The Symbioses Between Wujud and Walayah in Ibn ‘Arabi’s Thought

Background Of The Problem

Amidst their growing interest in the field of Ibn ‘Arabi studies, the contemporary scholars have not discussed a number of important yet familiar subjects in his thought, one of which is the symbioses between his perspective on wujud (existence) and walayah. As one notices from the contemporary works in the field of Ibn ‘Arabi studies, the idea of wujud and walayah in his thought has been usually discussed separately, almost without any attempt to look for possible symbioses between them. This is odd for both in Ibn ‘Arabi’s perspectives are firmly established on God’s characteristics as the Absolute Existence (Wujud al-Mumlaq) and the Supreme Protector (Wali). Under this circumstance, in the present article the symbioses under concerned will be investigated in three different but related angles, namely, Ibn ‘Arabi’s perspective on the Divine Assistance, his standpoint regarding the coming of manyness (kaisrsah) out of oneness (wa‘idadh), and his exposition on the Divine Administration (al-tadbirat al-ilahiyah) over all possible wujud. However, before we are going to discuss them, let see what he has in mind when talking about wujud and walayah.

Brief Account on Wujud and Walayah in Ibn ‘Arabi

The term wujud comes from the root W-J-D, which normally translated in its active sense as “to find” and in its passive sense as “to be found”, meaning “to be” or “to exist”. Wujud itself can be translated as being, existence, and finding.\(^1\) Posited as such, the term may be applied to everything that exists, be that God as the Absolute Being or all categories of non-absolute beings.\(^2\)

A thorough reading over his major works reveals that the essence of wujud for Ibn ‘Arabi is always one, namely, Allah, the one and only God of the entire universe.\(^3\) So, when one hears a sufí utters the formula
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“la wujud illa Allah” (there is no existence but Allah), it can only be understood in this sense, that is, only Allah who possesses the real existence while the rest can only exist in relation to Him. As a consequence, one may say that the existence of the cosmos and everything therein is considered metaphorical (majazi) for its essence is not other than the locus of Divine Manifestation (al-tajalli al-ilabi) or even a ‘part’ of God.

Yet it would be a great mistake to assume that the Syaykh denies other than God’s existence. As a matter of fact and just like the mutakallimin as well as Muslim philosophers, his ontological perspective also frames wujud in three categories. The first is the Absolute Existence (wajib al-wujud), whom he refers to Allah, the one and only existence that exists per se eternally, or the Necessary Being whose existence is more real than our hands. For Him belongs the attributes of Existence and of Self-Necessary Existence (ciisat al-wujud wa ciisat al-wujud al-nafs). It is therefore called the Absolute Existence (al-wujud al-mumlaq) or Necessary Being, that is, an independent existence who exists essentially and per se forever (al-wujud li dzatihi).

For Ibn ‘Arabi, the existence of the Absolute Existence necessitates the existence of what he calls the absolute non-existence (al-adam al-mumlaq) or impossible existence (mustahidil al-wujud). Constitutes the second category, this existence is the opposite of the Absolute Existence. So, if the latter has the attributes of Existence and of Self-Necessary Existence, the absolute non-existence has the attribute of impossible existence (mustahidil), a very condition which will always forbid it from becoming an existence.

With this feature in mind, one may infer that for the Syaykh it is nothing but just an imaginary existence.

Diffs from the above two categories, the third existence is called possible existence (mumkin al-wujud), identified by the Syaykh as that which may or may not exist. It is unique for two reasons. Firstly, it stands as an intermediary (barzakh) between the Absolute and the absolute non-existence. Yet, secondly, it always exists in God’s consciousness until He makes it manifests outwardly, i.e., outside His consciousness. With such characteristics, the third category of wujud is in reality closer to the absolute non-existence than to the Absolute Existence. This is so because as long as God does not want it to exist, it remains in Him and has no outwardly manifestation. In this state, so to speak, it is still Him. Yet it is also different from the absolute non-existence for it has chance to manifest itself out of God’s consciousness if God wishes so.

Under these circumstances, one may safely conclude that the Absolute Existence for the Syaykh is constantly considered as Independent Being, the absolute non-existence as the impossible being, and the possible existence as dependent being. With these categories in mind, every time one says about Ibn ‘Arabi’s perspective on the process of becoming, i.e., from non-being into being, it must always refer to the possible wujud. It is the symbiosis of this category of wujud with wulayh that we, in the present study, attempt to analyse.

It goes without saying that the notion on the process of becoming marks one of Ibn ‘Arabi’s fundamental contributions in ontology. Flourishing with the seemingly unchallenged brilliance called the theory of fixed entities or permanent archetypes (al-a’yan al-tsabitah), popularly known among the sufis as the Mu%ammadan Light (nur Mu%ammad), the Syaykh proceeds to detail
as many explications as possible regarding the process of be-coming on the part of possible existence. It is, to be more precise, the rising of manyness (katsrah) out of the oneness (wa%odah). We will have an occasion to speak about this idealater on. At the meantime it suffices us to say that this theory of fixed entities successfully solves many problematic issues in ontological perspectives over the ages, especially those found in the Platonic theory of emanation and, worse, Darwin’s theory of evolution.

Mention should also be made here that the theory of permanent archetypes is not a solo player in Ibn ‘Arabi’s ontological perspective. In a number of significant points it earns outwardly manifestation from walayah. The word walayah itself is an abstract verbal noun stemmed from the root W-L-Y. The famous Lisan al-‘Arab of Ibn Manur explains that the fi’alab pattern (waqyn) of the root, from which we have the term wiliyah, is normally taken to express ‘authority’ (salman), ‘power’ (qadrab) and ‘management’ (tadbir); whereas the fi’alab pattern, from which the term walayah is derived, is normally used to signify ‘friendship, assistance, alliance’ (nurab). In light of this linguistic perspective, we can safely conclude that while the term wiliyah expresses a function, as articulated by the term wali (pl. wulah), the term walayah indicates a state of being as in the case of the term wali (pl. wulah). However, it is worth underlining that the difference between wiliyah and walayah should not be exaggerated to the effect that one term is more adequate to express Islamic ‘sainthood’ over another.

In line with the above description of the meanings of the term walayah, one also notices that Ibn ‘Arabi employs two terminologies to denote the very nature of walayah, namely a shared characteristics (na’t isytirak) and a Divine characteristics (na’t ilah). By the former he means that all the qualities contained in the term walayah are to be found in either God or creatures. Hence, the name wali can be used to refer to God or His creatures. Meaning, apart from the walayah of God, there is also the so called walayah of creatures whose number, Ibn ‘Arabi states, corresponds to the number of species in the universe. However, in both cases, all the intrinsic meanings and characteristics of the term wali/walayah take place properly. They cannot be the same for God is also different from His creatures. So, those belong to the Absolute (God) should also be absolute, whereas those belong to the non-absolute (creatures) must in whatever condition be non-absolute.

With regard to Divine characteristics (na’t ilah), Ibn ‘Arabi perceives it as one of God’s most exclusive attributes. This is to say that inasmuch as waliyah is a Divine attribute, He is therefore the real Assistant (naqir) and Protector (wali) of everything in the truest sense of the words, and the One who is really close to all His creatures. Hence, God calls Himself the Supreme Protector (Wali).

In this regard, walayah for God is the pattern by which He creates the creatures (takballuq), and it is for the creatures the morals (khuluq) by which they live their life. As a rule, says Ibn ‘Arabi, all Divine characteristics must on the one hand be universal in nature and, on the other, last forever. Otherwise, they are not Divine characteristics. Posited in the first context, the waliyah of God is therefore called a universal walayah (al-walayah al-ammal), and as such it encompasses everything (amal al-ta’alluq), the visible and invisible beings. With regard to it’s eternity, that of God will never come to an end. It continues forever,
in this world and hereafter.

This brief exposition on wujud and welayah in Ibn ‘Arabi’s thought should provide a basic picture on how the symbioses between the two are possible. In what follows, such relationship will be further investigated through his notion on Divine Assistance, the raising of manyness out of oneness, and finally the Divine Administration over all possible existence.

**Divine Assistance**

As cited earlier, one of the connotations of welayah is assistance (mu‘arraf). With regard to God’s universal welayah, it definitely means God’s universal assistance/protection to all His creatures. This statement sounds complicated especially with regard to the fact that the God under concerned is Allah, the One worshiped by Muslim believers and believed by the later to assist or to protect only their like. So, the question is, does Ibn ‘Arabi think that the assistance of God will really be granted to all His creatures, regardless their status as believers or non-believers?

In response to this question, the Syaykh likely maintains that God’s assistance will only be afforded to the believers (mu‘minun) and pious people (al-cati‘oun). However, there is no secret that all creatures in Islamic perspective are always dependent beings to God in every details of their existence. Meaning, in so far as they are dependent beings, they will never escape His assistance. Shade in this light and realizing the fact that God for Ibn ‘Arabi only assists the believers, does not it mean that the Syaykh considers all creatures as believers?

To answer that question, one must understand what the Syaykh has in mind by a believer (mu‘min). Quite different from what the majority of Muslims would usually think, few passages from chapter 152 of the Futu′hat reveal that the believers for him are of two types, the specific and the general. The first is applied exclusively to the muwaddind (monotheist), that is, the one who believes in the oneness of God, whereas the second refers to the rest of the created beings, regardless what sort of beings they are. Having this in mind, one may conclude that in so far as Ibn ‘Arabi’s thought are concerned, there are no such beings who are not believers.

The Syaykh establishes this perspective on a number of Qur’anic verses. One of them is Q. S. al-Isra’ [17]:44, where God says “there is not a thing but celebrates His praise (wa in min sayy’illa yusabbirin bi %amidihi),”23 In chapter 12 of the Futu′hatentitled “On knowing the circle of the celestial sphere of our Mister Muhammad peace be upon him, which is the circle of sovereignty, and that the time has rotated as it was from the day Allah Almighty created it” (fi ma’rifat dawrat falak sayyidina Mu%ammad calla Allah ‘alayhi wa sallam wa biya dawrat al-sijadah wa anna al-zaman qad istadara katay’atibi yawm khalaqahu Allah Ta’ala), Ibn ‘Arabi explains that the term sayy in this verse is an indefinite noun (nakirah) and, as such, it refers to everything, classified in philosophy as animate and inanimate beings. He argues further that everything capable of praising Allah must at the same time be an intelligent-living being (%ayy’agil) and has knowledge of the prescribed praise. Otherwise, they would not be able to glorify Him. It is on the ground of this logical thinking that the Syaykh maintains over and over again in the Futu′hat that the people of unveiling (abil al-kasyf) conceive the minerals (jamad) and plants (nabat) as having their own spirits (arwa%), and that all creatures are either talking animal.
Since invocation is an act of worship, and the latter is itself a sign of belief, Ibn 'Arabi, for the reason he has presented, concludes that every species of the creatures is a believer with its own modes of worship. He, thus, writes:

Every species is a community from among the communities (ummah min al-umam) of the creatures. They are endowed by God with a specific form of worship, the ordinance of which has been revealed (n%yya biiha) to them in their selves. Their messenger (rasuluhum) comes from their own species, [who gets] the information from God with a specific inspiration (ijlim) that they are naturally disposed to it.27

However, here one smells a serious problem. Although the Q. S. al-Isra’[17]:44, al-‘ajj [22]:18 and al-Nur [24]:41 state that every thing in the seven heavens and on the earth praises Allah and hence considered as believers, Muslims are reluctant to include the musyrik (polytheist) among the believers. The reason for this is that Islam has clearly differentiated between the muwa%id and musbirik: the former is the one who worships Allah alone and the latter is that who associates Him with others. The question is, does Ibn ‘Arabi also consider the polytheist to be among the believers?

Again, here one finds the Syaykh answering the question with affirmative, that is, the musyrikis a believer. In a very long chapter 69 of the Futu%bat, entitled “On knowing the secrets of prayer and its universality” (fi ma’rifat asrar al-salah wa’ummumiba), Ibn ‘Arabi, in his commentary to the Q. S. al-Isra’[17]:23 “Thy Lord hath decreed that ye worship none but Him”, says that the real intention in every sort of

worship is but to worship Allah, be that worship performed by a muwa%idor musyrik.28 The polytheists themselves admit that their act of worshipping other than Allah is only for the sake of being closer to Him. This is clearly revealed in the Q. S. al-Zumar [39]:3 whichpictures the confession of the polytheists, “We only serve them in order that they may bring us nearer to Allah”.29

On this reason, one may infer that the distinction between the muwa%id and musyrik for Ibn ‘Arabidoes not rest in the number of God or god/goddess that they worship because the essence of each worship is no other than Allah, the One and only God of the universe. Rather, it lies in the fact that the muwa%id follows what has been prescribed for him in his worship, while the musyrik does not.30

Although such a difference looks simple, it does not mean that both muwa%id and musbirik in Ibn ‘Arabi’s perspective share the same position and privilege in the front of God, as the religion-pluralists use to convince themselves. On the contrary, the difference between the two is quite fundamental, because the Syaykh stresses that it is for the reason of not following the prescribed law that the musyrikfeels distress or unhappy (syqi) throughout his life in this world and hereafter.31

Going back to the issue of God’s assistance, since the musyrikun for the Syaykh are as believers as the muwa%idun, the former, on the basis of the Q. S. al-Baqarat [2]:257, “Allah is the Wali of those who believe”, will also be granted God’s assistance. This is so because Allah, although worshiped by the Muslim believers, is in reality not confined to be their God alone, but also the God of the rest of created beings. As such, His attributes must also be exercised to each of
them. Bearing this in mind, God’s assistance will always encompass every believer, no matter what sort of object they worship, the true or false God.\(^{32}\)

In conclusion, God’s waslakah is really universal for it encompasses and granted for every being. As such, it is not confined to monotheist alone, but to all believers, whom Ibn ‘Arabi perceives as none other than all created beings:

[God] did not make His assistance compulsory (wajiban) for monotheist alone, for He actually made it for the believer based on his veneration to Divinity (al-nilahy) and the fulfillment [of the requisite responsibilities] toward Him.\(^{33}\)

**The Rising of Manyness (Katsrah) Out of Oneness (Wahdah)**

As is mentioned earlier, the waslakah of creatures in Ibn ‘Arabi’s thought encapsulated in the idea of other’s assistance for God (naṣrū nā ma wāla Allah li Allah).\(^{34}\) At glance, this sounds irritating for it indicates the weakness on the part of Allah. However, apart from the two Qur’anic verses (Q. S. al-bāṣaff [61]:14 and Muhammad[47]:7) which justify that idea, the Syaykh also stresses that it does not mean to turn the Most Powerful God into powerless, so much so that He cries for help from His creatures. This is unlikely the case for God is always the Almighty and Most Powerfull in the truest senses of the words. In stead, says Ibn ‘Arabi, the assistance of others for God simply alludes to the participation of the creatures in the existence He gives them.\(^{35}\)

This point leads to three important points in Ibn ‘Arabi’s ontological perspective. First of all, such an assistance marks the turning point in the course of Fixed Entities (al-‘a‘yan al-tsabitah) from the state of potential being into actual being. Secondly, it takes place from the first time the ‘a‘yan receives their existence from the Absolute Existence. Finally, in spite of God’s longingness to be known by other than He, as articulated in the famous had-th al-quds+”kuntu kanzan makhsfiyan”, the attempt of the ‘a‘yan to assist God is in reality the very initial motive that is responsible for the becoming of the entire universe.

Shade in this light, one may safely say that the waslakah of creatures in Ibn ‘Arabi’s thought is not only a matter of religious piety and sanctity. More than that, it marks the emergence of manyness (katsrah) as well as their separation (jarq) from darkness, or the rising of creatures from the darkness. In short, this sort of waslakah initiates the first step of the perpetual journey of the creation, a journey which can be stretched a long the way back from the primordial time when the others than God are nothing but Fixed Entities, i.e., those who have not yet to become.

The question that confronts us here is, how does the manyness appear? It must be noted again that prior to its emergence, manyness is nothing but Fixed Entities (al-‘a‘yan al-tsabitah) which occupy the middle position between the Absolute and non-absolute existence. In this state they have access to both of them in the sense that they could stay forever in the state of non-existence with the non-absolute existence, or could be endowed with existence by the grace of the Absolute Existence.

Such characteristics determine the future course of Fixed Entities in existence. As is clear from Ibn ‘Arabi’s exposition, being a possible existence, the Fixed Entities contain all possible beings (mumkinah), themselves are the loci of God’s potential outward manifestation. If He wills, He gives
them existence with only one single Divine Command, "Bel So they be" (kun fa yakun). As a rule, if the d'yan are given existence, they will therefore be governed by what God’s Reality has given them, thus making them His kingdom and the dwelling place of His manifested power. However, if He does not want them to exist, He will leave them as such in the state of non-existence forever.

Ibn ‘Arabi pictures the becoming of possible existence or Fixed Entities to existence in a very dramatic way. He writes:

...knowing the possibility of our non-existence to receive the existence from God, which then makes us His kingdom, the absolute non-existence demands us to stay in the state of non-existence and to establish its kingdom. The absolute non-existence said: “Be what you are in the non-existence, because you cannot be anything else apart from what you are in my rank.”

But God commands each of the possible entities to exist, saying “Be!” Upon hearing this, the possible entities say to one another: “So far we are in the state of non-existence. We know it and taste it. Now, the Absolute Existence has commanded us to exist. We know nothing of existence and [if we obey His command] we also have no eternity in it. Come here and let us help (nācur) the Absolute Existence against the absolute non-existence, so that we know and taste that existence.

Once the Fixed Entities come to the grab of outward existence, they taste its sweetness and do not want to return to the state of non-existence again and forever. They praise their commitment to accept the existence, for which they can see the bless of helping (nācr) God, the Absolute Existence, against the absolute non-existence. Indeed, says Ibn ‘Arabi, in so far as their substance is concerned, all created beings are nothing but the helpers (nādir) of God. Bearing this in mind, it is confirmed that the walayah of creatures, which is their assistance for God, is none other than their participation in the existence given by God.

The Divine Administration Over All Possible Wujud

Our discussion that deals with the Divine Assistance at work in the process of becoming on the part of the d’yan al-īsābitah—that is, the process of their outward manifestation from God’s consciousness or the rising of manyness out of oneness—furnishes this study with sufficient evidences that both wujud and walayah in the thought of Ibn ‘Arabi relate to one another since the very beginning of the outward manifestation of the creatures. However, realizing the fact that such a cooperation does not stop at this point, but continues everlasting, in what follow an analysis will be driven to illustrate it so that the symbioses between the Shaykh’s notion of wujud and walayah can be further comprehended.

To start with, the Divine Administration (al-tadbirat al-ḥabīyyah) under concern is carried out in Ibn ‘Arabi’s perspective by a number of awliyā’. Some of them, as stated in chapter 154 of the Futūhat, are the Angels of Love (al-mubayyun), the Subservient Angels (al-malāʾikah al-musakkhkharah), and the Governing Angels (malāʾikat al-tadbir). Some others, as depicted in Ibn ‘Arabi’s first answer to the first of question posted by al-Hakim al-Tirmidzi in chapter 73 of the Futūhat, are known as the holders of six mother stations (ummahat al-m,abaqat), namely, the Pole (qum, b), the two Leaders (imamān), the four Pillars (awtad), the seven Substitutes (abdāl), the twelve Seekers.
(nuqaba') and the eight Nobles (najabah).\textsuperscript{44} Each of them is assigned with specific task just in order to ensure the course of all possible existence to run properly in accordance with what God’s Reality has dictated over them.

A thorough reading on the Futuhat reveals that the Angels of Love (al-muthayyamin) are those whom God manifests in one of His Divine Names, namely the Most Beautiful (al-jamili). God loves them and annihilates them from themselves, so much so that they are not only blind about their states and their compatriots, but also about the reason why they love Him so much. They are created from the Fine Dust (al-'ama), and are belong to the walaya’ of possibilities (al-walaya’ al-munkinar), i.e. walaya’ related to the distribution of existence as is discussed above.\textsuperscript{45}

In so far as the Subservient Angels (al-mala’ikah al-musakbhkarah) is concerned, they are the awliya’ who stand under the command of the Sublime Pen (al-qalam al-a’la), also called the First Intellect (al-aqil al-a’wil), that is the Chief-in-Command (sultan) of the world where human actions are all recorded (’alam al-ladvin wa ’alam al-tasm., ir). Created together with the Angels of Love, they have walaya’ related to Divine Forgiveness and Assistance. Through the former they come to God and ask His forgiveness for those among humans who repent from their sins,\textsuperscript{46} and through the latter they come to assist the believers in their battle as in the case of the battle of Badr.\textsuperscript{47}

The last group of the awliya’ from the under concerned Angels is the Governing Angels (mala’ikat al-tadbir). They are the spirits who administer (al-arwa% al-mu’abbirah) every thing (al-aqam), like things of luminous nature (al-mabi’ah al-nuriyyah), fine dust (al-baba’yyah), celestial sphere (al-falakiyyah), elemental (al-uncuriyyah) and all in the realm of physics (ajism al-alam).\textsuperscript{48} Ibn ‘Arabi identifies them as the Rational Souls (al-nafs al-namiqab), whose walaya’ is to bring happiness for all the spirits and the bodies they dwell in.\textsuperscript{49}

With regard to the holders of the six mother stations, they have specific cosmic roles and function. The Pole, for example, is the central orbit of the universe. He is a part of the universe but the latter itself stands on him.\textsuperscript{50} He is attached to the Divine Name and called ‘Abd Allah.\textsuperscript{51} His deputies are the two Leaders, i.e., the Leader of the Left who keeps the world of command (’alam al-arab), the world of unseen (’alam al-ghayb), and the ‘alam al-mulk and the Leader of the Right who keeps the world of creation (’alam al-khalq), the manifested world (’alam al-syadalah) and the ‘alam al-mala’akoh. The former is called ‘Abd al-Malik and the latter ‘Abd al-Rabb.\textsuperscript{52}

The Pillars are those who come after them. They are four in number, each is entrusted to watch the four directions (namely, the East, West, North and South) and their walaya’. Their function in the universe is just like the mountains which ensure the stability of the earth.\textsuperscript{53} Just like the previous two groups of awliya’, they are also associated with Divine Names as ‘Abd al-Sayy, ‘Abd al-’Alim, ‘Abd al-Qadir and ‘Abd al-Murid.\textsuperscript{54} Below them are those called the Substitutes (abdalah), who are seven in every given epoch, and called ‘Abd al-Sayy, ‘Abd al-’Alim, ‘Abd al-Qadir, ‘Abd al-Murid, ‘Abd al-Syakur, ‘Abd al-Sami’ and ‘Abd al-Ba’ir. Each of them follows one of the seven faculties (qumurah) of the seven prophets, namely, Abraham, Moses, Aaron, Enoch (Idris), Joseph, Jesus, and Adam; and each of them guards one of the seven climates.\textsuperscript{55}

With regard to the Seekers (nuqaba’), they are twelve in every given epoch. The
Syaykh says that they are the twelve orbits of the universe as well as the twelve zodiac, in the sense that they are the twelve differentiated stations, namely: 1) The station of spirit of spirits (rub al-arwah); 2) The station of soul of souls (nafs al-anfa); 3) The station of origin of origin (ac, al-awc,ul); 4) The station of form of forms (a, urat al-ac, urat); 5) The station of shape of shapes (gukel al-asukal); 6) The station of pillar of pillars (rukn al-arkan); 7) The station of nature of natures (kaawm al-akwan); 8) The station of matter of matters (madat al-mawad); 9) The station of element of life (urn, ur al-hayah); 10) The station of essence of union (jam al-jam’iyat); 11) The station of knowledge of knowledge (ilm al-ilum); and 12) The station of action of actions (‘amal al-a’mal). Finally, there are those called the eight Nobles (ayubaa). Their difference from the Seekers is that the latter possesses the secrets of the ninth heaven, i.e., that which has no stars, the Nobles have the secrets of the eight lower spheres, which is the heaven of the fixed stars and the seven planetary heavens. Their station is the Chair (al-kursi).

Concluding Remarks

The above presentation demonstrates that they are, indeed, symbioses between Ibn ‘Arabi’s notion of wujud and walayah. These can be seen in his perspective on the rising of manyness out of oneness and on the Divine administration over all possible beings. It is also interesting to note these symbioses according to the Syaykh continue everlastingingly, so much so that one cannot stand without another. Realizing the role and function played by walayah, one can even say that all categories that fall under possible existence are continuously in serious need for walayah.
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