Twitter Thread by AthariCritic



AthariCritic
@AthariCritic



Leaving aside the antagonistic rhetoric, this response highlights the inadequacy of late salafi theology.

> My response to the Shaykh: https://t.co/tMgcFww9Rs https://t.co/EBA62i2ZyV
>
> — EBN HUSSEIN \U0001f3f3\ufe0f\U0001f3f4 (@EbnHussein1424) November 2, 2020

The entire post is premised on the understanding that one should adopt the salafi methodology is these regards, namely, to affirm the apparent meaning of an attribute while negating the kayfiyat. This raises a number of problems

Firstly, what does it mean when one takes the apparent meaning of things.Vernacularly speaking, all words are given specific meanings along with their specific connotations.Hence, taking a lexically established vernacular definition requires one to adopt its attached connotations

By negating that specific meaning of a word, one also negates that given connotation. In this way, one may affirm the terms itself, while negating its meaning, and thereby negating its connotations.

Ex: Affirming the literal meaning of "hand" for Allah entails affirming its attached connotations. By rejecting the affirmation of the literal meaning of hand, we then reject its attached connotations.

A common critique made by some is that the same vernacular word may have multiple different meanings. Therefore, one may say "hand of a clock" or "hand of a door" without appealing to a "human hand". This type of thinking, however, is more problematic then it is often seen to be

Firstly, although vernacular terms may be expressed in different ways, there exists a commonality in its connotations.While the "hand" in the "hand of a clock" or "hand of a door" may not be a human hand, both "hands" do refer to the same connotations- an appendage-like apparatus

Therefore, affirming the vernacular meaning of hand requires one to affirm its appendage-like connotation. Secondly, if one believes the meaning can be taken without affirming its connotations, such as affirming the hand in "the hand of a clock or door", then there is no problem

This is because by doing so, you no longer take the apparent (literal) meaning of hand, but rather a figurative one. Here, a personification exists amongst the door and cock, rendering it metaphorical -something which nullifies the salafi creed.

Hence, if Allah's hand is not like a humans hand (like the hand of a door or clock is not like a humans hand) then Allahs hand is like the hand of a door or clock, namely, it is FIGURATIVE. In this sense, the vernacular term is affirmed, yet the meaning is not established

Hussein's post then says that the Ashari fail in this argument as it presupposes a 3D image for Allah. This critique is nothing but nonsensical. The real idea being shown here is that Allah can not be conceived of. Thus, critiquing an imposed meaning entails conceivability.

The problem here, however, is that all vernacular definitions require some form of conceivable abstractedness. Otherwise, to impose a vernacular term along with its meaning- and hence, connotation- onto an unconceivable abstractedness is... meaningless (a contradiction)

Therefore, all vernacular and lexically established meaning of terms are negated for Allah, as Allah is an unconceivable being. You can not pick and chose when or when not to use vernacular definitions. Hence why the ashari position is so powerful.

To conclude, affirming the dhahir meaning while negating the kayfiyah is illogical, as affirming the dhahir meaning IS to AFFIRM a kayfiyah.