



## History of Islamic Philosophy

Home Page: [hpi.aletaha](http://hpi.aletaha)

Ale-Taha Institute of Higher Education

Online ISSN: 2981-2097

# Knowledge of Logic: Necessity or Refusal (Examining the Views and Reasons of Muslim Proponents and Opponents)

Ebrahim Noei<sup>1</sup> 

1. Associate Professor of Department of Islamic Studies, Faculty of Theology and Religions, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.

E-mail: [e\\_noei@sbu.ac.ir](mailto:e_noei@sbu.ac.ir)

---

### Article Info

**Article type:**  
Research Article

**Article history:**

Received 14 December 2024

Received in revised form  
04 January 2025

Accepted 05 January 2025

Published online 21  
March 2025

**Keywords:**

*Logic, Islam, Ghazali,  
Suyuti, Ibn al\_Salah,  
Ibn\_Taymiyyah.*

---

### ABSTRACT

Knowledge of logic includes the rules that govern the way of thinking and reasoning. Muslims became familiar with this science in the third century by translating Aristotle's books and immediately faced the challenge of what does this science have to do with Islam? Should Muslims use the same method as Aristotle in their religious sciences or avoid paying attention to this science? The present research, by searching the books of Muslim jurists and theologians, shows that each of these two assumptions had supporters, and of course, the number of opponents of the science of logic was more than its supporters. And those opponents used violence against the proponents of the science of logic and brought arguments to ban the science of logic and tried to show that God is not pleased with this knowledge.

This article also tries to bring these two views closer together. The final result of this research is that most of the arguments of the opponen of the logic are a warning for those who may not use this knowledge correctly or are involved in the thoughts of philosophers who have distanced themselves from religion.

---

**Cite this article:** Noei, E (2025). Knowledge of Logic: Necessity or Refusal (Examining the Views and Reasons of Muslim Proponents and Opponents), *History of Islamic Philosophy*,4 (1), 143-164.



<https://doi.org/10.22034/hpi.2025.494024.1123>

© The Author(s). **Publisher:** Ale-Taha Institute of Higher Education Institute..

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22034/hpi.2025.494024.1123>

---

## Introduction

Logic teaches thinking and reasoning in the form of rules to define concepts and arguments. Although these laws are given to man by nature; But sometimes it doesn't use them properly. Aristotle tried to collect those rules by writing books. When these books entered the Islamic world in the third century, Muslim thinkers were faced with the question of what is the relationship between these books and the Islamic religion. Muslim thinkers were divided into two groups in this regard.

First category: A number of Muslim thinkers considered the use of these books in religious studies a necessity; Because otherwise there is no guarantee that we will not make mistakes in our studies and will not mislead others. In this category, in addition to logicians and philosophers, there are some jurists and theologians who considered the use of logic important to the extent that they said that without the use of logic, one cannot achieve the happiness that religion wants us to have.

The second category: There were many jurists and theologians who, mainly paying attention to the characteristics of the centuries before the arrival of logical books in the Islamic world, came to the conclusion that the use of logical books in religious studies is not only unnecessary; They should also be avoided. The number of jurists and theologians who fall into this category has been so great that the claim of their consensus has become a reason to ban the use of logical books in religious studies. They did not refrain from any violence against those books and their use, and they accused those who used them of infidelity and called them the people of Hell.

The present article examines the above categories and the ups and downs that the Knowledge of logic has found among these conflicts. Hence, he first deals with the views of those who considered the use of the laws of logic necessary for religious studies, and then refers to the reactions of their opponents. It then examines the arguments of those opponents as to whether the Knowledge of logic is useful or harmful to Muslims, and finally tries to cite as many aspects as possible that bring

the two groups closer together.

### **1. The necessity of logic for religious people**

Many Muslim thinkers consider the study of logic necessary for human happiness. They believe that there is no other way to distinguish truth from falsehood and reasoning from sophistry except using the science of logic. According to Ibn Sina (d. 428 AH), human nature requires the use of logic. (Ibn Sina, 1985, 1:9) Al-Farabi (d. 339 AH) considered the Knowledge of logic to be a set of rules that strengthen the intellect and prevent people from making mistakes on the right path (Farabi, 1999: 29) Rather, there is no other way to reach the truth except by applying the science of logic (Ibn Rushd, 1993: 221) The main argument was that the science of logic provides religious people with rules that help them not fall into error when thinking and reasoning about religious doctrines. It also helps believers to recognize the fallacies of others and not be deceived. Although these claims were made by philosophers and logicians, they were also accepted by a number of Muslim jurists and theologians. One of these jurists was Ibn Hazm of Andalusia (d. 456 AH), who considered the logic to be a good and high-ranking knowledge (Ibn Hazm, 1983, 4:35) because it helps people to know the facts. Knowing the facts is also a prelude to knowing God and His commands and achieving happiness (Ibid, 4: 75) He wrote a book titled "Al-Taqqreeb Le had al-Mantiq" and said: "Anyone who reads this book will see that its usefulness is not limited to one Knowledge, but it is useful for the thinkers of all Knowledges." It is useful for everyone in understanding the Holy Qur'an and the instructions of the Prophet, as well as in jurisprudence (Ibid, 4: 98). According to Ibn Hazm, it will not be possible to understand the words of God and the Prophet and recognize the correct fatwa without knowing the Knowledge of logic.

Among Muslim theologians, the number of Ash'ari theologians who considered the use of logic necessary to achieve human happiness was not small. It seems that the first of them is Abu Hamid Ghazali (d. 505 AH).

He believed that the achievement of eternal happiness for humans and freedom from the domination of the senses and the domination of the intellect are conditioned by the use of logic. All benefits are small compared to such happiness, and the eternal happiness of man is conditional on the acquisition of knowledge, which, of course, is only possible with the help of the laws of logic (Ghazali, 1961, 36). Therefore, whoever does not know the laws of logic, his knowledge can never be trusted (Ghazali, 2015, 1: 20). He said: I do not claim to evaluate only religious knowledge with the help of logic rules, but with their help, I also measure each of the sciences of arithmetic, geometry, natural sciences, jurisprudence and theology. With the help of the rules of logic, I can distinguish right from wrong. Because logic is an accurate scale that does not make mistakes when measuring (Ghazali, 1996, 195) He introduced logic terms into jurisprudence and included jurisprudential examples in his logic books. However, he gave the titles of *Mahak al\_Nazar*, *Meayar al\_ilm* and *Al\_Qastas al\_Mustaqim* to the books he wrote in the science of logic. Because he wanted to avoid the possible harm of the opponents of logic (Goldziher, 1966, 154). Fakhr Razi (d. 606 A.H) was another Ash'ari theologian who, by authoring several books on the Knowledge of logic, pointed out the place of this knowledge and its place in achieving happiness. He wrote the book *Logic al\_Mulkhas* and also explained and summarized the books of Ibn Sina in the Knowledge of logic, and he wrote *Sharh al\_Isharat*, *Sharh oyun al\_Hikmah*, *Sharh al\_Najat* and *Lubab al\_Isharat*. Saif al\_Din Ali ibn Muhammad Amodi (d. 622 A.H) also wrote books on logic and philosophy such as *Daqayq al\_Haqayq* and *Kashf al\_Tamwihat fi Sharh al\_Tanbihat*. Shams al\_Din Muhammad ibn Ashraf Samarqandi (d. 704 A.H) also wrote an important logical book called *al\_Qistas* and later wrote a commentary on it. He also wrote the book "*Basharat al\_Isharat fi Sharh al\_Asharat*". Saad al\_Din Taftazati (d. 792 A.H) wrote both *Tahzeeb al\_Mantiq* and described the book *al\_Shamsiyah*. Jourjani (d. 816 A.H) also wrote the book *Al\_Kobra fi al\_Mantiq* and in his commentary on the book "*Al\_Mawaqif*" Azod

al\_Din Eeji (d. 756A.H) gave logical arguments.

## **2. Reactions to the necessity of logic for religious people**

After the translation and introduction of logical books in the Islamic world, many Muslim thinkers expressed their opposition to them in different ways. Ibn Taymiyyah (d.728 AH) writes: After the Knowledge of logic was translated into Arabic and became famous, Muslim scholars always criticized it and did not pay attention to that knowledge and its people in religious studies (Suyuti, 333) This opposition was not limited to the jurists, and as Ibn Taymiyyah wrote: "Most of the early theological schools, such as the Ash'arites, the Mu'tazilites, the Karamites, and the Shiites, dealt with logic in the strongest possible way." (Ibid,324) To the extent that they have said: Whoever teaches logic becomes an infidel (Badawi, 147) Many of its topics are a kind of sophistry and deception, and those who are engaged in those topics will be the people of Hell and the examples of the Companions of the Fire of Hell (Ibn Taymiyyah, 1971, 1:218) Salafists considered logic to be a tool in the hands of Satan (Recher,2005, 164) Suyuti considered the Knowledge of logic to be evil and reprehensible. According to him, whoever says that learning logic is obligatory is ignorant and a heretic; Because even interpretation, hadith and jurisprudence -which are the best of all knowledge - are not objectively obligatory (Suyuti, 2004, 1: 301). Suyuti also said: One of the most false lies and worst slanders is when someone says that belief in the oneness of God cannot be realized without knowing the laws of logic. Because on this basis, we must say that most Muslims are infidels (ibid). The opponents of logic considered it abhorrent to even greet someone who is engaged in logic and did not allow communication with such a person except out of necessity. Such a person cannot be a judge and his verdict is not valid in any court. His testimony will not be accepted in any court unless he repents. Also, you should not go to him and hear hadiths from him (Suyuti, 2008, 184). It is not permissible to rent a building to teach logic teachers and it is obligatory to expel them from schools

(Zarkashi, 1998, 1: 51). Under the influence of such words, the Abbasid ruler banned the purchase and sale of logical books in 279 AH (Ibn Emad, 1986, 3: 326). The jurists opposed to the logic considered it the Sharia duty of the ruler to ward off the evil of these misguided people and expel them from Religious schools and punish them for engaging in the Knowledge of logic. If a logician promotes the ideas of philosophers, he should be killed unless he returns to Islam. One of the most important religious duties is to expel professors of philosophy and philosophical sciences such as logic from religious schools. After that, they should be imprisoned or imprisoned at home and a teacher from the elders of religion should come in their place. (Ibn al\_Salah, 1986, 1: 211) These kinds of words caused Saif al\_Din Ali bin Muhammad al-Shafi'i (died 622 AH) to be threatened with death by some jurists, because he also taught logic in addition to teaching religious sciences in Cairo. He also fled to Syria for fear of his life (Ibn Khallaqan, 1900, 3: 293). Abu Hayyan al\_Andalus wrote about Ibn Rushd (d.595 AH): People turned away from him and did not narrate from him; Because he was engaged in Philosophical knowledge and logic. Finally, the ruler of Andalusia, at the request of the jurists there, expelled Ibn Rushd and exiled him, causing him to be beaten and cursed (Abu Hayyan Andalusi, 1420, 6: 46). Burning logical and philosophical books has been a relatively common Opinion for jurists (Suyuti, 2008, 145). In the news of 277 AH, at the height of the Baghdad scientific movement, they wrote: All those whose profession was the reproduction of books were sworn not to write philosophical and logical books (Badawi, 135). Historians also wrote in the news of 555 AH, that is, 50 years after Ghazali's death, that the Abbasid ruler, al\_Mustanjad, arrested one of the judges and took his books and found every philosophical and logical book among them (such as al\_Shifa Ibn Sina and the letters of Akhwan al\_Safa) ordered to burn all those books in the city square (Ibn Athir, 1965, 11: 258). Ibn Kathir al\_damasqi (d. 774 AH) also wrote in the events of 603 AH that the Abbasid ruler set fire to the books and property of Abdul Qadir Jilani's grandson, that is, Abd

Salam bin Abdul Wahhab (d. 611 AH); Because among them he had seen philosophy and logic books (Ibn Kathir, 1986, 13: 45). It was in this direction that Yahya bin Sharaf Navavi (d.676 AH) prohibited the purchase and sale of philosophical and logical books and ordered their destruction (Novavi, 9: 253). Such violence in Andalusia led to the fact that when someone wanted to buy a book on logic, he secretly bought it. The logicians there did not allow themselves to use the word logic (Al\_mantiq) for this science and used the term "Al\_mafal" instead (Abu Hayyan Andalusi, 1420, 6: 48).

### **3. Reasons for opposing the necessity of logic for religious people**

The jurists and theologians who opposed the conversion of Muslims to the Knowledge of logic have cited various reasons to show that learning logic is not necessary for Muslims and that God is not pleased with Muslims paying attention to it. And for this reason, it must be said that the Knowledge of logic not only does not lead to the perfection of human beings, but also leads to their cruelty. On this occasion, the most important reasons for their examination are examined.

#### **3.1. Uselessness of logic for Muslims**

The jurists and theologians who oppose the science of logic in the first step say that even if it can be claimed that logic is not inherently an obstacle to knowing God and His commands and serving Him, it will undoubtedly be of no use. Logical laws only refer to general matters, and generalities do not exist externally in the outside world, and do not imply specific and particular matters (Suyuti, 1: 301). According to these opponents, Islamic rules do not need the science of logic. The rules that the science of logic provides about definition and reasoning are useless, and God has made religious scientists without the need of those rules (Ibn al\_Salah, 1986, 1: 211). According to these opponents, even if it is useful to learn the knowledge of logic, it should not be accepted that pure people are inherently deprived of these benefits and it should not be assumed that

these people are forced to learn logical concepts and terms (Subki, 1999, 281).

### **3.2. Disadvantages of logic for Muslims**

The jurists who are against the knowledge of logic have counted many evils for the study of logic. Ibn Taymiyyah considered many issues of this science to be sophistry (Ibn Taymiyyah, 1971, 1: 218) Ibn Qayyim Juziyeh (d.751 AH) enumerated these corruptions in a poem as follows: 1) It is full of lies and slander. 2) It drives good minds to the brink of insanity. 3) It destroys human nature and disrupts its principles and foundations. 4). Science is unstable and on the edge of the abyss. 5) He secretly and openly betrays the one who feels that he needs that knowledge. 6) The movement of language in the field of logic is like the walking of a person who cannot walk because a stone is tied to his feet. 7) It is accompanied by slips and weaknesses. 8) It is like a mirage that sees a thirsty person in the desert and thinks that it will quench his thirst, but it disappoints him and he regrets that he spent his life in a false dream ( Ibn Qayyim, 158) He also claims that if logic is used in any other knowledge, that knowledge will be destroyed and its rules and principles will be messed up (Ibid) Such corruptions and harms lead every Muslim to the conclusion that studying logic is not rewarding and if he spends a lifetime studying it, he will not be safe from divine punishment on the Day of Resurrection, Unless he repents (Zubaydi,2005, 1: 283).

### **3.3. Logic is the cause of disbelief and misery**

Jurists such as Abu Mansour Muhammad ibn Asaad al\_Attari (d. 571 AH) (Subki, 1999, 281), Ibn al\_Salah (d. 643 AH) (Ibn al\_Salah, 1407, 1: 210), Siraj al\_Din al\_Qazvini (d. 736 AH) (Suyuti, 145) Taqi al\_Din ibn Abdul\_Sattar al\_Hanbali, the master of Ibn Taymiyyah (Ibid. 148), Badr al\_Din al\_Zarkashi (d. 794 AH) (Zarkashi, 51), Suyuti (d.911 AH) (Suyuti, 300), Ali al\_Qari al\_Harawi (d.1014 AH) (Zubaydi, 2005, 1: 277) says that learning the logic causes Muslims to disbelieve. Because



logic is an introduction to philosophy and philosophy contains blasphemous claims (Ibn al\_Salah, 1986, 1: 210). Sheikh Abu Mansour al\_attari also wrote in response to the question of Yusuf ibn Muhammad al\_damasqi about the permissibility or prohibition of studying logic: No one deserves to turn to logic; Because the one who plunges into these issues is not sure that he will be safe from dangerous consequences like disbelief (Subki, 281)

### **3.4. Refusal of the Qur'an, Prophet, Companions and followers from the knowledge of logic**

Some opponents of the knowledge of logic say that God has not allowed learning the knowledge of logic. If there was any good in this knowledge, the Quran or the Prophet would have said something about it (Suyuti, 156). Also, the companions of the Prophet and the mujtahids did not allow the teaching of logic. God has removed all these leaders from this pollution. Ibn Salah disagrees with Ghazali who says: You cannot trust the words and thoughts of someone who does not know anything about logic (Ibn al\_Salah, 210-211) The reason for Ibn Salah's opposition is that Abu Bakr, Umar and many of the Companions were convinced of their religious beliefs, while none of them had studied logic (Ibn al\_Salah, 1992, 1: 252) Ibn al\_Daqq (d.702AH) also made the same objection to Ghazali (Zarkashi, 1994, 8: 233). On the other hand, if the topics of logic had an impact on the guidance and growth of Muslims, the Prophet and his companions would not have stopped expressing it. Before his death, the Prophet stated what Muslims needed in religious affairs and never refrained from stating what would bring Muslims closer to God or avoid His punishment. Therefore, learning logic is heresy. According to them, only the knowledge that has reached us from the Prophet can be considered knowledge, and anything else, even if it is knowledge, is of no benefit. If it were, the Prophet would have definitely explained it to us (Abdollahi, 2024, 77).

### **3.5. Hadiths imply a prohibition of logic**

Opponents of logic believe that the prohibition of paying attention to the Knowledge of logic can be seen as one of the requirements of the hadiths indicating the prohibition of employment in any work that leads to corruption or fear of sedition (Suyuti, 65) According to Suyuti, logic does not lead to good and anyone who thinks about it will not reach the goals of religion, because there is incompatibility between it and religious issues (Zubaydi, 2005, 1: 282).

Al-Zubaydi (d. 1205 AH) also listed some of these general hadiths and under some of them, he considers the logic to be one of the examples of Knowledges that have no use for its companions except in this world. Those who want to show their superiority over their co-religionists turn to the science of logic. Also, these opponents warn by relying on another hadith: Whoever learns the science of logic to achieve his worldly goals will not taste the smell of heaven (Ibid) Therefore, logic is not one of Knowledges that can be paid attention to with the divine eye, and the only motivation to deal with it is worldly motives such as gaining fame and excellence.

### **3.6. Muslim consensus on the ineffectiveness of the laws of logic in happiness and the hindrance of those laws to reach perfection**

There have been a large number of Muslim jurists and theologians who have opposed the science of logic. Ibn Taymiyyah introduces them as those who are very careful in scientific matters (Suyuti, 333) Ibn Qayyim Joziyeh had access to the books of theologians that were written in opposition and prohibition of logic. The books of: Abu Bakr ibn Tayyeb Baghalani (d. 403 AH), Abdul Jabbar (d. 415 AH), Abu Ali Jubai (d. 304AH) and his son Abu Hashem (d. 321 AH), Abu Al\_Maali Juvini (d.478 AH), Abu al\_Qasim Ansari (d. 319 AH) (Ibn Qayyim, 158) Before these books, Abul Al\_Hasan al-Ash'ari (d.324 AH) wrote a book titled "Al\_rad ala Al\_Mantiq" which is not available now (Badawi, 1997, 516). Ibn Khaldun (d. 809 AH) also wrote that before Ghazali, Ash'ari

theologians adhered to laws and principles that were never compatible with logical criteria in proving their religious claims, so they were not happy with the Knowledge of logic (Ibn Khaldun, 1988, 1: 647) In addition, a number of jurists of the four Sunni schools banned the Knowledge of logic and thus showed that the Knowledge of logic should not be included in religious studies. Imam Shafi'i (d.204 AH) is at the head of them. Among the Shafi'is are people like Ibn al\_Sabbagh (d.477 AH), Ibn Qushiri (d. 465 AH), Nasr Al\_Muqdisi (d. 490 AH), Imad al\_Din Muhammad Ibn Yunus (d. 608 AH), Al\_Hafiz Abu Tahir Ahmad Al\_Salfi Al\_Isfahani al\_Damashqi (d. 576 AH), Abul Muhasen Yusuf Ibn Bandar Damasqi (d. 563 AH), Ibn Asaker (d. 571 AH), Ibn Athir (d. 555 AH), Taqi al\_Din Ibn al\_Salah Shahrzuri (d. 643 AH), Abu Muhammad eazz al\_Din Abd al\_Aziz Ibn Abd al\_Salam (d. 660 AH), Shahab al\_Din Ibn Ibrahim Muqdisi (d.665 AH), Yahya Ibn Sharaf al\_Navavi (d.676 AH), Muhammad Ibn Ali Ibn Al\_Wahaab known as Ibn Daqiq (d.702 AH), Abu Ishaq Burhan al\_Din Al\_Jabari (d. 732 AH) , Abuhian al\_Tawhidi (d. 414 AH), Sharaf al\_Din Abdullah ibn al\_Mu'min ibn Khalaf al\_Damyati (d.705 AH), Shams al\_Din Dhahabi (d.748 AH), Hassan ibn Muhammad ibn Abdullah al-Taibi (d.743 AH), Abu Muhammad Abd al\_Rahim ibn Hassan ibn Ali al\_Asnawi (d.772AH). Shahab al\_Din Al\_Azraei (d.837 AH), Abdul Rahim Ibn Hossein known as al\_Wali al\_Iraqi (d.806 AH), Sharaf al\_Din Ismaeil Ibn Abi Bakr Al\_Muqari (d.837 AH) and Sharaf al\_Din Manawi (d.871 AH) with knowledge Logic has opposed. Among the jurists of the Maliki sect, some jurists such as Abu Muhammad Abdullah ibn Abi Zayd al\_Qairwani (d.386 AH), Abu Bakr Ibn Al\_Arabi (468-543 AH), Abul Waleed Sulaiman Ibn Khalaf al\_Baji (d.494 AH), Abu Talib Makki (d. 386 AH), The author of Qut al\_Qulub, Abul Hasan Ibn al\_Hassar (d.610 AH), Abu Bakr Muhammad Ibn Walid al\_Tartushi (d. 502 AH), Abu Amer Ibn Al\_Rabie, Abul Hasan Ibn Habib Maliki (d. 520AH), Abul Hasan Ali Ibn Habib (d. 540 AH), Ibn Al\_Munir and Ibn Abi Jamarah (d.599 AH) and most of the jurists living in the Maghrib consider learning logic

forbidden. Abu Saeed al\_Serafi (d.368 AH) and Siraj al\_Din Qazvini Baghdadi (d.745 AH) are two Hanafi jurists who forbade the Knowledge of logic. Hanbali jurists such as Ibn Juzi (508-598 AH), Saad al\_Din Harithi (d.711 AH) and Ibn Taymiyyah (d.728 AH) also prohibited learning logic (Suyuti, 39) As it can be seen, by listing the names of the thinkers of the four Sunni schools of jurisprudence, Suyuti tried to show their consensus on the prohibition of logic; But the truth is that the number of jurists of these schools cannot be limited to this number, and therefore his claim of consensus cannot be accepted. Some of the figures of those religions, such as Ibn Hazm Andalusi, Abu Hamid Ghazali, Ibn Rushd and Fakhr Razi, considered the use of the laws of logic necessary for Muslims. It is surprising that Suyuti mentions the names of Ghazali and Ibn Rushd among the jurists who sanction logic; It seems that he did not pay much attention to the logical books of these two scientists.

### **3.7. Dangerous motivations to introduce the Knowledge of logic to the Islamic world**

How can we expect logic to be a kind of perfection for Muslims, while the entry of this Knowledge into the Islamic world was motivated to distance Muslims from religion? During the rule of Ma'mun Abbasi, the Barmakians translated and published logical books with the motive of spreading heresies in the Islamic society and deviating from the prophetic way. Barmakians (whose hearts were full of disbelief and enmity with the Islamic government) created events to destroy the religion of Islam. If God had not promised his prophet that the religion of Islam would win over other nations, those perverts might have invalidated the religion of Islam. According to Suyuti, the first events that the Abbasids created in Islam was the issue of bringing Greek books to the land of Islam and translating and distributing them among Muslims. The Roman ruler, fearing that the Christians would abandon their religion and follow the Greeks, hid all those books from the Christians. When Yahya ibn Khalid Barmaki became a minister in the court of Bani Abbas government, he

learned about those books and sent gifts to that Roman ruler to take those books from him. After receiving many gifts, the Roman ruler consulted his ministers. The next time Barmaki's envoy brought him a gift, the ruler of Rome said to him: What does Barmaki want from me instead of these gifts? Barmaki replied: You have to lend us the books you have hidden. The ruler was pleased to hear Barmaki's request and asked Barmaki to never return those books so that they would be safe from the evil of those books. After receiving those books, Barmaki tried to gather every infidel and philosopher and give the books to them to translate. Among those books were logical writings that were translated, and of course most of the translators of these books became infidels. Barmaki held meetings in his palace with the presence of these translators and promoted those misleading books (ibid).

#### **4. Efforts to bring views closer**

##### **4.1. The difference between logic in human nature and books written in logic**

Proponents of logic note that logic has the dignity of a method used in thinking and reasoning. Thinking and reasoning are not limited to a moment in human life, and since the beginning of their existence, humans were equipped with a method that helped them not to make mistakes when thinking or reasoning. They also relied on a method when they wanted to present their ideas and arguments to others or to examine the ideas and arguments presented by others. This method was in human nature and it was a kind of logic that they had not learned from anyone and had not read a book about. Years and centuries later, some people (Aristotle) sought to compile and regulate these natural ways of human thinking and wrote books in this field. These books were translated and entered the Islamic world in the third century. Therefore, it can be accepted that the books of logic were not useful for people like the Prophet, Companions and followers; Because they followed the rules of logic with their pure nature and not having logical books did not cause

mistakes in their rational and reasoning concepts. Although the Prophet and his companions did not learn the terms and logic expressed by Aristotle and did not advise others to learn it, they used the rules of logic based on their pure nature. Therefore, it should not be assumed that other people and religious people should not use those books; Because it is quite conceivable that factors such as the passage of time and the influence of other cultures have caused Muslims to need logical books. Of course, it should be added that according to the numerous verses of the Holy Qur'an, both God and the prophets used the rules of logic to guide people. Ghazali clearly showed that the Holy Qur'an and the prophets used the laws of logic in guiding people to God. Ghazali considered God as the first teacher, Gabriel as the second teacher, and God's Messenger as the third teacher in using logical rules (Ghazali, 1996, 195). God revealed these logical laws in his book and taught them to his prophets. The laws of logic are examples of the proofs that God has given to Ebrahim (Ibid.194). Ebrahim used the first form of analogy against Nimrod; This argument is stated in verse 258 of Surah Al-Baqarah as follows: « فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ »  
 « يَأْتِي بِالشَّمْسِ مِنَ الْمَشْرِقِ فَأْتِ بِهَا مِنَ الْمَغْرِبِ » ; 'Indeed Allah brings the sun from the east; now you bring it from the west (Ibid). Ebrahim also used the second form of analogy. God has narrated his argument in verse ٧٦ of Surah Al-an'aam as follows: « فَلَمَّا جَنَّ عَلَيْهِ اللَّيْلُ رَأَىٰ كَوْكَبًا ۖ قَالَ هَٰذَا رَبِّي ۖ فَلَمَّا أَفَلَ قَالَ لَا أُحِبُّ الْآفِلِينَ » ; When night darkened over him, he saw a star and said, 'This is my Lord!' But when it set, he said, 'I do not like those who set (Ibid, 202) Of course, al-Ghazali immediately added that although this analogy was used by Prophet Ebrahim, God also taught it to Prophet Muhammad (Ibid) God has asked the Prophet to use this analogy in verse 18 of Surah Al-maa'idah and verses 6 and 7 of Surah Jumu'ah (Ibid, 203). In verse 91 of Surah Al-an'aam, the third form of analogy is used. « وَمَا قَدَرُوا اللَّهَ حَقَّ قَدْرِهِ إِذْ »  
 « قَالُوا مَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ عَلَىٰ بَشَرٍ مِّن شَيْءٍ قُلْ مَنْ أَنزَلَ الْكِتَابَ الَّذِي جَاءَ بِهِ مُوسَىٰ نُورًا وَهُدًى لِلنَّاسِ » ; They did not regard Allah with the regard due to Him when they said, 'Allah has not sent down anything to any human.' Say, 'Who had sent down the Book that was brought by Moses as a light and guidance for the people

(Ibid, 204) An exceptional analogy is also used in verses 22 of Surah Anbiya and 42 of Surah Bani Israeil (Ibid, 206). In addition to Ghazali, another Muslim thinker named Sadr al\_Din Muhammad ibn Ebrahim Shirazi (d.1050 AH) also shows the use of these analogies by divine prophets such as Noah, Abraham, Moses and Muhammad (Sadr al\_Din Shirazi, 1985, 5: 338) It should also be noted that Farabi collected hadiths from Prophet Muhammad in which the use of logic was recommended in some way; However, now nothing remains except the name of this Farabi book (Ibn Abi usiba'ah, 609) Taghi al\_Din Subki even said: The first and second caliphs had such a mastery over these logical issues that even Ghazali and his ilk were unaware of even a tenth of it. Anyone who thinks that the first two caliphs did not know about this introduction has insulted them. We are sure that this introduction was in their nature. As they mastered the science of syntax and we must learn it now. Grammar scholars have always tried to introduce us to the rules that early Muslims naturally observed in their speech. By following these rules, we make ourselves similar to those companions of the Prophet (Subki, 281).

#### **4.2. The non-use of the knowledge of logic by the Qur'an, the prophets, the companions and the followers does not indicate the heresy and illegitimacy of this knowledge.**

It cannot be said that the topics of the science of logic have not been used by the Holy Qur'an and the prophets of God and the companions of the Messenger of God, therefore, the Knowledge of logic is heretical and illegitimate. Also, it cannot be said that anyone who says that logic is useful for Muslims, wants to say that we consider the Prophet and his companions to be ignorant; Because the Prophet and his companions were not unaware of any of these matters and knew them in detail, but only talked about the issues that were raised in their time. In addition, the Prophet did not say anything about some jurisprudential issues, such as vows and rulings of servants and testaments. Therefore, many jurists and imams of the past, including Shafi'i, Abu Hanifa and Malik, should also

be considered heretics (Ash'ari, 1925, 88). According to Ibn Hazm, it was not only the Knowledge of logic that the righteous ancestors did not mention, but other sciences also have a similar fate. None of the Muslim forefathers have said anything about syntax, but after Muslims paid attention to these issues and examined the effect of the difference in movements at the end of words and the Arabs' difference in the difference in meanings, grammar books were written and the misunderstanding of the meaning of the word of God was prevented (Ibn Hazm, 1983, 4: 94) Ibn Hazm used to say: Muslims also needed logic in this way. And being alien to logic could cause them to fall into error and sophistry and make them unable to distinguish right from wrong (Ibid) From Subki's point of view, the relationship between logic and mind is like the relationship between syntax and language; Just as the knowledge of grammar was needed when the Arabic language was mixed with other languages, the science of logic was needed when minds lost the ability to distinguish right from wrong (Subki, 281).

#### **4.3. The difference between humans in the need for the Knowledge of logic**

From the beginning, the proponents of logic did not claim that all humans need to learn logic or that all humans need it equally so that no one can object why the Prophet and his followers did not use it. Ibn Sina believes that human nature is familiar with the laws of logic and learning the Knowledge of logic is not obligatory for those who have been approved by God (Ibn Sina, 1985, p. 9). Abul Barakat al-Baghdadi (d. 547 AH) considers logic useful for guiding the mind to the truths of science and preventing the mind from wrong thinking, but he considers human beings to be of four types. Two of them do not require learning logic. People who have a clean nature and the purity of that nature has made them unnecessary to learn logic. The second category is people who have completely contaminated this nature and instinct. This contamination prevents them from using the Knowledge of logic (Baghdadi, 1994 ,vol.1,



p. 7). Fakhr Razi Ash'ari also came to the conclusion that only two groups benefit from logic. People who have not benefited from any of the acquired knowledge, but have the ability to have this knowledge, and people who have acquired a part of knowledge, but due to the contamination of their minds, do not understand other parts of knowledge. Also, people whose divine nature has reached perfection do not need the science of logic (Fakhr Razi, 1994, vol.1, p. 46).

#### **4.4. The need to distinguish between the nature of the Knowledge of logic and the practice of logicians**

Sometimes, some claimants of the Knowledge of logic, when using this knowledge, do not follow its rules correctly, and fall into sophistry and mistakes in the position of thinking and reasoning, and mislead others as well. This statement is not specific to the knowledge of logic, and some people may be engaged in the knowledge of jurisprudence or hadith and interpretation, but due to not observing the terms and conditions of using this knowledge, they mislead both themselves and others. Therefore, it cannot be concluded that because some people who used the laws of logic have become disbelievers or gone astray, then this Knowledge should not be used. According to Ibn Rushd, what is inherently beneficial should not be prohibited due to complications. On the other hand, the contents of the summary hadiths which indicate the condemnation of seeking knowledge for the sake of the world and superiority over others cannot be attributed to the principle of the Knowledge of logic; Rather, the scholars of any Knowledge (including the logic) are subject to these hadiths if they study and promote this knowledge with such motivations. Also, it cannot be said that because this knowledge is common among infidels and polytheists or originated among non-Muslims, its nature has the ability to lead Muslims to disbelief and sedition.

#### **4.5. The difference between the motives of studying a Knowledge and its nature**

When logicians count the benefits of the Knowledge of logic, they only

pay attention to the principle of this Knowledge; Regardless of the motivations of translating these books, the degrees of Islam. According to them, following the rules of logic requires that everyone can use them when thinking and reasoning so as not to make mistakes. On the other hand, some may think that the laws of logic can be a tool to confront and oppose Islam. It is even possible that people with such motives have translated logical books or introduced them to the Islamic world. But it cannot be concluded that the essence of logic necessarily has such a capacity that it can be used to confront Islam; Even if those who have followed the translation of logical books with such thinking, they have mistakenly assumed that such an expectation can be expected from logical books. In addition, history has shown that the translation of logical books and their entry into the Islamic world did not lead to the negation of Islam, and Muslims used the laws of this Knowledge to explain the teachings of Islam and answer the opponents. We do not have any reports that show that after the spread of the Knowledge of logic in the Islamic world, the desire of the Abbasid rulers, i.e. the deviation of the Muslims, was fulfilled, and it cannot be said that the translation of these sciences. He helped the rulers in this regard.

#### **4.6. The difference between the nature of a knowledge and its application**

Logicians and supporters of logic have never claimed that logic corrects the details of thought and reasoning; Rather, they claimed that the knowledge of logic provides humans with general rules that can be used to provide reliable thinking and reasoning. In logic, like in other knowledges, laws are presented in general, and when a person needs the details of his thoughts, he refers to those general laws and adjusts and corrects his thoughts. On the other hand, the details are infinite, and checking unlimited details is impossible and unnecessary; Because they can be put in a general description, and therefore by discussing that general, there is no need to discuss the details that come under that

general title.

## 5. Conclusion

Many Muslim thinkers, including philosophers, logicians, theologians, and jurists, believed that it was necessary to use logic in religious studies. The knowledge of logic is useful in studying the perfection and happiness of religious people and strengthens the religiosity of Muslims. Of course, this does not mean that all human beings, even prophets, must read Aristotle's books on logic in order to achieve this happiness; Rather, it is possible that human beings, who had these laws in their nature and without access to or need for logic books, practically followed the laws that were later put into the science of logic by Aristotle.

Although the science of logic has such a capability, it should be noted that it is always possible that some people do not use this knowledge properly or use it as a method and tool to explain or prove their false or even blasphemous beliefs. The jurists and theologians opposed to the knowledge of logic, in most of their criticisms of this knowledge, were concerned with preserving the religion of the Muslims. They wanted to discourage Muslims from paying attention to the knowledge of logic and recommend the same method of studying religion that the Prophet and his companions used that method of understanding religion. Of course, these objections should be taken as a serious warning, but it cannot be concluded based on them that the use of logic is forbidden for all Muslims; As it cannot be said that the use of logical books has been obligatory for all Muslims.

## References

### Books

- The Holy Quran.
- Abu Hayyan Andalusi, Muhammad ibn Yusuf, (1999), Al badr al\_muonier, Beirut, Dar al\_Fikr.
- Ash'ari, Ali ibn Ismaeil, (1925), Estahsan al\_Khud fi al\_kalam, India, Hyderabad. In Arabic.
- Badawi, Abd\_al Rahman, (1997), mazahib al\_islaamein, Beirut, Dar al\_Alam. In Arabic.
- Baghdadi, Hebah Allah Ibn Maleka, (1994), Al\_Mu'tabar Fi al\_hikmah, Isfahan, Isfahan University Press. In Arabic.
- Fakhr Razi, Muhammad ibn Umar, (1994), Sharh uoyoun al\_Hikma, Tehran, Sadiq Institute. In Arabic.
- Ghazali, Muhammad ibn Muhammad, (2015), Al\_Mustasfa, Al\_Muktabah Al\_Asriyah. In Arabic.
- Ghazali, Muhammad ibn Muhammad, (1996), Al\_Qastas al\_Mustaqim, in: Collection of the treatises of Imam al\_Ghazali, Cairo, Almaktabah al tofiqieah. In Arabic.
- Ghazali, Muhammad ibn Muhammad, (1961), Maqased al\_ phalasifah, Egypt, Dar al\_Ma'arif. In Arabic.
- Goldziher Ignac, (1966), The position of the ancient Sunnis towards the sciences of the early, in: Badawi, Abd al \_Rahman, Alturath al \_uonanieah fi al\_ hezarah al\_ islamieah, Egypt, maktabah alnehzah. In Arabic.
- Novavi, Yahya bin Sharaf, (-), Al\_Majmoo Fi Sharh Al\_Madhhab, Beirut, Dar al\_Fikr. In Arabic.
- Ibn Abi usiba'ah, (-), oueon al\_aanbaa fi tabaqat al\_atebbaa, Beirut, Dar and Maktab al\_Hayat. In Arabic.
- Ibn Athir, Ali Ibn Muhammad, (1965), Al\_Kamil Fi Al\_Tarikh, Beirut, Dar Sader. In Arabic.
- Ibn Hazm, Ali ibn Ahmad, (1983), Al\_Taqrib le had al\_Mantiq, in: Ibn Hazm's treatises, Beirut, Arab Institute. In Arabic.
- Ibn Kathir, Ismaeil Ibn Umar, (1986), Al\_ bedayah va Al\_nehayah, Beirut, Dar al-Fikr. In Arabic.
- Ibn Khaldun, Abd al\_Rahman ibn Muhammad, (1988), Diwan al-Mubtada, Beirut, Dar al-Fikr. In Arabic.

- Ibn Khallaqan, Ahmad Ibn Muhammad, (1900), *vaafayat al\_aayaan*, Beirut, Dar Sader. In Arabic.
- Ibn Sina, (1985), *Al\_Najat*, Tehran, Tehran University Press. In Arabic.
- Ibn Rushd, Muhammad ibn Ahmad, (1993), *Tahafut al\_Tahafut*, Beirut, Dar al\_Fikr. In Arabic.
- Ibn Rushd, Muhammad ibn Ahmad, (1972), *Fasl al\_ maqaal fi ma bain al\_hekmate va al\_Shari'a men al atesal*, Egypt, Dar al\_Ma'arif.
- Ibn Emad Al\_Hanbali, (1986), *Shazrat al\_Dhahab*, Beirut, Ibn Kathir. In Arabic.
- Suyuti, Abd al\_ Rahman Ibn Abi Bakr, (-), *Tajred al\_naseiha*, Cairo, Khanji Library. In Arabic.
- Ibn al\_Salah, Uthman ibn Abd al\_Rahman, (1407 AH), *Fatwas Ibn al\_Salah*, Beirut, Aalam al\_ketab. In Arabic.
- Ibn al\_Salah, Uthman ibn Abd al\_Rahman, (1992), *Tabaqat al\_Foghaha al\_Shafi'i*, Beirut, Dar al-Bashair. In Arabic.
- Ibn Taymiyyah, Ahmad ibn Abd al\_Halim, (1971), *Daaro al\_taruz al\_maaqul wa al\_manqoul*, Republic of the United Arab Emirates, Dar al\_Ketab. In Arabic.
- Ibn Qayyim al\_Jawziyyah, Muhammad ibn Abi Bakr, (-), *Maftah daar al\_Saadah*, Beirut, Dar al\_Kitab al\_Alamia. In Arabic.
- Recher, Nicholas, (2005), *The history of logic among the Arabs*, Paris, Asmar Publications. In Arabic.
- Jorjani, Ali ibn Muhammad, (2007), *Tahrir al\_qavaid al\_mantiqueah*, Qom, Bidar Publications. In Arabic.
- Saavi, Amr Ibn Sahlan, (2004), *Al\_Basair Al\_Nasairiyah*, Tehran, published by Shams Tabrizi. In Arabic.
- Subki, Abd al\_ Wahab Ibn Ali, (1999), *Raafa Al\_Hajib an Mukhtasar Ibn Al\_Hajib*, Beirut, Aalam al\_kotob. In Arabic.
- Suyuti, Abd al\_ Rahman bin Abi Bakr, (2004), *Al\_Hawi fi al\_ Fatwas*, Beirut, Dar al\_Fikr. In Arabic.
- Suyuti, Abd al\_Rahman bin Abi Bakr, (-), *saun al\_mantiq wa al\_kalam*, Cairo, Majmaa al\_bouhoth al\_islamiyah. In Arabic.
- Suyuti, Abd al\_ Rahman Ibn Abi Bakr, (-), *Tajred al\_naseiha*, Cairo, Khanji Library. In Arabic.

- Suyuti, Abd al\_ Rahman bin Abi Bakr, (2008), Al\_Qawl al\_Mashreq fi Tahrim al-Mauntiq, Cairo, Dar al-Hadith. In Arabic.
- shirazi, Sadr al\_Din, Muhammad ibn Ibrahim, (1985), Tafsir al\_Quran al\_Karim, Qom, Bidar Publications. In Arabic.
- Tawhidi, Abu Huhyan, (2003), Al\_ama'a va al\_muanisah, Beirut, Al\_Muktabah Al\_Nusrah. In Arabic.
- Zarkashi, Badruddin, (1998), Al\_Nukat aala muqadimah Ibn al\_Salah, Riyadh, Members of the Salaf. In Arabic.
- Zarkashi, Badruddin Muhammad bin Bahadur, (1994), Al\_Bahr al\_Muhit, Beirut, Dar al\_Kitabi. In Arabic.
- Zubaydi, Murtaza bin Muhammad, (2005), Ettihaf al\_Sadat al\_Muttaqin, Beirut, Dar al\_Kitab al\_Almiya. In Arabic.

#### Articles

- Abdollahi, J (2024). The puzzle of scientific revolution in Islamic civilization, History of Islamic Philosophy, 3 (3), 67-99.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22034/hpi.2024.459638.1089>.

