

Summary of: “Thunderbolts and Thunderclaps: Exposing the Ignorance of Arafat Al-Muhammadi—the Spiteful Strayer” By ‘Abd Allāh al-Khayrī

Original article in Arabic:

<https://abuiyaad.com/d/khayri-arafat-nizar-names>

After ‘Arafāt and his group had been exposed by Shaykh Nizār bin Hāshim and Shaykh ‘Alī al-Huḍhayfī for complicity in rebellion, sedition, conspiring to lie to senior scholars in matters of war and bloodshed, making unwarranted tabdī‘ of Salafīs and sheltering Ḥaddādī innovators, he and his followers sought to discredit Shaykh Nizār through various issues, one of which is his comments regarding Allāh’s Name, “al-Shāfi”.

These are the main points:

①—Shaykh Nizar simply pointed out a factual reality that some scholars when extracting Allāh’s Names and listing them, rely on the Qur’ān only. This does not mean that they reject the Sunnah in this respect, but this is just an approach, and scholars have different approaches in extracting the ninety-nine names. ‘Arafāt lied upon Nizār by accusing him of saying that those scholars do not affirm Allāh’s Names found in the Sunnah, as a principle.

②—Shaykh Nizār cited from al-Ḥāfiḍh Ibn Ḥajar regarding Allāh’s Names, and ‘Arafāt found fault with this, while belittling the status of al-Ḥāfiḍh (a Ḥaddādī tendency). However, scholars such as Shaykh ‘Abd al-Muḥsin al-‘Abbād, Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn and Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalī have all referenced Ibn Ḥajar in the issues of the Names.

③—The liar then accused Shaykh Nizār of lying upon Ibn Ḥajar by allegedly saying that he does not affirm the name “al-Shāfi”. However, Shaykh Nizār said that the issue of specific names is one of investigation given that some scholars, alluding to Ibn Ḥajar, when they list the Names, list them from the Qur’ān only. And Ibn Ḥajar, in two of his works (al-Fathḥ and al-Talkhīṣ) lists the ninety-nine Names without mention of “al-Shāfi”. So this is not a lie at all, but just a statement of fact.

④—The liar accused Shaykh Nizār of denying the name “al-Shāfi” upon the way of the Mu‘aṭṭilah. However, there are various approaches taken by scholars in extracting the Names from the texts, some taking only from the Qur’ān, others taking from the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, and they may also differ regarding specific names, and this returns to ijtihād and istinbāt. A scholar may conclude that this is a

name of Allāh but another scholar may not, and numerous scholars have mentioned this fact. Further, some names are mentioned referring to actions of Allāh, but may not necessarily be names, but just indicative of *ṣ̣ifāt fi'liyyah* and hence, they are from the angle of ikhbār, i.e. informing of Allāh's actions, and this is broader than the issue of names. Shaykh al-Fawzān is of the view that “al-Shāfi” should not be said on its own, but used just as occurs in the ḥadīth, as part of a supplication.

⑤—Then ‘Arafāt exposed his ignorance and contradiction in refuting what is a correct statement of Shaykh Nizār, “Not every ikhbār (report) about Allāh (i.e. in what may appear to be a name) is actually a name...” ‘Arafāt's reply to this contains compound ignorance and contradiction as well. You have to read the document for the details (fifth observation, page 17). ‘Arafāt stumbled regarding the well-known principle that the subject matter of reports (ikhbār) is broader than that of the Names and Attributes, since the Qur’ān and Sunnah inform about Names, Attributes and Actions and other matters, and ‘Arafāt made a statement in refutation of Shaykh Nizār's statements which has the very same meaning as that statement without realising it, indicating that he does not comprehend this principle.

In short, ‘Arafāt al-Muḥammadi took what he thought was an opportunity to make Shaykh Nizār appear ignorant and deviated in the subject of Allāh’s Names, and ended up exposing himself in a few ways.

Firstly, confirming for us again that he is an established liar and knowledge is not taken from a liar.

Secondly, the influence of the Ḥaddadī ideology upon him when he belittled the status of Ibn Ḥajar and found fault with Shaykh Nizār saying that he is a very senior scholar.

Thirdly, his confusion in the subject, trying to refute, what he actually affirms himself in his very refutation.

Fourthly, these refutations of his are not sincere, or out of protective jealousy for the religion, but are based on whims and are driven by spite and malice.