

()

(70))

(71)

1431 22

نقد تقسيم التوحيد إلى ألوهية وربوبية
Assessment of the Division of *Tawhid* (Oneness of Allah)
into *Uluhiyyah* (Divinity) and *Rububiyyah* (Lordship)

1946 / : 1365

Allamah Abu Mahasin Jamal Ad-Din Yusuf bin Ahmad Ad-Dijwi Al-Maliki Al-Azhari (d. 1365 H) said:

:

"

} :

{

The person who viewed such was Ibn Taymiyyah, who invented this, saying:
'Indeed the Messengers were not sent save for the purpose of (teaching) *Tawhid Al-*

Ulubiyah which means to single out Allah (alone) for worship; as for (the other,) *Tawhid Ar-Rububiyah*, which is to believe that Allah is the Lord of all existence and disposer of their affairs, none has disagreed with this, Muslim or polytheist, the proof for which is the Almighty's statement "And if you were to ask them who fashioned the heavens and the earth they would reply Allah" (39:38)

:

" :

..

!"

They also say: Those who seek means (*waseelah*) through the Prophets and pious, intercede through them and call upon them during hardships are worshipping them. (The Arabs of *jahaliyyah*) rejected the belief of the *Rububiyah* of statues, Angels and the Messiah but they did not become disbelievers because of disbelieving in the *Rububiyah* of these statues and whatever is alongside it, rather by abandoning *Tawhid Al-Ulubiyah* by worshipping them – and this is the same for those who visit graves, seek means through the pious, call upon them, and seek their assistance, seeking from them that which Allah has not given them the ability to do. Muhammad bin Abdil Wahhab said: 'Indeed their disbelief is more distasteful than the disbelief of worshipping statues.'

:

14 13/ 8 7

:

Their view that *Tawhid* divides into *Ulubhiyyah* and *Rububiyyah* was unheard of before Ibn Taymiyyah and is unimaginable as you shall soon learn. The Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم did not say to anyone who accepted Islam ‘there are two *Tawhids*, and unless you single out Allah in *Ulubhiyyah* you are not a Muslim’ and neither did he demonstrate this in a single discourse and this was not heard from a single member of the *Salaf* who they (the followers of Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Abdil Wahhab) boast of following in everything.

. } :
 .{

This division makes no sense for the true God is the true Lord and the false god is the false lord. None is deserving of worship or being assumed as divine except one who is the Lord. This division makes no sense also because we do not worship except those who we believe to be a lord that benefits and harms and thus worship is but a result of lordship, as the Almighty says ‘**The Lord of the heavens and the earth and what is between them, so worship Him and be patient in His worship. Do you know of any equal to Him?**’ (19:65). Therefore *Ulubhiyyah* is a consequence of *Rububiyyah*; for if we do not believe he is a lord who benefits and harms, then worship to him is illogical.

There is no meaning in worshipping other than Allah. This is proven from the Qur’an and Sunnah.

.{ } :

:

!

As for the Qur'an it states '**And (a prophet) will not instruct you to take the Angels and Prophets as lords.**' (3:80) which clarifies the great number of lords they possessed; despite the clarity of the Qur'an that they made the Angels lords, Ibn Taymiyyah and Muhammad bin Abdil Wahhab said 'they are monotheists in *Rububiyyah* since they have only one lord but they commit *shirk* in *Tawhid Al-Ulubiyah*'!

:

{ }

} :

.

.. .{

Yusuf عليه السلام said to his two companions in prison while inviting them to *Tawhid* '**Are many lords better or Allah, the One, the Irresistible?**' (12:39) And Allah the Almighty says '**Accordingly We have sent you among a nation, before which other nations passed away, to recite to them what We have revealed to you. Yet they still reject the All-Merciful. Say: "He is my Lord. There is no god but Him. I put my trust in Him and I turn to Him."**' (13:30) for they did not make him lord.

{ } :

} :

{

{..

} :

!

Another example is as Allah says of the statement of a person '**But he is Allah, my Lord**' (18:38) in response to one who denounced the Almighty's *Rububiyyah*. Also consider their discourse on the Day of Rising '**By Allah! Indeed we were in clear error when we made you equals to**

the Lord of all existence.’ (26:97-98) and observe the Almighty’s statement ‘When it is said to them “Prostrate before the Most Merciful!” they reply “What is the Most Merciful – should we prostrate before whom you instruct us to?”’ (25:60). Do you view the one to say this, a monotheist?!

{ } :

{ } :

In addition, Allah has said when he took the covenant from all people “**Am I not your Lord?**” and they replied “**Yes**” (7:172) so if acceptance of *Tawhid Ar-Rububiyyah* was insufficient and accepted by the polytheists, as Ibn Taymiyyah said, then taking this covenant would be unnecessary and they would not have to say on the Day of Rising ‘**Indeed we were unaware of this**’ (7:172); it would be necessary for Allah to change the conditions of the covenant to what they recognise and include *Ulubiyyah* since *Rububiyyah* is insufficient according to them. Anyway, *Tawhid Ar-Rububiyyah* was sufficient for them and they were not required to accept *Tawhid Al-Ulubiyyah* also. If they were not inherent and inseparable He –subhanahu- would have asked from them to confirm *Tawhid Al-Ulubiyyah* as well.

:

!

As for the Sunnah, there is the case of the two Angels asking the dead of the identity of one’s lord and not of one’s god because there is no distinction between lord and god; in the view of these people it would be necessary to ask ‘Who is your god?’ not ‘Who is your lord?’!!

{ } :

Regarding the statement ‘**And if you were to ask them who fashioned the heavens and the earth they would reply Allah**’ (39:38) this is what they say with their tongues but do not believe in their hearts; they were forced to say this for the decisive proofs that were presented before them. Perhaps they spoke of something that wouldn’t even come near to settling in their hearts or reaching their souls, since they accompanied this statement with phrases showing they were lying because they believed the idols could benefit and harm. Also they became completely ignorant of Allah and attributed even the smallest of matters to other than him.

!!

:

!!

!!

The followers of Ibn Taymiyyah after all this say ‘they are monotheists in regards *Tawhid Ar-Rububiyah* and the Messengers did not fight them but for the purpose of *Tawhid Al-Ulubiyah*, and they disbelieved not except by abandoning this’!! I do not know the connotations of such restrictions, considering they denied the Messengers, refuted what was sent to them, made Halal the Haram, rejected life after death and the Afterlife, claimed that Allah has a wife and a son and the Angels are the daughters of Allah . And for all these reasons the Messengers did not fight them according to these people but fought them for the absence of *Tawhid Al-Ulubiyah* and they are

like the Muslims in regards to *Tanbid Ar-Rububiyah!* Or the Muslims are greater disbelievers in the view of Muhammad bin Abdil Wahhab!

.

We do not agree with any of this, yet we say: Upon the supposition there is a distinction between *Tawhid Ar-Rububiyyah* and *Tawhid Al-Ulubiyyah* as is claimed, *Tamassul* (seeking means to Allah) does not negate *Tawhid Al-Ulubiyyah* because it is not worship, neither linguistically, nor legally, nor customarily and none have said that to call upon and seek means through the pious is worship.

If one insists that Allah is closer to us than our jugular vein so we need no intermediation we reply 'you have learnt a thing but are ignorant of a thing' for if your view is such it would be necessary for you to leave all means and

intermediates in everything since this world is built on the wisdom that there are means and accessories to everything. It would be necessary for him to deny intercession on the Day of Rising.

..) : .(

It will follow that Umar erred when he said ‘We seek means to you through the cousin of your Prophet, Abbas’ (Sahih Bukhari). They would have to close all doors to means and intermediates which is in opposition to the divine Sunnah (way). It is also necessary they fall under the same rule they place the Muslims under since it is impossible they leave all means and intermediates. As a matter of fact they are the most attached people to means and the most dependent.

The difference between the live and dead in this context has no implication for the one seeking means does not ask of anything from the dead by principle but seeks from Allah alone through the means of the dead or the repute of the dead person in Allah’s eyes or His love for him or the like of this – is there any ascription of divinity to the dead in this, or is this worship? These people base their view on unverified conjecture – after all Muslims have permitted *Tawassul*, rather have considered it to be good.

