [of the soul]) is one of the two principle works besides *al-Qānūn fi al-Tibb* (canon of medicine) of Ibn Sina which made him an undisputed master in medicine, natural science, and philosophy (EI2, II, 944). According to Jaʿfar ʿAlī Yasīn, the book is written because of (1) the urge of Ibn Sīnā's disciples who asked him to write a comprehensive encyclopaedia in philosophy; (2) the defence for the intellectual dispute in which he was engaged; and (3) his inclination and keenness on being occupied with Greek sciences. See, Yasīn, Jaʿfar ʿAlī, *Faylasuf ʿAlim: Dirasa Taḥlīliyya li ḥayāt ibn Sīnā' wa Fikrih al-Falsafi,* Beirut, Dār al-Andalus, 1984/1404, 1st Edn., pp. 74-75.

32. Viz, The Prophet Muḥammad (ﷺ).

33. Viz, *Naṣīhat Ahl al-Imān fi al-Radd ʿalā Manṭiq al-Yūnān*.

34. Ibn Taymiyyah *al-Radd ʿalā al-Mantiqiyyīn*, (Ed. ʿAbd al-Samad Sharaf al-Dīn al-Kutubī), Bombay, Qayyima Press Sharafuddin and Sons, 1368/1949, p. 106. There are a number of literal differences in quoting a number of words, which may spring from an error of typewriting of the editors of both books, between al-Suyṭūtī's *Sawn al-Manṭiq* which is edited by ʿAlī Shāmi al-Nashshār and Ibn

Taymiyyah's *al-Radd* which is edited by 'Abd al-Samad Sharaf al-Dīn al-Kutubī. Such as *wa qad la ya'rifuna* in *al-Radd,* in *Sawn*: *wa lā ya'rifuna: wa qad lā yuqirrūna* and *bal qad la yuqirrūna: bal yuftuna anna dhālika* and *bal yazunnuna dhālika: 'indahum (wa 'inda)* Ibn Sīnā and *'inda* Ibn Sina.

35. The typographical errors also occur in this place. A number of words are wrongly quoted such as *wa sammuh ḥudūd li ḥudūd* instead of *wa sammuh hudūdan ka hudūd;* *wa'l-'amāl al-ṣālīḥ* instead of *ma'a'l-'amāl al-ṣālīḥ.* See, Ibn Taymiyyah, *Kitāb al-Radd 'ala 'l-Mantiqiyyīn*, Bombay, al-Maṭba'a al-Qayyima, 1949, Ed. Sharaf al-Dīn al-Kutubī, pp. 137-138.

36. This work was edited by Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Ḥārūn as a part of his thesis in the University of Madinah in 1409/1988.

37. Qayrawān, arabized form of a Persian Karawān, was a big city in Africa, into which the celebrated Abū Bakr al-Baqilānī and Muḥammad ibn Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Abū Naṣr Hibat Allah ibn 'Alī ibn Mālik Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Tamīmī were affiliated. Al-Ḥamawī, Yāqūt ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Rūmī, *Jacut's geographisches Worterbuch*, Ed. F. Wustenfeld, Leipzig, 1866-1873, IV, pp. 212-214.

38. Yaḥyā ibn Khālid was appointed *wazir* by Ḥārūn al-Rashīd. He was appointed a Governor of Adharbayzan in 158/775. In 161/778 he became a secretary tutor to Prince Ḥārūn, and he remained in office for 17 years, from 170/786 to 187/803. See, Sourdel, D., 'al-Baramika,' EI2, I, p. 1034.

39. Al-Rashīd bi'llāh, Abū Ja'far al-Manṣūr, the thirtieth 'Abbāsid Caliph, the son of al-Mustarshid, was born ca. 501/1107-8. He was appointed a caliph after his father's death in 529/1135. He died in 532/1138. See, Hillenbrand, C., EI2, VIII, pp. 439-440.

40. Al-Ṣalāḥ, al-Ṣafadī, Ṣālāḥ, al-Dīn Abū al-Ṣ afā Khalīl ibn Aybak al-Ṣafadī the Shāfi'īte died in 746/1345. He was the author of the celebrated *al-Wafī bi'l-Wafayāt.*

41. *Kitāb al-Majisṭī,* to the Arab astronomers, was the name of the great astronomic work by Ptolemy (the great compilation). Al-Ya'qubi says in his historical work (written in 278/891, Ed. M. th. Houtsma, Leiden, 1883, p. 151; "The book *al-Majisṭī* treats of the science of the stars and their movements; the meaning of *al-Majisṭi* is "the greatest book". See, EI1, I, p. 313.

42. The elaborate discussion of this matter can be found in Van Koningsveld's *Greek Manuscript op. cit.*, pp. 345-372.

43. Yūḥannā ibn al-Biṭrīq was a younger contemporary of Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq with whose aid he translated *De Antidotes.* It is related that he was the physician of al-Muwaffaq Talḥa (d. 276/891) brother and mainstay of the weak Caliph al-Mu'tamid. His son Biṭrīq ibn Yūḥannā was physician to the Caliph al-Muqtadir and al-Raḍī, and died in 329/941. See, Meyerhof, Max, "New Light on Ḥunain ibn Isḥāq and his Period," in ISIS (1925), VIII, pp. 685-724.

44. 'Abd al-Masīḥ ibn Allah ibn Nā'ima al-Ḥimṣī was a translator who worked for the Caliph al-Mu'taṣim (218-227/833-842). He died in 220/835.

45. Hunayn ibn Isḥāq Abū Zayd died in ca. 260/873. He was the headmaster of the well-known school of translation. He lived at Baghdad during the reigns and partly at the court of ten calips, viz Al-Amīn (809-813), al-Ma'mūn (d. 216/833),

al-Muʿaṣim (d. 225/842), al-Wāthiq (d.231/847), al-Mutawakkil (d.245/861), al-Muntaṣir (d. 246/862), al-Mustaʿin (d. 250/866), al-Muʿtazz (d. 253/869), al-Muhtadī (d.254/870), and al-Muʿtamid (870-892). See, Meyerhof *ibid em.*

46. Perhaps this refers to Abū Naṣr Ismāʿīl ibn Ḥammād al-Jawharī, a celebrated Arabic lexicographer of Turkish origin who died ca. 393/1002-3. His fame was associated with his monumental dictionary *Tāj al-Lugha wa ʾl-Siḥāḥ al-ʿArabiyya*. See, Kopf, L., EI2, II, pp. 495-497.

47. Euclid is one of the most well-known mathematicians whose name was synonymous with geometry until the twentieth century. He lived after the pupils of Plato (d. 397 B.C.) and before Archimedes (d. 287 B.C.). He taught in Alexandria. Euclid's fame rests preeminently upon *Elements*, written in thirteen books. According to Bussard, translation of *Elements* is made by Isḥāq ibn Ḥunayn (d. 295/910) son of the most famous of the Arabic translators, Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq. See, Busard, H.L.L., (Ed.), *The First Latin Translation of Euclid's Elements, Commonly Ascribed to Adelard of Bath: Books I-VIII and Books X. 36-XV.2*, Canada, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1983.

48. According to Busard, Thābit ibn Qurra (d. 288/901) was a scholar who prepared the second recension of Euclid's *Elements.* He was a scholar who in his own right holds a major position within the history of Islamic mathematics. See, Busard *op. cit*, p. 3.

49. Ḥājji Khalīfa, *Kashf al-Ẓunūn*, vol. II, p. 388.

50. *Sunan Ibn Mājah,* Cairo, Dār al-Iḥyāʾ al-Kutub al-ʿArabiyya, 1373/1953, Ed. Muḥammad Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī, vol. II, p. 1322.

51. Probably this refers to the most important of Ibn al-Kathīr's works on the history of Islam, *al-Bidāya wa ʾl-Nihāyah*. On Ibn Kathīr, see, Loust, H., "Ibn Kathīr," EI2, vol. III, pp. 817-818.

52. *Tārīkh al-Dhahabī, Tārikh al-Islām* by Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348). This book is the greatest work of the author since it summarizes a number of historical books. Thus it became a reference of great importance of historians such as al-Safadī, Ibn Shākir al-Kutubī, al-Subkī, al-Isnawī, Ibn Kathīr, Ibn Rajab, al-Fayūmī, Ibn Daqmāq, al-Sibt ibn al-Jawzī, al-Sakhāwī, Ibn ʿAbd al-Hādī, al-Suyūṭī. See, Maʿrūf, Bashshār ʿAwwād, *al-Dhahabī wa Minḥājuhu fī Kitābih Tārikh al-Islām,* Cairo, Matbaʿa ʿIsā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī wa Shirkāhu, 1976, pp. 9-17.

53. Here he means the books on *uṣūl al-fiqh*.

54. According to Ibn Kathīr, Qarmatian interpretation means batinite interpretation (esoteric or allegorical interpretation) of the Qurʾān, (Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya waʾl-Nihāyah,* VI, p. 92). Ivanov maintains that the term *bāṭin* (from *batn,* "belly" means 'deduced' (with the help of allegorical interpretation (*taʾwīl*). It leads to the doctrine that there is no *ẓāhir* without its corresponding *bāṭin* and *vice versa*. Thus, the knowledge of the *bāṭin* of each *ẓāhir,* to its full extent, formed an exclusive prerogative of the *Imām,* as did therefore the privilege of conveying its *taʾwīl*. Qualified theologians, or anyone, could only offer a *taʾwīl* explanation with the authorisation and endorsement of the *Imām.* The principles of *taʾwīl,* Ivanov maintains, was violently condemned by the orthodox as easily leading to possible abuse, and chaos in religion. See Ivanov, W., *Brief Survey of the Evolution of Ismailism,* Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1952, pp. 24-25.

55. *Al-Zajal* is a popular Arabic poem in strophic form; *al-Muwashshah* is a post-classical form of Arabic poetry arranged in stanzas; *Dūbayt* is a rhymed poem consisting of four hemistitches; while *Mawali* is a poem in colloqueal language. See, Lane, E.W., *Arabic-English Lexicon*, Cambridge, The Islamic Texts Society, 1984, vol. I, p. 94.

56. The *Qāḍī al-Muslimīn al-Ḥāfiẓ ʻIzz al-Dīn ʻAbd al-ʻAzīz ibn Qāḍī al-Quḍāt* Badr al-Dīn ibn Jamāʻa, belonging to the distinguished Shāfiʻī family of the Mamlūk period in Syria and Egypt, was appointed Shāfiʻī Chief Judge of Egypt in 738/1340 and remained in this position for 25 years. He died in 767/1366. See, Salibi, K.S., "Ibn Djamāʻa", EI2, III, pp. 748-749.

57. Al-Qurʼān, XIV (Ibrāhīm), 4, Bell, I, p. 236.

58. Viz The Greek system.

59. Namely al-Kāfījī.

60. Al-Qurʼān, III (*ʼĀl-ī ʻImrān*), 7, Bell, I, pp. 44-45.

61. Al-Qurʼān, III (*ʼĀl-ī ʻImrān*), 7, Bell, I, p. 45.

62. *Tāʼrikh Madīnat Dimashq*. See, GAL, G. I, p. 331.

63. *Ḥarf* may mean various ways of reading the Qurʼān, as it is attached to the expression *al-aḥruf al-sabʻa*, sometimes identified with *al-qiraʼat al-sabʻa* of the prophetic *Tradition* "*unzila al-qurʼān ʻalā sabʻati ahruf* and another tradition: "… *qāla: faqulnā innamā ʼkhtalafnā fī al-qirāʼa. qalā: fa ʼhmarr wajh Rasūl-allāh wa qāla: innamā halaka man kana qablukum bi ʼkhtilafihim baynahum…*" See, Mukarram, ʻAbd al-ʻAli Sālim, *et al.*, *Muʻjam al-Qirāʼat al-Qurʼāniyya*, Kuwayt, Matbūʻat Jamīʻat al-Kuwayt, 1406/1986, I, p. 32.

64. Al-Qurʼān, XXI (*Al-Anbiyāʼ*), 22, Bell, I, p. 306.

65. Al-Qurʼān, II (*al-Baqarah*), 189, Bell, I, p. 26.

66. Al-Ṭabarī interpreted *yawm al-baʻth* as the day when the people were awakened from their graves. See, *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī*, XVIII, p. 58.

67. There are a number of verses in the Qurʼān which deals with the concept of *waʻīd*, such as XIV:14; XX:113; L: pp. 20, 28, 14, 45.

68. Al-Qurʼān, XXXVI (*Yāsīn*), 76, Bell, II, p. 439.

69. Al-Qurʼān, VIII (*al-Anfāl*), 58, Bell, I, p. 168.

70. Al-Qurʼān, XVIII (*al-Kahf*), 11, Bell, I, p. 274.

71. Al-Qurʼān, XXV (*al-Furqān*), 73, Bell, II, p. 351.

72. Al-Husayn ibn ʻAlī ibn Yazīd al-Baghdādī al-Karabisī was referred to by al-Dhahabī as *Faqīh Baghdād* who studied jurisprudence under Imām al-Shāfiʻī. He was the author of many works. He died in ca. 245/860. Al-Dhahabī, SAN, XII, pp. 79-82.

73. This probably refers to Abū Thawr Ibrāhīm ibn Khālid ibn Abī ʼl-Yamān al-Kalbī who died in Baghdad in 240/854. Abū Thawr, according to Schacht, was a prominent jurisconsult and founder of a school of religious law. Due to his stay in Irak one generation after al-Shāfiʻī, Abū Thawr, Schacht argues, "seems to have been influenced by al-Shāfiʻī's methodological insistence on the authority of the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet (ﷺ), without, however, renouncing the use of *raʼy* as had been customary in the ancient schools of law." See Schacht, J., "Abū Thawr," in EI2, I, p. 155.

Bibliography

Abrahamov, Binyamin, *Islamic Theology*: *Traditionalism and Rationalism,* Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1998.

Al-Ba'albaki, Rūḥī, *al-Mawrid, Arabic English Dictionary,* Beirut, Dār al-'Ilm li'l-Malāyīnī, 1988.

Bell, R., *The Qur'ān,* translated with a critical re-arrangement of the *Sūrahs,* Edinburgh, T&T. Clark, 1937, 2 vols.

Brockelmann, Carl, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, 2 vols., Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1943-1949); 3 Supplements, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1937-1942.

Busard, H.L.L., (Ed.), The First Latin Translation of Euclid's Elements, *Commonly Ascribed to Adelard of Bath,* Books I-VIII and Books X.36-XV.2. Canada, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1983.

Chroust, Anton-Herman, *Aristotle New Light on his Life and on Some of His Lost Works,* London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973, 2 vols.

Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā',* Beirut, Mu'assasa al-Risala, 1986-1992, 25 vols., Ed. Shu'ayb al-Arna'ut.

Al-Ghazālī, Abū Ḥāmid, *al-Mustasfā min 'Ilm al-Uṣūl,* Cairo, Al-Matba'a al-Amirīyya, 1322/1904, 2 vols.

Gibb, Sir. H.A., "The Influence of Islamic Culture on Medieval Europe," In: *Bulletin of the John Ryland's Library*, Manchester, 38 (1955), pp. 82-98.

Goichon, A.M., "Ibn Sīnā," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, Leiden & London, E.J. Brill & Luzac & Co, 1971, Ed. B. Lewis *et al.*, vol. III, pp. 941-947.

Hallaq, W.B., *Ibn Taymiyya Against the Greek Logicians*, translation with an introduction and notes, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993.

Al-Hamawī, Yaqut ibn 'Abd Allah al-Rūmī, *Jacut's Geographisches Wörterbuch*, Ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Leipzig, 1866-1873, 6 vols.

Heffening, W., "al-Nawawi" in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, Leiden & New York, E.J. Brill, 1993, Ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al.*, vol. VII, p. 1041.

Hillenbrand, C., "al-Rashīd," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1995, Ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al.*, vol. VIII, pp. 439-440.

Ibn Mājah, *Sunan Ibn Mājah,* Cairo, Dār al-Ihyā' al-Kutub al-'Arabiyya, 1373/1953, Ed. Muḥammad Fu'ād 'Abd al-Bāqī, vol. II.

Ibn Taymiyyah, *Kitāb al-Radd 'ala 'l-Manṭiqiyyīn,* Bombay, al-Maṭba'a al-Qayyima, 1949, Ed. Sharaf al-Dīn al-Kutubī.

Ivanov, W., *Brief Survey of the Evolution of Isma'ilism*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1952.

Jolivet, J and R. Rashed, "al-Kindī," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1986, Ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al.*, vol. V, pp. 122-123.

Khalīfa, Ḥājjī *Kashf al-Ẓunūn 'an asāmī 'l-Kutub wa 'l-Funun*, Ed. Serefettin Yaltkaya and Kilisli Rifat Bilge, Istanbul, 1941-1943, 2 vols.

Kopf, L., "al-Djawharī," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, Leiden & Paris, E.J. Brill, G.-P. Maisonneuve and Larose S.A., 1965, Ed. B. Lewis *et al.*, vol. II, pp. 495-497.

Lane, E.W., *Arabic-English Lexicon,* Cambridge, The Islamic Texts Society, 1984, 2 vols.

Laoust, H., "Ibn Kathīr," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, Leiden & London, E.J. Brill and Luzac & Co., 1971, Ed. B. Lewis *et al.*, vol. III, pp. 817-818.

Lewis, B., et. al., "Ibn Zūlāq," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, Leiden & London, E.J. Brill and Luzac & Co, 1971, ed., B. Lewis *et al.*, vol. III, p. 979.

Madjid, Nurcholish, *Ibn Taymiyyah in 'Kalam' and 'Falsafah' (A Problem of Reason and Revelation in Islam)*, Michigan, UMI Dissertation Services, 1997.

Ma'rū, Bashshār 'Awwād, *al-Dhahabī wa Minḥājuhū fī Kitābihī Tārīkh al-Islam*, Cairo, Matba'at 'Isā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī wa Shirkāhu, 1976.

Meyerhof, Max, "New Light on Ḥunain b. Isḥāq and his Period," in ISIS, 1925, VIII, pp. 685-724.

Monnot, G, 'al-Shahrastani,' *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edn., Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1998, Ed. C.E. Bosworth *et al.*, vol. IX, pp. 214-216.

Mukarram, 'Abd al-'Ali Salim *et al.*, *Mu'jam al-Qira'a al-Qur'aniyya,* Kuwayt, Matbū'āt Jami'at al-Kuwayt, 1406/1986.

Al-Nashshar, 'Ali Sami, *Manahij al-Baḥth 'inda Mufakkirīn al-Islam*, Cairo, Dar al-Ma'arif, 1978.

Salibi, K.S., "Ibn Djama'a," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, Leiden & London, E.J. Brill and Luzac & Co., 1971, Ed. B. Lewis *et al.*, vol. III, p. 748-749.

Sartain, E.M., *Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī: Biography and Background,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Schacht, J., "Abū Thawr," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, Leiden & London, E.J. Brill and Luzac & Co., 1960, Ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al.*, vol. I, p. 155.

Sourdel, D., 'al-Barāmika,' in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, Leiden & London, E.J. Brill and Luzac & Co, 1960, Ed. H.A.R. Gibb *et al.*, vol. I, p. 1034.

Suter, H., "al-Magest," in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1st Edition Leyden & London, E.J. Brill and Luzac & Co, 1913, Ed. M. Th. Houtsma *et al.*, vol. I, p. 313.

Al-Suyūṭī, *Kitāb al-Tahadduth bi Ni'mati 'llāh*, Cairo, al-Matba'a al-'Arabiyya al-Ḥadītha, Ed. E.M. Sartain

———, *Tabaqāt al-Huffāz,* Cairo, Maktaba Wahba, 1973, Ed. 'Ali Muhammad 'Umar, 2 vols.

Al-Ṭabarī, Ibn Jarīr, *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī*, Cairo, 1954-1957, XVIII, Ed. A.S. 'Ali, Mustafā al-Saqqā *et al.*

Van Koningsveld, P.S., "Greek Manuscripts in the Early Abbasid Empire: Fiction and Facts about their Origin, Translation and Destruction," in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, LV No. 3/4, Mei-August (1998), pp. 345-370.

Von Grunebaum, G.E., "Islam and Hellenism," in *Logic in Classical Islamic Culture* (Ed.) G.E. von Grunebau, Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1970.

Wensinck, E.J., *The Muslim Creed: Its Genesis and Historical Development,* New Delhi, Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1979.

Yāsīn, Ja'far 'Alī, *Faylasūf 'Alim: Dirāsa Taḥīliyya li Ḥayāt ibn Sīnā wa Fikrih al-Falsafī,* Beirut, Dā al-Andalus, 1984/1404.

IMÓM SUYÕÙÔ'S ORIGINAL THOUGHT

IMÓM SUYÕÙÔ'S ORIGINAL THOUGHT

FINAL GRADE

/0

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8

PAGE 9

PAGE 10

PAGE 11

PAGE 12

PAGE 13

PAGE 14

PAGE 15

PAGE 16

PAGE 17

PAGE 18

PAGE 19

PAGE 20