THE MUSLIM SCHOLARS’ ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE ‘FRUIT’ OF HELLENISM: A HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE MUSLIM LITERATURES AGAINST FALSafa, MANDIQ AND KALAM

I. Introduction

The opposition against falsafa, mantiq, and kalam will be dealt with individually due to following obvious reasons. First, Muslims have different attitudes toward this ‘fruit’ of Hellenism. Some of them were opposed to falsafa, but receptive to scholastic kalam and Aristotle’s logic, while others were theologians who were opposed to falsafa and mantiq. Some of them, such as al-Gazali and Ibn Hazm, adopted Aristotle’s logic and regarded it as an instrument to gain the truth but rejected some
thesis of the philosophers, which could lead Muslims to heresy. Secondly, those who opposed against falsafa, mantiq and kalam at once, condemned the scholars who adopted ‘foreign sciences’. To this criteria belongs the autodafe of some theological works of al-Gazali, i.e. ihya Ulum al-Din, and works by Ibn Hazm.

II. Muslim Opposition to the ‘Fruit’ of Hellenism, i.e. Falsafa, Mantiq and Kalam

A. Muslim Opposition to Falsafa

The earliest Muslim opposition to falsafa, Van Koningsveld suggests, occurred during the last part of the second century of Hijra when the abhorrence to “the books of infidels” increased among the fore runners of the Jurists such as al-Awza‘i (d. 159/774), Malik b. Anas (d. 178/795) and al-Shafi‘i (d. 203/820).¹ Their opposition, Van Koningsveld suggests, was related to their exhortation of the destruction of the “ancient books” which contain the “ancient sciences” among which are mantiq and falsafa. In sum, he says that the unfavourable attitude of some of the early authorities in Islam toward falsafa was closely connected to their opposition against things Greek, which was specifically reflected in their “suspicion and overt enmity” toward the “Books of the Infidels” (the Books of the Greeks).²

The opposition against falsafa by the Muslims not only occurred in the East of the Muslim World, but also in the West. This can be clearly seen in the fact, according to Van Koningsveld, that books of falsafa were burnt. Al-Mansur b. Abi Amir (d. 392/1002) was said to have ordered the people to take out all the books of falsafa and logic from the library and ordered them to incinerate them.³

However, the systematic refutation against falsafa took place in the latest part of fifth century of Hijra, when “the greatest figure in the history of the Islamic reaction to Neo-platonism.”⁴ al-Gazali (d. 505/1111), composed Tahafut al-Falasifa. In that celebrated work, he, according to Fakhry, ‘enumerates sixteen metaphysical and four physical propositions that have an obvious religious relevance and against which
the unguarded believers must be warned.' Of these propositions, three are obnoxious, and consequently those who uphold them deserve the charge of irreligion (kufr). Those three obnoxious theses are: the eternity of the world, the negation of God’s knowledge of the particulars, and the denial of the resurrection of the body.\(^5\)

When comparing al-Gazali’s attitude toward philosophers with that of Ibn al-Salah, Griffel suggests that al-Gazali’s harsh judgment on the philosophers was reflected by his legal opinion saying that the philosophers are apostates who might be killed on the ground of their apostasy. Whereas Ibn al-Salah, Griffel suggests, maintains that the philosophers should be given two choices: either they be killed or be forced to revert to Islam.\(^6\)

Falsafa was also subjected to the opposition of an Andalusian traveler and writer who was born at Valencia in 540/1145 and died in Alexandria on 27 Sha’ban 614/29 November 1217, Abu ʿl-Hasan Muhammad b. Jubayr al-Kinani.\(^7\) His opposition is well reflected, according to Tritton, by his harsh judgment on the philosophers, as can be read in the following verses:

A sect has come forth in our age, a bane to it, [saying]
In religion follow only the creed of Ibn Sina or Abu Nasr\(^8\)
Danger to Islam from a sect which busies minds with folly;
It has cast the true religion behind its back and claims to possess wisdom and falsafa.\(^9\)

Falsafa was also encountered with systematic political opposition in the first part of 7th/13th century. According to Hartmann, measures against philosophers, philosophical literatures and those who were occupied by the dangerous books have been taken by the 34th Abbasid Caliph, al-Nasir li ʿl-Din Allah (d. 1225) who was well known for being a traditionist and a mujtahid. During his rule and certainly based on his approval, the celebrated individuals who were occupied by falsafa were subjected to denunciation, libraries in which were philosophical literatures were burnt,\(^10\) and ‘dangerous’ books were incinerated.\(^11\) Likewise, during his reign, the prominent scholars who were secretly occupied by falsafa lose their job and dignity.\(^12\) The very measures were
taken by al-Nasir, according to Hartmann, out of his conviction that inner disintegration of Islamic society would not be caused by nothing but by the danger of the philosophers and their followers.  

Falsafa was also subjected to the opposition by ‘one of the most important Sufis in Sunni Islam,’ the Shafi’ite Abu Hafs Umar al-Suhrawardi (d. 632/1234) who was well-known for his condemnation of the Panteist Ibn Arabi for the latter’s establishing connection between *tasawwuf* and elements of Greek falsafa. *Rashf al-Nasa’ih al-Imaniyya wa Kashf al-Fada’ih al-Yunaniyya*, according to Hartmann, is a polemical work composed by al-Suhrawardi to refute ‘the arguments of the apologetic-dialectical theology (*kalam*), Islamic philosophy (*falsafa*) and its ancient origins.’ This work was dedicated, according to Hartmann, to the caliph al-Nasir, ‘whom al-Suhrawardi quotes as an authority of Hadith.’

His opposition to falsafa was not limited by the fact that he composed *al-Rashf*, but he even, according to Hartmann, sink ten volumes of *Kitab al-Shifa* into the water, as can be read in his words: “I have sunked those books [viz. *Kitab al-Shifa*] with the help of God.”

One hundred fifty years after al-Gazali (d. 505/1111), the most knowledgeable person of his time in *Tafsir*, Tradition and Jurisprudence, Ibn al-Salah (d. 643/1254) issued *fatwas* in which he not only warned the people about the dangers of falsafa and logic, but also asserts his prohibition of people from being occupied by studying works by Ibn Sina who was well-known as one of the prominent authorized commentators of Aristotelian writings as well as from using peripatetical concepts, such as, *burhan* and *hadd*.

In sum, the opposition against falsafa not only took a form of condemning the philosophers and incineration of philosophical literatures but was also reflected by the emergence of the madaris, ‘colleges’ which are regarded as the learning centers for training legal scholars and as well as institutes with formalized curricula in which falsafa and *kalam* were excluded.

In the light of afore-mentioned argument, one could say that if these institutions were established to facilitate the dissemination of
orthodoxy and barricade the ‘infiltration’ of Greek learning, among which is falsafa, the opposition against falsafa could have taken place as soon as these orthodox institutions were founded.

The institutions which Makdisi suggests to have excluded the ‘foreign sciences’ from their curricula were embodied by ‘the formation of the personal schools of law in the second half of the second century; in the proliferation of masjids for the study of law in the third and fourth centuries,’ by the ‘subsequent development and proliferation of the madrasa’ in the fourth and fifth centuries, and by ‘significant development of other conservative institutions, such as the dar al-hadith, in the sixth century.’

In her identification of the decline of the scientific studies at the latest of the 13th century with the Muslims’ unfavourable attitude toward falsafa, Brentjes also associates the decline with four more factors, which also implicitly reflects the opposition against falsafa: (1) that there was ‘dichotomy between the ancient ‘rational’ sciences and the religious and legal disciplines’, (2) ‘the marginal relevance of the ancient sciences for the central concerns of the Muslim world’; (3) the rejection of innovation as a positive value for the Muslim society and the insistence on social practice based on authoritative learning;’ and (4) that falsafa is replaced by ‘the canon of religious duties as the ideal of salvation.’

B. The Opposition against Mantiq

Goldziher in his ‘Stellung’, suggests that the opposition against logic by the Muslim has been started by a scholar as early as Ja’far al-Sadiq (d. 148/764), the seventh imam of the Shi’ite Ithna ‘Ashariyya (d.148/764), to whom the words are ascribed: “People will occupy themselves with logic until they even question the belief in God. If you hear something of that kind, say: ‘there is no god except the unique One; there is nothing like unto Him.’”

Logic was also subject to opposition by the eponym of Shafi’ite legal school, al-Shafi’i (d. 203/820) whom al-Suyuti quoted as having said that 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.\textsuperscript{23} In al-Shafi'i's opinion, the neglect of the people of the language of the Arabs and their inclination to the language of Aristotle brought about the emergence of the dispute on the createdness of the Koran, the negation of the divine vision and other innovations.\textsuperscript{24}

The opposition against logic was not a monopoly of a certain denomination, i.e. Sunnite traditionalist and that of a certain profession, i.e. jurists. Logic was also opposed by some members of the Mu'tazilite theological school. The Mu'tazilite poet and thinker Abu 'l-Abbas al-Nashi' al-Akbar, known as Ibn al-Shirshir (d. 293/905), for instance, was the first who refuted logic. Likewise, the Shi'ite thinker Hasan b. Musa al-Nawbakhti (d. ca. 310/922), the author of \textit{Kitab al-Ara' wa 'I-D!Janat} and \textit{al-Radd ala Ahl al-Mantiq}, which is no longer extant, was another scholar mentioned by Hallaq as a fervent opponent of logic. The grammarian Abu Sa'id al-Sirafi (d. 368/979) was cited as the one who launched an attack against the philosopher-logician Matta b. Yunus (d. 328/940).\textsuperscript{25}

In Muslim Spain, the incineration was not only afflicted on the books on logic but also on the books belonging to those who were occupied by studying logic. This is clearly reflected by the fact that in 453/1059-1060, according to Griffel, the writings of Ibn Hazm were burnt.\textsuperscript{26}

In the first half of eight century of Hijra, the vehement attack against mantiq was found in the personality of 'Hanbalite theologian and Juristconsult,' Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1351). According to Laoust, Ibn al-Qayyim was born at Damascus on 7 Safar 691/29 January 1292 and died there in 751/1350. His father was the Superintendent of the Jawziyya Madrasa, which 'served as a court of law for the Hanbalii \textit{Qadi al-qudat} of Damascus.\textsuperscript{27} His criticism against logic can be clearly read in several pages of his \textit{Miftah Dar al-Sa'ada}. In this celebrated work of his, he, for instance, tell us a number of points: Greek logic bears lie and falsehood; it leads sounds mind astray and corrupts one's disposition; it is not based on well-ordered principles and foundations;
rather, it is built on an unsteady brink. He then continued saying that logic is like *fata morgana* which perplexes the thirsty man wandering for water on the dessert. Being guided by his subjective perception when seeking water, he finds nothing but deprivation. At last, Ibn al-Qayyim says, he repents lamenting the loss of his age. Concluding his verses, Ibn al-Qayyim exhortates people not to be acquainted with it and says that being ignorant of it is better.\(^{28}\)

C. The Opposition against Kalam

The earliest opposition against “philosophical kalam” by Muslims was embodied in a form of scholastic movement, “a movement of schools, guild schools of legal science,” which was prepared by the efforts of two leaders, al-Shafi’i (d. 203/820) and Ahmad b. Hanbal (d. 245/855), whose influence against *kalam* remained throughout Muslim history. This movement was brought into existence, according to Makdisi, by the movement of juridical kalam against the kalam of *kalam*, in which *al-Risala* was composed by al-Shafi’i as its religious manifesto.\(^{29}\) Like al-Shafi’i, the first champion of the traditionalists whose “career signaled the first triumph over rationalism and whose life was imbued with a deep sense of submission to the Koran, the Word of God, the *hadith* and the deeds of the Prophet,” Ahmad b. Hanbal with his resistance against the Great Inquisition marked the second defeat of Rationalism.\(^{31}\)

The traditionalist triumph over Rationalism does not end up with Ahmad b. Hanbal, it continues through two other landmarks, the defection of al-Ash’ari (d. ca. 324/935) from Mu’tazilism to Hanbalism and the promulgation of the Traditionalist creed\(^{31}\) by the Caliph al-Qadir (381-422/991-1031).\(^{32}\) The rise of legal studies and institutions such as Mosque-Inn and Madrasa, in which they were taught and in which *kalam* and falsafa were not admitted as a part of the curriculum,\(^{33}\) is associated by Makdisi with the effort by the Traditionalists in their respective “guilds of law,” the rise of which was the effect of the rise of such institutions, to preserve their dominance over the Rationalists. Although,
in the passage of time, the Traditionalist institutions, Makdisi suggests, were not immune of Rationalist infiltration as reflected in the fact that the Ash’arite movement, in search of a home, infiltrated into the Shafi‘ite school like the Mu’tazilite into the Hanafite, the Traditionalists had succeeded in their attempt to exclude the Rationalists from their institutions.

The defeat of the Mu’tazilites in the political arena, on the other hand, forced them to make use of *usul al-fiqh* as an intellectual vehicle to maintain their rational influence with which they have brought some of the problems of philosophical kalam and legal falsafa into it. The character of *usul al-fiqh* changed from purely traditionalist, in the sense that al-Shafi‘i does not treat a single problem of *kalam*, to rationalist, in the sense that it deals with philosophico-theological problems. *Usul al-fiqh*, which was founded by al-Shafi‘i to be against *kalam*, acquired authors whom al-Shafi‘i himself had previously called ‘the Partisans of Words’, *Mutakallimun*. The intellectual effort of the Rationalist camp, Makdisi suggests, gained their success. This was clearly reflected in the fact that many eminent scholars of Shafi‘ite or Hanbalite juridical denomination have dealt with the inroads made by other sciences into the field of *usul al-fiqh*.

The result of such infiltration brought about the phenomenon by which a Sunni Muslim, a member of a Rationalist movement, could also become a member of a Sunni guild of law. Setting examples, Makdisi then enumerates a number of scholars who were knowledgeable of the ‘foreign sciences’, the Shafi‘ite al-Gazali (d. 505/1111) with Ash’arite theological tendency with his introduction of Aristotle’s logic into *usul al-fiqh*, Sayf al-Din al-Amidi (d. 631/1233) who was being sacked from his chair of law of the Aziziyya Madrasa for teaching falsafa and philosophical kalam, and Ibn Aqil whose *al-Wadh fi Usul al-Fiqh* was receptive to a Rationalist instrument of methodology, dialectic.

*Kalam* was also subject to the opposition of a *mujaddid* of the third Islamic century, “the supreme universal historian and the Qur’an commentator of the first three or four centuries of Islam,” Abu Ja’far
Muhammad b. Jarir al-Tabari who was born in Amul, the principal capital city of Tabaristan at the end of 224 or the beginning of 225/841 and died in 310/923. Al-Tabari was an independent mujtahid, who studied jurisprudence under the guidance of al-Shafi‘i and then under that of al-Ja‘farani and al-Rabi’ al-Muradi.

That al-Tabari was a fervent critic of the Mutakallimun is confirmed by Gilliot. In his study of the influence of theological views on al-Tabari’s linguistic approach in his exegesis, Gilliot suggests that despite the usage of certain arguments and methods of kalam in his exegesis, al-Tabari shares the ideas upheld by other traditionalists, such as Ahmad b. Hanbal, al-Bukhari, al-Darimi, etc. His being fervent critic of the Mutakallimun was also represented by the fact that al-Tabari composed some works in which he attempted to attack the people who strictly upheld qadarite theological views as well as the Jahmites. In his Sarib al-Sunna, for instance, al-Tabari condemns the discussion on the createdness of the Koran, saying: “Not a single saying in that respect is allowed for us to express except his saying: If we do not have a leader in [the discussion on the createdness of the Koran], we look for another person with whom [we are] pleased and satisfied. He is the leader to whom one adheres (al-imam al-muttaba). The discussion on the name: whether it stands for a thing or for nothing is one of the recent stupidities about which not a single tradition to be followed was transmitted. Neither has an opinion from an imam been transmitted. Thus, being occupied by [such a discussion] is a disgrace, whereas, being silent of it is a grace.”

In the first half of the fourth century, a Shafi‘ite judge and the author of many monographs on Tradition such as al-Arb‘un al-Ajunjya, al-Shari‘a fi ‘l-Sunna, Akhlaq al-Ulama‘, Abu Bakr Muhammad b. al-Husayn al-Àjurri composed al-Shari‘a in which he expresses his hostile attitude toward kalam and all kind of speculative argumentations. Al-Àjurri was a prominent Shafi‘ite jurist who composed several important works and whose authority is, according to Isma‘il, extensively cited by more than fifteen biographers. Al-Àjurri’s opposition against kalam can
be clearly read in his remarks on the heretics: “Anyone who upholds Tradition is admonished to abandon all the heretics including the Kharijites, Qadarites, Murji’ites, Jahmites, Mu’tazilites, Rafidites, Nasibites and anyone whom the leading scholars of the Muslims identify with an author of a misleading innovation. One is not admonished to talk to him, to greet him, to befriend him, to pray behind him, to give [his daughter] to him in marriage, to get married with him, to accompany him, to deal with him, to argue with him and to debate with him. One is rather to humiliate him. If you meet him on a street, take another road if it is possible.”

Bagdad of the fourth century of Hijra also witnesses the opposition against kalam by a prominent Shafi’ite scholar, Abu Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Khattabi (d. 388/988), the author of al-Gunya an al-Kalam. Al-Khattabi was a leading scholar in the field of jurisprudence, language, who was, according to Günther, a Shafi’ite traditionalist, whose one of his prominent disciples was the Shafi’ite Abu Hamid al-Isfara’ini (d. 406/1015-6), the teacher of al-Gazali.

According to Günther, al-Gunya was composed by al-Khattabi to anathemize kalam. This can be clearly read in the latter’s remarks: “You have established your own opinion, my brother, may God protect you in a fair manner. You have [also] portrayed your attitude to us with respect to the heretical views of the Mutakallimun, to the occupation of those who are involved in vain discourse with [those heretical views], to the tendency of some followers of the Sunna towards them and their being deceived by them. [You are also well-informed of] their pretension that kalam is a protection for tradition…”

In the first half of the fifth century of Hijra, the opposition against kalam was markedly represented by two prominent scholars: First, ‘an important sufi Hagiographer and Kur’an commentator,’ Abu Abd al-Rahman al-Sulami who was the author of al-Radd ala Ahl al-Kalam, and secondly, al-Khatib al-Bagdadi (d. 463/1071), the author of Sharaf Ashab al-Hadith. Al-Sulami was born in Nisabur in 325/937 or 330/942 and died in the same city in 412/1021. He received a teaching certificate
from the Hanafite Abu Sahl al-Su’luki (d. 296-369/909-80) and some
time, after the sufi cloak, from the shafi’ite Abu ‘l-Qasim al-Nasrabadi
al-Shafi’i, well-known as al-Khatib al-Bagdadi, was born in Bagdad in
392/1002. He was one of the leading scholars in the field of Tradition,
jurisprudence and usul al-fiqh. He was referred to as an authority in hadith
because of his profound erudition in this field. His works on hadith is
said to have made him the great critical systematiser of hadith
methodology. His vehement opposition against kalam can be clearly
read in several pages of Sharaf Ashab al-Hadith in which he condemns
theologians. He, for instance, identifies some characteristics of the
authors of innovation and personal opinions: (1) That they scorned the
adherents of the Sunan and Athar, refused to study the laws contained in
the Koran, left aside the arguments derived from clear verses of the
Koran and neglected the Sunna; (2) That they legislated in matters of
religion by making use of their personal opinions; (3) the young among
them are greedy of words of love, while the old are fascinated by kalam
and debate; (4) they have made their religion subject to disputations;
(5) that they are the enemies of the Tradition; (6) that they seek
[religious] truth with the help of kalam.

While in the second half of the fifth century, the history of Muslim
Spain witnesses the opposition against kalam by the greatest traditionist
in the Magrib, a Qadi of Lissabon and Santarem during the reign of al-
Muzaffar, Abu ‘Umar Yusuf b. ‘Abd al-Barr al-Namari. Al-Namari was
born in Cordoba on 24 Rabi’ II 368/30 November 978 and studied
under the supervision of Abu ‘Umar Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Malik b. Hashim
in Cordoba and died on 29 Rabi’ II 463/3 February 1071. His work
composed to condemn kalam is Jami Bayan al-Tlam wa Fadlith in which he
expresses his abhorrence toward debate and argumentation. He also
condemns people’s speculation about matters of belief in God based on
personal opinion and analogy without a textual foundation.

The first half of the fifth century witnesses the opposition against
kalam by the Shafi’ite Hafiz and jurist who was given a certificate of
jurisprudence by the Shafi’ite Abu Hamid al-Isfara’ini, a teacher of al-Gazali, Abu 1-Qasim Hibat Allah b. al-Hasan b. Mansur al-Tabari al-Lalaka’i, who was born in Tabaristan and died in Bagdad in Ramadan 418/1028. His work, Sharh Usul 1’tiqad Ahl al-Sunna, is said to have exercised very important influence on what he calls ‘Salafi school’ (al-madhhab al-salafi). This work, he argues, constitutes a significant reference that shed lights to the knowledge of the religious doctrines (aqa’id) of the scholars from among the Pious Ancestors.64 His criticism of kalam can be read in his quotation of Kharim b. Hayyan’s65 remark: “An author of kalam finds himself one of two positions: If he is negligent in it, he is defeated [by his opponent]; but if he is deeply rooted in it, he sins.”66

The opposition against kalam of the second half of the fifth century of Islam was reflected by the composition of Dhamm al-Kalam by al-Harawi, a professor in Nizamiyya College, who was awarded the title of Shaykh al-Islam, due to his prominent position in the Hanbalite school,67 who died in Herat on 22nd of Dhu ‘1-Hijja 481/8th of March 1088.68 Dhamm al-Kalam, itself according to Beaurecueil, was the fruit of al-Harawi’s labour against the Ash’arites as well as the Mu’tazilites.69 In his Dhamm al-Kalam, al-Harawi discusses the prohibition of making use of speculative arguments (kalam) by his predecessors from among the Pious Ancestors (al-salaf al-Salih), ranging from the Companions of the Prophet till his contemporaries (viz, his teachers) whom he classified into nine generations.

The first half of the sixth century of Hijra also witnesses the vehement attack against kalam by Abu Sa’d Abd al-Karim al-Marwazi al-Shafi’i, known as Ibn al-Sam’ani(d. 562/1166), born in Marw on 21 Shaban 506/10 February 1113, a scholar whose father was an authority in the field of Shafi’i law. Ibn al-Sam’ani was a prolific writer on the prophetic traditions and their transmission. He was the author of great biographical works on the Traditionist, Kitab al-Ansab and Kitab al-Takhbir fi ‘l-Mu’jam al-Kabir. He seems to enjoy a high authority in the Shafi’ite circle, due to extensive reference to his authority by al-Subki in his Tabaqat al-Shafi’yya.70 Al-Intisar li Ahl al-Hadith is his literary
production that deals with the condemnation of kalam by his predecessors. In this work, Ibn al-Sam’ani emphasizes that kalam is prohibited due to not only that which has been claimed by their adversaries as mentioned above, i.e. the Companions and the Followers have not been occupied by it, but also because God has said: “Today I have perfected your religion for you...” If He [viz. God] has already perfected and completed it, they argue, a Muslim should believe in it and rely on it. Asserting their contention, they remark: “So, why does one need to refer to rational evidences and their propositions? God by His virtue makes it superfluous and unnecessary to him. He did not introduce [man] to an affair, due to which one is seized by ambiguity and vagueness, and which leads one to the destructions and troubles. Man strayed, perished and deviated only because of ideas and rational thoughts and his following the opinions of the past and the present. Man was safe only because of following the traditions of the Messengers and the leading scholars from among the early ancestors, who guide people to the right course.”

Re-emphasizing his hostile attitude to kalam, he then quotes the prayer of the Prophet: “O God, I ask your protection against knowledge which has no significance...”

Kalam also became an object of opposition by an ‘Almoravid AmDr and the second sovereign of the Tashufinid dynasty, who ruled over the large part of the maghrib and of southern Spain from 500/1106 to 537/1143. This is apparently reflected by the fact that under the approval of ‘Ali b. Yusuf b. Tashufin, the Fakihs have promulgated autos-da-fé and burned the Ihya of al-Gazali who was referred to as a theologian considered to have limited God’s unlimited power of creation. The incineration of al-Gazali’s Ihya took place in the parvis of the Great Mosque of Cordoba in 503/1109.

The opposition against kalam in the first half of the seventh century of Hijra can also be clearly seen in the hostile attitude of the “celebrated doctor of the Hanbalite theologico-juridical school”, Muwaffaq al-Din b. Qudama (d. 620/1224) toward kalam, who composed Tahrim al-Nazar fi Kutub Abl al-Kalam in which he, according
to Makdisi, not only condemned specifically Ibn Aqil, but also censured those who indulge in speculative kalam, i.e. those who apply allegorical interpretation of the revealed text with regard to the divine attributes. Ibn Qudama, Makdisi argues, opposes all manner of speculation in matters of religious belief because such speculation is unorthodox. According to Ibn Qudama, speculative kalam (kalam) was prohibited not only because of the fact that the pious ancestors did not practise it, but also due to its inherent danger, i.e. that speculative kalam leads to the use of allegorical interpretation (ta'wil) whose principal evil is that it leads to the practice of stripping God of the attributes which He attributed to Himself and of those which He did not. Representing the Traditionalists i.e. in the defence of the Hanbalite school against the accusation of anthropomorphism, Ibn Qudama, Makdisi says, advocates the unreserved acceptance of the Koranic expressions and the traditions on the divine attribute as they stand and as they were handed down from the Prophet without attempting any interpretation. A rationale of Ibn Qudama's advocating this principle is that only God knows their intended meaning. This principle is what distinguishes, according to Ibn Qudama, the pious believers, the followers of the pious ancestors, from the error-laden partisans of allegorical interpretation, the speculative theologians.

In the ninth century of Islam, kalam was also encountered with the condemnation of a great savant and an independent mujtahid of Zaidite denomination, Muhammad b. Ibrahim b. al-Wazir al-San'ani, well-known as Ibn al-Murtada al-Yamani (d. 840/1436), who composed Tarijih Asalib al-Qur'an ala Asalib al-Yunan and al-Rawd al-Basim fi Dhabb an Sunnat Abi al-Qawasim, in which he condemned kalam and the Mutakallimun. Ibn al-Wazir's criticism against kalam can be found in a number of statements, dealing with various contexts. When discussing the qualification of a mujtahid (an independent scholar who undertakes an ijtihad), Ibn al-Wazir, for instance, maintains that the most important one for a mujtahid is to avoid from being occupied by the questions of kalam. His censure on kalam is also found when he discusses the attitude of
some members of the *ahl al-bayt* against *kalam*. According to Ibn al-Wazir, Muhammad b. Mansur said that Abd Allah b. Musa - may God be pleased with him - used to hate *kalam* on what people speak about. If a man told him about one who speculates (*yatakallam*) on what people speak about, he will say: O my God, make us die in Islam and then he gets silent.85

**III. Conclusion**

The cultural contact of Greek civilization with other cultural groups has brought about intellectual tradition which is typically identified as Hellenistic tradition which his own intellectual characteristic. Well known for his fascination, this tradition has 'tempted' the most intelligent human resources of the Muslim world to translate, interpret and give commentaries, to these Hellenistic literatures, which lead to the emergence of the ‘fruit’ of Hellenism, neo-platonisme (*falsafa*), neo-scholasitism (*kalam*), and neo-aristotelianism (*mantiq*).

The emergence of these Hellenistic traditions drew the unfavourable attitude from the Muslim scholars who perceived that Muslim intellectual tradition derived from the Qur'an and the Sunnah has sufficient epistemological tool for their search of truth. These scholars composed books, leaflet, fatwas, that lead to the emergence of anti-Hellenism literatures.

This study reveals that the opposition of the Muslim scholars to this tradition is so vehement and aggressive that we could find so much literatures that can be identified as anti-Hellenistic.
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