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“Stay away from talk of limits and direction.”

Al-Muḥāsibī, Risālat al-Mustarshidīn.

“The Pre-Eternal One ﷺ does not have a ‘towards’ nor a limit. Nor is there any link between Him and creatures nor any separation from them. Being in a place, for Him, is an absurd impossibility. He was – Exalted is He – when there was no place, and He is now just as He ever was.”

Al-Qushayrī, al-Mi‘rāj.

“The sum total of our knowledge of Allāh ﷺ is certitude in His existence without modality and without place.”

Aḥmad al-Rifā‘ī, Hikam.

“The attribution of ‘highness’ to Allāh ﷺ refers to meaning. It is impossible that it refer to sensory perception.”

Ibn Ḥajar, Fath al-Bārî.
ABBREVIATIONS

Abū Dāwūd = his Sunan
Abū Nu‘aym = his Ḥilya
Aḥmad = his Musnad
Al-Bukhārī = his Ṣaḥīḥ
Al-Dāraquṭnî = his Sunan
Al-Dārīmî = his Musnad, also known as the Sunan
Al-Ḥākim = his Mustadrak ‘alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn
Al-Haythami = his Majma‘ al-Zawā’id
Ibn Abī Shayba = his Muṣannaf
Ibn ‘Asākir = his Tārīkh Dimashq
Ibn Ḥibbān = his Ṣaḥīḥ
Ibn Mājah = his Sunan
Muslim = his Ṣaḥīḥ
Al-Nasā‘ī = his minor Sunan known as al-Mujtabā
Al-Tīrmidhî = his Sunan
FOREWORD
BY SHAYKH MUHAMMAD AFIFI AL-AKITI

Like the Judaic and Christian theological traditions, the Islamic one also, – arguably with less crassness – faced the problems of scriptural literalism that result in an anthropomorphic theology. As the early (salaf) Muslim community became more sophisticated and began to lead the world in scientific progress – and especially from the time of Islam's Doctor Angelicus, al-Ghazâli (d. 505/1111) – Muslim theologians came to embrace and institutionalize the case for ta'wil. This was Islâm’s systematic solution of the problem, through a canon of figurative interpretation of scripture as a necessary tool of hermeneutics.

Not only did the method of ta'wil keep anthropomorphism in check through offering a middle way in the understanding of Divine Attributes as limited by human language, but it served to reconcile Divine Scripture with the discoveries afforded by human reason. This legitimization of ta'wil by the classical ‘ulamâ’ and its systematic treatment in the Golden Age of Islâm made it an established doctrine among Muslim theologians. It became the standard position in later (khalaf) orthodoxy within the Sunni tradition (alongside the formerly dominant, simpler alternative, and utterly unexplainable "non-method": tafwîd) – the cultural milieu that brought forth this work.

This short theological tract, Fi Naﬁ al-Jiha, or On Denying Direction to God, by the Ash‘ari theologian and celebrated Shafi‘i jurist, Qâdî Ibn Jahbal (d. 733/1333), is a clinical rebuttal of the controversial fatwâ, the ‘Aqîda Ọmawiyya, penned by his legendary contemporary, Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328). It is
considered, rightly, a classic manifesto of anti-literalism, which embraces the successful pro-ia’wil Ghazālian theses advocated centuries earlier – to the extent that Ibn al-Subkī (d. 771/1370) reproduced the whole of Ibn Jahbal’s work in his magisterial Ṭabaqāt.

The present volume is a special “all-Damascene” edition, which contains the very first (and definitive) English translation of Ibn Jahbal’s Arabic text; completed by an authorized, nay Damascus-trained and native scholar, Shaykh Gibril Fouad Haddad, who possesses the complete and exclusively Dimashqī ijāza going back to the original Damascene author; and supplemented by superb scholarly documentation and a running commentary. The volume includes the Muqaddima of one of Damascus’s senior living Ḥanafi jurists, Shaykh Wahbī Sulaymān Ghāwji, which presents an up-to-date explanation of figurative interpretation in Islamic theology. The volume is also prefaced by another introduction, which catalogues the problematic positions of the redoubtable Ibn Taymiyya raised by scholars throughout the ages including his own students, regarding which a Dimashqī muhaddith recently quipped: “The mistakes of the great are the greatest mistakes.”

This convenient Collectio Errorum by Shaykh Haddad is not a zero-sum critique. In fact, it will be appreciated for it isolates Ibn Taymiyya’s unquestionably controversial materials from the rest of his vast corpus – thus enabling one to take the good and leave the bad; and this list will be a service to the non-scholar who might want to benefit from reading the works of this prolific Ḥanbalī jurist, one who is now enjoying a greater following and who indeed can be said to be a phenomenon of present-day Islām.
Along with a work by an earlier Ḥanbalī theologian, the *Daf Shubah al-Tashbīḥ* of Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200), this medieval contribution by Ibn Jahbal remains one of the most important texts refuting the anthropomorphists of the Muslim world. This will be an indispensable reference for advanced students of Islamic theology, other professional theologians, and modern academics needing primary source materials in English or a source book on the controversies surrounding Ibn Taymiyya’s theology.

This same work embodies, moreover, a contemporary exercise in polemic representing the longstanding views in the conformist tradition of Muslim theology, whether via *tawil* or *tafwīd*, and whether in the schools of the Ash’arīs, Māturidis or Ḥanbalis. In particular, it pits itself against one of the two opposite non-conformist readings of the Qurʾān and Sunna; and in general, it highlights the pitfalls of a literalistic mindset which plagues all scripturally-based religions.

Muhammad Afifi al-Ak średni
Research Fellow in Islamic Theology, Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies, Oxford University.
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TRANSLATOR’S INTRODUCTION

IBN JAHBAL AL-KILĀBĪ

Aḥmad ibn Muḥyī al-Dīn Yaḥyā ibn Tāj al-Dīn Ismāʿīl ibn Ṭāhir ibn Naṣr Allāh ibn Jahbal, al-Qāḍī Shihāb al-Dīn or Naṣīr al-Dīn Abū al-ʿAbbās al-Kilābī al-Ḥalabī thumma al-Dimashqī al-Shāfiʿi al-Ashʿarī, known as Ibn Jahbal (670-733), is described in al-Dhahabī’s Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ as “the erudite scholar, the guiding leader of Muslims” and in his ʿIbar fī Khabari Manʿ Abār as “The muftī of the Muslims.”¹ He took fiqh from Abū al-Faraj Sharaf al-Dīn al-Maqdīsī, al-Ṣādr ibn al-Wakīl, Ibn al-Naqīb, Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar Ṣadr al-Dīn ibn al-Muraḥḥal al-ʿUthmānī, and ḥadīth from Abū al-Ḥasan ibn al-Bukhārī, ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-Munʿim ibn al-Qawwās, Aḥmad ibn Hibat Allāh ibn ʿAsākir, and others. He narrated in Makka, Madīna, al-Qudūs, and Damascus. He taught at the Ṣalāḥiyya School in al-Qudūs then moved to Damascus where he assumed the headmastership of Dār al-Ḥadīth at al-Ẓāhiriyya. When the headmaster of the Bādirāʾiyya School died, he replaced him while al-Dhahabī took over Dār al-Ḥadīth. He died in Damascus at age sixty-three and was buried in Maqbarat al-Ṣūfiyya. His older brother, the headmaster of the Atābakiyya School, vice-governor of Damascus and qāḍī of Tripoli, Muḥyī al-Dīn Abū al-Fīdā

¹ Al-Dhahabī, al-ʿIbar (4:96-97).
Ismā’īl ibn Yaḥyā (666-740) survived him seven years and was buried next to him.

Al-Dhahabī said of Ibn Jahbal: “There was great goodness and pious devotion in him; he possessed excellent traits, great merits, and perspicuity in the ramifications of knowledge.” Ibn Kathīr in his Bidāya named him “the Shaykh, the admirable Imām, the muftī of the Muslims” and said: “He was among the authoritative fuqahā’. He took nothing from the Bādirā’yya nor the Zāhirīyya which he did not already know.” Ibn al-Kutbī said: “He was a scrupulously Godwary scholar. When he fell sick he spent a great deal in charity, including his clothes.” After relating the above in the Durar al-Kāmina, Ibn Hajar said: “Our Shaykh al-Burhān al-Shāmī narrated to us what he heard from him.” Ibn Jahbal also taught the historian and hadith Master ʿAlām al-Dīn al-Birzālī and the lexicographer Majd al-Dīn al-Fayrūzābādī who read Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim to him in Damascus in three days.²

² Cf. al-Qāsimī’s Qawā’id al-Tahdīth (p. 262).
The Controversy Surrounding 
Ibn Taymiyya's Orthodoxy

Ibn Jahbal's *al-Radd 'alâ Man Qâla bil-Jiha* or “The Refutation of Him Who Attributes Direction [to Allâh]” came in response to a *fatwâ* given in the year 698 to some people from Ḥamâ:

Towards the end of the rule of Lâjin after Qabjaq left Syria, a trial took place for Shaykh Taqi al-Dîn Ibn Taymiyya. A group of jurists opposed him and demanded that he be summoned before the judge Jalâl al-Dîn al-Ḥanafî but he did not come. An outcry was raised in the country concerning the statement of doctrine (*al-‘aqîda*) that the people of Ḥamâ had asked him and which is called *al-Hamawiyya*. The Emir Sayf al-Dîn Jâ‘ân defended him and sent out word summoning those who had opposed him. Many of them hid themselves while others were flogged. As a result, the rest remained silent. On the day of Jumu‘a, Shaykh Taqi al-Dîn held his usual gathering in the mosque and explained the statement of Allâh Most High, *{And lo! You are of a tremendous nature}* (68:4). Then he met with the qâdi Imâm al-Dîn on the following day, at which time a group of eminent people gathered there and discussed the *Hamawiyya*. They disputed with him over certain passages but he gave
them replies that silenced them after much talk. Then Shaykh Taqī al-Dīn left and things went back to normal.\(^3\)

The “group of jurists” rightly saw in the Fātwa Hāmawiyya a sophisticated attempt at reviving the belief of the Karrāmiyya sect in the corporeality, place, upward direction (jihāt al-‘ulūw) and literal abovelessness (fawqīyya ḥaqīqīyya) of Allāh Most High. The fātwa was forgotten until its revival by the “Salafis” and recently received a glossy edition at the hands of one of the Saudi propagandists of the Wahhābī movement, Ḥamd al-Tuwayjirī, the author of ‘Aqīdat Ahl al-Īmān fi Khalqī Ādama ‘alā Šūrat al-Ｒahmān (“The Doctrine of the Believers Concerning the Creation of Ādām in the Image of the Merciful”), in which he actually quotes the book of Genesis—“We shall create Man in Our image and likeness”—in support of his anthropomorphism.\(^4\) Ibn al-Subkī reproduced Ibn Jahbal’s refutation in full in his Tabaqāt al-Shāfi‘īyya al-Kubrā and we publish its full annotated translation here for the first time.

\(^3\) Ibn Kathīr, al-Biḍāya wal-Nihāya (year 698).

\(^4\) Al-Tuwayjirī is the mufti who demanded that women caught driving in Saudi Arabia be labeled as prostitutes in the courts. He authored a 300-page book titled al-Diobandīyya in which he castigates the Ulema of Deoband as holding corrupt and deviant beliefs. See our book Albānī and His Friends.
Strange as they sound, the positions forwarded in the *Fatwā Ḥamawiyya* affirming the upward direction, altitude, and literal aboveness of Allāh Most High on top of the sky are nothing new. Christians have been saying “Our Father Who art in heaven” in this sense for centuries and it is part of their obligatory creed to say that on the Day of Judgment “the Son [Jesus] will be seated at the right hand of the Father.” The Ulema have refuted similar intimations of anthropomorphism since the earliest times. Ibn Jahbal only recounted some of their statements and clarified them in the best way he could.

Imām Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, for example, said that the sayings of Allāh {Wait they for naught else than that Allāh should come unto them in the shadows of the clouds with the angels?} (2:210) and {Await they aught save that the angels should come unto them or your Lord’s command should come to pass?} (16:33) refer to the Jews, as do the verses {O you who believe! Come, all of you, into submission – and if you slide back after the clear proofs have come unto you, then know that Allāh is Mighty, Wise.} (2:208-209):

---

5 As established in al-Wāḥidī’s *Asbāb al-Nuzūl* and al-Suyūṭī’s *Asbāb al-Nuzūl*. This is also the position of Ibn Kathir, al-Qurtubi, and others on verse 2:210.
The meaning is: “They shall not accept your Religion except if Allah comes to them in the shadows of the clouds so that they can see Him distinctly,” for the Jews were anthropomorphists (mushabbhiha). They considered it possible for Allah to come and go, and they said that He manifested Himself to Mūsâ on the Mount in the shadows of the clouds. So they asked for something similar in the time of Muḥammad.  

Imām al-Qushayrī said in the beginning of his famous Risāla:

I heard the Shaykh Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān Muḥammad ibn al-Husayn al-Sulamī say – Allah have mercy on him!: I heard ‘Abd Allah ibn Mūsā al-Sulamī say: I heard Abū Bakr al-Shibli say: “The One (al-Wāḥid) is [He Who ought to be] known [to exist] before limits/directions (al-ḥudūd) and before letters/sounds (al-hurūf).” This is an explicit statement on al-Shibli’s part that the Pre-Eternal (al-Qadīm) has no limit/place/direction for His Essence (lā ḥadda li-dhātīh).

Shaykh Muḥammad Saʿīd Ramaḍān al-Būṭi commented on the above: “We do not explain elevation (‘uluw) but simply attribute it to Allah Most High because He attributed it to Himself in the Book. For height, with respect to a human being, is relative, while in relation to Allah, it is absolute. Al-Shibli linked this to His being ‘The One.’ That is, ‘He was and there was nothing with Him’ – i.e. neither place nor direction.”

Imām Abū Maṣḥūr al-Māturīḍī (d. 333) said: “To suggest a place for Allah is idolatry.”  

7 From his Damascus Jumu’a lectures on the Risāla Qushayrīyya in the late nineties.
Ibn Ḥazm said: "By no means whatsoever is Allāh in a place or time. This is the position of the vast majority of the scholars (al-jumhūr) and ours as well, and other than this position is not permissible, for anything other than that is false."\(^9\)

Qādī Badr al-Dīn Ibn Jamāʿa said: "Know that the term 'above' (fawq) in the language of the Arabs is used to mean the firmly established location of height (al-ḥayyiz al-thābit al-ʿāli) and it is used in the sense of power (al-qudra) and upper rank (al-rutbat al-ʿaliyya). Examples of the aboveness of power are the verses {The Hand of Allāh is above (fawq) their hands} (48:10) and {He is the Omnipotent over (fawq) His slaves} (6:18, 6:61). For what accompanies the mention of the omnipotence indicates that sense."\(^10\)

Fakhr al-Islām Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Pazdawī (d. 482) said in his magisterial Uṣūl:

For us [Māturīdīs], {those who are firmly grounded in knowledge} (3:7) have no share in the knowledge of the ambiguous content of Qurʿān (al-mutashābih) other than pure resignation (al-taslīm), believing in the real nature of the meaning (ḥaqiqiyat al-murād) in the Divine presence and that the pause at His saying: {None knows its explanation save Allāh} (3:7) is required (waqf wājib). The People of Belief belong to one of two levels in knowledge: some over-zealously demand that it be read without pause – those are tested with a form of ignorance; some demand the pause – those are honored with a form of knowledge [...]}. An example of the ambiguous verses is the individual letters that open certain sūras. Another example is the affirmation of His vision with the

\(^9\) In al-Fīṣal fil-Mīlal (2:125).
\(^{10}\) Ibn Jamāʿa, Iduḥ al-Dallī (p. 108).
sight of the eyes in reality in the hereafter, according to the explicit text of the Qur'ān: {On that day will faces be resplendent, looking towards their Lord} (75:22-23). For He exists with the attribute of perfection, and the fact that He can be seen both by Himself and others is among the characteristics of perfection; moreover, the believer is made to receive such bestowal of the Divine gift. However, the affirmation of direction is precluded (išbāḥ al-jiha muntani'ī). It follows that the description of the vision is among the ambiguities, and so it is obligatory to assest to it while believing in its reality. Similarly, the affirmation of the Hand and the Face are right (ḥaqq) in our School, known in principle (ma'ālimun bi-ašlihi) but ambiguous in description (mutashābihun bi-waṣfihi). It is not permitted to invalidate the principle on the grounds that one is unable to comprehend the descrip-

---

11 Hence the invalidity of Ibn Taymiyya's claim in al-Iklīl fil-Mutashābih in the Majmū' al-Fatāwā (13:309-310) that since "Mālik did not say that the modality was nonexistent but only that it was unknown", resignation (tafwīḍ) consists only in the resignation of the modality (ka'yfiyya) and not that of meaning (ma'na). This argument banks on an anomalous version of Mālik's statement on istiwa' cf. our Four Imāms. Mālik said the modality is unthinkable (ghayru ma'gūl) i.e. nonexistent. Imām Aḥmad himself said: "We believe and confirm the ḥadiths of the Attributes without 'how' and without meaning" (see below, note 262). This is also Imam al-Baghawī's definition of tafwīḍ in Sharḥ al-Sunnah (1:170): "The Salaf of this Nation and the Scholars of the Sunna accepted all [the reports about the Attributes] with faith and avoided likening Allāh to His creation and figurative interpretation. They committed (wakalā) all knowledge pertaining to them [the Attributes] to Allāh." Imām al-Nawawī defines tafwīḍ as the committal of meaning in countless places of his Sharḥ Ṣaḥīh Muslim. Shaykh al-Īsām Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī in al-Sayf al-Saqqī (p. 128) pointed out that the inconceivability of the modality of istiwa' proved that it precluded the meaning of sitting. Similarly, al-Nabhānī in Shawāhīd al-Haqiq (p. 251) pointed out that "If the meaning of such verses were known it could not be other than in the sense in which the attributes of created entities are known, as in istiwa' in the sense of sitting (al-jūlūs) which we know in relation to ourselves, and this applies to the rest of the ambiguous terms." A more recent attempt to force this particular error of Ibn Taymiyya through the wall of correct doctrine can be seen in Mashhūr Salmān's book al-Ruḍūd wal-Ta'āqqubāt (p. 67-84) in which he casts aspersions on Imām al-Nawawī's Sunni definition of tafwīḍ.
tion. The Muʿtazila went astray only in this respect, for they rejected the principles because of their ignorance of the Attributes and became nullifiers-of-the-Attributes (muʿaṭṭila).

In his commentary on al-Pazdawi’s *Uṣūl* entitled *Kashf al-Asrār* (1:55-60) Shaykh ʿAlā’ al-Dīn al-Bukhārī (d. 730) comments on the above passage:

By saying: “For us,” the Shaykh shunned the position of those who say: “Allāh is not to be described as possessing a face and hands, rather, what is meant by the face is contentment (al-ridā) or the Essence (al-dhāt) and the like; and what is meant by the hand is power or favor and the like.” The Shaykh therefore said: Rather, Allāh is described with the Attribute of Face and that of Hand, together with the upholding of His Transcendence (tanzīh) above having a form (ṣūra) and a limb (jāriḥa) [...]. Similarly with the affirmation of modality (ithbāt al-kayfiyya): its description is ambiguous, therefore it is obligatory to resign to it, firmly believing in its reality without busying oneself with interpretation.

Ibn Taymiyya also contradicted the Sunni definition of the *mutashābih* as formulated by Imām Abū Maṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī in *Uṣūl al-Dīn* in which the latter cites, among those who consider the verse of *istiwā* one of the *mutashābihāt* or Qur’ānic ambiguities, Imām Mālik ibn Anas, the seven jurists of Madīna, and al-Aṣmaʿī. This is also the position of Imām al-Khaṭṭābī in his commentary on Abū Dāwūd’s *Sunan* with regard to the meaning of the ḥadith of the “descent” of Allāh Most High to the nearest heaven: “This [ḥadith] belongs to the knowledge in the outward expression of which we have been ordered to believe and not seek to disclose its inward sense. It is among the
many ambiguities (mutashābih) which Allāh has mentioned in His book.”

Mullā ‘Alī al-Qāri states something similar with regard to the interpretation of the ḥadīth of the placing of the “Hand” of Allāh between the shoulders of the Prophet ﷺ (in his dream), as narrated by al-Tirmidhi who declared it ḥasan šaḥīḥ:

It is of necessity absurd to interpret it as a real or literal manifestation (taḥallī ḥaqīqī). Allāh ﷺ has many kinds of manifestations (anwā‘ min al-taḥalliyāt) according to His Essence and Attributes. Likewise, He possesses all-encompassing power and ability, well beyond the angels and all others, to fashion forms and appearances. Yet He is Transcendent beyond possessing a body (jīsm), a form (sūra), and directions (jihāt) with respect to His Essence. These considerations help solve many of the purported difficulties in the ambiguous verses and the narrations of the Attributes. Allāh knows best the reality of spiritual stations and the minutiae of objectives.... If the ḥadīth is shown to have something in its chain that indicates forgery, then fine; otherwise, the door of figurative interpretation is wide and imperative (bāb al-ta‘wil wāsi‘un muḥattam).

All the above evidence shows the fallacy of Ibn Taymiyya’s typically over-reaching claim in the epistle entitled al-Iklīl fil-Mutashābih wal-Ta‘wil that “I do not know any of the Salaf of the Community nor any of the Imāms, neither Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal nor other than him, that considered these [the Divine Names and Attributes] as part of the mutashābih.” Worse, as Qāḍī Yūsuf al-Nabhānī pointed out in Shawāhid al-Haqq, Ibn

---

12 Al-Khaṭṭābī, Ma‘ālim al-Sunan (Hims ed. 5:101).
14 In Majmū‘at al-Rasā‘il also compiled as Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (13:294).
Taymiyya not only claimed to know the meaning of these verses, but also added categorical interpretive terms to their purported meanings, such as “literally” (haqiqatan) and “with His essence” (bi-dhatihi).  

Ibn Jahbal’s refutation of Ibn Taymiyya remains one of the most precise statements of Sunni doctrine against anthropomorphism to date, together with Shaykh al-Islam al-Taqi al-Subki’s al-Sayf al Saqil fil-Radd ‘alà Ibn Zafîl (a critique of Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya’s Nuniyya poem), Ibn al-Jawzi’s Daf Shubah al-Tashbih written against Abû Ya’la al-Hanbali and other anthropomorphists, and the great Shâfi’i Faqih of Damascus Taqi al-Dîn al-Hiâni’s scathing critique of Ibn Taymiyya entitled Daf Shubah man Shabbaâ wa-Tamarrad wa-Nasaba Dhâlika il-lâl-Imâm Ahmad (“Repelling the Sophistries of the Rebel Who Likens Allâh to Creation Then Attributes this Doctrine to Imâm Ahmad”). Other refutations of the heresy of the jihawiyya were authored by the following authorities:

- Ḥujjat al-Islâm Imâm al-Ghazzâlî has a section in his Qawâ'id al-'Aqâ'id in refutation of this heresy and also in al-Risâlat al-Qudsiyya.
- His teacher Imâm al-Ḥaramayn Ibn al-Juwaynî in Luma' al-Adilla fi Qawâ'id 'Aqâ'id Ahl al-Sunna.

Al-Nabhânî in Shawâhid al-Haqq (p. 251).
REFUTATION OF HIM WHO ATTRIBUTES DIRECTION TO ALLAH

- The ḥadith Master Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī al-Ḥanāfī in his commentary on Ḥiyā’ ‘Ulūm al-Dīn titled Itḥāf al-Sādat al-Muttaqīn, section of the Qawā‘id: “Direction does not surround Him and neither the earth nor the heavens are on different sides of Him.”


- Imām Ibn ‘Abd al-Salām said in his Fatāwā that the most correct position concerning those who attribute direction to Allāh is that they are not kāfir but muftadi’.¹⁶


- Imām Fākhī al-Dīn al-Rāzī in his refutation of the Karrāmiyya sect titled Asās al-Taqdis (which Ibn Taymiyya attacked at length and aimed to refute in a book he called al-Taṣīs) and in al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr for the verse {He is the Omnipotent over His slaves} (6:18, 6:61).


- Imam Shihāb al-Dīn al-Ramlī in his Fatāwā gave a long answer in refutation of this innovation.

- Shaykh al-Islām Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī wrote in al-Durrat al-Muṣṭiyya:

---

When Ibn Taymiyya innovated whatever he innovated in the principles of Doctrine and destroyed the pillars and seams of the foundations of Islam after camouflaging himself with the pretense of following the Book and the Sunna, purportedly summoning people to the truth and guiding them to Paradise, he left conformity and entered innovation, strayed from the Congregation of the Muslims by violating the Consensus, and attributed to the Transcendent Essence what presupposes corporeality and compound nature.


- Imam Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī in his Fatāwa Hadīthīyya declared it impermissible to attribute direction or height to Allāh Most High in the literal sense and blasted Ibn Taymiyya for holding this and other deviant views. Both he and al-Subki attributed kufr to him in ‘aqīda and countless innovations in the branches of the Law.17

- Qādī Yusuf al-Nabhānī (1265-1350) refuted the same heresy in his recently republished Raf’ al-Ishtibāh fi Istiḥlālat al-Jihā ‘alā Allāh (“The Removal of Doubt Concerning the Impossibility of Direction for Allāh”).18 We will mention more refutations.

17 Nu’mān al-ʿAlūsī – the “Salafi” son of the famous commentator – took the side of Ibn Taymiyya and attacked al-Haytamī in an epistle entitled Jalā’ al-ʿAynayn bi-Muḥākamat al-Aḥmadyayn which al-Nabhānī in the Shawāhid and others refuted point by point.
18 Reproduced in full in al-Nabhānī’s Shawāhid al-Ḥaqq (p. 210-240) and recently republished as a monograph.
Ibn Jahbal described his work thus: “Know that these clear proofs which we enumerated and which we received from the Shaykhs of the Path, were themselves inferred from none other than the Glorious Book. But not everything that is in the Glorious Book can be known by each and every person. Each can only scoop up what his vessel can contain, no more and no less.” Ibn Jahbal uses this simple and clear style to denounce out loud what everybody knows but no one is able to express about Ibn Taymiyya. He lays bare the intimidating manner in which Ibn Taymiyya produces avalanches of proofs that do not apply in reality, or are inauthentic, or both. In particular, Ibn Jahbal repeatedly emphasizes the gravity of discussing kalām issues in public in the guise of corrective da‘wā and the fitna it causes for the majority of the public at large, a sin for which, no doubt, the greatest culprits in Islām have been the “Salafīs” and Wahhabis in the wake of Ibn Taymiyya’s legacy. Finally, he exposes Ibn Taymiyya’s peculiar understanding of the basic elements of language such as prepositions, and reiterates the creed of Ahl al-Sunna one and all that Allāh Most High exists beyond any attribution of time, space, place, dimension, corporeality, and direction.
He is the Knower of the invisible and the visible, the Great, the High Exalted

(13:9)

And those who are of sound instruction say:
We believe therein; the whole is from our Lord; but only people of understanding really heed

(3:7)
Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥalīm ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Abī al-Qāsim ibn Taymiyya, Taqī al-Dīn Abū al-ʿAbbās ibn Shihāb al-Dīn ibn Majd al-Dīn al-Ḥarrānī al-Dimashqī al-Hanbali (661-728) was one of the most influential scholars of the late Ḥanbali school, praised by al-Dhahabī as “greater than his life can be illustrated by the like of myself” and by the ḥadith Master Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-ʿAlāʾī as “Our Shaykh, Master, and Imām between us and Allāh ﷻ, the master of verification, the wayfarer of the best path, the owner of the multifarious merits and overpowering proofs which all hosts agree are impossible to enumerate, the Shaykh, the Imām and faithful servant of his Lord, the doctor in the Religion, the Ocean, the light-giving Pole of spirituality, the leader of Imāms, the blessing of the Community, the sign-post of the people of knowledge, the inheritor of Prophets, the last of those capable of independent legal reasoning, the most unique of the scholars of the Religion, Shaykh al-Islām […]” Later, both al-Dhahabī and al-ʿAlāʾī changed their minds and the latter went on to list the matters in which Ibn Taymiyya went astray.
Al-'Alâ'i's Summary of Ibn Taymiyya's Deviations

Ibn Ṭūlūn said in *Dhakhā'ir al-Qaṣr fi Tarājim Nubalā' al-ʿAṣr*:

The ḥadīth Master Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-ʿAlâ'i said: “List of the matters in which Ibn Taymiyya contravened the people [of knowledge] in the foundations and the branches. Among them are the matters in which he violated Consensus, and among them those in which he contravened the correct position in the [Ḥanbalī] School.

“Of those matters is the swearing of a [conditional] oath to divorce (*yamīn al-ṭalāq*). He said divorce does not take place when the condition of the oath is met but all that one has to do is pay or perform an expiation for perjury (*kaффārat yamīn*). Not one of the Jurists of the Muslims before him ever said that such an expiation was valid. He gave this *fatwā* for a long time. The matter grew such that huge masses of the uneducated public fell into imitating him and general disaster ensued. He also said that the divorce of a woman in menses does not take effect; nor does it take effect in the non-menstrual cycle either, if the husband has intercourse with his wife; that the triple divorce amounts to one, although he had reported the Consensus of the Muslims to the contrary in the matter, and said that whoever violates it
commits apostasy; then he violated it and caused a great many people to fall into the same violation.

"He also said that if one deliberately misses a prayer, it is not lawful to make it up; that a woman in menstruation may circumambulate the House without owing any expiation and that it is permissible for her; that taxes are licit to take by those who allocate them; that taxes taken from merchants fulfill their zakāt obligation even if not levied under the name, nor in the form, of zakāt; that liquids do not become impure if a mouse or the like dies in them; that the person in a state of major ritual impurity (al-junub) can pray his supererogatory night prayers with dry ablation (tayammum) and that he does not wait until he washes with water in order to pray if the time for fajr has entered, even if he is at home. I saw one of his imitators doing this and I forbade him to do it. [...] He was also asked about the sale of female slaves who gave birth to their master’s child or children and he said it is correct and gave fatwā to that effect.

"Among the doctrinal positions which no one [in Sunni Islām] held but he, is that of ‘good and bad’ (al-ḥusn wa-l-qubh) [for Allāh], which is the belief of the Muʿtazila. He adopted their position, defended it, wrote in support of it, and represented it as the Religion of Allāh [...]. Among his doctrinal positions is the claim that created matters subsist in Allāh – greatly exalted is He above what he claimed! – and that He is made of parts and needs a hand, an eye, a foot, and the like in the way the whole needs the part; that the Qur’ān is created in His Essence; that the world is ‘generically pre-existent’ (qadimun bil-naw‘) and that it was always with Allāh without beginning, created but everlasting, thus representing
Allāh as forced and not freely choosing to act – exalted is He, how patient and gentle He is! He also believed in the corporeality, direction, and displacement of Allāh Who is exalted beyond such things. He wrote in one of his books that Allāh is the same size as the Throne, neither larger nor smaller – exalted is Allāh beyond that! He authored a book stating that the knowledge of Allāh does not apply to infinites such as the bliss of the people of Paradise and that it does not encompass infinites. This is the issue over which the foot of the Imām slipped [i.e. Imām al-Ḥaramayn Ibn al-Juwaynī in his book al-Burhān].

“Among his lone doctrinal positions is the claim that Prophets are not immune to sin, that our Prophet ﷺ has no special status before Allāh, and that he cannot be used as an intermediary except if someone is mistakenly doing so. He authored many pages on this. He also said that the undertaking of travel to the Prophet ﷺ in order to visit him is a sin and that it is unlawful to shorten the prayers during such travel. He insisted on this a great deal. None of the Muslims ever said this before him.

“He also said that the punishment of the people of the Fire will come to an end and not last eternally. Among his lone positions also is that the actual words of the Torah and the Gospel were not substituted (lam tubaddal) but remain in the exact same form in which they had been revealed, and that corruption (al-tahrīf) took place only with regard to their interpretation (ta’wilihā). He authored a book on this.

“This is the last that I saw in the matter. I ask forgiveness of Allāh for writing such things, besides strenuously clearing myself of holding them!”
His Teachers and Students


Among his most noted students were the ḥadīth masters Ibn al-Qayyīm, the closest student; al-Dhahabī, the senior companion by far; Ibn Kathīr and Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd al-Hādī al-Maqdisī, who were both in their twenties when he died; and the Ḥanbali jurist and ḥadīth narrator Sirāj al-Dīn Abū Ḥāfṣ ʿUmar ibn ʿAli ibn Mūsā al-Azjī al-Bazzār (688-749) who should not be confused with the ḥāfīz Abū Bakr al-Bazzār (215-292).

Ibn Taymiyya’s views and manners created intense controversy both during his lifetime and after his death. Ibn Rajab relates that ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Wāsīṭī admired Ibn Taymiyya to the point that he swore to his greatness and studied under him although older than him, yet “he and a group of his close companions at times condemned what they heard the Shaykh say against some of the major great Imāms or against the ascetics and so forth.”20 Al-Sakhāwī in al-I‘lān wal-Tawbikh (p. 61) noted: “Certain people gave rise to disavowal and a general reluctance to make use of their knowledge despite their stature in knowledge, pious scrupulousness, and asceticism. The reason for this was the looseness of their tongues and their tactlessness in blunt speech and excessive criticism, such as Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn Taymiyya, who were subsequently tried and harmed.”

An illustration of Ibn Taymiyya’s ambivalent status is the fact that, although the Shāfī’ī ḥadīth Master al-Mizzi did not call anyone else “Shaykh al-Islām” in his time besides Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn Abī ‘Umar al-Ḥanbālī, and Imām Taqī al-Dīn al-Ṣubkī,21 the Ḥanāfī Scholar ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn al-Bukhārī issued a fatwā that if

anyone called Ibn Taymiyya “Shaykh al-Islām” they would commit disbelief and authored against the latter a book titled *al-Muljima lil-Mujassima* ("Curbing the Anthropomorphists").

Ibn Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Dimashqī countered this *fatwā* by authoring *al-Radd al-Wāfir*, in which he listed all the authorities who had ever written in praise of Ibn Taymiyya or called him Shaykh al-Islām. Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī in his certificate (*taqrīz*) on *al-Radd al-Wāfir* wrote: “Nevertheless, he was a human being who sometimes erred and sometimes was right. Whatever he was right in – and this is the greater part – is available for benefit and is a cause for our asking for mercy for him. Whatever he erred in, he should not be imitated in it; rather, he is excused.” Shaykh ‘Abd al-Fattāh Abū Ghudda in his book *al-‘Ulama’ al-‘Uzzāb* includes Ibn Taymiyya among the scholars who never married and names him “Shaykh al-Islām and the Standard-Bearer of all standard-bearers.”

---

In *Bayān Zaghl al-ʿIlm* al-Dhahabī writes:

If you were to excel in the Principles (al-*Uṣūl*) and their affiliates – logic, ethics, philosophy, the sayings of the ancients and the conundrums – all the while protecting yourself with the Book and the Sunna as well as the doctrines of the *Salaf*, then joined between reason and transmission, still, I do not think you would reach the level of Ibn Taymiyya. No, by Allāh! You would not even come near it. Yet, I saw what happened to him – how much opposition he faced, desertion, rightful and wrongful declarations of heresy, apostasy, and mendacity! Before he entered into this science [i.e. Islamic Doctrine], he was shining with light and enlightening others, bearing the marks of the *Salaf* on his face. Then he became lightless, dark and somber to countless droves of people, a wicked Anti-Christ and disbeliever according to his enemies, while great numbers of the wise and the elite considered him an eminent, brilliant, and scholarly innovator (*mubtadi‘ fādil muhaqqiq bāri‘*), while the commonality of his uneducated friends, one and all, deemed him the standard-bearer of Islām, the defender of the Religion, and the reviver of the Sunna.”

Al-Dhahabī in the ‘Ibar, after praising his teacher, states: “He also had some strange opinions on account of which he was attacked.”²⁵ Muḥammad Ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī in al-‘Uqūd al-Durriyya makes a similarly meandrous admission that his teacher committed innovation: “He gave vent to certain expressions which early and late Scholars never dared use while he boldly indulged them.”²⁶

In his biographical monograph al-Durrat al-Yatīmiyya fil-Sīrat al-Taymiyya, al-Dhahabī reports that Ibn Daqiq al-‘Īd – the Renewer of the seventh century – said, upon meeting with Ibn Taymiyya: “I saw a man with all the sciences [laid open] before his eyes, taking what he wished and leaving what he wished.” Asked why he did not debate him, Ibn Daqiq al-‘Īd answered: “Because he loves to speak (yuḥibbu al-kalām) and I love silence.”²⁷

“He was Very Learned but Lacked Intelligence”

Imām Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ṣafadī said: “The Shaykh, Imām, and erudite scholar Taqī al-Dīn Ahmad ibn Taymiyya – Allāh have mercy on him! – was immensely learned but he had a defective intelligence (‘aqlūhu nāqiš) that embroiled him in perils and made him fall into hardships.”²⁸

²⁵ Al-Dhahabī, al-‘Ibar (4:84).
²⁶ Ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī, al-‘Uqūd al-Durriyya (p. 117).
²⁸ Al-Ṣafadī, Sharḥ Lāmiyyat al-‘Ajam il-Ṭuḥrātī, in al-Nabhānī, Shawāhid (p. 189).
Ibn Rajab wrote:

Large groups of the Imāms of Ahl al-Ḥadīth and their ḥadīth Masters and Jurists loved the Shaykh and venerated him but they disliked that he was involved with the theologians and philosophers, for uninvolvment was the way of the early Imāms of Ahl al-Ḥadīth such as al-Shāfi‘ī, Aḥmad, Ishāq, Abū ʿUbayd and the like. Similarly, many of the Ulema among the Jurists, the ḥadīth Scholars, and the righteous hated his idiosyncratic promotion of certain aberrant matters which the Salaf had condemned together with those who promoted them, to the point that one of the judges among our companions forbade him to give fatwā in some of those instances.29

In his brief Radd ʿalā man Ittabaʿa Ghayr al-Madhāhib al-Arbaʿa, in which he castigates anyone that claims ijtihād outside the Four Sunni Schools, Ibn Rajab unmistakenly points the finger at Ibn Taymiyya when he writes: “Do not pass judgement on all Divisions of the Believers as if you were given knowledge they were not or reached a state that they did not!”

29 Ibn Rajab, Dhayl Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila (2:394).
The Fatwā Hamawīyya
Attributing Direction to Allah

His first clash with the scholars occurred in 698 in Damascus when he was barred from teaching after he issued his Fatwā Hamawīyya in which he unambiguously attributes literal upward direction to Allah. He was refuted by his contemporary, Imam Ibn Jahbal al-Kilābī (d. 733) in a lengthy reply translated in this book – which Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī reproduced in full in Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿīyya al-Kubrā. Ibn Jahbal wrote: “How can you say that Allah is literally (ḥaqīqatan) in (fī) the heaven, and literally above (fawq) the heaven, and literally in (fī) the Throne, and literally on (ʿalā) the Throne??”

Qādī Yūsuf al-Nabhānī also refuted the Hamawīyya in his magnificent epistle Rafʿ al-Ishtibāh fī Istiḥālat al-Jiha ʿalā Allāh ("The Removal of Uncertainty Concerning the Impossibility of Direction for Allah") cited in full in his Shawāhid al-Haqq.

Muḥammad Saʿīd ibn ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Baghḍādī al-Naqshbandī (d. 1339) wrote another refutation, as of yet unpublished, titled al-Wajh fī Ibṭāl al-Jiha in thirty-six folios.

30 There had been a precedent to the scandal as early as 690 cf. Ibn Rajab, Dhaiyl Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila (2:389).
31 See below (§113) cf. Ibn al-Subkī, Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿīyya al-Kubrā (9:61).
Imām al-Kawthārī penned another refutation, *Khūṭūrat al-Qawli bil-Jiha* (“The Gravity of the Doctrine that Attributes Direction [to Allāh ﷻ]”) in which he reports al-Bayāḍī’s explanation of Imām Abū Ḥanīfa’s statement: “Whoever says ‘I do not know whether my Lord is in the heaven or on earth’ is a disbeliever and, similarly, whoever says, ‘He is on the Throne and I do not know whether the Throne is in the heaven or on earth’ is a disbeliever.” Al-Bayāḍī said in *Ishārāt al-Marām*:

This is because he implies that the Creator has a direction and a boundary, and anything that possesses direction and boundary is necessarily created. So this statement explicitly attributes imperfection to Allāh ﷻ. The believer in [Divine] corporeality and direction is someone who denies the existence of anything other than objects that can be pointed to with the senses. They deny the Essence of the Deity Who is transcendent beyond that. This makes them positively guilty of disbelief.

---

33 In *Fiqh al-Absat* (“The Greatest Wisdom”), the same work as the *Fiqh al-Akbar* but in catechetical form narrated from the Imām exclusively by Abū Muṭṭī al-Ḥakam ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muslim al-Balkhī al-Khurāsānī through Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī al-Alma’ī al-Kāshghārī (d. >484), both of them discarded as narrators.

Ibn Taymiyya then returned to his activities until he was summoned by the authorities again in 705 to answer for his ‘Aqīda Wāsitiyya. He spent the following few years in and out of jail in Cairo and Damascus or defending himself from various “abhorrent charges” according to Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī. Because he officially repented, his life was spared, although at one point it was proclaimed in Damascus that “Whoever follows the beliefs of Ibn Taymiyya, his life and property are licit for seizure.”

These events instigated great dissension among the scholars in Damascus and Cairo as detailed by the Shāfi‘ī Imām Taqī al-Dīn al-Ḥiṣnī (d. 829) in his Daf‘ Shubahi Man Shabbaha wa-Tamarrad.35

35 Published in Cairo at Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Kutub al-‘Arabiyya, 1931.
Ibn Taymiyya at various times declared himself a follower of the Shāfi‘i school – as did many Ḥanbalis in Damascus – and an Ash‘arī. Ibn Ḥajar wrote in *al-Durar al-Kāmina*:

An investigation [of his views] was conducted by several scholars and a written statement was drawn up in which he said: “I am Ash‘arī.” We find in his handwriting, verbatim: “I believe that the Qur‘ān is a meaning which exists in the Divine Essence, and that it is an Attribute from the pre-eternal Attributes of His Essence, and that it is uncreated, and that it does not consist in the letter nor the voice, and that His saying: *{The Merciful established Himself over the Throne}* (20:5) is not meant literally (*layṣa ‘alā ẓāhirīhi*), and I do not know of what consists its meaning but only Allāh knows it, and one speaks of His ‘descent’ in the same way as one speaks of His ‘establishment.’ It was written by Aḥmad ibn Taymiyya.” They witnessed that he had repented of his own free will from everything that contravened the above. This took place on the 25th of Rabī‘ al-Awwal 707 and it was witnessed by a huge array of scholars and others.\(^3^7\)

\(^3^6\) Cf. al-Ḥiṣnī, *Da'f Shubah* (p. 43-45).

\(^3^7\) The names of the scholars who counter-signed Ibn Taymiyya’s deposition are listed by al-Kawtharī in his notes to Ibn al-Subkī’s *al-Šayf al-Šaqil* (p. 95-96).
Al-Ṭūfī’s Summary of
İbn Taymiyya’s Deviations

The Ḥanbalī scholar of prodigious memory, specialist of principles, canonical readings, Qur’ān commentary, Ḥanbalī and Shāfi‘ī jurisprudence, belles-lettres and medicine, Najm al-Din Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd al-Qawī al-Ṭūfī (657-716)\(^{38}\) – whom al-Dhahabī admired – said:\(^{39}\)

He [İbn Taymiyya] could bring up in one hour from the Book, the Sunna, the Arabic language, and philosophical speculation, material which no one could bring up even in many sessions, as if these sciences were before his very eyes and he was picking and choosing from them at will. A time came when his companions took to over-praising him and this drove him to be satisfied with himself until he became conceited before his fellow human beings. He became convinced that he was a scholar capable of independent reasoning (mujtahid). Henceforth he began to answer each and every scholar great and small, past and recent, until he went all the way back to ‘Umar ﷺ and faulted him in some matter. This reached the ears of Shaykh İbrāhīm al-Rāqī who reprimanded him. İbn Taymiyya went to see him, apologized, and

\(^{38}\) Obitus per İbn ‘İmâd and İbn HECKAR while later biographers said 710.

\(^{39}\) In İbn HECKAR’s al-Durar al-Kāmina (1:153-155).
asked forgiveness. He also spoke against ‘Ali ☪ and said: “He made mistakes in seventeen different matters.” [...] 

Because of his fanatic support of the Ḥanbali School he attacked the Ash’arís until he started to insult al-Ghazzālī, at which point some people opposed him and almost killed him. [...] They asserted that he had blurted out certain words concerning doctrine which came out of his mouth in the course of his sermons and legal pronouncements. They mentioned that he had cited the hadīth of the descent of Allāh ☪ (to the nearest heaven), then climbed down two steps from the pulpit and said: “Just like this descent of mine” and so was branded as an anthropomorphist. They also cited his censure of whoever uses the Prophet ☪ as an intermediary or seeks help from him (aw istaghātha). [...] 

People were divided into parties because of him. Some considered him an anthropomorphist because of what he mentioned in al-‘Aqīda al-Hamawiyya, al-‘Aqīda al-Wāsitiyya, and other books of his, to the effect that the Hand, Foot, Shin, and Face are literal Attributes of Allāh and that He is established upon the Throne with His Essence. It was said to him that were this the case, He would necessarily be subject to spatial confinement (al-tahayyuz) and divisibility (al-inqisām). He replied: “I do not concede that spatial confinement and divisibility are necessarily properties of bodies,” so it was concluded against him (ulzima) that he held the Divine Essence to be subject to spatial confinement. Others considered him a heretic (zindiq) due to his saying that the Prophet ☪ is not to be sought for help and the fact that this amounted to diminishing and undermining the greatness of the Prophet ☪. [...] Others considered him a secret dis-
believer (munāfiq) because of what he said about ‘Ali: [...] namely, that he had been forsaken everywhere he went, had repeatedly tried to acquire the caliphate and never attained it, fought out of lust for power rather than religion, and said that “he loved leadership while ‘Uthmān loved money.” He would say that Abū Bakr had declared Islām in his old age, fully aware of what he said, while ‘Alī had declared Islām as a boy, and a boy’s Islām is not considered sound upon his mere word. [...] In sum, he said ugly things such as these, and it was said against him that he was a hypocrite, in view of the Prophet’s ḫ saying (to ‘Ali): “Only a hypocrite has hatred for you.”

Al-Bukhārī narrated that the Prophet ḫ came in and saw ‘Ali and Fāṭima sleeping, whereupon he said: “Are you not praying?” ‘Alī said: “Our souls are in the Hand of Allāh...” The Prophet ḫ walked away, slapping his thigh and saying {Man disputes much} (18:54). Ibn Taymiyya commented in his Fatāwā (15:229): “This is blameworthy disputation [...] and is one of the kinds of arguments used by the Qadariyya sect.” Such an explanation has no precedent.

Narrated from ‘Ali by Muslim, al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasāʾī, and Aḥmad.
Another reason why Ibn Taymiyya was opposed was his disrespect of Sufis, particularly Shaykh Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ἃrabi, although he described himself, in his letter to the Sufi Shaykh Abū al-Faṭḥ Naṣr al-Manbiji, as a former admirer of the Shaykh al-Akbar:

From Aḥmad Ibn Taymiyya to the Shaykh, the Knower, the Exemplar, the Wayfarer, the Worshipful Abū al-Faṭḥ Naṣr [...] I was previously one of those who used to hold the best opinion of Ibn ‘Arabi and extol his praise, because of the benefits I saw in his works, such as what he said in many of his books, for example: al-Futūḥāt, al-Kunh, al-Muḥkam al-Marbūt, al-Durrat al-Fākhira, Maṭāli’ al-Nujūm, and other such works."11

Ibn Taymiyya also acknowledged the reality of the God–given, extraordinary spiritual unveilings or kashf that take place at the hands of the Friends of Allāh, saying: “It is established that the awliyā’ possess spiritual communications and unveilings” (faqad thabata anna li-awliyâ’ Allâhi mukhâṭabâtin wa-mukâshafât).42


42 Ibn Taymiyya, al-Furqân (p. 52).
In our time, most of his purported followers and imitators as well as modernists reject this miraculous and, in their view, elitist aspect of Islām under the misguided impression that it suggests that the Prophetic Dispensation needs additions or completions! A “Salafī” editor even takes Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī to task for expressing his belief in kashf.43

His Sufi Affiliation
With the Qādiri Țariqa

The Ḥanbalī Sufi Yūsuf ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī, known as Ibn al-Mibrad (d. 909), in his Bad’ al-‘Ilqa bi-Labs al-Khirqa narrates Ibn Taymiyya’s declaration that he is a follower of several Sufi paths, among them the Qādiri path of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Gilānī: “I have worn the Sufi cloak (khirqat al-tašawwuf) of a number of Shaykhs belonging to various țariqa (min țuruqi jamā‘ atin min al-shuyūkh), among them Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlī, whose țariqa is the greatest of the well-known ones” and again: “The greatest țariqa (ajallu al-țuruq) is that of my Master (sayyidī) Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlī.”44

43 Jāsim al-Dawsarī in his notes on Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī’s al-Qawā’id al-Kulliyya (Bashā‘ir ed. p. 29).
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Ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī cites Ibn Taymiyya’s *Sufi silsila* thus:

i. ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Gilānī

ii.-iii. Abū ‘Umar ibn Qudāma and Muwaffaq al-Dīn ibn Qudāma

iv. Ibn Abī ‘Umar ibn Qudāma

v. Ibn Taymiyya

vi. Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya

vii. Ibn Rajab

[§ii. and §iii. both received the *khīrqa* from al-Gilānī himself.]

Ibn Taymiyya gave further corroboration of “only two links” separating him from Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Gilānī in *al-Mas'ālat al-Tabriziyya* where he declares: “I wore the blessed Sufi cloak of ‘Abd al-Qādir, there being between him and me two Shaykhs (Labīstu al-*khīrqa* al-mubāraka līl-Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir wa-baynī wa-baynahu ithnān).” This is quoted in a unique manuscript of the work *Targīh al-Mutahābbīn fi Labs Khīrqa al-Mutamayyizīn* by Jamāl al-Dīn at-Ṭalyānī.

On Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir’s *Futūḥ al-Ghayb*, Ibn Taymiyya wrote a hundred-page partial commentary covering only five of the seventy-eight sermons of the book. The substance of this commentary aims to show that orthodox *taṣawwuf* is in consonance with Qur’ān and Hadith and the Consensus of the Community.

---

45 Ms. Damascus, Zāhiriyya §1186 H.
46 Al-Ṭalyānī, manuscript Chester Beatty 3296 (8) in Dublin, f° 67a.
48 As Ibn al-Qayyim wrote in his poem *al-Nūriyya*: “Ahl al-Hadīth, all of them, and the Imāms of Fatwā are Sufis!”
Insofar as the goal of *taṣawwuf* is the purification of the heart by progress through states (*aḥwāl*) and stations (*maqāmāt*), Ibn Taymiyya in *al-Tuḥfat al-‘Irāqiyya* (al-Zarqā‘, Jordan 1978, p.18) imitated Imām al-Ghazālī’s *fatwā* in *al-Munqidh min al-Ḍalāl* in considering *taṣawwuf* obligatory upon every Muslim, naming it *a‘māl al-qulūb*.
Further charges of heresy were brought against Ibn Taymiyya for his assertions on divorce pronounced in innovative fashion in violation of Consensus. He held that:

(1) a threefold formulation of divorce in a single sitting counted as one;
(2) divorce pronounced at the time of menses did not take effect; and
(3) swearing a vow to divorce could be taken back through expiation (kaifara), in violation of the Consensus of the Four Imams and others of the Salaf.49

Following this, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Bukhārī issued his infamous fatwā. Shaykh al-Islām Taqī al-Subkī said: “Ibn Taymiyya has spread deceit in [affirming] the existence of a difference of opinion in the matter [of divorce], which is a lie, a fabrication, and impudence on his part against Islām. […] It has been affirmed by many of the Scholars that he who opposes the Consensus (al-ijmā‘) of the Community is a disbeliever (kāfīr).”50

50 Al-Subkī, al-Durrat al-Mudīyya fil-Radd ‘alā Ibn Taymiyya (1” epistle, Naqūd al-Ijtima‘ p. 12, 14).
Ibn Rajab Supports then Rejects His *Fatwā* on Divorce

Ibn Rajab first wrote *al-Aḥādith wal-Āthār al-Mutazā'ida fi anna al-Ṭalāqa al-Thalāthata Wāhida* in which he supported Ibn Taymiyya’s position that a triple divorce in one sitting counts as one divorce. Then, after further analyzing the ḥadiths relevant to the topic, he revised his position and issued his *Mushkil al-Aḥādith al-Wārida anna al-Ṭalāqa al-Thalāthata Wāhida* in which he refuted Ibn Taymiyya’s position with the words:

Know that nothing explicit whatsoever is established as authentic from any of the Companions, nor any of the Successors, nor any of the Imāms of the *Salaf*, whose word is relied upon in *ḥalāl* and *ḥarām fatwās*, that a triple divorce after consummation counts as one when pronounced in a single formula.\(^{51}\)

Ibn Ḥajar relates, “Ibn Rajab was criticized for giving *fatwā* according to the positions of Ibn Taymiyya but when he dissociated himself from them the Taymiyyans ostracized him.”\(^{52}\)

In his defense of Ibn Taymiyya titled *Sayr al-Ḥāthth ilā ’Ilm al-Ṭalāq al-Thalāth*, Yūsuf Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥādī disputed the above summation by Ibn Rajab although he readily admitted that “the

\(^{51}\) In Yūsuf Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥādī, *Sayr al-Ḥāthth* (p. 31).

position that the triple divorce counts as three divorces is the sound and true position of the [Hanbali] School” and that it is that of “Aḥmad, al-Shāfiʿī, Abū Ḥanīfa, Mālik, al-Thawrī, Ibn Abī Laylā, and al-Awzāʿī [...] and in Ibn al-Mundhir’s al-İjmāʿ is an indication that there is Consensus over it although not explicit.” Ibn al-Mundhir did cite Consensus that if a man tells his wife “You are divorced three times less two” she is divorced once, and that if he tells her “You are divorced three times less one” she is divorced twice. Further, explicit Consensus is cited that three divorces in a single sitting count as three by:

(1) Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr in al-Istidhkār as quoted by Ibn Qaṭṭān al-Fāsī in his encyclopedia of Consensus titled al-Iqnaʿ fī Masāʾil al-Ijmāʿ;
(2) Ibn Hubayra in al-Ijmāʿ ‘inda A’immat Ahl al-Sunnati al-Arbaʿa; and
(3) Ibn Ḥajār in Fath al-Bārī.

His Prohibition of Travel to Visit the Prophet

After spending the years 719-721 in jail, Ibn Taymiyya was jailed again in 726 until his death two years later amid charges of kufr for declaring – without precedent in Islam – that one who travels to visit the Holy Prophet commits a prohibition (ḥarām), a sin (maʿṣiya), and an innovation (bidʿa).

The Ḥanbalī
Rejection of this Fatwā

Al-Mardāwī, Ibn Hubayra, and others stated that the entirety of the early and late authorities in the Ḥanbalī Madhhab stipulate the desirability (istilbāb) of visiting the grave of the Prophet ﷺ in Madīna, most especially after Ḥajj, and/or traveling to do so.\(^{55}\) Ibn Mufliḥ, al-Mardāwī, and Marʿī ibn Yūsuf in Ghāyat al-Muntahā stated the Sunna character of visiting the graves of the Muslims and the permissibility (ibāḥa) of traveling to do so. Marʿī reiterates this ruling in his unpublished monograph on the ethics of graves and visitation, Shifā’ al-Ṣudūr fi Ziyārat al-Mashāhid wal-Qubūr.\(^{56}\)


Shaykh al-Islām al-Subkī’s
Rejection of this Fatwā

This most notorious of all Taymiyyan fatwās was refuted by Ibn Taymiyya’s contemporary the ḥadīth Master and Shaykh al-Islām Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī in his landmark book Shiḥā’ al-Siqām fī Ziyāratī Khayr al-Anām (“The Healing of Sickness Concerning the Visitation to the Best of Creatures”) also titled Shann al-Ghāra ‘alā man Ankara al-Safar lil-Ziyāra (“The Raid Against Him [Ibn Taymiyya] Who Denied the Lawfulness of Travel for the Purpose of Visitation”). Shaykh al-Islām adduced the ḥadīth “Whoever visits my grave, my intercession will be guaranteed for him” as proof against Ibn Taymiyya’s claim that “all the ḥadīths that concern the merit of visitation are weak or rather forged”57 and denounced Ibn Taymiyya’s unprecedented fatwā as a flagrant innovation.

57 A claim heedlessly imitated by Ibn Taymiyya’s followers in our time. On the ḥadīth see further down (p. 59).
Imām Abū al-Fadl Zayn al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥīm ibn al-Husayn al-ʿIrāqī al-Miṣrī (725-806), Shaykh al-Islām, the Imām, Qāḍī of Cairo, ḥadīth Master of his time, and principal teacher of the ḥadīth Master Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, said in al-Awjibat al-Makkiyya, a refutation of Ibn Taymiyya’s fatwā claiming the prohibition of travel to visit the Prophet ☪: “There is no taḥrīm (prohibition) of an act of travel in the ḥadīth [“Mounts are not to be saddled except to travel to three mosques”]; rather, it is an emphasis on the importance of traveling to these three mosques in particular, and the emphasis becomes an obligation in case of a vow (nadhr), which is not the case for a vow to pray in any mosque other than these three.”

Al-ʿIrāqī further reacted to Ibn Taymiyya’s claim that it was an innovation in the Religion to show generosity to relatives on the day of ʿĀshūrā with the words: “I find it strange that such words should come from this Imām, whose followers say that he has encompassed the Sunna in knowledge and practice [...]. One who has not heard of something should not deny that it exists!” Al-ʿIrāqī then proceeded to show that, on the contrary, it was a Sunna based on sound narrations from the Prophet ☪ as

59 Cf. Ibn Taymiyya, Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā (25:299-300) and his Minhāj (Sālim ed. 7:39).
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well as the Companions and the Imāms of the Successors and the succeeding generations.⁶⁰

Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Ḥajar’s
Rejection of this Fatwā

Imām Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī in Fath al-Bārī said of Ibn Taymiyya’s fatwā prohibiting travel in order to visit the Prophet ﷺ: “This is one of the ugliest matters ever reported from him.”⁶¹

Hāfiz al-Ṣafadi’s
Rejection of this Fatwā

Al-Ṣafadi said:

Ibn Taymiyya gilded his statement
Concerning the visit to the Best of Creation,
Whereupon souls came in droves to complain
To the best of scholars and purest of Imāms [i.e. al-Subkī]
Who compiled this book, providing them with a cure
And so it was indeed The Healing of Sickness.

⁶¹ Fath al-Bārī (1989 ed. 3:66). In his marginalia on that work the “Ṣalafi” mufti Ibn Bāz comments: “This was not an ugly thing but a correct thing for Ibn Taymiyya to say”!
Al-Qārī said in his commentary on ‘Iyād’s al-Shifā’:

Ibn Taymiyya – one of the Ḥanbalis – committed excess when he declared it prohibited to travel to visit the Prophet † just as others also committed excess in saying that it is obligatory in the Religion to know that the Visitation is an act by which one draws near to Allāh (qurba) and whoever denies it is judged to be a disbeliever (kāfir). Yet, the latter view is probably closer to being correct than the first, because to declare prohibited something the Ulema by Consensus declared desirable (mustaḥabb), is disbelief. For that is graver than to declare prohibited something agreed upon as merely permitted (mubāḥ).62

62 Al-Qārī, Sharḥ al-Shifā’ (2:514).
Imām al-Khafājī’s
Rejection of this *Fatwā*

Another Ḥanafī Imām who wrote a major commentary on ‘Iyād’s *Shifā*, al-Khafājī, said of Ibn Taymiyya in relation to his heretical *fatwā*: “He imagined that he was defending monotheism with all kinds of nonsense which do not deserve mention for they do not originate from the mind of a rational person, let alone an eminent one – Allāh forgive him!”

Other Rejections of this *Fatwā*


63 In al-Nabhānī’s *Shawāhid* (p. 185).
64 In four volumes edited by Dr. Nūr al-Dīn ‘Itr (Beirut: Dār al-Bashā‘ir al-Islāmiyya, 1994) 4:1384.

56
included in al-Nabhānī’s Ḥujjat Allāh ‘alā al-‘Ālamīn, among many other works on the topic of seeking an intermediary and asking the Prophet’s help (al-tawassul wal-istighātha); al-Nabhānī with his Shawāhid al-Haqq; Imām al-Lacknawī’s three Urdu treatises against Muḥammad Bashīr al-Sahsawānī who had advocated not visiting the Prophet after pilgrimage; Shaykh Muḥammad ibn ‘Alawī al-Mālikī in Shifā’ al-Fu‘ād fi Ziyāratī Khayr al-‘Ibād; Shaykh ‘Īsā al-Ḥimyarī of Dubai; Sayyid Yūsuf al-Rifā‘ī of Kuwait; and others.

Muḥammad Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥādi’s
Fanatic Defense of His Teacher

A Sufi but anti-Ashʿarī student of Ibn Taymiyya and al-Dhahabī, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥādi violently attacked Shaykh al-Īlam al-Subkī in a refutation entitled al-Ṣārim al-Munkī fī Nahīr al-Subkī (“The Hurtful Blade in the Throat of al-Subkī”) in which he “adopted the manner of fanatics and departed from the norms of the scholars of ḥadīth,” filling his book with unfounded accusations “in order to defend the innovations of his teacher […]. It would have been better titled al-Shātim al-Ifkī (“The Mendacious Abuser”).” He falsely accuses al-Subkī of encouraging pilgrimage to the Prophet’s grave, prostration to it, circumambulating around it, and the belief that the Prophet removes difficulty, grants ease, and causes whoever he wishes to enter into Paradise, all independently of Allāh ḥiasm!

66 Al-Nabhānī, Shawāhid al-Haqq (p. 275-276).
Nu‘mān al-Alūsī also wrote an attack on both al-Haytami and al-Subkī titled Jala‘ al-‘Aynayn which he dedicated to the Indian Wadhābī Sufi, Šiddīq Ḥasan Khān al-Qinnawī and in which, according to al-Nabhānī, he went even further than Ibn ʻAbd al-Hādī.


Belief in the infallibility of Ibn Taymiyya typifies a good deal of his supporters such as those mentioned above. Shaykh ʻAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda said: “My teacher Shaykh Muḥammad Rāghib al-Ṭabbākh treated Ibn Taymiyya as if he were a Prophet!”68 The Ḥanbalī jurist Abū Ḥafṣ al-Bazzār (688-749) went so far as to claim it impossible for anyone but an “ostentatious world-crazed liar” to find fault with Ibn Taymiyya!69

68 As related to the translator by Shaykh Muʿtazz al-Subaynī and others.
69 In his al-Aʾlam al-ʻAliyya fi Manāfīb Ibn Taymiyya (p. 82). “Salafis” confuse him – unwittingly or otherwise – with Ḥafṣ al-Bazzār, the author of the Musnad, who died four and a half centuries earlier.
The Ḥadith “Whoever Visits My Grave, My Intercession is Guaranteed for Him”

The ḥadith “Whoever visits my grave, my intercession is guaranteed for him” (Man zūra qabri wajabat lahu shafā' atī) is a fair

Narrated from Ibn ‘Umar by al-Dāraquṭnī (2:278 §194), al-Taylīsī in his Musnad (2:12), al-Dūlābī in al-Kunā wal-Asmāʾ (2:64), al-Khaṭīb in Talkhīṣ al-Mutashābih il-Rasm (1:581), Ibn al-Dubaythī in al-Dhayl ‘alā al-Tārīkh (2:170), Ibn Abī al-Dunyā in Kitāb al-Qubūr, al-Bayhaqī in Shu'ab al-Īmān (3:490), al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidhī in Nawādir al-Uṣūl (p. 148), al-Haythami (4:2), al-Subkī in Shīfā al-Siqām (p. 12-14), Abū al-Shaykh, Ibn ‘Adī in al-Kāmil (6:235, 6:351), al-ʿUqaylī in al-Duʿāʾ (4:170), al-Bazzār with a very weak chain containing ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ghifārī [cf. Ibn Ḥajar’s Mukhtāṣar (1:481 §822)] with the wording (1) “Whoever visits my grave, my intercession shall take place for him” (ḥallat lahu shafā' atī), and Ibn Ḥajar who indicated its grade of ḥasan in Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr (2:266) as it is strengthened by other ḥadiths which both he and al-Haythami mention, such as: (2) “Whoever visits me without any avowed purpose other than my visit, it is incumbent upon me to be his intercessor on the Day of Resurrection.” Narrated by al-Ṭabarānī in al-Awsat and al-Kabīr with a chain containing Maslama ibn Sālim and by Ibn al-Sakān in his Sunan al-Ṣiḥāṣ as stated by al-Shirbīnī in Mughnī al-Muḥtāj (1:512). (3) “Whoever makes pilgrimage then visits me after my death it is as if he visited me in my life.” Narrated by al-Ṭabarānī in al-Kabīr (12:406), al-Dāraquṭnī (2:278), and al-Bayhaqī in al-Sunan al-Kubrā (5:246 §10054-10055) all through ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Qādī, whom only Ahmad declared passable (ṣāliḥ). Māmduḥ said (p. 337-340) it is more daʿīf than other weak ḥadiths in this chapter. (4) “Whoever visits my grave after my death is as those who visited me in my life.” Narrated by al-Ṭabarānī in al-Kabīr (12:406) and al-Awsat (1:94) with a chain containing ʿĀisha bint Yūnus whose status is uncertain, and from Ḥāṭib by al-Dāraquṭnī (2:278) cf. al-Maqdisī, Fadāʾil al-Aʾmāl (p. 108) with another chain which al-Dhahabī said was one of the best chains in that chapter. Māmduḥ said (p. 330-334) it is daʿīf but not mawḍūʿ, contrary to the claims of Ibn Taymiyya and its imitators. (5) “Whoever makes pilgrimage and does not visit me, has been rude to me.” Narrated by al-Dāraquṭnī in Gharāʾib Mālik. Al-Lakhnawi said in his Muwaṭṭa’ marginalia: “It is not forged as Ibn al-Jawzi and Ibn Taymiyya said, rather, a number of scholars considered its chain fair, and a number considered it weak.” Māmduḥ (p. 344-346) considers it forged. Al-ʿUqaylī in al-Duʿāʾ (4:170) declared the chains of
REFUTATION OF HIM WHO ATTRIBUTES DIRECTION TO ALLAH

(hasān) narration as concluded by Imām ‘Abd al-Ḥayy al-
Lacknawī,⁷¹ his editor ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda, and
Maḥmūd Mamdūh,⁷² although some early scholars had declared
it sound (ṣaḥīḥ) such as Ibn al-Sakan in al-Sunan al-Ṣihāh and
ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-Ishbīlī in al-Aḥkām, followed by Shaykh al-
Islām al-Taqī al-Subkī in Shifāʾ al-Siqām in view of the totality of
the chains.⁷³ Other ḥadīth scholars who considered it authentic
are the ḥadīth Master Diyāʾ al-Dīn al-Maqdisī in his Faḍāʾil al-
Aʾmāl,⁷⁴ Ibn Ḥajār and his student the ḥadīth Master al-
Sakhāwī,⁷⁵ the ḥadīth Master of Madīna Imām al-Samhūdī,⁷⁶
Imām al-Haytamī in al-Jawhar al-Munazzam fi Ziyārat al-Qabr
al-Mukarram, and Aḥmad al-Ghumārī in Ḥīyāʾ al-Maqbūr min
Adillati Jawāz Bīnāʾ al-Masājid ‘alā al-Qubūr (3rd ed. Cairo:
Maktabat al-Qāhirah, 2005). Al-Ghassānī (d. 682) did not include
it in his documentation of al-Dāraquṭnī’s weak narrations en-
titled Takhrij al-Aḥādith al-Dīʾāf min Sunan al-Dāraquṭnī.⁷⁷

Ibn ‘Umar’s narration “soft” (layyima) as did al-Dhahabi, the latter adding – as did al-
Bayhaqī and al-Fattani in Tadhkira al-Mawdūʿ āt – that they strengthened each other as
none contains any lia or forger, as stated by al-Suyūṭī in al-Durar al-Muntahira, al-
Munawwī in Fayād al-Qadīr (6:140), and al-ʿAjlūnī in Kashf al-Khafā (2:328-329). The
narration (6) “Whoever visits me in al-Madīna anticipating reward (muhātasībah), I shall be
for him a witness and an intercessor on the Day of Resurrection,” narrated from Ansān
Abī al-Dunyā, Ibn Ḥasan, al-Janadi, and others, through Abū al-Muthannā Sulaīmān
ibn Yazid al-Madani al-Kaʾbī who was declared weak by al-Dāraquṭnī, Abū Ḥātim, and
Ibn Ḥabīb while al-Tirmidhī considered his narrations fair cf. Ibn Ḥajār, Lisān (7:481)
and Tuhdīḥīh (12:242). It was declared fair by al-Suyūṭī in al-Jāmiʿ al-Saghīr ($8716) and
“fair or rather sound through its corroborators” by al-Ghumārī in al-Mudāwī (6:290) in
confirmation of al-Subkī in Shifāʾ al-Siqām.

⁷¹ In Zaʿfar al-Amānī (p. 422) and al-Ajwībat al-Fāḍila (p. 155).
⁷² In his Raʾf al-Minārā (p. 280 and p. 318).
⁷³ As related by Ibn Ḥajār in Tālkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr (2:267). Cf. al-Shawkānī in Nayl al-Awṭār
(5:95) and al-Sindi in his notes on Ibn Mājah.
⁷⁵ In Ibn Ḥajār’s Tālkhīṣ and Ṭuruq Ḥadīth al-Ziyārā and al-Sakhāwī’s al-Qawwāl al-Badi’ (p.
160).
⁷⁶ In al-Samānnūdī’s Saʿādat al-Dorayn (1:77) and al-Samhūdī’s Waḍā al-Wafā.
Some late scholars, beginning with Ibn Taymiyya, remained undecided whether to grade this ḥadīth weak or forged.

Imām al-Lacknawī said about this ḥadīth:

There are some who declared it weak [e.g. al-Bayhaqī, Ibn Khuzayma, and al-Suyūṭī], and others who asserted that all the ḥadīths on visitation of the Prophet ﷺ are forged, such as Ibn Taymiyya and his followers, but both positions are false for those who were given right understanding, for verification of the case dictates that the ḥadīth is ḥasan, as Taqī al-Din al-Subkī has expounded in his book *Shifa' al-Siqām*.78

Among those who fall into the category of “Ibn Taymiyya and his followers” on this issue:

- Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥādī who wrote *al-Ṣārim al-Munkī* in rude refutation of al-Subkī’s book on visitation, but contradicted his own position in another book of his: he makes much ado about the reliability of ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar al-ʿUmarī in *al-Ṣārim al-Munkī*, but relies upon him in another book, *al-Tanqīḥ*79 Shaykh Maḥmūd Mamduḥ refuted his weakening of this ḥadīth in great detail80 and stated that *al-Ṣārim al-Munkī* is at the root of all subsequent generalizations in weakening the ḥadīths that concern the desirability of visitation.81

- The nawāb of Bhopal and Indian Sufi Wahhābī, Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān al-Qinnawjī in his travelogue entitled *Riḥlat al-Ṣiddīq ilā al-Bayt al-ʿAtīq* as critiqued by al-Lacknawī.82

---

77 Published at Riyadh: Dār ʿĀlam al-Kutub, 1991.
78 Al-Lacknawi, Ẓafār al-Amānī (p. 422).
80 In *Rafʿ al-Mināra* (p. 280-318).
81 In *Rafʿ al-Mināra* (p. 9).
82 Al-Lacknawi, Ẓafār al-Amānī (p. 422 n.1), cf. his catalogue of al-Qinnawjī’s mistakes entitled *Ibrāz al-Ghayy* which we mention further down in this book (p. 302).
REFUTATION OF HIM WHO ATTRIBUTES DIRECTION TO ALLAH

- The late Wahhābī “Desert Storm” muftī, 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Bāz, who imitated Ibn Taymiyya’s imprudent verdict: “The ḥadīths that concern the visitation of the grave of the Prophet ﷺ are all weak, indeed forged”.

- The late Nāṣir al-Albānī84 who claimed that the visit to the Prophet ﷺ ranks among the innovations85 although he himself is the rank arch-innovator of our time.

- Nāṣir al-Jadya’, who in 1993 obtained his Ph.D. with First Honors from the University of Muḥammad ibn Saʿūd after writing a 600-page book entitled al-Tabarruk in which he perpetuates the same aberrant claim.

(All these books are available in print but Shīfā’ al-Siqām!)

Imām al-Sakhāwī said:

The emphasis and encouragement on visiting his noble grave is mentioned in numerous ḥadīths, and it would suffice to show this if there was only the ḥadith whereby the truthful and God-confirmed Prophet ﷺ promises that his intercession, among other things, becomes guaranteed for whoever visits him, and the Imāms are in complete agreement from the time directly after his passing until our own time that this [i.e. visiting him] is among the best acts of drawing near to Allāh ʿalā.86

83 In his annotations on Ibn Ḥajar’s Fath al-Bārī (1989 ed. 3:387), echoing the exact words used by Ibn Taymiyya in his Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyya (1986 ed. 2:441) and Majmū‘ al-Futūḥā (27:119).

84 In his Irwā’ al-Ghali (4:337-338) in which he imitated Ibn 'Abd al-Hādī’s claims.

85 In Taṣkhiṣ Aḥkām al-Janā‘iz (p. 110) and elsewhere in his writings.

86 Al-Sakhāwī, al-Qawi‘ al-Badi‘ (p. 160). In al-Maqaṣid al-Hasana (p. 413) he adopts al-Dhahabi’s opinion that “the chains of the ḥadith of visitation are all ‘soft’ (lāyyīn) but strengthen each other because none of them contains any liar.”
There is no contest among the jurists of the Four Schools as to the probative force of the narration of Ibn 'Umar, as they adduce it time and again to illustrate the strong desirability of visiting the Prophet ﷺ in Madîna. See, for example, among Ḥanbali sources alone, the textbooks already cited. See also the additional sound texts illustrating visits to the Prophet ﷺ, among them that of the Companion Bilāl ibn Rabāḥ al-Habashi ﷺ all the way from Damascus with the expressed intention of visiting the Prophet ﷺ to greet him and, upon arrival, his rubbing his face against the Prophetic grave in tears before proceeding to raise the adhān upon the request of the two grandsons of the Prophet ﷺ, as well as the Companions' practice of seeking the Prophet ﷺ as an intermediary for their needs by visiting his grave, such as Bilāl ibn al-Ḥarîth al-Muzanî, Abū Ayyûb al-Anṣârî, 'Āisha, and Fāṭima ﷺ, all as cited in the sections on Tawassul and Visitation in the Encyclopedia of Islamic Doctrine.

87 Narrated by Ibn 'Asâkir (7:137) with a good chain (sanad jayyid) as stated by al-Shawkâni in Nayt al-Awjâr (5:180), at the conclusion of Kitâb al-Manâsik.
In the final five months of his last two-year period in jail, Ibn Taymiyya was prevented from writing, at which time he turned to prayer and the intensive recitation of the Qur’ān and repented from having spent time writing doctrinal refutations instead of focusing on the commentary of the Qur’ān. The His Last Days and Repentance from His Activities

Al-Ṣafādī said: “He wasted his time refuting the Christians and the Rāfiḍa, or whoever objected to the Religion or contradicted it, but if he had devoted himself to explaining al-Bukhārī or the Noble Qur’ān, he would have placed the garland of his well-ordered speech on the necks of the people of knowledge.”

Al-Nabḥānī said: “He refuted the Christians, the Shi‘is, the logicians, then the Ash‘arīs and Ahl al-Sunna, in short, sparing no one whether Muslim or non-Muslim, Sunni or otherwise.”

Al-Dhahābī said: “Our Shaykh Ibn Taymiyya, in his last days, used to say, ‘I do not declare anyone of the Umma a disbeliever

---

88 As related from al-Dhahābī by Ibn Rajab in Dhayl Ţabaqāt al-Hanābila (2:401–402).
89 In Ibn al-Qayyim, al-Wābīl al-Sayyib min al-Kālim al-Tayyib (p. 69).
91 Al-Nabḥānī, Shāwāhid al-Haqq.
(kāfir),’ and he said, ‘The Prophet ﷺ said, “No one always keeps his ablution except a believer.”’ Therefore, whoever regularly performs the prayers with ablution, he is a Muslim.”

His Abandonment
by His Former Admirers

His student al-Dhahabī praised him lavishly as “the brilliant Shaykh, Imām, erudite Scholar, censor, jurist, mujtahid, and commentator of the Qur’ān,” but acknowledged that Ibn Taymiyya’s disparaging manners alienated even his admirers. For example, the grammarian Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalusī – whom al-Dhahabī considered the most knowledgeable Master of his time in the Arabic language – praised Ibn Taymiyya until he found out that the latter believed himself a greater expert in the Arabic language than Sibawayh, whereupon he retracted his previous praise and dissociated himself from him. In his Tafsīr he mentioned the anthropomorphist beliefs of Ibn Taymiyya. Hajjī Khalīfa said: “Ibn Taymiyya authored a book entitled al-‘Arsh in which he stated that Allāh sits on the kursī and leaves some space vacant for the Prophet ﷺ to sit next to him. Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalusī mentioned it in [his Qur’ānic commentary titled] al-Nahr and said he read it in Ibn Taymiyya’s own handwriting.”

92 Narrated from Thawbān by Ibn Mājah, Ahmad, and al-Dārimi.
93 In al-Dhahabī, Siyar (Risāla ed. 15:88 in the notice on Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī).
94 Cf. Siyar (7:189).
95 See below, note 200.
praised him in a letter to al-Dhahabi\(^{96}\) but later accused him of disbelief in the same manner as the ḥadīth Master al-‘Alā’ī.

Other former admirers turned critics were the Qāḍī al-Zamalkānī, Jalāl al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī, al-Qūnawī, al-Jarīrī, and al-Dhahabī himself. The latter, in his Naṣiḥa, addresses Ibn Taymiyya with the words: “When will you stop criticizing the scholars and finding fault with people?” Al-Zamalkānī moved from praising Ibn Taymiyya as “the greatest memorizer of the last five hundred years” to becoming his chief prosecutor in Damascus and authoring two refutations against him: one on divorce and another one on the visitation of the Prophet ﷺ.\(^{97}\)

---

\(^{96}\) Reproduced by Ibn Rajāb in Dhayl Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābīla (2:392) and Ibn Hajar in al-Durar al-Kāmīna (1:159) cf. Abū Ghudda, al-‘Ulamā’ al-‘Uzzāb (p. 175). In light of al-Subkī’s published positions on Ibn Taymiyya the authenticity of this letter is dubious.

His Revival of
Ibn Ḥazm’s Vicious Style

The Ulema saw the influence of Ibn Ḥazm in Ibn Taymiyya’s poisoned quill. Al-Ṣafadi said: “He adorned himself with [Ibn Ḥazm’s] Muḥallā, imitating whatever he wished from it – if he wished, he could cite it from memory – and adducing from it a number of attacks and disparagements.”\(^98\)

Al-Dhahabi said: “I do not consider him sinless, and I even disagree with him on a number of questions in both the foundations and the branches, for, despite his vast knowledge, great courage, abundant wit, and staunch defense of what Allāh had prohibited, he was nevertheless a human being among other human beings, hot-tempered in his manner of debate, given to anger and outbursts against his opponents. This would sow enmity toward him in people’s hearts. If he had shown kindness towards his opponents he would have been the pivot of Consensus.”\(^99\)


\(^99\) Al-Dhahabi as cited by Ibn Ḥajar in *al-Durar al-Kāmina* (1:176-178).
His Excessive Involvement in *Kalām* and Philosophy

Dr. Saʿīd al-Būṭī pointed out that although Ibn Taymiyya blamed al-Ghazzālī and other Ashʿarī Scholars for involving themselves in philosophical or dialectical disputations, he himself went much further than most into *kalām* and philosophy. This is shown by Ibn Taymiyya’s books in *kalām* and philosophy such as *Muwafaqāt al-Manqūl wal-Maʿqūl, al-Tāsīs Radd al-Asās*, and most notably by his positions in *al-Radd ‘alā al-Manṭiqiyyīn* (“Against the Logicians”) on the “generic beginninglessness” of created matters and Aristotelian causality (*al-ʿilla al-aristiyya*).¹⁰⁰

Al-Dhahabī alluded to this in his epistle to Ibn Taymiyya: “When will you stop investigating the poisoned minutiae of philosophical disbelief, so that we have to refute them with our minds? You have swallowed the poisons of the philosophers and their treatises, not once, but several times!”¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰ Cf. al-Būṭī, *al-Salafīyya* (p. 164-175) and al-Ikhmīsī’s (700-764) refutation of Ibn Taymiyya published as *Risāla fīl Radd ‘alā Ibn Taymiyya* cf. below (p. 74-75, 103-104). See also our edition of Ibn Khāṣīf’s *ʿAqīda* §41 (“Things do not act of their own nature...”) and its note.

Al-Dhahabî's *Bayân Zaghl al-‘Ilm* and His *Naṣiḥa* to Ibn Taymiyya

Al-Dhahabî's *Bayân Zaghl al-‘Ilm wal-Ţalab* is a brief epistle in which he lists the different disciplines and sciences of Islam and then proceeds to describe them, as well as the Four Sunnî Schools. In his chapter on doctrine, he mentions his teacher: "Ibn Taymiyya was considered by his enemies to be a wicked Anti-Christ and disbeliever, while great numbers of the wise and the elite considered him an eminent, brilliant, and scholarly innovator (*mubtadî fâdal muḥaqiq bâri‘*).”¹⁰² It recently received a meticulous edition at the hands of Muḥammad Naṣîr al-‘Ajmî.

*Al-Naṣiḥat al-Dhahabiyya li-Ibni Taymiyya* is an epistle written when al-Dhahabî was around fifty-five years of age and addressed to Ibn Taymiyya near the end of his life. In this brief but scathing epistle, the author distances himself from his contemporary and admonishes him without naming him, calling him "an eloquent polemicist who neither rests nor sleeps."¹⁰³

The *Naṣiḥa* contains the following prediction of Taymiyya-followers in our time:

---

¹⁰³ See note 101.
Oh! The disappointment of him who follows you! For he is exposed to corruption in basic beliefs and to dissolution, particularly if he is short of learning and religion, a self-indulgent idler who does well for you by fighting on your behalf with his hand and tongue, while he is actually your enemy in his being and heart. What are your followers but dogmatic do-nothings of little intelligence, common liars with dull minds, silent outlanders strong in guile, or dryly righteous without understanding? If you do not believe it, just look at them and honestly assess them!\(^{104}\)

A “Salafi” apologist recently cast doubt on the authenticity of al-Dhahabi’s authorship of this epistle, also claiming that, even if al-Dhahabi wrote it, then it is directed to someone other than Ibn Taymiyya!\(^{105}\)

However, al-Sakhāwī does not doubt the authenticity of its attribution to al-Dhahabi and calls it “a glorious statement of doctrine.”\(^{106}\) And the two major experts on al-Dhahabi’s works, Şalāh al-Dīn al-Munajjīd and Bashshār ‘Awwād Ma’rūf, declared there was no doubt al-Dhahabi wrote it in his mature years and addressed it to Ibn Taymiyya.\(^{107}\) Among the proofs of its authenticity is that the ḥadīth Master Abū Saʿīd al-ʿAlāʾī said he copied it himself from al-Dhahabi’s autograph manuscript.

---

\(^{104}\) See www.masud.co.uk for a full translation of the Naṣīḥa.

\(^{105}\) Muhammad al-Shaybānī, al-Tawdīḥ al-Jadī fil-Radd ʿalā al-Naṣiḥat al-Dhahabiyya al-Manhūṭa ʿalā al-Imām al-Dhahabī (Kuwait: Markaz al-Makhṭūṭat wal-Turāth, 1993). This type of revisionist scholarship is reminiscent of the story-teller who was caught by Imām Ahmad and Yahyā ibn Maʿīn falsely claiming: “Ahmad ibn Hanbal and Yahyā ibn Maʿīn narrated to us...” whereupon the unfazed fibber replied: “I meant another Ahmad and another Yahyā, not you two!”

\(^{106}\) Al-Sakhāwī, al-Iʿlān wa-Tawbiḥ (p. 77= p. 136).

\(^{107}\) Cf. Bashshār ‘Awwād Ma’rūf, al-Dhahabī wa-Manhajahu (p. 146). Two extant manuscripts of the Naṣīḥa are kept, one in Cairo at the Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya (£B18823) copied by Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba and one in Damascus at the Zāhiriyā library (£1347).
The *Mufassir* Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn Ibn Jamā‘a, Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm ibn Muḥammad al-Miṣrī *thumma* al-Maqdisī al-Dimashqī (725-790) then copied it himself from al-ʿAlāʾī’s autograph manuscript, then Taqī al-Dīn Abū Bakr ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba (d. 779) copied it himself from the autograph manuscript of Ibn Jamā‘a. Al-Kawtharī published its facsimile edition as written by Ibn Qāḍī Shuhba.
Al-Subkî's Summary of
Ibn Taymiyya's Deviations in Doctrine

Shaykh al-Islâm Taqî al-Dîn al-Subkî (d. 756) refuted him in his al-Durrat al-Mudîyya, al-Sayf al-Šaqîl, and al-Rasâ'il al-Subkiyya fil-Radd 'alâ Ibn Taymiyya. In the Durra and the introduction to the first epistle of the Rasâ'il he wrote:

When Ibn Taymiyya innovated whatever he innovated in the principles of doctrines and destroyed the pillars and seams of the foundations of Islâm after camouflaging himself with the pretense of following the Book and the Sunna, pretending to summon people to the truth and guide them to Paradise, he left conformity (ittibâ‘) and entered novelty (ibtidâ‘), strayed (shadhâda) from the Congregation (jamâ‘a) of the Muslims by violating the Consensus (al-ijmâ‘), and attributed to the Transcendent Essence what presupposes corporeality and compound nature (mâ yaqtadî al-jîsmiyya wal-târkîb).

He claimed that dependency on composite parts is not an impossibility; that created entities (al-hawâdîth) subsist in the Essence of Allâh ﷺ; that the Qur’ân is originated, Allâh speaking it after its nonexistence; that He speaks, falls silent, and originates in His Essence the volitions (al-irâdât) according to created things, in the process arriving at the necessary pre-eternity of the world (istilzâm qidâm al-‘âlam) by stating
that there is no beginning for created entities. So he claimed the existence of “originated entities without beginning” (hawādith lā awwala lahā),\textsuperscript{108} and that the attribute of pre- eternity was created, and that the created was without beginning. None ever held these two doctrines at one and the same time in any society nor in any religious community, so he is not part of any of the seventy-three sects\textsuperscript{109} into which the Umma split, nor can there be any ground for him to stand with any particular umma. And even if all this constitutes the foulest disbelief (kufran shami‘an), yet it is little compared to what he innovated in the branches!\textsuperscript{110}

Al-Haytami’s Summary of Ibn Taymiyya’s Deviations

Another Shafi‘ī jurist, al-Haytami, wrote:

Ibn Taymiyya is a servant whom Allāh forsook, misguided, blinded, deafened, and debased. That is the declaration of the Imāms who have exposed the corruption of his positions and the mendacity of his sayings. Whoever wishes to pursue this must read the words of the mujtahid Imām Abū al-Ḥasan al-

\textsuperscript{108} Cf. below (n. 112).

\textsuperscript{109} Hadith of the Prophet ﷺ: “My Community shall divide into seventy-three sects, all of them in the Fire except one: the Congregation.” Narrated from Abū Hurayra by Ibn Mājah and, as part of a longer hadith, from Mu‘āwiya by Abū Dāwūd and Ahmad, all with good chains as stated by al-‘Irāqī in al-Mughni while al-Ḥākim (1:128=1990 ed. 1:218) said “a sound chain,” and in part from Anas by Abū Ya‘lā in his Musnad (7:32-36 §3938 and §3944 isnād da‘īf).

\textsuperscript{110} Al-Subkā, al-Durrat al-Mudiyya fil-Radd ‘alā Ibn Taymiyya (1st epistle, Naqīd al-‘Ijtimā‘ p. 6-7).
Subkī, of his son Tāj al-Dīn Ibn al-Subkī, of the Imām al-‘Izz ibn Jamā‘a and others of the Shāfi‘ī, Mālikī, and Hanafī shaykhs [...] He must be exposed as a misguided and misleading innovator (mubtadi‘ dāll mudill) and a fanatically ignorant person (jāhilun ghālin) whom Allāh treated with His justice. May He protect us from the likes of his path, doctrine, and actions! [...] Know that he has differed from people on questions about which Tāj al-Dīn Ibn al-Subkī and others warned us. Among the things Ibn Taymiyya said which violate the scholarly Consensus are:

- that whosoever violates the Consensus commits neither disbelief (kufr) nor grave transgression (fisq);\(^{111}\)

- that our Lord is subject to created events (mahallun lil-hawādith) — glorified, exalted, and sanctified is He far beyond what the depraved ascribe to Him!

- that He is compound or made of parts (murakkab), His Essence standing in need of something as the whole stands in need of its parts, elevated is He and sanctified beyond that!

- that the Qur‘ān is created in the Essence of Allāh (muḥdath fī dhātillāh), elevated is He beyond that!

- that the world is of a pre-eternal nature and exists with Allāh since pre-eternity as an “ever-abiding created object” (makh-lūqan dā‘īman), thus making it necessarily existent in His Essence (mūjaban bil-dhāt) and [representing Him as] not acting deliberately (la fā‘ilan bil-ikhtyār), elevated is He beyond that!\(^ {112}\) [Ibn Taymiyya was refuted by his contemporary

\(^{111}\) A necessary corollary of Ibn Taymiyya’s claim that the triple formulation of divorce counts as one in unambiguous violation of the Consensus on the matter.

\(^{112}\) Fatḥ al-Bārī (1959 ed. 13:411). Whoever holds this doctrine is considered a kāfir by

- suggestions of the corporeality, direction, and displacement [of Allāh ℐ] (al-jismiyya wal-jiha wal-intiqāl),115 and that He fits the size of the Throne, being neither bigger nor smaller, exalted is He from such a hideous invention and wide-open disbelief, and may He forsake all his followers, and may all his beliefs be scattered and lost!

- that the Fire shall go out (al-nār tafnī);116

- that Prophets are not sinless (al-anbiyāʾ ghayr maʿṣūmin);

- that the Prophet ℐ has no special status before Allāh (lā jāha lahu) and must not be used as an intermediary (lā yutawassalu bihi);

- that the undertaking of travel (al-safar) to the Prophet ℐ in order to visit him is a sin, for which it is unlawful to shorten

Imām Abū Ishāq al-Isfarāyīnī who said: “If, together with belief, one holds a view such as that the world is without beginning, or other such position which contradicts belief, then belief is altogether annulled in that person.” In Ibn al-Šubkī, Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿīyya al-Kubrā (4:256-262 §358).

114 Ibn Ḥajar, Fath (17:81).
115 This doctrine was refuted by Ibn Jahbal al-Kilābī and Qādī Yūsuf al-Nabhānī among many others as already discussed.
116 As reported from him by Ibn al-Qayyim – who tends to agree with him – in his Ḥāḍī al-Arwāḥ (p. 252-258 and following).
the prayers, and that it is forbidden to ask for his intercession in view of the Day of Need;\textsuperscript{117}

– and that the words (\textit{alfāz}) of the Torah and the Gospel were not substituted, but only their meanings (\textit{ma‘ānī}) were.\textsuperscript{118}

Some said: “Whoever looks at his books does not attribute to him most of these positions, except his view that Allāh ﷺ has a direction, and that he authored a book to establish this, which, by extension, proves that the people who follow this school of thought are believers in Divine corporeality (\textit{jismiyya}), dimensionality (\textit{muḥādḥāt}), and settledness (\textit{istiqrār}).” That is, it may be that, at times, he used to assert these proofs and they were consequently attributed to him in particular. But whoever attributed this to him from among the Imāms of Islām on whose greatness, leadership, religion, trustworthiness, fairness, acceptance, insight, and meticulousness there is agreement – then they do not say anything except what has been duly established with added precautions and repeated inquiry. This is especially true when a view is attributed to a Muslim which necessitates his disbe-

\textsuperscript{117} See the discussion of the narration “Whoever visits my grave” (p. 59-63) previously.

\textsuperscript{118} As for the claim that the same view was reported from Ibn ʿAbbās by al-Bukhārī in his \textit{Ṣaḥīḥ} (in the fourth to last chapter-title of \textit{Kitāb al-Tawḥīd}): this is inauthentic from Ibn ʿAbbās as indicated by Ibn Hajar – in \textit{Taḥqīq al-Taʿlīq} – who attributes it to Wahb ibn Munabbih, a frequent narrator of Israelite reports, as does Ibn Kathir in his \textit{Tafṣīr} in commentary of the verse \{of such as say with their mouths: “We believe,” but their hearts believe not, and of the Jews: listeners for the sake of falsehood, listeners on behalf of other folk who come not unto you, changing words from their context and saying: If this be given unto you, receive it but if this be not given unto you, then beware!\} (5:41). Ibn Kathir goes on to say: “If Wahb meant the books that are in their hands, then there is no doubt at all that substitution (\textit{tahdīl}), tampering (\textit{taḥrīf}), addition (\textit{ziyāda}), and omission (\textit{naqṣ}) have entered into them.” And how could it possibly be authentic when Allāh ﷺ mentioned the name of the Prophet ﷺ in the Scriptures of \textit{Aḥl al-Kītāb} as “Ahmad” but such a name is not found in them now? In \textit{Fath al-Bārī}, Ibn Hajar goes on to say he found the reasoning of Ibn Taymiyya on this issue “astounding” (ʿajīb).
lie, apostasy, misguidance, and execution. Therefore, if it is true of him that he is a disbeliever and an innovator, then Allāh will deal with him with His justice, and other than that, He will forgive us and him.\(^{119}\)

The “Salaḥī” Nu‘mān al-ʿAlūsī responded to the above condemnations and took the side of Ibn Taymiyya in his *Jalāʾ al-ʿAynayn bi-Muhākamat al-ʿAḥmadayn* ("The Arbitration Between the Two ʿAḥmads"), which Shaykh Yusuf al-Nabhānī refuted in turn in his *Shawāhid al-Haqiq fil-Istighātha bi Sayyid al-Khalq* ("The Witnesses to Truth Concerning the Obtainment of Aid through the Master of Creatures").

Ibn Taymiyya’s Incredulity of Imām ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm’s *Fatwā* on *Tabarruk* with the Prophetic Grave

Imām Badr al-Dīn al-ʿAynī said in his monumental commentary on *Ṣaḥḥ al-Bukhari*: “Our Shaykh Zayn al-Dīn said the ḥadīth master Abū Saʿīd ibn al-ʿAlāʾī said, ‘I saw in an old volume on the sayings of ʿAbd al-ʿAẒĪM ibn Ḥanbal countersigned by Ibn Nāṣir [al-Dīn] and other ḥadīth masters that Imām ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm was asked about the kissing of the grave of the Prophet ﷺ and his pulpit, and he replied, ‘There is nothing wrong with that.’ We showed it to Shaykh Taqī al-Dīn Ibn Taymiyya. He was astonished at this and began saying, ‘I wonder! I consider ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm too great! He said this? These are his words??’ or something to that effect.”\(^{120}\)


\(^{120}\) Al-ʿAynī, *Umdat al-Qāri* (9:241). This fatwā of Imām ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm is firmly established as documented in our *Four Imāms and Their Schools* and *Albānī and His Friends*.  
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His Denial of *Tawassul*
and His Denial of Such Denial

Among the grave charges brought against Ibn Taymiyya was his denial of the lawfulness and validity of *tawassul* or seeking an intermediary through the Prophet ﷺ after his lifetime as he forwarded in *al-Tawassul wal-Wasila* and his *Fatāwā*, and as quoted above from Ibn Ṭūlūn citing al-‘Alā‘ī and Ibn Ḥajar citing al-Ṭūfī, among others. This unprecedented denial is explicitly contradicted by the Scholars before and after him, beginning with Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal\(^\text{121}\) and including Ibn Taymiyya’s own defenders, Ibn al-Qayyim (cf. *Nūniyya*, section on *tawassul*) and al-Dhahabī as well as al-Shawkānī and countless others.\(^\text{122}\) Yet Ibn Rajab relates a contradictory position of Ibn Taymiyya in which all he denied was “asking help (*istighātha*) in the sense of worship (*bi-ma‘nā al-‘ibāda*), however, one may make *tawassul* through him”\(^\text{123}\)

---

\(^{121}\) See his chapter in our *Four Imāms and Their Schools*.

\(^{122}\) Cf. the comprehensive volume on *tawassul* in the *Encyclopedia of Islamic Doctrine*, Shaykh Ḥasan Qaribullāh’s monograph *al-Tawassul*, Muḥammad ʿAbīd al-Sindi’s treatise on *tawassul*, and the summation by our teacher Dr. Sāmir al-Naṣṣ, *al-Wasila ilā Fāhmi Ḥaqiqat al-Tawassul*.

His Invention of a Post-Conversion
Reconversion of al-Ashʿari

It is mass-transmitted that Imām Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ashʿari converted from Muʿtazilism at age forty and spent the following quarter century refuting non-Sunni sects, including the free-thinkers, the Muʿtazila, the anthropomorphists, the Rāfiḍis, and others. Under Ibn Taymiyya’s pen, however, this conversion subdivides into two doctrinal phases, the first only a semi-Sunni phase under Ibn Kullāb’s influence, and the latter a full-fledged Sunni phase in which he was supposedly taught by the Ḥanbalis of Baghdād. No one preceded him in such a claim and he gave no proof of it other than his own words. (Furthermore, according to Ibn Ḥajar, al-Bukhāri and Muslim followed Ibn Kullāb in doctrine. Certain Ḥanbalis questioned their Sunnism as well.)

124 See note 430 below.
125 Ibn Taymiyya, Majmūʿ al-Fatāwá (3:228). Subsequent Ḥanbalis imitated him in this such as Ibn ʿImād in Shādhārat al-Dhahab and al-Muʿallimi in al-Tanḥil.
126 Ibn Ḥajar, Fath al-Bārī (1:243)
The Renewer of Islām in the previous century, Imām Muhammad Zāhid al-Kawthari, stated in strong terms that Ibn Taymiyya’s position on the Divine Attributes is tantamount to disbelief and apostasy because it reduces Allāh to a corporeal body. He states in his Maqālāt:

In *al-Taṣīs fī Radd Asās al-Taqdis* (“The Laying of the Foundation: A Refutation of al-Rāzī’s “The Foundation of Divine Sanctification”), Ibn Taymiyya says: “Al-‘arsh (the Throne) lexically means *al-sarīr* (elevated seat or couch), so named with respect to what is on top of it, just as the roof is so named with respect to what is under it. Therefore, if the Qur’ān attributes a throne to Allāh, it is known that this throne is, with respect to Allāh, like the elevated seat is with respect to other than Allāh. This makes it necessarily true that He is on top of the Throne.” So then the Throne is, for Ibn Taymiyya, the seat (*maqʿād*) of Allāh – Exalted is He far beyond such a notion!

He also says: “It is well-known that the Book, the Sunna, and the Consensus nowhere say that all bodies (*ajsām*) are created, and nowhere say that Allāh Himself is not a body. Nor did any of the Imāms of the Muslims ever say such a
thing. Therefore if I also choose not to say it, it does not expel me from fiṭra nor from Shariʿa.” These words are complete impudence. What did he do with all the verses declaring Allah to be far removed from anything like unto Him? Does he expect that the idiocy that every single idiot can come up with be addressed with a specific text? Is it not enough that Allah said: {There is nothing whatsoever like Him}(42:11)? Or does he consider it permissible for someone to say: Allah eats this, chews that, and tastes this, just because no text mentions the opposite? This is disbelief laid bare and pure anthropomorphism.

In another passage of the same book he says: “You [Ashʿarī] say He is neither a body nor an atom (jawhar) nor spatially bounded (mutahayyiz), and that He has no direction, and that He cannot be pointed to as an object of sensory perception, and that nothing of Him can be considered distinct from Him. You have asserted this on the grounds that Allah is neither divisible nor made of parts, and that He has neither limit (hadd) nor end (ghāya), with your view thereby to forbid one to say that He has any limit or measure (qadr), or even that He has a dimension that is unlimited. But how do you allow yourselves to do this without evidence from the Book and the Sunna?” The reader’s intelligence suffices to

127 Al-Ashʿarī in Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyin (p. 211) says precisely the contrary: “Aḥl al-Sunna and the people of ḥadith said that Allah is not a body.” Similarly al-Kalābādhi in al-Taʿarruf (p. 34-35). Ibn Taymiyya knows this cf. his Minhāj (2:326): “Al-Ashʿarī and his early disciples said [...] He is not a body.”
128 Ibn Taymiyya, al-Tāsīs Radd Asās al-Taqdis = Bayān Talbīs al-Jahmiyya (1:118) cf. Minhāj (2:205). He also claims in the latter (2:220) that the first to say that Allah is not a body were the Jahmiyya and Muʿtazila.
129 Ibn Taymiyya, al-Tāsīs (1:101) = Bayān Talbīs al-Jahmiyya (1:444). It is amusing that the defenders of Ibn Taymiyya indirectly acknowledge the heresy of this position by protesting that “he was merely paraphrasing the position of those who affirm the
comment on these heretical statements. Can you imagine for an apostate to be more brazen than this, right in the midst of Muslim society?

In another place in the same book he says: "It is obligatorily known that Allāh did not mean by the name of "the One" (al-Wāḥid) the negation of the Attributes." He is here alluding to all that entails His "coming" to a place and the like. He continues: "Nor did He mean by it the negation that He can be perceived with the senses, nor the denial of limit and dimension and all such interpretations which were innovated by the Jahmiyya and their followers. Negation or denial of the above is not found in the Book nor the Sunna." And this is on an equal footing with what came before with regard to pure anthropomorphism and plain apostasy.

In another book of his, Muwāfaqat al-Maʿqūl, which is in the margin of his Minhāj, Ibn Taymiyya asserts that things occur newly in relation to Allāh and that He has a direction according to two kinds of conjecture. And you know, reader, what the Imāms say concerning him who deliberately and intently establishes that Allāh has a direction, unless his saying such a thing is a slip of the tongue or a slip of the pen. Then there is his establishing that the concept of movement

Attributes among the mutakallimūn"! Mashhūr Ḥasan Salmān, al-Rudūd wal-Tāʿaqubāt ‘alā al-Imām al-Nawawī (p.21-22). As this Salmān undoubtedly knows, the truth is that this particular argument of Ibn Taymiyya comes up frequently and favorably enough under his pen (cf. Bayān Tentials (1:548, 1:600, 2:169); Sharh Hādith al-Nuzūl (69-76); Majmūʿ al-Fatāwa (3:306-310, 13:304-305); Minhāj (2:134-135, 192,198-200, 527)) to be safely attributed to him. Compare to Imām Mālik’s statement: "He is neither ascribed a limit nor likened with anything"(lā yuhaddad wa-lā yushabbeḥ). Ibn al-ʿArabī said after citing it in Aḥkam al-Qurʾān (4:1740): "This [statement] is a pinnacle of tawḥīd to which no Muslim preceded Mālik."

130 Ibn Taymiyya, Muwāfaqat al-Maʿqūl on the margins of Minhāj al-Sunnah (2:75, 1:264, 2:13, 2:26). The Muwāfaqa was republished under the title Darʿ Tāʿ ārūd al-ʿAqīl wal-Naql.
applies to Allāh, along with all the others who establish such a thing. His denial that there is an eternal sojourn in hellfire has filled creation; so has his doctrine of the “generic pre-existence” of the world (al-qidam al-naw’ī).[131]

In his article Taḥdhir al-Umma min Du‘āt al-Wathaniyya (“Warning the Community about Those Who Call to Idol-Worship”), written in 1942 and reprinted in his Maqālāt, al-Kawthāri be- rates al-Azhār for allowing the publication of ‘Uthmān ibn Sa’īd al-Dārimī’s al-Radd ʻalā al-Jahmiyya which contains phrases like “[Allāh ﷻ] moves if He wishes, descends and ascends if He wishes […] stands and sits if He wishes;” “Allāh ﷻ has a limit […] and His place also has a limit, as He is on His Throne above His heavens, and these are two limits;” “if He wished, He would have settled on the back of a gnat” and other enormities. [132] This is identical to Ibn Karrām’s doctrine that “Allāh has a body unlike bodies, and a limit.”[133] Yet Ibn Taymiyya ardently defends al-Dārimī’s views,[134] citing them time and again in al-Taṣīs Radd Asās al-Taqdīs[135] – an all-out attack on Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī’s refutation of anthropomorphism titled Asās al-Taqdīs – including the gnat remark.[136]

---

[133] See ʻAbd al-Qāhir al-Baghdāḍī, al-Farq Bayn al-Firaq (p. 203, 217).
Ibn Taymiyya's Denial of the Eternity of Hellfire

Ibn Taymiyya affirmed and denied the eternity of hellfire intermittently in the same way he intermittently affirmed and denied the corporeality of the Deity and the beginninglessness of the world. His denial of the eternity of hellfire and his suggestion of its eventual extinction was refuted, among others, by the Commander of the Believers in Ḥadīth Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl al-Ṣan‘ānī in his Raf‘ al-Astār li-Ibṭāl Adillat al-Qā‘ilin bi-Fanā‘ al-Nār (“Exposing the Nullity of the Proofs of Those that Claim that Hellfire Shall Pass Away”), by the great Egyptian Ḥanbali Jurist Mar‘ī ibn Yūsuf al-Karmī al-Maqdisī (d. 1033), author of countless valuable works still extant, in his Tawqīf al-Farīqayn ‘alā Khulūd Ahl al-Dārayn, and by Shaykh al-Islām Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī in his treatise al-I‘tibār bi-Baqā‘ al-Jannati wal-Nār; published as part of his book al-Durrat al-Muḍīyya fil-Radd ‘alā Ibn Taymiyya, which also contains two epistles refuting the latter’s positions on divorce. In al-I‘tibār, al-Subkī states:

The doctrine of the Muslims is that Paradise and Hellfire do not pass away. Abū Muḥammad Ibn Ḥazm reported Consensus over the matter and the fact that whoever violates such Consensus is a disbeliever (kāfir) by Consensus. There is no

doubt over this, for it is obligatorily known in the Religion and the evidence to that effect is abundant.\footnote{138}{Al-Subkî, \textit{al-Durrat al-Mudiyya fil-Radd `alá Ibn Taymiyya} (3\textsuperscript{rd} epistle, \textit{al-I'tibār bi-Baqā' al-Jannati wal-Nār} p. 60).}

This heretical doctrine was endorsed by Ibn Taymiyya’s admirer Ibn Abî al-‘Izz in his commentary on al-Ṭahâwî, in flat contradiction of the latter’s statement: “The Garden and the Fire are created and shall never be extinguished nor come to an end.”\footnote{139}{Cf. Ibn Abî al-‘Izz, \textit{Sharḥ al-Taḥāwīyya} (p. 427-430).}

The sound position and the belief of \textit{Ahl al-Sunna} is that the disobedient Muslims who are in the Fire temporarily are not on a par with the disbelievers who are in the Fire forever. The Muslims who remain in the Fire until they are taken out and enter Paradise no longer feel the Fire past the point of burning to the bone, without their skins being renewed, since the Prophet ﷺ said of them: “After being burnt to the bone (\textit{umtuhishū}) they will be taken out and the water of life will be poured upon them.”\footnote{140}{Narrated from Abu Hurayra and Abu Sa‘îd al-Khudrî by al-Bukhârî and Muslim.} Allâh ﷻ said: \{\textit{Shall we treat the Muslims like the criminals?}\} (68:35) and \{\textit{It may be that those who disbelieved wish ardently that they were Muslims}\} (15:2) i.e. when they find themselves in the Fire, in comparison to the Muslims.
His Invention of a Double or Triple Tawḥīd

Also among Ibn Taymiyya’s kalām innovations was his division of tawḥīd into two types: tawḥīd al-rubūbiyya and tawḥīd al-ulūhiyya, respectively, Oneness of Lordship and Oneness of Godhead.\[^{141}\] The first, he said, consisted in the acknowledgment of Allāh as the Creator of all, a belief shared by believers and non-believers alike. The second, he said, was the affirmation of Allāh as the one true deity and only object of worship, a belief exclusive to believers. His natural conclusion was that “whoever does not know tawḥīd al-ulūhiyya, his knowledge of tawḥīd al-rubūbiyya is not taken into account because the idolaters also had such knowledge.” He then compared the scholars of kalām to the Arab idol-worshippers who accepted tawḥīd al-rubūbiyya but ignored tawḥīd al-ulūhiyya! This dialectic was imitated by Ibn Abī al-‘Izz in his commentary on al-Ṭaḥāwī’s ‘Aqīda.\[^{142}\] Ibn Taymiyya’s followers also credit him with a third tawḥīd, tawḥīd al-asma’ wal-ṣifāt. The Algerian Shaykh al-‘Arabī ibn al-Tubbānī refuted this innovation in his Barāḥat al-Ash‘ariyyīn, among others.

\[^{141}\] In his Fatawā (1:219, 2:275); Minhāj al-Sunna (2:62); Risālat Abī al-Ṣuffa (p. 34).

\[^{142}\] But in no other commentary of the same text, not even the “Salafi” commentary on the Ṭaḥāwīyya by Ḥasan al-Busnawi, although the latter does follow Ibn Abī al-‘Izz in other matters.
Abū Ḥāmid Ibn Marzūq [Imām al-ʿArabī ibn al-Tubbānī] wrote:

*Tawḥīd al-rubūbiyya* and *tawḥīd al-ulūhiyya* were invented by Ibn Taymiyya who claimed that all Muslims among the *mutakallimūn* worshipped other than Allāh due to their ignorance of *tawḥīd al-ulūhiyya*; he claimed that the only *tawḥīd* they knew was *tawḥīd al-rubūbiyya*. The latter consists in affirming that Allāh is the Creator of all things, as, he says, the polytheists conceded. He then declared all Muslims to be unbelievers. Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb imitated him in this, and others imitated Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb. The late erudite scholar al-Sayyid Aḥmad ibn Zaynī Daḥlān (d. 1304) looked into this matter in a small section of his treatise *al-Durar al-Saniyya fil-Radd ala al-Wahhābiyya* (“The Resplendent Pearls in Refuting the Wahhābīs”). So did the savant al-Shaykh Ibrāhīm al-Samannūdī al-Manṣūrī (d. 1314) who spoke excellently in his book *Saʿādat al-Dūrayn fil-Radd ala-Firqatayn al-Wahhābiyya wal-Ẓāhiriyya* (“The Bliss of the Two Abodes in the Refutation of the Two Sects: Wahhābīs and Zāhirīs”).143 The late erudite scholar al-Shaykh Salāmat al-ʿAzmāmī (d. 1376) also wrote valuable words about it in his book *al-Barāhīn al-Sātiʿa fi Radd Baʿḍ al-Bidaʿ al-Shāʿīʿa*

143 Both recently republished in Damascus (2001) and Cairo (2005) respectively.
("The Radiant Proofs in Refuting Certain Widespread Innovations"). [...] 

Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal [...] never said that tawḥīd consisted in two parts, one being tawḥīd al-rubūbiyya and the other tawḥīd al-ulūhiyya. Nor did he ever say that "whoever does not know tawḥīd al-ulūhiyya, his knowledge of tawḥīd al-rubūbiyya is not taken into account because the idolaters also had such knowledge." [...] None of the followers of the Followers [...] none of the Successors [...] none of the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ ever said that tawḥīd consisted in two parts, one being tawḥīd al-rubūbiyya and the other tawḥīd al-ulūhiyya, nor did any of them ever say that "whoever does not know tawḥīd al-ulūhiyya, his knowledge of tawḥīd al-rubūbiyya is not taken into account because the idolaters also had such knowledge." [...] Nowhere in all the Sunna of the Prophet ﷺ [...] is it related that the Prophet ﷺ ever said or ever taught his Companions that tawḥīd consists in two parts, one being tawḥīd al-rubūbiyya and the other tawḥīd al-ulūhiyya, nor that "whoever does not know tawḥīd al-ulūhiyya, his knowledge of tawḥīd al-rubūbiyya is not taken into account because the idolaters also had such knowledge." If mankind and jinn joined together to establish that the Prophet ﷺ ever said such a thing, even with an inauthentic chain of transmission, they would not succeed.

The books of the Sunna of the Prophet ﷺ overflow with the fact that the call of the Prophet ﷺ to the people to Allāh was in order that they witness that there is no God except Allāh alone and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh, and in order that they repudiate idol-worship. One of the most famous illustrations of this is the narration of Muʿādh
ibn Jabal when the Prophet ﷺ sent him to Yemen and said to him: “Invite them to the testimony that there is no God but Allāh and Muḥammad is the Messenger [...]”. And it is narrated in five of the six books of authentic traditions – and Ibn Ḥibbān declared it sound – that a Bedouin Arab reported the sighting of the new moon to the Prophet ﷺ and the latter ordered the people to fast without asking this man other than to confirm his testimony of faith. According to that drivel of Ibn Taymiyya, it would have been necessary for the Prophet ﷺ to call all people to the tawḥīd al-ʿulūhiyya of which they were ignorant – since tawḥīd al-rubūbiyya they knew already – and he should have said to Muʿādh: “Invite them to tawḥīd al-ʿulūhiyya;” and he should have asked the Bedouin who had sighted the new moon of Ramadan: “Do you know tawḥīd al-ʿulūhiyya?”

Finally, in His precious Book which falsehood cannot approach whether from the front or from behind, Allāh never decreed belief in tawḥīd al-ʿulūhiyya to His servants, nor did He ever say that “whoever does not know this tawḥīd, his knowledge of tawḥīd al-rubūbiyya is not taken into account.”


Ibn Taymiyya’s method in debate was to provide a barrage of quotes and citations in support of his positions. In the process, he often mentioned reports or stated positions which, upon closer examination, are dubious either from the viewpoint of transmission or that of content. For example:

– His report of Ibn Baṭṭa’s narration whereby Ḥammād ibn Zayd was asked by a man: “Our Lord descends to the heaven of the earth – does that mean that he removes Himself from one place to another place?” (yataḥawwalu min makān ilā makān?) Ḥammād replied: “He Himself is in His place, and He comes near His creation in the way that He likes (huwa fi makānihi yaqrabu min khalqihi kayfa shā”).146 Aside from the questionable status of Ibn Baṭṭa, the doctrine of attributing place to Allāh ﷻ is unheard of among the Salaf.

– His report that Ishāq ibn Rāhūyah said to ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ṭāhir: “He is able to descend without the Throne being vacant of Him” (yaqdiru an yanzila min ghayri an yakhlua al-‘arshu minh).147 Such a statement leaves nothing of the characteristics

147 Ibn Taymiyya, Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā (5:376-377). Also narrated by al-Dhahabi with a sound chain according to al-Albānī in Mukhtasār al-‘Ulwā (p. 192 §235).
of creatures except it attributed them to the Creator: body, place, surface, and displacement.

- Al-Bayhaqi in *al-Asmāʾ wal-Šifāt* narrates the reports of Ishāq’s encounter with the Emir ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ṭāhir with five chains – three of them sound – none of which mention the words “without the Throne being vacant of Him.” This apparent interpolation is nevertheless the foundation of Ibn Taymiyya’s position in *Sharḥ Ḥadīth al-Nuzūl* that Allāh Most High descends “in person” yet remains above the Throne “in person.” The phrase was characterized by Muḥammad Abū Zahra (see below) as a dual assertion of the aboveness and belowness of Allāh Most High on the part of Ibn Taymiyya, although strenuously denied by Ibn Taymiyya himself in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* and by al-Albānī who defends the latter against Abū Zahra’s conclusion in his introduction to *Mukhtasar al-‘Uluw.*

- His report from Abū ‘Umar al-Ṭalamankī’s book *al-Wuṣūl ilā Maʿrifat al-Uṣūl*: “Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamāʿa are in agreement (muttafaqūn) that Allāh established Himself in person (bi-dhātihi) on the Throne.” Al-Dhahabī quotes from the same book the following passage: “The Muslims of Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamāʿa have reached Consensus (ajmaʿ [ū]) that Allāh is above the heavens in person (bi-dhātihi) and is established over His Throne in the mode that He pleases (kayfa šārī).” Of course, both assertions are false since no such Consensus

---

149 *Sharḥ Ḥadīth al-Nuzūl* (p. 42-59).
152 Al-Dhahabī, *Mukhtasar al-‘Uluw* (p. 264 §321). Al-Dhahabī criticizes these assertions: see article “Allah is Now as He Ever Was” in our *Sunna Notes.*
exists; and the position of Ahl al-Sunna is that whoever attributes place to Allāh commits apostasy.

- His statement: “The scholars approved by Allāh and His accepted Friends have narrated that Muḥammad the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ will be seated by His Lord on the Throne next to Him.”153 By “the scholars approved by Allāh and His accepted Friends” he means a minority of Ḥanbalī scholars with anthropomorphist leanings.

- His claim regarding the narration of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Khalīfa from ʿUmar whereby “the Prophet ﷺ glorified Allāh and said: ‘Verily, His Seat of Authority (kursī) encompasses the heavens and the earth, and verily He sits on it (immahu yajlīs ‘alayh) and there does not remain of it [but] a space of four fingers, and verily it groans like the sound of the new saddle when one mounts it, due to His weight pressing down on it’”154 that “most of Ahl al-Sunna accept [this narration]” when their near totality – including his own students al-Dhahabi and Ibn Kathīr – grade it “denounced” (munkar), and he himself acknowledges Abū Bakr al-Iṣmāʿīlī’s rejection of it among others.155

- His statement that “I do not know any of the Salaf of the Community nor any of the Imāms, neither Ḥāmūd ibn Ḥanbal nor other than him, that considered these [verses on the Divine Names and Attributes] as part of the mutashābih”156 when everyone has heard the statement of Imām Mālik on istiwā’ whereby “its modality is inconceivable” (al-kayfu ghayr maʿqūl).

155 In his commentary on Sūrat al-ʿAqāq in Ibn Ṭaymiyya, Majmūʿ at Rasāʾil (16:435).
156 Ibn Ṭaymiyya, Majmūʿ at Rasāʾil (13:294).
Al-Baghda’i in Uṣūl al-Dīn cites Mālik ibn Anas, the seven jurists of Madīna, and al-ʿAṣmaʾī among those who consider the verse of ḵistiwā’ one of the mutashābīḥāt. Imām al-Ghazzālī also counted the verses and narrations on the Divine Attributes among the mutashābīḥāt in al-Mustasfā and Imām al-Nawawī concurred with him.¹⁵⁷

- His statements: “The elevation of Allāh ﷺ over the Throne is literal, and the elevation of the creature over the ship is literal” (līl-Lāhī taʿāla istiwā’un `alā ʿarshī ḥaqīqatan wa-lil-ʿabdi istiwā’un `alā al-fulki ḥaqīqatan).¹⁵⁸ “Allāh is with us literally and He is above His Throne literally (Allāhu maʿanā ḥaqīqatan wa-huwa fawqqa al-ʿarshi ḥaqīqatan). [...] Allāh is with His creation literally and He is above His Throne literally (Allāhu maʿa khalqihi ḥaqīqatan wa-huwa fawqqa al-ʿarshi ḥaqīqatan).”¹⁵⁹

Abū Zahra wrote:

It is strange that Ibn Taymiyya gets so terribly angry at those who interpret those texts [on the Divine Attributes] figuratively [...] yet he considers [in al-Iklīl fil-Mutashābīḥ wal-Taʿwīl] all the names transmitted about the delights of Paradise to be figurative! [...] If he applies figurativeness here, is it not feasible to do so in order to distance himself wholly from corporeality and preclude doubt from the mind? He might reply that he only follows the texts [...]. Everyone can see that even if the Companions kept mute about that matter, nevertheless, the denial of figurative interpretation was not transmitted from them; and even if the expressions that are narrated indicate resignation (taffwīd), nevertheless, there is no affirmation of direction in the expressions that are narrated.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁷ Al-Ghazzālī, al-Mustasfā (p. 85); al-Nawawī, Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim (16:218).
¹⁵⁸ Ibn Taymiyya, Majmāʿ al-Fatāwā (5:199)
¹⁵⁹ Ibid. (5:103).
¹⁶⁰ Abū Zahra, Ibn Taymiyya (p. 229).
His Climbing Down the Pulpit to Illustrate the Divine Descent

The above statements support Ibn Ḥajar’s and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s reports that Ibn Taymiyya once climbed down the *minbar* in purported illustration of the descent of Allāh ﷻ to the nearest heaven, saying: “Just like this descent of mine!”161 Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (d. 770) said he witnessed Ibn Taymiyya preach this although his *Riḥla* states, “I arrived Thursday 9 Ramaḍān 726 in Damascus,” while Ibn Taymiyya was already imprisoned on Monday 16 Sha’bān 726 – according to Ibn Kathīr’s citation of al-Birzālī – and remained so until his death two years later. However, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa gathered his travel notes late in life and they were edited by Ibn Marzūq and Ibn Juzay.162 Further, Ibn Ḥajar’s citation of al-Ṭūfī is proof that Ibn Baṭṭūṭa is not the only contemporary to attribute this statement to Ibn Taymiyya. Therefore, it is likely the discrepancy is due to a simple inaccuracy and not, as claimed with typical elegance by one of the Wahhābīs in his *Sharḥ Qaṣīdat Ibn al-Qayyim*, “the fabrication, by Allāh, of a shameless liar!”

His Appearance

Al-Dhahabī said:

He was poor and possessed no property. His clothes were those of a common jurist: a wide-sleeved floating robe (farājīyya), an overcoat (dīlq), a thirty-dirham turban (‘imāma), and cheap shoes. His hair was cut. He was medium-sized and wide-shouldered. His eyes seemed two eloquent tongues.163

The Revival of His Teachings by the Wahhābī Movement

Ibn Taymiyya’s burial was attended by thousands of people. His teachings were by and large forgotten until Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhab al-Najdi brought them back from oblivion. Later, the “Salafi” movement revived them through a large-scale publication campaign backed up by political and financial activism from the 1930s to our day.

163 In Ibn Rajab, Dhayl Taḥaqāt al-Ḥanābila (2:395).
Imām Muhammad Abū Zahra said in his book on the history of the madhāhib in Islām:

The “Salafis” and Ibn Taymiyya assert that settledness takes place over the Throne. [...] Ibn Taymiyya strenuously asserts that Allāh descends, and can be above (fawq) and below (taḥt) “without how” [...] and that the school of the Salaf is the affirmation of everything that the Qur’ān stated concerning aboveness (fawqīyya), belowness (taḥtiyya), and establishment over the Throne.¹⁶⁴

The Wahhābīs appeared in the Arabian desert [...] and revived the School of Ibn Taymiyya. The founder of the Wahhābiyya is Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb who died in 1786. He had studied the books of Ibn Taymiyya which became inestimable in his sight, deepening his involvement with them until he brought them from the realm of opinion into the realm of practice. In reality, the Wahhābīs did not add anything to what Ibn Taymiyya had asserted but they exaggerated it beyond his intent, instituting practical matters which Ibn Taymiyya had not addressed because they were not widespread in his time. These can be summarized thus:

1. They did not view worship (ʿibāda) in the same way that Islām had stipulated in the Qur’ān and Sunna and as Ibn Taymiyya had. Rather, they included customs (ʿādāt) into the province of Islām so that Muslims would be bound by them as well. Thus, they declared cigarette smoking ḥarām and exaggerated this ruling to the point that their general public considered the smoker a mushrik. As a result they resembled the Khawārij who used to declare apostate whoever committed a sin.

¹⁶⁴ Abū Zahra, Tārīkh al-Madhāhib al-Islamiyya (p. 320-322).
2. In the beginning of their movement they would also declare coffee and whatever resembled it *harām* to themselves but it seems that they became more indulgent as time went by.

3. The Wahhābīs did not restrain themselves to proselytism alone, but resorted to warmongering against whoever disagreed with them. They did so on the grounds that they were fighting innovations, and innovations are an evil that must be fought, and it is obligatory to command good and forbid evil. [...] The leader of Wahhābī thought in the field of war and battle was Muḥammad ibn Saʿūd, the ancestor of the ruling Saʿūdi family in the Arabian lands. He was a brother-in-law to Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and embraced his *madhhab*, defending it fervently and calling unto it by force of arms. He announced that he was doing this so as to uphold the Sunna and eradicate *bidʿa*. Perhaps, this religious mission that turned violent doubled as a rebellion against Ottoman rule. [...] Then the governor of Egypt, Muḥammad ʿAlī, faced them and pounced on the Wahhābīs with his formidable army, routing them in the course of several battles. At that time their military force was reduced and confined to the Arab tribes. Riyadh and its vicinity were the center for this permanent *daʿwa* that would turn violent whenever they gathered strength and lie still whenever they found violent opposition.

4. Whenever they were able to seize a town or city they would come to the tombs and turn them into desolate ruins [...] and they would destroy whatever mosques were with the tombs also. [...]
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5. Their brutality did not stop there. They also came to whatever graves were visible and similarly destroyed them. When the ruler of the Hijāz regions caved in to them they destroyed all the graves of the Companions and razed them to the ground. [...] 

6. They would harp on small matters which they condemned even though these matters had nothing to do with idolatry nor with whatever leads to idolatry, such as photography. We found this in their fatwās and epistles at the hands of their Ulema, although their rulers ignore this saying of theirs completely and cast it by the wayside.

7. They expanded the meaning of bid‘a to strange proportions, to the point that they actually claimed that draping the walls of the noble Rawḍa is an innovated matter. Hence they forbade the renewal of the drapes that were in it, until they fell in tatters and became unsightly, were it not for the light that pours out to all that are in the presence of the Prophet ﷺ or feel that in this place was the abode of Revelation on the Master of Messengers. In fact, we find among them, in addition to this, those who consider that the Muslim’s expression “our liege-lord (sayyidūnā) Muḥammad” ﷺ is an impermissible bid‘a. They show true extremism about this and, for the sake of their mission, use foul and furious language until most people actually flee from them as fast as they can.

8. In truth, the Wahhabis have actualized the opinions of Ibn Taymiyya and are extremely zealous followers and supporters of those views. They adopted the positions of Ibn Taymiyya which we explained in our discussion of those who call themselves “Salafiyya.” However, they enlarged the
meaning of bid'a and construed as innovations things that have no relation to worship. [...] In fact, it has been noticed that the Ulema of the Wahhābis consider their own opinions correct and not possibly wrong, while they consider the opinions of others wrong and not possibly correct. More than that, they consider what others do in the way of erecting tombs and circumambulating them close to idolatry. In this respect, they are like the Khawārij who used to declare those who dissented with them apostate and fight them as we have already mentioned. This was a relatively harmless matter in the days when they were cloistered in the desert and not trespassing its boundaries; but when they mixed with others and the lands of Ḥijāz fell into the hands of the Saʿūd family, the matter became of the utmost gravity. This is why the late King ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz of the Saʿūd family opposed them, and treated their opinions as confined to themselves and irrelevant to others.\footnote{Abū Zahra, Tārikh al-Madhāhib al-Islāmiyya (p. 235-238 = p. 212-214).}
Akhtā’ Ibn Taymiyya fī Ḥaqqi Rasūl Allāh ﷺ wa-Ahli Baytihi ("Ibn Taymiyya’s Errors Concerning the Messenger ﷺ and the People of His House"). Maḥmūd al-Sayyid Ṣubayḥ. (Cairo 2003). The most detailed scholarly analysis to date.


cyclopedia of Sunni proofs against the teachings of Ibn Taymiyya in 2 large volumes, the second of which focusses on his offensive positions regarding Ahl Bayt.


Fatāwā Ibn Taymiyya fil-Mīzān (“Ibn Taymiyya’s Fatwās Under Scrutiny”) by the Mauritanian Shaykh Muḥammad Ahmad Miskah ibn al-ʿĀṭīq al-Yaʿqūbī (Damascus 2000) mostly cites and sources Ibn Taymiyya verbatim in the following chapters:

Foreword
Introduction
1. Sayings of the Scholars on Ibn Taymiyya
2. The Hashwīyya: Ibn Taymiyya’s group
3. The doctrine of Ahl al-Sunna wal-Jamāʿa
   Al-Ghazzālī’s Qawāʾid al-Aḥkām
   Ibn ʿAbd al-Salām’s Mulḥa

Chapter One: Salient characteristics of Ibn Taymiyya’s Fatāwā
1. The prevalence of Tashbīḥ and Tajsīm in the Fatāwā of Ibn Taymiyya
2. Ibn Taymiyya’s aggressiveness against his opponents and his manipulation of their words
3. His style of verbose argumentation
4. Concerning his scholarly trustworthiness
5. Concerning his agenda

Chapter Two: Refutation of Ibn Taymiyya's position on the direction [of the Deity]
1. Refutation of direction in the Qur'an and Sunna
2. Refutation of direction by rational proofs
   First Corollary
   Second Corollary:
   Ibn Taymiyya's virulent denial of kalâm terminology
3. Refuting the sayings of those who affirm direction
4. Status of those who affirm direction according to Ahl al-Sunnah

Chapter Three: Refutation of Ibn Taymiyya's creed of "contingencies subsisting in Allâh ﷻ" and his belief in the pre-existence of the world
1. Establishing his creed from his own words
2. Refutation of his creed in the pre-existence of the world
3. The Divine transcendence beyond the subsistence of contingencies in Him ﷻ

Chapter Four: Refutation of Ibn Taymiyya’s statement that the Qur'ân is created and that Allâh speaks with a voice
1. Establishing his creed from his own words
2. Refutation of his creed that the Qur'ân is created and his attribution of voice and silence to Allâh Most High

Chapter Five: His creed in the non-‘îshma of the Prophets, upon them blessings and peace

Chapter Six: His statement that travel [solely] to visit the grave of the Prophet ﷺ is a sin and that tawassul through him is shirk or leads to shirk
Chapter Seven: His statement that Hellfire comes to an end and his opinion on resurrection
Chapter Eight: His proclivity for insulting the pious servants of Allāh
Chapter Nine: His probing the positions of the philosophers and their influence on him and that of other non-believers
Chapter Ten: Some issues in which he violated Consensus.


REFUTATION OF HIM WHO ATTRIBUTES DIRECTION TO ALLAH

‘Abd al-Laṭīf Fawdah. 128 p. (Amman 1998). This was written in refutation of Ibn Taymiyya’s belief that the world is of a pre-eternal nature and has existed with Allāh since pre-eternity as an “ever-abiding created object” (makhlūqan dā‘īman), thus making it necessarily existent in His Essence (mūjaban bil-dhāt) and preventing Him from acting deliberately (lā fā‘īlan bil-ikhtyār), elevated is He beyond that! Al-Būṭī in Kubrā al-Yaṣīnīyyāt al-Kawnīyya called this belief Aristotelianism and, before him, Abū Ishāq al-İsparāyīnī said that whoever holds such a doctrine is considered a kāfir.


Al-Qāḍī Yūsuf al-Nabhānī said in Shawāhid al-Ḥaqq that he saw in his dream that Ibn Taymiyya had been forgiven but that he was in a lower level of Paradise than Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī. He never declared Ibn Taymiyya a disbeliever nor did any of the reliable Ulema of Ahl al-Sunna. May Allāh forgive them, take us back to Him as Muslims, and join us with His righteous servants. Āmīn.
SHAYKH GHĀWJĪ’S INTRODUCTION

THE SALAF, THE KHALAF, TA’WĪL AND
THE CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN ‘AQĪDA

The Salaf

The Salaf are those that preceded (al-mutaqaddimūn). The salaf of a man are his forefathers. Al-Kāshānī said: “The pious Salaf are the first generation, {those with a firm foothold in learning} (3:7), who are guided with the guidance of the Prophet ﷺ and preserving his Sunna. Allāh Most High chose them for the companionship of His Prophet, picked them for leadership in His Religion, and was well-pleased with them as Imāms for the Umma. They waged jihād for the sake of Allāh in the true and best sense, acting with utmost faithfulness and sincerity toward the Umma.”

Abū al-Ḥasan [al-Ashʿarī] said: “They are the Companions with regard to their sayings and deeds and in all [the rulings] they interpreted and extracted through their juridical exertions.”

---

Al-Ghazzālī said: “By the Salaf I mean the Madhhab of the Companions and the Tābi‘īn.” Al-Bājūrī, the author of the commentary on Jawharat al-Tawḥīd, said: “What is meant by the Salaf is those that came before among the Prophets, the Companions, the Successors, and their successors, especially the Four Imāms.”

Shaykh Maḥmūd al-Khafājī said, “The specification of a certain time is insufficient in defining this term. In addition to chronological precedence, one must add the condition that their doctrine be in conformity with the [letter of the] Book and the Sunna as well as their spirit. Whoever doctrinally contravenes the Book and the Sunna is in no way a [real] Salafi even if he lived among the Companions, the Successors, and their Successors.”

Shaykh Sa‘īd Ramaḍān al-Būṭī said – may the Lord of all preserve him – in agreement with the above:

When the lexical meaning of salaf is meant, it becomes a relative term usable by all the successive periods of time like the term “before” to mean exactly the same thing. As for the conventional, technical meaning for that term, it is the first three centuries in the history of this Islamic Umma – the Umma of our Master Muhammad ﷺ. The source for this is the saying of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ as narrated from Ibn Mas‘ūd ﷺ by the Two Arch-Masters: “The best of generations are my century, then those that follow them, then those that follow the latter. After that, a people will appear whose testimony precedes their oath and whose oath precedes their testimony.”

[A] Even less those who doctrinally contravene the Book and the Sunna and who are not even from the preferred centuries but reared up at the tail-end of times! [T]
He then quoted Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr: “Foremost merit is firmly established for the generality of the Muslims of those first three centuries, but it might not apply to some of the individuals. Some might come in later centuries that are even better than those individuals.”

So then, those who call themselves “Salafiyya” and decline to be affiliated with one of the Four Schools that are agreed upon in the Muslim Umma fall into a new innovation (bid‘a) while they claim to “flee from the innovation of Madhhabism,” as they say [...]. Another meaning of the word Salaf carries even more danger; namely, the fact that the Mu’tazila, the Khawârij, the Jahmiyya, the Karrâmiyya, and the innovative Murji’a all appeared in those first three centuries. They are therefore of the Salaf chronologically and lexically, but they are definitely not of the pious Salaf.

It follows that the claim of those individuals calling themselves “Salafiyya” compels them to say that they are of the pious Salaf! This is an impressive claim, but for every claim the proof must be produced.

O the delight of being affiliated to one of the Four Sunni Schools, since it is so well-known that their founders were of the Imâms of the pious Salaf historically, factually, reputedly and truly! Glory and thanks to Allâh for the testimony of the Muslims of the first three centuries, among whom are the experts of the Qur’an, the Sunna, ‘Aqîda, and Fiqh, and for the de facto testimony of their times and moral conduct – Allâh Most High have mercy on them! – and for the testimony of those after the three centuries among the Ulema of Qur’an, Sunna, ‘Aqîda, and Fiqh to our very day and until mâ shâ’ Allâh.

---

169 On those sects see our “Sunni Glossary” in The Four Imâms and Their Schools. [T]
Now, whosoever among them attains the rank of qualified scholarly exertion (ijtihād) in the knowledge of the Book, the Sunna, and the sayings of the pious Salaf, and whose qualification and rank in this the people of learning acknowledge without dispute, then, if he so wishes, let him not affiliate himself to any Madhhab, and Allāh is the Grantor of success.

The Khalaf

The Khalaf are the largest and most numerous group of the trustworthy Imāms and Ulema among the Jurists, Mujtahids, experts of the principles of the Religion (usūl al-dīn), and foremost leaders of Tafsir, ḥadith, and language that came after the first three centuries.

Many of them have formulated, concerning the verses and ḥadīths of the Divine Attributes, what can be described as specific interpretation (ta‘wīl tafsīlī). The latter is a subsection of what the Salaf had meant in general terms, as when they said: “While declaring Allāh transcendent beyond any resemblance to creation,” the Khalaf added: “Perhaps the meaning is such-and-such.” A case in point is their statement that what is meant by istiwā in the saying of Allāh Most High, {The Merciful established Himself over the Throne} (20:4), is “establishing dominion” (istīlā), or “ending up” (intihā), or “perfection and completion” (al-kamāl wal-tamām), as in {and rises firm upon its stalk} (48:29). And so forth, according to what the Arabic language permits, in conformity with the affirmation (ithbāt) of the Attribute in question for Allāh Most High while declaring Him transcendent beyond any resemblance to creatures.
Not everyone that came after the first three centuries interprets the [verses and ḥadīths of the] Divine Attributes specifically. Rather, many consider the avoidance of probing the Divine Attributes safer. For interpretation is conjectural discourse, and the one who makes that conjecture might not attribute what is absolutely true and correct to Allāh Most High. Moreover, interpretation is a burden which we assume without having been burdened with it by Allāh Most High. It is to delve into something into which neither the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ nor his Companions ﷺ delved except very little.

It is true that in some cases there is no escape from specific interpretation, as when one discusses with a layperson (ʿāmmī) to teach them, and when the latter lives in a materialistic environment that gives a body to the exalted Deity (as is the case with Jews and Christians), or an environment that claims resemblance between Allāh Most High and creation (as did the Jahmiyya and the misguided Murjiʿa who claimed that Allāh Most High is “higher than a mountain” or that “His length is seven of His own hand-spans”) – our refuge is in Allāh! In such a case interpretation comes first exclusively.

Specific interpretation, therefore, seems like the remedy to an ailment – and a remedy is given only in cases of illness. When the illness is over, there is no longer need for the remedy and the matter goes back to normal.

One reads in al-Musāyara by the Imām, Jurist, and expert of principles, Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-Humām, and its commentary by the savant Ibn Abī Sharīf, on the verse {The Merciful established Himself over the Throne} (20:4): “In sum, it is obligatory to believe that He, Most High, established Himself over the Throne together with negating resemblance to creatures. As for the
meaning of the establishment (istiwā') being dominion (istīlā'), it is a matter of possibility while there is no proof for it being specifically intended."  

See also Istihālat al-Maʿīyati bil-Dhāt by Shaykh Muḥammad al-Ḵaḍir al-Shinqīṭī, page 169, in explanation of the saying of Allāh Most High, {Alas, my grief that I was unmindful of the side of Allāh} (39:56) and that the meaning, as Ibn ʿAbbās said, is "What I have wasted of the Divine reward."  

The following are some texts from the Book of Allāh for which there is no escape from specific interpretation:

Allāh Most High said, {Allāh (Himself) does mock them, leaving them to wander blindly on in their contumacy} (2:15). Mockery is not attributed to Allāh Most High since the literal sense of mockery is not a noble trait, so what is meant is that Allāh requited them with the like of their own mockery.  

Allāh Most High also said, {And the calf was made to sink into their hearts} (2:93): this is a metaphor (majāz) for love of the [golden] Calf – our refuge is in Allāh!  

Allāh Most High also said, {Unto Allāh belong the East and the West, and whithersoever you turn, there is Allāh's countenance} (2:115). What is meant by the countenance (wajh) of Allāh? It is the direction of prayer (qibla).  

170 Al-Muṣāyara maʿa al-Muṣāmara (p. 33). [A]  
172 Cf. Ibn ʿAbd al-Salām in al-Ishāra ilā al-Ijāz fī Baʿd Anwāʿ al-Majāz ("The Metaphors of the Qurʾān"): "His sarcasm (ṣukhrīyya), mockery (istiḥāzā), scheming (makr), and deceit (khāidā): All of these are metaphors of similitude or metonyms naming the result by the name of its cause, His sarcasm being caused by theirs, His mockery by theirs, His scheming by theirs, and His deceit by theirs." [T]  
Allāh Most High also said, {Or deemed you that you would enter Paradise while yet Allāh knows not those of you who really strive, nor knows those (of you) who are steadfast?} (3:142). The knowledge of Allāh according to Ahl al-Sunna is pre-eternal (qādim) as are the rest of His Attributes, in no wise preceded by ignorance. So the meaning is the manifestation (ẓuhūr) of His knowledge.

Allāh Most High also said, {And Allāh would turn to you in mercy; but those who follow vain desires would have you go tremendously astray} (4:27). The will of Allāh cannot be repelled nor can anyone delay it in any way. Therefore what is meant here is love (al-maḥabbā) and good pleasure (al-riḍā).

Allāh Most High also said, {I created the jinns and humankind only that they might worship me} (51:56). How can the Divine intent be delayed in the least? For most people do not believe! Therefore what is meant here is [His] command and love.\(^{174}\) Just as He said, {And they are ordered naught else than to serve Allāh, keeping religion pure for Him} (98:5).

Allāh Most High also said, {He is Allāh in the heavens and in the earth. He knows both your secret and your utterance, and He knows what you earn} (6:3). What is the interpretation of

\(^{174}\) As for the meaning of worship, Ibn ‘Abbās said: “[Meaning] to know Me” as cited in al-Risālat al-Qushayriyya. This is also the explanation of Ibn Jurayj and Mujahid as in Ibn Kathīr and al-Qurṭubī’s Tafsīr respectively. Sīdī Muṣṭafā Baṣīr: “This is confirmed in the Qur’ān itself by the question of Allāh Most High: {And (remember) when your Lord brought forth from the Children of Ādam, from their loins, their seed, and made them testify against themselves, (saying): Am I not your Lord? They said: Yes, verily. We testify. Lest you should say at the Day of Resurrection: Lo! of this we were unaware} (7:172).” Māḥmūd and Shārif: “He created the world so that it may be used as a sign pointing to Him, just as He said: {And (also) in yourselves. Can you then not see?} (51:21). This is why it was said, ‘Those who know themselves most know their Lord most.’” Al-Būṭi: “That is, you can see the Divine Attributes in yourself: His power, His creation, His knowledge, His wisdom; for the fingerprints of His Attributes are in His creation.” [T]
this verse? Together with His saying, \textit{And He it is Who in the heaven is God, and on the earth God. He is the Wise, the Knower} (43:84); and His saying, \textit{Have you taken security from Him who is in the heaven that He will not cause the earth to swallow you} (67:16); and His saying, \textit{He is with you wheresoever you may be} (57:4); and His saying, \textit{He is with them when by night they hold discourse displeasing unto Him. Allāh ever surrounds what they do} (4:108); and His saying, \textit{And We are nearer unto him than you are, but you see not} (50:16). And so forth.

\textit{Tā'wil […]} is equally practiced by the \textit{Salaf} and \textit{Khalaf} in general terms. Imām ‘Alī al-Qārī said – Allāh have mercy on him – in \textit{Mirqāt al-Mafâtiḥ Sharḥ Mishkāt al-Maşâbiḥ}:

The \textit{Salaf} and \textit{Khalaf} agree over \textit{ta'wil}. The difference between them is only in terminology (\textit{al-khilāfu baynahumā lafzī}) as they have Consensus (\textit{ijmā‘}) over the fact that the outward term must not be taken literally (\textit{ṣarf al-lafzī min źāhirih}). However, the \textit{ta'wil} of the \textit{Salaf} is general (\textit{ijmā‘ī}) as they practiced resignation (\textit{tafwīd}) to Allāh Most High of the intended meaning of the wording, which is not taken literally as Allāh is beyond that. As for the \textit{Khalaf}, their \textit{ta'wil} is specific (\textit{tafsīlī}) because they were forced to recur to it due to the abundance of innovators. They did not intend, in so doing, to diverge from the pious \textit{Salaf} – Allāh is our refuge from such a thought! It is only that necessity demanded it, in their time, due to the many anthropomorphists (\textit{mujassima}), Jahmiyya, and others of the people of misguidance, lest they prevail over the minds of the general public. They intended thereby the deterrence and routing of their arguments. This is
why many of them apologized and said, “if only our times had the same purity of faith as that of the Salaf!” So what is obligatory upon us is what we mentioned regarding belief, together with the negation of resemblance. And if it is feared for laypersons that they do not understand *istiwā’* – short of saying it means *istilā’* (dominion) – except in the sense of contact (*ittiṣāl*) and the like among the requirements of corporeality such as contiguity (*muḥāḍhār*), and if it is feared that they are not actually precluding such corporeal requirements, then there is no harm in reorienting their understanding to the meaning of *istiwā’* in strict avoidance of what is forbidden, and in saying, “*Istiwā’* means *istiwā’*.”\(^{175}\)

**Ta’wil**\(^ {176}\)

The basic lexical meaning of *ta’wil* is the final resort and ultimate fate of something as when you say, “the matter has returned (*āla al-amru*) to such and such” and you have referred it or literally caused it to return (*awwaltahu ta’wilan*). This is the lexical meaning of *ta’wil*.

*Tafsīr* is also called *ta’wil*. Allāh Most High said, *{I will announce unto you the interpretation (ta’wil) of what you could not bear with patience}* (18:78) and *{and more seemly in the end (ta’wilan)}* (4:59). And that is the elaboration of the meanings referred to by the words.\(^ {177}\) In the same sense al-Ṭabarī and Shaykh Jamāl al-Dīn al-Qāsimī named their Tafsīrs, *Jāmi’ al-Bayān min Ta’wil [Āy] al-Qur’ān* and *Maḥāsin al-Ta’wil* respectively.

---


\(^{176}\) See also http://www.livingislam.org/n/tawil_e.html.

Ta‘wîl is equally shared by the Salaf and Khalaf in general terms. The Salaf upheld general ta‘wîl with regard to the Divine Attributes: “Let them pass just as they came,” at the same time as {There is nothing whatsoever like Him and He is the All-Hearing, the All-Seeing} (42:11)[…]. And they upheld specific ta‘wîl with regard to some of those Attributes, over and above general ta‘wîl, as when they said of His saying, {And He is with you wheresoever you may be} (57:4): “Meaning, with His knowledge.”\(^{178}\)

{There remains but the countenance of your Lord} (55:27), that is, Himself (dhâtuḥ) – may He be glorified!\(^{179}\)

Ibn ‘Abbâs \(^{180}\) said, concerning the saying of Allâh Most High, {And her Lord accepted her with full acceptance} (3:37), that is, He caused her to tread the path of the felicitous, as in al-Qurṭubî.\(^{180}\)

Allâh Most High said, {And whithersoever you turn, there is Allâh's countenance} (2:115), the qibla of Allâh wherever you turn yourselves, whether East or West.\(^{181}\)

Al-Bukhârî narrated in his Šâhîh from Tâwûs, from Ibn ‘Abbâs \(^{182}\) on the verse, {Then turned He to the heaven when it was smoke, and said unto it and unto the earth: Come both of you (itiyâ), willingly or unwillingly}, that is, “Give [all your benefits]” (a‘tiyâ). {They said: We come (ataynâ), obedient} (41:11), that is, “We do give” (a‘tainâ).\(^{182}\)

\(^{178}\) Tafsîr Sufyân al-Thawrî and Tafsîr al-Baghawî. [T]
\(^{179}\) Cf. al-Nahhâs, Ma‘anî al-Qur’ân, Ibn al-Jawzî, Zâd al-Masîr. [T]
\(^{180}\) And Šâhîh al-Bukhârî. [T]
\(^{181}\) See note 173. [T]
\(^{182}\) Ibn Abî Ḥâtim and al-Ṭabarî as in al-Durr al-Manthûr; al-Baghawî; al-Alûsî. [T]
Allāh Most High said, {His seat of authority (kursī) includes the heavens and the earth} (2:255). Ibn ‘Abbās said, “That is, His knowledge,” as in the abridgment of Ibn Kathir’s Tafsīr.

183 Narrated marfū’ from the Prophet  by Sufyān al-Thawrī with a sound chain according to Ibn Ḥajar in Fath al-Bārī (1959 ed. 8:199) and al-Tabarānī in al-Sunna; and mawqif from Ibn ‘Abbās by al-Ṭabarī with three sound chains in his Tafsīr (3:9-11), al-Māwardi in his Tafsīr (1:908), al-Suyūṭī in al-Durr al-Manhīt (1:327), al-Shawkānī in Fath al-Qadīr (1:245), and others. Also narrated in “suspended” form (mu’allaq) by al-Bukhārī in his Sahīh from Sa’īd ibn Zubayr (Book of Tafsīr, chapter on the saying of Allāh  [And if you go in fear, then (pray) standing or on horseback] (2:239). Its chains are documented by Ibn Ḥajar in Taqdīr al-Ta’līq (2:4:185-186) where he shows that Sufyān al-Thawrī, ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Mahdī, and Wāki’ narrated it marfū’ from the Prophet , although in the Fath he declares the mawqif version from Ibn ‘Abbās more likely. Al-Ṭabarī chooses it as the most correct explanation: “The external wording of the Qur’ān indicates the correctness of the report from Ibn ‘Abbās that it [the kursī] is His ‘ilm […] and the original sense of al-kursī is al-‘ilm.” Another authentic related mawqif report from Ibn ‘Abbās has, “The kursī is the footstool (mawdi’ al-qadamayn).” The difference between the two is that in the first report it explicitly attributes knowledge to Allāh  while in the second he does not attribute the feet nor the footstool to Him. The latter is narrated with a sound chain by al-Ṭabarānī in al-Kabīr (12:39 §12404) as stated by al-Haythami (6:323), al-Bayhaqī in al-Asmā‘ (2:196 §758), Ibn Khuzayma in al-Tawhīd (p. 108), al-Hākim (2:282), who declared it saḥīḥ, al-Khatib in Tārikh Bagdād (9:251), Ibn Ṭabūn in al-‘Arsh (p. 79 §61), Abū al-Shaykh in al-‘Azāma (2:552-553 §196, 2:582 §216); and marfū’ – erroneously – by al-Dāraquṭnī in al-Sifār (p. 49-50 §36) and Ibn Mandah in al-Radd ‘alā al-Jahmiyya (p. 44-45). Ibn al-Jawzī in al-‘Ilām (1:22) declared that it should not be considered a marfū’ Prophet report, a verdict confirmed by al-Dhabāhī in his Mizān (2:265), Ibn Kathir in his Tafsīr (1:317), and Ibn Ḥajar in al-Tafsīr (4:274), cf. Ḥādīth, Zawā'id (7:37-39 §1383). Al-Bayhaqī said: “He did not attribute the feet [to Allāh ], nor did Abū Mūsā al-As-Ṣārī in his own identical statement [Asmā‘ (2:296-297 §859) with a weak chain], and this [non-attributive form] seems the soundest version. Its interpretation among the authorities is that the kursī in relation to the Throne is as the footstool is in relation to the couch under which a footstool is placed for the person reclining on it […] At any rate, this is a halted report which is not narrated from the Prophet . As for our early companions, they did not explain such cases nor did they preoccupy themselves with interpreting them, believing, at the same time, that Allāh  is One without parts or limbs.” Al-Qurṭubi in his Tafsīr (3:278) cites a similar explanation from Ibn ‘Atiyya, Elsewhere (2:272) al-Bayhaqī, like al-Bukhārī and al-Ṭabarī before him, gives precedence to Ibn ‘Abbās’s authentic explanation of the kursī as “His Knowledge.” Ibn Kathir states his preference for the narration of the footstool in the introduction of his Bidāya while al-Bayḍawī (1:555) considers it “pure imagery” (tamthīl mujarrad) “and there is no seat and no one sitting in reality” (wa-lā kursī fil-haqīqa wa-lā qa‘īd). [1]
And He said, \textit{And your Lord shall arrive} (89:22), that is, His command (\textit{amruhu}) and His decree (\textit{qadā'uhu}), and His signs have appeared, as stated in al-Shawkānī's \textit{Tafsīr} (5:440). Ibn 'Abbās said, “His command and His decree,” as did al-Ḥasan.\textsuperscript{184}

I mentioned numerous similar examples for specific interpretation among the pious Salaf in my book \textit{al-Imānu bil-Lāhi Ta'ālā} (p. 140)[…].

[More of] the specific interpretation of the Salaf has been transmitted to us in some places, as is mentioned below with regard to “withness” (\textit{ma'īyya}), while many of the later accomplished experts refrained from interpretation in the specific matters that can be appropriately confined to their wordings, while resigning their intended meaning to Allāh Most High. This shows how methodologically close the Salaf and Khalaf are in reality.\textsuperscript{185}

\textit{Preconditions for Accepting Ta'wil}

The savant Muḥammad Abū Zahra – Allāh have mercy on him – said:

\textit{Ta'wil} consists in taking a wording away from its literal meaning to another possible meaning which is not apparent in it. \textbf{There are three preconditions for} ta'wil:

1. The original wording must carry the possibility, even remotely, of the interpretive meaning in a way that does not make that meaning totally alien to it.

2. There must be a compelling reason for \textit{ta'wil}. For example, the letter of the text must somehow contravene an obliga-

\textsuperscript{184} Cf. al-Wāhīdī and al-Baghawī. [T]

\textsuperscript{185} Cf. al-Shīnqīṭī, \textit{Istīhālat al-Ma‘īyyati bil-Dhāt} (p. 72). [A]
torily known, well-established and well-known rule of the Religion; that is, it contradicts a text (naṣṣ) stronger than it in transmission; for example, when a ḥadīth contradicts a verse while the ḥadīth can be interpreted figuratively (qābilan lil-ta’wil). In such a case the ḥadīth is interpreted figuratively or even rejected [...].

3. The interpretation must not be unsupported (min ghayri sanad), but rather, it must be supported and drawn (lahu sanad wa-mustamadd) from what makes [knowledge] necessary (al-mūjibāt).

Ibn Daqiq al-‘Īd said:

If ta’wil is close to the language of the Arabs it is not disapproved; if far, we neither confirm nor deny it (tawaqqafnā fih) while believing in its intended meaning together with upholding transcendence. Whatever is understood in those words of the communication of the Arabs, we endorse it without hesitation, as in the saying of Allāh Most High, {Alas, my grief that I was unmindful of the side of Allāh} (39:56): we say it means the right owed to Allāh and what is obligatory to pay Him.186

---

186 In Shaykh ’Abd al-‘Azīm al-Zarqānī, Manāhīl al-‘Irfān fi ’Ulūm al-Qurān (2:186). [A] Ibn Ḥajar reports Ibn Daqiq al-‘Īd as saying: “We say concerning the various Attributes that they are real and true according to the meaning Allāh ṣāhī wills for them. As for those who interpret them, we look at their interpretation: if it is close to the rules of language in use among the Arabs we do not reject it, and if it is far we relinquish it and return to basic belief while declaring Transcendence.” In Fath al-Bāri (1959 ed. 13:383). Al-Qārī for his part also quotes Ibn Daqiq al-‘Īd as saying: “If interpretation stems from an evident and prevalent figurative understanding, then it ought to be applied without reserve. If it stems from a far-fetched, aberrant figurative understanding, then it ought to be left out. If one is as good as the other, then difference in its permissibility or impermissibility is a matter of juridical exertion. This matter does not present any danger to the two sides of the argument.” Mīrqāṭ al-Mafāṭīḥ (1892 ed. 2:136-137=1994 ed. 3:298-301). [T]
Qādī Abū Bakr Ibn al-‘Arabī said, after some precious words:

The sound ḥadiths in this chapter – of the Divine Attributes – fall into three categories. The first category: Whatever is narrated which denotes pure perfection utterly devoid of defects. It is obligatory to believe them. The second category: Whatever is narrated which denotes pure imperfection. This can never be attributed to Allāh Most High in any way whatsoever and He is by absolute necessity expressly devoid of such a description, as in the ḥadīth: “My servant! I was sick and you never visited Me”\(^{187}\) and the like. The third category: Whatever denotes perfection but suggests likeness to creatures (tashbīḥ).

In the first category there is, for example: Oneness (wahdāniyya), Knowledge (‘ilm), Power (qudra), Will (irāda), Life (ḥayāt), Hearing (sam’), Encompassment (iḥāta), Decree of all circumstances (taqdir), Disposal (tadbīr), and Exemption from any match (mathil) or counterpart (naẓīr). There is nothing to object to such reports.

As for the second category, for example His saying – Most High! – {Who is it that will lend unto Allāh a goodly loan} (2:245), or in the ḥadīth qudsi: “I was hungry and you did not feed Me, I was thirsty […]”\(^{188}\) then both those that are protected [against confusion] and those that are outside [belief], the learned and the ignorant know that the above are figurative expressions (kināya) for the tenor of the meaning pertaining to these defective states, but He attributed them to His glorious and sanctified Self as an immense honor and homage to His friend, to make hearts tender and soft. This, O

\(^{187}\) Narrated from Abū Hurayra by al-Bukhārī and Muslim. [T]

\(^{188}\) *Ibid.* [T]
people of sound minds, is a warning to you regarding all possible wordings. For He has mentioned the safe wordings that denote perfection and are obligatory to believe in His regard; and He has mentioned the defective wordings and lowly meanings of which He is categorically and absolutely exempt. Now, if these two types of wordings are made to face one another, it becomes obligatory for every sensible believer to treat the latter as figurative expressions for the meanings that are appropriate for Him, and negate from Him what is impermissible to ascribe to Him.

Thus, His statements about “the arm/hand” (al-yad) “the forearm” (al-sā‘id), “the palm” (al-kaff), and “the finger” (al-iṣba‘) are forceful and expressive style (‘ibārātun badi‘atun) pointing to lofty meanings. For the forearm among the Arabs denotes strength, grip, and force. Do you not see what al-Zubayr said when he struck an enemy fighter with the sword and cleaved him in two until he reached what was under him, and he was told: “That is some sword!” But he replied: “It is not the sword but the sā‘id!”189 This is the reason the Prophet ﷺ said to Abū al-Aḥwāṣ about the latter’s father: “He maims camels then calls them, ‘Allāh’s Cripples’ – but the forearm (sā‘id) of Allāh is stronger and His blade sharper!”190 This is a threat for him because of his ugly deeds and as a warning of Divine disgrace and requital. It is in this context that he attributed a forearm to Allāh – for the entire matter belongs to Allāh – just as he attributed a blade to Him.

---

189 Cf. al-Zamakhshari, al-Fā‘iq (1:88), [T]
190 Narrated from Mālik ibn Naḍla by Aḥmad, al-Ṭabarānī in al-Kabīr (19:283), and Ibn al-Qānī in Mu‘jam al-Ṣaḥāba (3:42), [T]
Similarly, the saying of the Prophet ☪: “Truly, sadaqa falls into the palm of the Merciful”\(^{191}\) by which he denoted the palm of the pauper as an honor for the latter. One of the scholars even said that in the saying, “The upper hand is better than the lower hand,”\(^{192}\) the upper hand refers to the hand of the beggar who is given and takes the sadaqa for that reason. So the palm was attributed to Him as an honor for it. In the same way He said, \{the she-camel of Allah\}\(^{193}\) (90:13), and there are many more examples of this.

We have already clarified the use of the fingers and its wisdom in the context of the transformation effected by them.\(^{194}\) What is turned around by the fingers is easier, lighter, and faster. Therefore, the Creator wanted to show the lightness of the heavens, the earth, and all creation in comparison to His Power, and to express the swiftness of the heart’s transformation by placing it between the two fingers as well as its helplessness and insignificance. Both the heart and all creatures are as nothing to the Merciful with respect to His

\(^{191}\) See n. 429. [T]

\(^{192}\) Narrated from Ḥakim ibn Ḥizām, Ibn ‘Umar, Abū Hurayra, and Abū Umāma by the Nine except Ibn Mājah. [T]

\(^{193}\) Al-Nawawī: “A possessive of honor and exclusivity, as one says of the Ka‘ba 'the House of Allah et cetera, and Allah knows best.’ Sharḥ Ṣahīḥ Muslim (16:166). [T]

\(^{194}\) In the two ḥadīths, [1] “Allah places the heavens on a finger, the earths on a finger, the trees on a finger, the undersoil on a finger, and all creatures on a finger.” Narrated from Ibn Mas‘ūd by al-Bukhārī, Muslim, al-Tirmidhī, and Ahmad. [2] “There is no heart except it lies between the two fingers of the Merciful. If He wishes, He will set it aright; and if He wishes, He will lead it astray.” Narrated from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr by Muslim and Ahmad, from Anas by al-Tirmidhī (hasan ṣahīh) and Ibn Mājah, and from al-Nawwās ibn Sam‘ān al-Kilābī by Ahmad, al-Nasā’ī, Ibn Mājah, Ibn Hibbān, and al-Ḥākim, and others, all with sound chains. Al-Ḥākim declared the ḥadīth sound. The continuation of the ḥadīth states that the Prophet ☪ used to say: “O Transformer of hearts! Make firm our hearts in Your Religion,” and that he also said: “And the balance is in the hand of the Merciful. He elevates a people while He abases others and so on until the Day of Resurrection.” On these ḥadīths see al-Nawawī’s tawil in our Ash’ārī School and the article “The Hand of Allah” in our Sunna Notes series. [T]
power over them and their insignificance. It was also said that “between the two fingers” is a figurative expression for the two dispositions. One disposition comes from the angel inspiring one to choose goodness and confirm truth, the other coming from the devil inspiring one to choose evil and deny truth.

As for the cubit/arm (dhīrā‘), we have noted that it was mentioned in absolute terms without attribution to Allāh Most High Who said, {And then insert him in a chain whereof the length is seventy cubits} (69:32). As for the ḥadīth in which is found the term “the dhīrā‘ of al-Jabbār,”195 it is inauthentic [...]. Rather, the sound-chained version from Abū Hurayra states, “The thickness of the skin of the disbeliever will be forty cubits” unmodified and without further additions. We do not look twice at the ḥadīth containing an addition.196

The Later Need for Ta‘wil According to Ahl al-Sunna

Shaykh ‘Abd al-‘Azīm al-Zarqānī said – Allāh have mercy on him:

1. Ta‘wil is obedience to the order we were given of assenting to the ambiguous texts (al-mutashābīh) and adhering to the unambiguous (al-muḥkam), while understanding the former in the light of the latter, since the meaning of the latter is manifest, contrary to that of the former.

2. Ta‘wil is true and correct so that the Believer does not fall into contradictions when he reads certain verses, for example,

195 Narrated from Abū Hurayra by Abū Ḥamīd through ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Dinār whose ḥadīth forms no proof if it contains singularities. The same ḥadīth is narrated by Muslim, al-Tirmidḥī, and Ahmad without the terms in question. [T]
196 Ibn al-‘Arabī, al-‘Awāsim min al-Qawāsim (‘Ammār al-Ṭalibī ed. 2:42f.). [A]
the attribution of “an eye” to Allāh Most High, “eyes,” “two hands,” and “hands”; or that He is in the heaven and in the earth, and that He is with His creation anywhere they be, and so forth.

If we leave the texts to their apparent meaning we will fall into contradiction. This is impossible in the glorious Qur’ān: {If it had been from other than Allāh they would have found therein much incongruity} (4:82). However, when we exempt Allāh from any resemblance whatsoever to His creation in all such texts, then resign their meaning to Him, we become safe from contradictions in our understanding and make the Qur’ān safe from any misperceived incongruity in it.

Further, it makes no difference whether ta’wil is general or specific since it is the only way contradiction and contravention of meanings that pertain to the Divine Attributes and the glorious Book can be avoided.

3. Ta’wil – whether general or specific – is the path of the pious Salaf among the Companions and those after them, and these are the most proficient of all human beings in Islām after the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ.

4. Ta’wil as followed by Ahl al-Sunna wal-Jamā‘a is the protection of the general public in particular, by Divine permission, from falling into aberrant comparisons and anthropomorphism.

5. As mentioned, recourse to specific and detailed ta’wil is on the basis of need.
6. Among the preconditions of ta'wil is that it must conform to the principles of the Arabic language and rhetorical style among the Arabs. As for what does not, then such ta'wil is neither licit nor acceptable.\(^{197}\)

An example of the latter is the ta'wil of the Bāṭiniyya and the people of innovation – refuge is in Allāh!

**Ta'wil Does Not Mean Negation of the Attributes**

A certain type among the seekers of knowledge erroneously thinks that ta'wil of the attribute of the “laughter” of Allāh Most High to mean His mercy – as done by al-Bukhārī in his Ṣaḥīḥ – is a negation (naṣṭa) of the attribute of laughter from Allāh Most High. Allāh forbid! He also thinks that ta'wil of the attribute of istiwā’ to mean elevation or dominion (istīlā’) as opposed to settlement and sitting, is a negation of the attribute of istiwā’ from Allāh Most High. He also thinks that ta'wil of the withness (ma‘iyya) of Allāh Most High with His creation to mean the withness of knowledge and encompassment (iḥāta) is a negation of the attribute of ma‘iyya from Allāh Most High. Refuge is in Allāh! When did the overwhelming masses of the Muslims among the pious Salaf and those that trod their path ever negate the Divine Attributes when they are the reliable trustees in receiving knowledge and conveying it to those after them? May Allāh be glorified!

---

\(^{197}\) Manāhīl al-‘Irfān. [A] I did not find the quotation in the Manāhīl nor is it referenced to it in the identical text printed in the introduction of ʿIṣl al-Dalīl (p. 61-62). It appears to be from Abū Zahra’s Usul al-Fiqh or the words of Shaykh Ghāwji himself but he could not positively confirm this upon review, and Allāh knows best. [T]
REFUTATION OF HIM WHO ATTRIBUTES DIRECTION TO ALLAH

The most erudite, accomplished scholar and proof in the Religion, al-Kawtharī said – Allāh have mercy on him:

\{The Merciful established Himself over the Throne\} (20:5): Whoever denies that the Merciful established Himself on the Throne has denied a verse from the glorious Dhikr and thereby commits disbelief. However, the established istiwā’ for Allāh Most High is an istiwā’ that befits His Majesty according to the meaning intended by Allāh Most High and by the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ, without probing the meaning, in accordance with the path of the Salaf such as Ibn Mahdī.

The path of the Khalaf is to understand this to mean sovereignty (mulk) and the like, as dictated by language. In this there is no negation of the verse. This can never be said of them! As for understanding it to mean “sitting” and “settlement,” then this is manifest deviance.\(^{198}\)

Note the difference between the above discourse and that of the author of the Ṽuniyya poem who claims:

“And the Throne, they emptied it of the Most Merciful.”\(^{199}\)

It seems that the above writer considers the truth to be that Allāh Most High sits on the Throne and fills its vacant spot – our refuge is in Allāh! This is very grave.

Worse than the above is the view of the author’s teacher [Ibn Taymiyya] as related by the ḥadīth Master and commentator of the Qur’ān, Abū Ḥayyān, who was dazzled by him for some time then abandoned him and loathed him when he read the following words by him. Abū Ḥayyān said:

\(^{198}\) Al-Kawthari, commentary on al-Bayhaqī’s al-Asmā‘ wal-Ṣifāt (p. 249). [A]
\(^{199}\) Ibn al-Qayyim, Ṽuniyya. [T]
I read in a book by Aḥmad ibn Taymiyya – that man who is our contemporary – in his handwriting, which he titled “Book of the Throne” (*Kitāb al-‘Arsh*), that Allāh Most High sits on the *Kursī* and leaves a spot vacant on it on which He makes the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ sit with Him. Al-Ṭāj Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-Bānnībārī obtained it from him by ruse, after he led him to think that he was going to promote his cause. He took it from him and we read this in it.  

---

200 Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalusi, *al-Nahr al-Mādd* (1:254), and there is no power nor might except in Allāh. [A] Ḥajjī Khalīfa said: “Ibn Taymiyya authored a book titled *al-‘Arsh* in which he stated that Allāh sits on the *Kursī* and leaves some space vacant for the Prophet ﷺ to sit next to him. Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalusi mentioned it in [his Qur’ānic commentary entitled] *al-Nahr* and said that he read it in Ibn Taymiyya’s own handwriting.” Ḥajjī Khalīfa, *Kashf al-Zunūn* (2:1438). This mention was removed from the printed edition of both Abū Hayyan’s commentaries *al-Bahr al-Muhīṭ* and *al-Nahr al-Mādd min al-Bahr* [passage on *Ayat al-Kursī*] by their Cairo publisher as the latter acknowledged it himself. See al-Kawtharī’s note in his commentary on al-Subki’s *al-Sayf al-Ṣaqīl* (p. 96-97) and al-Ghumārī’s *Bida’ al-Taḥāsīr* (p. 156). [T]
Putting to Rest Certain Insinuations and Warning of Certain Scholarly Errors That Pertain to Doctrine

The Issue of Limit (Hadd) in the Attributes and Names

1. Imām Abū Ḥanīfa – Allāh have mercy on him – said in al-Fiqh al-Akbar: “He is ‘something’ yet not like things, and the meaning of something is that we affirm His existence without body, substance, accident, limit or counterpart.”

Imām Aḥmad used to say: “Allāh Most High has two hands that are an attribute of His. They are not limbs. Nor are they made of parts. Nor are they a body nor are they corporeal. Nor are they among things limited, composites, portions nor limbs. Nor is any analogy permissible on that basis.” Nor does He have an elbow nor a muscle nor anything else of what their saying ‘hand’ entails except what the noble Qur’ān said.” Abū al-Faḍl al-Tamīmī the head of the Ḥanbalīs in Baghdad said:

Aḥmad rebuked whoever attributed a body to Allāh [...]. Names are taken from the Divine Law and from language. The linguists use that name [i.e., “body”] for something

201 In al-Qāri’s Sharḥ al-Fiqh al-Akbar (p. 36). [A] Or: “He is an entity but not in the sense of created entities.” Hamid Algar has: “He is a thing, but unlike other things, by saying ‘thing,’ we intend merely to affirm His reality. He has neither body nor substance, neither accidental property nor limit, neither opposite nor like nor similitude.” [T]
202 Such as saying, as the anthropomorphists do: “Since your Lord is not one-eyed; therefore we affirm two eyes for Him.” [T]
possessing length, width, density, complexity, image, and composition. Allāh Most Exalted is completely free of all that and nothing was reported in the Divine Law to that effect, so it is false.


Imām Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭahāwī said in Bayān al-Sunnati wal-Jamā‘a:

Allāh Most Glorious is beyond having limits placed on Him, or having boundaries, or having parts, limbs or organs! Nor is He contained by the six directions as all created things are.

Ibn Baṭṭāl said of the verse \{for what I created with both My Hands\} (38:75):

In this verse there is the affirmation of two hands for Allāh Most High. They are two attributes of His and not limbs, contrary to what the anthropomorphists who affirm the Attributes and the Jahmiyya who deny them say.\(^{204}\)

In contrast to the above, ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd al-Dārimī (not the compiler of the Sunan but a different man) said:

Allāh Most High has a limit which none but He knows and it is impermissible for anyone to imagine that His limit possesses a boundary. However, we believe in the limit and we commit that to Allāh. Further, place is also a limit and He is over His Throne above His heavens, so these are two limits (haddān ithnān) [...]. Therefore, whoever claims He has no limit has denied the Qur’ān.\(^{205}\)

\(^{204}\) Fath al-Bārī (13:393). [A]

\(^{205}\) Al-Naqd (p. 24). [A]
As for Ibn Taymiyya, he said:

It is well-known that the Book, the Sunna, and the Consensus nowhere say that all bodies (ajsām) are created, and nowhere say that Allāh Himself is not a body. Nor did any of the Imāms of the Muslims ever say such a thing. Therefore if I also choose not to say it, it does not expel me from fiṭra nor from Shari'a. Ibn Taymiyya also said in Muwāfaqat al-Manqūl:

There is agreement one and all among the Muslims and the disbelievers [sic] that Allāh Most High is in the heaven and they ascribed it to Him as a limit except al-Marrīsī the misguided and his friends. Even little boys that have not reached puberty know this: when a boy is sad he raises his hand to his Lord and calls unto Him in the heaven and nowhere else. Everybody knows of Allāh and His place (makāniḥ) better than the Jahmiyya! [...] All this and its like are corroborations and proofs for a limit, and whoever does not admit it has committed disbelief in the Divine Revelation and has denied the verses of Allāh.

Al-Dhahabī rejected this position of his teacher and said:

Exalted is Allāh beyond being ascribed a limit or being described other than in the terms He described Himself or taught His Messengers, according to the meaning He wants, without similitude nor modality – {There is nothing
whatsoever like Him, and He is the All-Hearing, the All-Seeing} (42:11).²⁰⁹

Ibn Taymiyya also said:

There is not, in the Book of Allāh, nor in the Sunna of His Messenger ﷺ, nor in the words of any of the Salaf of the Community and its Imāms, anything saying that He is not a body and that His attributes are not bodies and accidents (a‘rād). Therefore, to negate meanings established in the Law by negating wordings whose meanings neither Law nor reason ever negated is ignorance and misguidance.²¹⁰

We already cited the words of Abū Hanīfah, Aḥmad, al-Tamīmī, and al-Ṭahāwī negating limit and corporeality for Allāh Most High.²¹¹

2. The saying of Allāh Most High, {The Merciful established Himself over the Throne} (20:5).

Ibn Ishāq [Abū Bakr al-Ṣibghī] said: “He established himself without ‘how.’” The transmitted reports from the Salaf to that

²⁰⁹ Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’ (Risāla ed. 16:97). [A] Al-Dhahabi also says in Mizān al-I’ tīdāl (3:507): “There is no text for either the denying or the asserting [of a limit for Allāh] while there is nothing like unto Allāh whatsoever. Therefore, whoever asserts a limit to Allāh is told: ‘You have given limits to Allāh by your view without proof from a text, and he who has limits is [necessarily] created – exalted is Allāh beyond this!’ while the one who asserts a limit says to the other: ‘You have reduced your Lord to a nonexistent thing, for there is no limit to the nonexistent.’ Therefore, whoever affirms Transcendence for Allāh and keeps silent, he is safe and has followed the road of the Salaf.” Ibn Ḥajar in Līsān al-Mīzān (5:114) rejects al-Dhahabi’s reasoning as fallacious: “Al-Dhahabi’s words, ‘the one who asserts a limit says to the other: <You have reduced your Lord to a nonexistent thing, for there is no limit to the nonexistent>’ are untrue. We do not grant that to deny limit to Allāh is tantamount to reducing Him to the nonexistent after the certitude of His existence.” Note that al-Dhahabi does not explicitly endorse those words. [T]


²¹¹ See more additional references on the heresy of attributing limits in the chapter on Imām Aḥmad in our Four Imāms and their Schools. [T]
effect are many, and to this path points the School of al-Shâfi‘î – Allah Most High have mercy on him – and this is the position of Ahmad ibn Hanbal, al-Hasayn ibn al- Faḍl al-Bajali, and, among the later authorities, Abū Sulaymān al-Khaṭṭābī, as stated in al-Asma‘ wal-Ṣifāt by Imām al-Baḥāqī.212

When Rabī‘ at al-Ra‘ī – the teacher of Imām Mālik, Allah have mercy on both of them – was asked about the saying of Allah Most High, {The Merciful established Himself over the Throne} (20:5), and “How did He establish Himself?” he said:

“The how is unknown, the establishment is inconceivable (ghayr ma‘qūl), and it is your obligation to believe in this.”213

Imām Ahmad said – Allah Most High have mercy on him:

We believe that Allah Most High is over the Throne howsoever He wants and in the way He wants, without circumscribable limit nor describable attribute whatsoever. The Attributes of Allah are from Him and to Him and He is as He described Himself, {Vision comprehends Him not} (6:103).214

Al-Ṭahāwī also said in his summation of Imām Abū Ḥanīfa’s doctrine – Allah have mercy on both of them [as per the Madina ms. of the Ṭahāwīyya and its commentary by al-Bābartī]:

The Throne and the Footstool are true; He is in no need of the Throne and that which is beneath it; He encompasses all things and that which is above it, and what He has created is incapable of encompassing Him.

212 Al-Asma‘ wal-Ṣifāt (p. 409-410). [A]
213 Ibid. [A]
What is above the Throne of the Merciful is *Umm al-Kitāb*.

Whereas Ibn Taymiyya said:

“He is – exalted is He! – above His heavens, over the Throne, separate from His creatures, and despite this He is with them wheresoever they are.”

And he said [in *Al-Taşīs*):

“The Creator Most High and Exalted is above the world literally, not in the sense of an aboveness of rank.”

Similarly, Shaykh Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-ʿUthaymīn said in his book ‘*Aqidat Ahl al-Sunna* – prefaced by Shaykh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Bāz:

“Whoever has such attributes is with His creatures literally even if He is above them and on His Throne literally, {There is nothing whatsoever like Him, and He is the All-Hearing, the All-Seeing} (42:11).”

He also said in one of his fatwās:

In sum, our doctrine [concerning *with*] in such verses as {And He is with you wheresoever you may be} (57:4) and {He is with them wheresoever they may be} (58:7) is that Allāh Most High possesses literal “withness” with His very Essence (maʿiyya ḥaqiqiyya dhātiyya) in the way that befits Him and entails His encompassment of all things with His knowledge, power, hearing, sight, authority, and disposal […]

---

217 ‘Aqidat Ahl al-Sunna wal-Jamāʿa (p. 9). [A]
218 Anthropomorphists always follow up the greatest enormities with the phrase “in the way that befits Him,” which they imagine exonerates them of *tashbīh*. [T]
219 ‘Uthaymin, *Fatāwā fil-ʿAqidā*. [T]

Ibn Taymiyya further said in his commentary on the hadīth of the Descent:

The established position – and it is the correct position and the position received from the Predecessors of the Community and its Imāms — is that He is above the Throne unceasingly and the Throne is never devoid of Him, together with His approach and descent (dunuwwiḥ wa-nuzūliḥ) to the nearest heaven without the Throne being above Him.

He even said, “The Scholars approved by Allāh and His accepted Friends have narrated that Muḥammad the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ will be seated by His Lord on the Throne next to Him.”

Shaykh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Bāz said in one of his fatwās: “The statement that Allāh exists in every place is the greatest kufr.”

220 Typical of Ibn Taymiyya’s polemical method is takwīl – the bombastic attempt to canonize his own position as being that of the Book, the Sunna, the Salaf, the Imāms, etc. and to constantly demonize the position of those he tries to refute as being that of Jahmis, Christians, Jews, Hindu, Brahmins etc. cf. notes 281, 315, 343, 376, 378, 399 [...]. His student Ibn al-Qayyim faithfully emulates his style: “This is a position rejected by the Book, the Sunna, the Consensus of the Companions, as well as the evidence given by reason, common sense, and Pristine Disposition, and is the position of one who does not know his own soul let alone the souls of others!” Ibn al-Qayyim, al-Rūḥ (1975 ed. p. 111–1998 ed. p. 286). [T]


Then he said, “Because Allāh is above His Throne, above all His creatures.”

I ask, what is the patent, unambiguous difference between Ibn Uthaymīn’s statement that Allāh is “with His creatures literally,” the claim that “Allāh is in every place,” and Shaykh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’s statement, “Because Allāh is above His Throne, above all His creatures”?

What refutes the latter is that there is no explicit proof-text denoting aboveness (fawqiyya) for Allāh Most High. What was transmitted was {over the Throne} (20:5). Then what is his proof? And who are his predecessors among the early authorities in saying such a statement? Moreover, the phrase “above His creatures” reeks of the attribution of place to Allāh Most High. Exalted is He beyond the attributes of creatures! [...]. ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd al-Dārimī said:

As for your [al-Marrisi’s] statement that He is “not separate (bā‘in) with any segregation nor gap between Him and His creation,” you have lied in your statement and went astray from the right way. Rather, He is separate from His creation and above His Throne with a huge gap (bi-furjatin kabīra) and the seven heavens are between Him and His creatures on the earth.

The Ulema have said that the expressions “with His Essence” (bi-dhātiḥ) and “separate from His creation” (bā‘in min khalqiḥ) were not transmitted to describe Allāh Most High in any verse nor ḥadīth whatsoever, nor did any Companion ever say them.


224 Al-Naqd (p. 79). [A]
Rather, these two expressions were invented by one or more persons in the course of refuting their opponents. The Imāms said this, including al-Kawtharī. So did Nāṣir al-Albānī in the abridgment of al-Dhahabī’s ‘Uluw. Those that used those expressions have said what no one said before about Allāh and have gone astray with good intentions but evil expressions.

Al-Dhahabī in the biographical notice on “the ḥadīth Master and Proof in the Religion (Ḥuṣṣa)" Abū Naṣr al-Sijzi cites the latter’s words in his book al-Ibnā:

Our Imāms such as Sufyān al-Thawrī, Mālik, Ḥammād ibn Salama, Ḥammād ibn Zayd, Sufyān ibn ‘Uyayna, al-Fuṣayl [ibn ‘Iyād], Ibn al-Mubārak, Aḥmad, and Iṣḥāq [ibn Rāhūyah] are in agreement that Allāh Almighty is in person (bi-dhātihi)

---

225 Such as Ibn al-Mubārak as narrated from ‘Ali ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Shaqiq by al-Bayhaqī cf. note 415. In contrast, [1] Abū Nu‘aym (1997 ed. 1:114 §227) narrates with his chain from ‘Ali, in the chapter on ‘Ali ibn Abī Ṭalīb, the latter’s saying to the forty Jews who asked him about the nature and description of Allāh: “How can even the most eloquent tongues describe Him Who did not exist among things so that He could be said to be ‘separate from them’ (bā‘in)? Rather, He is described without modality, and He is {nearer to [man] than his jugular vein} (50:16).” [2] Ibn Mahdī al-Ṭabarī said, as cited by al-Bayhaqī, op. cit. (Kawtharī ed. p. 410-411=Ḥāshidi ed. 2:308-309): “The Pre-Eternal One (al-Qādim) is thus elevated over His Throne but neither sitting on (qā‘id) nor standing on (qā‘īn) nor in contact with (mumās) nor separate from (mubāyiyn) the Throne – meaning separate in His Essence in the sense of physical separation or distance. For ‘contact’ and its opposite ‘separation,’ ‘standing’ and its opposite ‘sitting’ are all the characteristics of bodies (ajsām), whereas {Allāh is One, Everlasting, neither begetting nor begotten, and there is none like Him} (112:1-4). What is allowed for bodies is impermissible for Him.” This shows with remarkable clarity that those who made it a categorical imperative to declare that “Allāh is separate from creation” such as Ibn Khuzayma [as narrated by al-Harawi in Dhamm al-Kalām (4:377 §1245) and al-Dhahabī in his ‘Ulūw (p. 500) cf. Mukhaṣṣar al-‘Ulūw (p. 225)] or Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb (cf. note 223) went to excess although their intention is ostensibly to preclude notions of indwelling. Al-Ḥimyarī said in Taṣḥīḥ al-Maḥāmim al-‘Aqḍiyā (p. 52): “The few expressions used by the Sunni Ulema to describe Allāh but which did not come to us [in the Qu’ān and Sunna] as such, are not actually Attributes of the Essence but only a commentary (tafsīr) for those Divinely ordained Attributes.” Allāh knows best. [T]
above the Throne, His knowledge is in every place, He descends to the nearest heaven, He gets angry and pleased, and He speaks to say whatever He wishes.

Al-Dhahabi comments: "What he narrated from them is well-known except the expression 'in person,' which is from his own bag. He attributed it to them in meaning [as opposed to literally] so that it will differentiate between the Throne and all other places." 226

3. The Tābi‘ī Imām Abū Ḥanīfa said – Allāh have mercy on him:

No one should utter, concerning Allāh Most High, anything of his own. Rather, one should describe Him only how He described Himself. One should not say anything about Allāh of his own mind. Allāh be blessed, the Lord of the worlds! 227

As for Ibn Khuzayma who gathered the verses of the Attributes, each Attribute in a separate chapter – no one of the Predecessors preceded him in this – he piled up in his book, al-Tawḥīd, inauthentic and unspeakable ḥadiths, then said:

Whoever does not definitely confirm that Allāh is established over His Throne above His seven heavens, separate (bā‘ūn) from His creation, he is a disbeliever who must be summoned to repent, otherwise his head is cut off and he must be dumped on a garbage heap so that his stench will not disturb Muslims and non-Muslim citizens. 228

227 Ibn Ṣā‘īd, al-I‘tīqād. [A]
228 Narrated by al-Harawi in Dhamm al-Kalām (4:377 §1245) and al-Dhahabi in his ‘Uluw (p. 500) cf. Mukhtāsar al-‘Uluw (p. 225-226) with a sound chain from al-Ḥākim, from Muḥammad ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Hānī, from Ibn Khuzayma. Ḫasan al-Saqqaʿ pompously
See al-Dhahabi’s ‘Ulūw\(^{229}\) — without the least comment nor condemnation, although al-Dhahabi did determine that the expressions “with His Essence” (bi-đhātīh) and “separate” (bā’īn) were never transmitted anywhere in the Book nor the Sunna, nor did any Companion nor Successor ever utter them! It is astonishing that someone who does not believe in that innovation which suggests likeness between Allāh and His creatures should be guilty of apostasy and not be washed nor shrouded nor prayed upon, nor even buried, but thrown into a garbage dump. Wonder of wonders, when real harm is caused only if one is left in such fashion, not when he is buried!

Abū Ismā‘il al-Harawi the author of Manāzil al-Sā‘irīn who suggested union with the Divine — our refuge is in Allāh! — said:

I heard Yaḥyā ibn ‘Ammār the admonisher reply, when I asked him about Ibn Ḥībbān, “We expelled him from Sijistān. He was very learned but had little religion. He came to us denying Allāh had a limit, so we expelled him!”

The ḥadīth Master al-Dhahabi commented:

Your condemnation of him is an innovation and delving into this topic is among the things for which Allāh Most High gave no permission. Nor was any text transmitted to that effect whether for or against, and part of the excellence of one’s Islām is to leave what does not concern him. Exalted is

\(^{229}\) Al-‘Ulūw (p. 152) and Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’ (16:97-98). [A]
Allāh beyond being ascribed a limit or being described except in the way He described Himself or taught His Messengers, according to the meaning He wants, without similitude nor modality – {There is nothing whatsoever like Him, and He is the All-Hearing, the All-Seeing} (42:11).\(^{230}\)

The ḥadith Master Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn ibn Khalīl Kikaldī al-ʿAlāʾī said, “Wonder of wonders! By Allāh! Who is more deserving of being expelled and declared a Godless innovator?”\(^{231}\) [...].

4. Imām al-Ṭahāwī said in Bayān al-Sunnati wal-Jamāʿa:

Exalted is Allāh beyond having limits (ḥudūd) placed on Him, or having boundaries (ghāyāt), or having parts (arkān), limbs (aʿdāʾ) or organs (adawāt), nor is He contained by the six directions (jihāt) as all created things are.

The meaning of limit (al-ḥadd) is the end (nihāya) of something and masses or bodies (al-ajrām) all have limits. The Throne is not an infinitely stretching mass. Similarly, the Footstool, Paradise, Hellfire, the heavens and the earths all have surfaces. However, we human beings do not know what the surface of the Throne is, nor that of the Footstool, nor that of the seven heavens, nor that of Paradise, nor that of Gehenna. Nor does the preclusion of limit for Allāh Most High mean that He is infinitely extended, so let one beware of such an illusion! “Boundaries” signifies where something ends. “Parts” means sides, of which Allāh Most High is exempt because whatever possesses parts is necessarily

---

\(^{230}\) Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ (Risāla ed. 16:97) cf. notes 209 and 422. [T]

limited. "Limbs" means that He is exalted beyond possessing any limb since a human being and everything endowed with a soul possesses limbs. "Organs" are small body parts such as the tongue and teeth. Some explained the "organs" to mean the instruments which human beings use as aids in accomplishing their acts, such as building and carpentry tools. This is because it can be gathered from the discourse of the People of Truth that Allâh Most High does whatever He wishes "without process" (‘ilâj). What they mean by the latter expression is that He does not need the application of movements, pauses, and implements, but rather creates whatever He wishes without any of that. Whoever He wished, in pre-eternity, to bring into existence, He does so and fashions him with His pre-existent power. "The six directions" means that the six directions do not encompass Allâh Most High in the way they encompass all creatures, because the latter necessarily fall within dimensionality (taḥayyuz) in one of the directions and whatever has a beginning must necessarily exist in a place.\textsuperscript{232}

The erudite Proof of the Religion, Imâm al-Kawtharî – Allâh have mercy on him – said:

The word "direction" (al-jiha) was never mentioned in any hadîth whatsoever. Even the Ḥanbalî Abû Ya‘lâ said in al-Mu’tamad fil-Mu’taqad: "Limit is impermissible for Him – Exalted is He! – as well as boundaries, ‘before,’ ‘after,’ ‘under,’ ‘in front of,’ ‘behind,’ because these are attributes which the Law never transmitted and they are attributes that necessitate place."\textsuperscript{233}


\textsuperscript{233} Maqâlît al-Kawtharî (p. 102). [A]
[Maḥmūd Muḥammad Khaṭṭāb al-Subkī said:]

Whoever attributes direction to Allāh Most High is heedless of the “judicative” (muḥkam) verse that states {There is nothing whatsoever like Him} (42:11) and turns a blind eye to transcendence (tanzīh) which is the core of Muslim belief and which stipulates that Allāh Most High existed before the universe was fashioned and before its ensuing directions existed – therefore these directions were created simultaneously with the creation of the universe.234

‘Ali was asked – Allāh be well-pleased with him – “Where was Allāh before He created the heavens and the earth?” He replied, “‘Where’ is a question about place and Allāh existed when there was no place and He is today as He ever was.”235

Imām al-Qurṭubī said in his commentary on the saying of Allāh Most High, {Have you taken security from Him Who is in the heaven} (67:16):

What is meant by the above-mentioned verse is the reverence and transcendence of Allāh Most High beyond [the

---

descriptives of] lowliness and belowness (al-sufl wal-taht) and [the affirmation of] His description with loftiness and magnificence (al-'uluw wal-'azama) – not places nor directions nor limits, as these are the attributes of bodies and because He created places and is in no way in need of them. Rather, He exists from His pre-eternity before the creation of place and time, as there was no place nor time, and He is now as He ever was.\textsuperscript{236}

Al-Kamāl ibn al-Humām said – Allāh have mercy upon him:

The seventh principle is that Allāh Most High is not in a specific direction because directions were created simultaneously with the creation of human beings and their like of two-legged creatures. For the meaning of “above” is the layer next to one’s head while the rest is below. As for four-legged creatures or those that crawl on their bellies, the meaning of “above” is the layer next to their backs. Even so, this is a relative matter because if an ant is walking on the ceiling then “above” in relation to it is the direction of the earth because that is the layer next to its back. If every single creature were round, none of those directions would exist. Allāh Most High existed from pre-eternity and there was nothing of all creation, therefore He exists without direction.\textsuperscript{237}

\textsuperscript{236} Tafsīr al-Qurtubī (18:216). [A]
\textsuperscript{237} Al-Musāyara (p. 29). [A]
{Glorified be thy Lord, the Lord of Majesty, from that which they attribute unto Him!}

(37:180)
IBN JAHBAL AL-KILĀBI
The Refutation of Him [Ibn Taymiyya] Who Attributes Direction to Allāh ﷺ
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إسناد هذا الكتاب

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

الحمد لله والصلاة والسلام على رسول الله وآله وصحبه ومن والاه

» سيحانك اللهم لا علم لنا إلا ما علمتنا إنك أنت العليم الحكيم»

قال (اللا شيء) جريل بن فؤاد الصالحي الشافعي: أروي هذه الرسالة الجميلة ضمن روايتي المسلسلة بالسادة الشافعية الدمشقيين لكتاب طبقات الشافعية الكبرى إجازة عن الشيخ المسيد أبي الجود محمد تسير بن توفيق المخزومي (ولد 1321)، عن شيخ القراء العلامة محمد سليم بن أحمد الخلواني (ت 1363)، عن العلامة شيخ الشام سليم العطار (ت 1377)، قال: أخبارنا محدث الشام عبد الرحمن الكزبري الحفيد، عن الحافظ الزبيدي والسيد أحمد العطار ومحمد الكزبري الشهير بالأوسط، جميعهم عن الشهاب المبني، زاد الكزبري الأوسط: والوالي - أي عبد الرحمن الجد - كلاهما عن أبي المواهب محمد بن عبد الباقي الخنبل، عن أيوب الخلوتي العذوي، عن الممّر إبراهيم الأحذب، عن الشهاب ابن حجر الهنمي، عن السيوطي، عن قاضي القضاة عز الدين أحمد بن إبراهيم
الخنابي والجلال أبي الفضل عبد الرحمن بن أحمد القُمْشَي، كلاهما عن الجلال
عبد الله بن علي بن محمد الكلتاني، عن مؤلف الكتاب - كما في (فهرس
الفهرس) للكلتاني و(أسانيد الهئيتي) للفهداني.

وهو الحافظ، قاضي القضاة، شيخ الإسلام، تاج الدين عبد الوهاب بن
الإمام، حافظ عصره، قاضي القضاة، شيخ الإسلام، تقي الدين علي بن عبد
الكافي السبكي الحجازي الأنصاري، المعروف بابن السبكي، قال في كتابه
طبقات الشافعية الكبرى في ترجمته للإمام ابن جهل الكيلاني: "وقفتْ له على
تصنيف صنَّفه في نفي الجهة ردًا على ابن تيمية لا بأس به وهو هذا. ثم ساق
المتن بكمامه. رحمهم الله تعالى ونفعنا بهم، آمين.
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By the grace of Allāh I narrate this treatise as part of my all-Damascene Shāfi‘i-chained narration of Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘yya al-Kubrā by permission from the specialist of transmission Shaykh Abū al-Jūd Muḥammad Taysīr ibn Tawfīq al-Makhzumī (b. 1331), from the foremost master of canonical readings Shaykh Muḥammad Salīm ibn Ḥalwānī (d. 1363), from the Shaykh of Shām Salīm al-ʿAṭṭār (d. 1307) who said: The Ḥadith Scholar of Shām ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Kuzbārī al-Dimashqī the Grandson reported to us: from the Ḥāfīz Sayyid Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī, Sayyid Aḥmad al-ʿAṭṭār, and Muḥammad al-Kuzbārī the Middle, all three from al-Šīḥāb al-Manīnī, al-Kuzbārī adding: and from my father, i.e. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Kuzbārī the Grandfather, both of them from Abū al-Mawāhib Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Bāqī al-Ḥanbālī, from Ayyūb al-Khalwātī al-ʿAdwā, from the aged Ḫabrīm al-Ḥądab, from al-Šīḥāb Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī, from al-Suyūṭī, from Qāḍī al-Quḍāt ʿIzz al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Ḫabrīm al-Ḥanbālī and al-Jalāl al-Qumuṣī, both of them from al-Jamāl ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Kinānī, from the author of the book, all of the above per al-Kattānī’s Fāhras al-Fahāris and al-Fādānī’s ʿAsānīd al-Haytamī.
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AUTHOR’S INTRODUCTION

[Ibn al-Subki’s narration of Ibn Jahbal’s text in Tabaqat al-Shafi‘iyya al-Kubra (9:35)238]

In the Name of Allâh, All-Beneﬁcent, Most Merciful.

All Praise to Allâh Almighty, the sovereign Lord of Power and Dominion, the Self-Sufﬁcient Who stands in need of nothing, and in need of Whom stand all things. Nothing that exists depends on anything other than Him alone. He sent forth Muhammad with the pristine path and the resplendent Faith, whereupon he produced the clearest proofs and illumined the path of wayfarers. He described his Lord with the Attributes of majesty and negated from Him all that does not befit magniﬁcence and perfection. Exalted is Allâh Most Great and Most High far beyond the claims of the transgressors! The Throne does not carry Him – nay, both the Throne and Throne-bearers are themselves carried by the subtlety of His Power and subdued in His Grip.239 He encompasses all things with His knowledge.


239 This entire sentence is a quotation from al-Ash‘ari’s Ibina (Ma‘mûd ed. 2:21 = Sabbagh ed. p. 35) cf. note 371.
REFUTATION OF HIM WHO ATTRIBUTES DIRECTION TO ALLAH

He well knows the number of all things in creation and is aware of the deep recesses of consciences and the movements of innermost thoughts. Glory to Him! How great is the matter upon which He stands, how tremendous is His Dominion! {All that are in the heavens and the earth entreat Him} because of their need for Him, {every day He exercises universal power} (55:29) for He is omnipotent. Blessings and peace upon our master Muḥammad, the Seal of His Prophets and Bearer of His News, and upon his Family and Companions!

2 The reason for undertaking this small work is that recently someone produced something in which he asserted direction (jiha) for Allāh ﷺ.²⁴⁰ He deceived with that work those who have no firm foothold in learning, no mastery of knowledge, no share of understanding, and no ability to see with the light of wisdom. Therefore, I decided to speak about the doctrine of Ahl al-Sunna wal-Jamāʿa and show the corrupt nature of what he said, although he himself contradicts every single claim he makes and spontaneously destroys every single foundation he lays. [36] Then I produce proofs from the doctrine of Ahl al-Sunna wal-Jamāʿa and what pertains thereto.

3 Before turning to the above, I begin with an explanatory introduction on the subject at hand.

²⁴⁰ Ibn Taymiyya and his Fatwā Hamawiyya remain unnamed throughout the entire text.
The Ḥashwiyya or
Vulgar Anthropomorphists

The doctrine of the Ḥashwiyya that consists in asserting a
direction for Allāh is a corrupt and unacceptable doctrine.
The falsehood of this doctrine is obvious if one only tries to
imagine it. Consequently the Imāms have said that, were it not
for the seduction of the uneducated public by the Ḥashwiyya,
they would not have thought to address the latter [heresy] nor
used a single drop of ink to refute them.

The Ḥashwiyya are of two types. The first make no pretense
of hiding their gross anthropomorphism; {And they fancy that
they have some standing – Lo! is it not they who are the liars?}
(58:18). The second type cloak themselves in the school of the
Salaf, hoping thereby to gain something from ill-gotten property
– if only scraps – to take with them. For this vain purpose they
marshalled the common people and the ignorant, the rabble and
the riffraff. For they know well that Iblīs toils for nothing other
than the defeat of the Community of Muḥammad. Hence, the
hearts of the common people do not concur on other than inno-
vation and misguidance, by which Iblīs destroys the Religion
and corrupts the certitude of faith. History shows that Iblīs –
Allāh curse him! – was unable to marshal other than the likes of

241 The author built on Imām Ibn Ḥāshim ibn ʿAbd al-Salām’s prefatory words in al-Mulḥa fī ʾl-ʾtiqād
Ahl al-Ḥaqq, a refutation of the anthropomorphist Ḥanbalīs of Syria in his time. See our
full published translation entitled The Belief of the People of Truth.
the Khawārij, or the Rāfiḍa, or the atheists, or the Qarāmiṭa. As for Ahl al-Sunna wal-Jamāʿa, they never concurred on other than the manifest Book of Allāh and His strong Rope.

6 Among the second type of the Ḥashwiyya are those who lie about the First and Foremost among the Emigrants and Helpers. They claim that the latter say the same as what they, the Ḥashwiyya, say. But even if they spent the earth’s weight in gold, they would never be able to pass off one word as having been said by the Companions to justify their claims! This group cloaked themselves with the Salaf to preserve their reputation of leadership and retain the scraps they have fetched for themselves. [[They] desire that they should have security from you, and security from their own folk] (4:91). Their kind clothe themselves with self-display and over-ascetic manners. Dung they deem gilded with silver, and latrines as white palaces. They make others renounce pearls in order to procure mustard-seeds.

They make a show of piety before people
While going around looking for cash.

7 The school of the Salaf is none other than the assertion of Divine Oneness and Transcendence as opposed to asserting a body or likeness for Allāh. The innovators claim that they follow the school of the Salaf, [37]

Each one proclaiming his kinship to Layla
But Layla does not confirm it for any of them.

242 The Shīʿis who insult the Companions.
243 A sect of frank anthropomorphists.
244 See §§39, 110, 130 (p. 173, 207, 213) etc. The expression “the First and Foremost” denotes those who prayed towards both qiblas cf. Ibn Qutayba, Maʿārif (p. 318).
246 Diwān al-Ṣabāba 3.
For how can anyone believe that the Salaf subscribe to tashbīh, or even sat quietly when the innovators appeared? [How could they do this] after Allāh ﷻ said: {Confound not truth with falsehood, nor knowingly conceal the truth} (2:42); and {(Remember) when Allāh laid a charge on those who had received the scripture: You are to expound it to mankind and not hide it} (3:187); and {That you may explain to mankind what has been revealed for them} (16:44)?

The Companions ﷺ did not probe any of these things because they knew that the welfare of the masses of the people was the most important thing. Yet the swords of their proofs were honed and their spears well-whetted. When the Seceders (Khawārijj) emerged, the two erudite doctors of the Community and cousins of the Prophet ﷺ pounced on them – ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās ﷺ! As a result of the debate that ensued, some of the Khawārij were persuaded by the truth, while the rest remained obdurate and the sword fell on their heads.

The law of the sword must be carried out on you.
We shall be pleased only when the sword is pleased!

Similarly, when the heresy of absolute free will (Qadariyya) emerged in the person of Ma‘bad al-Juḥanī, Allāh ﷻ dispatched for him the ascetic of the Community, [38] the son of him who distinguished truth from falsehood – ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb ﷺ.

247 Ma‘bad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Uwaymir al-Juḥanī al-Andalusi (d. 80) is one of the Successors, considered by some of the Imāms of hadith to be “truthful in himself” (ṣadīq fi nafsīh) although an innovator. Ibn Mājah narrates through him the hadith of the Prophet ﷺ: “Do not indulge in mutual praise for it is nothing short of butchery.” [Narrated from Mu‘āwiyah with a fair (ḥasan) chain as stated by al-Sindi.] He was the first to speak of absolute free will in the time of the Companions, a doctrine that became the mainstay of the Qadariyya and was adopted by the Mu‘tazila. Al-Hasan al-Andalusi forbade people from sitting with him and called him “astray and leading others astray” (dāll muḍīlī). He was killed by al-Ḥajjāj. Mizān (4:141); Siyar (5:192-194 §443).
If these two innovations had not emerged, the Companions would never have spoken out to refute the latter or repress the former. Their habit was but to exhort people to Godwariness and good deeds. That is why there is no report that the Prophet ﷺ – nor the Companions – ever gathered people together and then ordered them to believe such and such about Allah Almighty, although this kind of meeting took place for many other matters. He only touched upon it in a way which the elect understood and which the common people did not disavow.

And I swear by Allah ﷻ upon my conscience, not only once but a million times, that the master of Prophets ﷺ never said: “O people, believe that Allah is in the upward direction”! Nor did the Rightly-Guided Caliphs say that, nor any of the Companions. Rather, they left people alone after ordering them in the matters of worship and legal rulings. When the innovations appeared, the Salaf subdued them. As for inquisition into people’s beliefs and activism for the sake of exposing these beliefs and enacting reprisals on their basis – this they never did. They only put an end to innovations upon their appearance.

The Hashwiyya, whenever they engage their opponents on matters of the foundations of belief, use rational arguments and bring up transmitted proofs in their own way. However, when they come to questions of gross anthropomorphism, they become stupefied and distressed. You realize at that time that they

---

248 Ibn Taymiyya had gathered people together and given the fatwā on direction from the pulpit.
249 A reference to Ibn Taymiyya’s claim that such a belief is not an innovation, which the author refutes in the present work.
understand neither Arabic nor other than Arabic. By Allah, they do not! By Allah, if they understood, they would have surely fallen in love [with the truth] (law fahimü lahāmû). Instead, they embarked on the sea of their vain passions and went sailing on it. They indoctrinated every feeble-minded simpleton they found. In so doing they contravened the way of the Salaf, who refrained from broaching such topics with the common people.

Whenever al-Hasan al-Baṣrí spoke on the science of tawhīd, he would begin by taking out of his gathering all those that were not fit to hear. May Allah have mercy on the Salaf! They did not speak about doctrine except with the Ahl al-Sunna among them — for the Sunna is the basis of the verifying authorities — and they withheld any such discourse from newcomers. They said: Newcomers [39] see things for the first time and are barely starting on their way; they have no prior experience and no firm foothold in these matters — even if they are seventy years old.

Sahl [al-Tustarī] said: “Do not acquaint newcomers with the secrets before they become firmly settled in their belief that God is One and that the object of monotheism is Unique, Everlasting, and transcends modality and place. Thoughts cannot encompass Him nor can hearts conceive of Him in terms of ‘how.’”

In addition, this sect [the Hashwiyya] does not rest from testing people’s belief until they assert direction for Allah. It is as if they never heard of the sound ḥadīth of Prophet: “I was ordered to fight people until they say là ilâha illallâh.” Are they

251 Hence the superiority of Sunni debators trained in language and logic over Wahhābis the world over, especially in non-Arab lands where those sciences are stronger such as in South and Southeast Asia.

252 On the foremost Imam of the Tābi’in al-Hasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110) and the early Sufi master al-Tustarī (d. 283) see our Four Imāms and Their Schools.

253 A mass-narrated (mutawātir) ḥadīth of the Prophet narrated by al-Bukhārī, Muslim, and others from nineteen Companions as stated by al-Kattānī in Naẓm al-Mutanāthir.
not satisfied with what satisfied their Prophet ﷺ. No, they want to order even the handicapped to plunge into a sea without shores, and to search for something for which the Prophet ﷺ never ordered them to search, nor any of his Companions. Nor do they content themselves with what is less, namely, the report from their own Imām, Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal ﷺ who said:

<Allāh is not to be described other than in the terms with which He has described Himself, or in which the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ has described Him. We do not exceed the Qur'ān and the ḥadīth.> We know that the terms with which Allāh was described in these two sources are the truth, free of nonsense and mystery (luğhz). The meaning of these terms is known from the way that the speaker's intent is known from his words. Together with this, {There is nothing whatsoever like Him} (42:11) – whether in His sanctified Self which is mentioned in His Names and Attributes, or in His acts. It is necessary that Allāh possesses an Essence in the real and literal sense (lahu dhātun ḥaqiqiyyatun), He possesses acts in the real and literal sense and He possesses Attributes in the real and literal sense. Yet {There is nothing whatsoever like Him} whether in His Essence, His Attributes, or His acts. Whatever entails imperfection (naqṣ) or the quality of contingency (ḥudūth), Allāh transcends it in the real sense. He rightly

254 The Prophet ﷺ heard a call [to prayer] coming from a valley saying: “I bear witness that there is no God but Allāh and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh” whereupon he said: “And I bear witness to the same, and I bear witness that no one bears witness to the same except he clears himself of shirk (associating a partner to Allāh).” Ahmad and al-Ṭabarānī in al-Awsat relate it with a sound chain, as stated by al-Haythami (1:59).

255 Aqāwīl al-Thiqāt has: “Just as it is known with certitude that Allāh possesses an Essence in the real and literal sense and possesses acts in the real and literal sense, similarly He possesses Attributes in the real and literal sense. Yet {There is nothing whatsoever like Him}, etc.”
owns perfection above which there is no limit. And contingency is precluded from Him. [40] For nonexistence is precluded from Him, while contingency presupposes nonexistence as its prior attribute. Moreover, the contingent depends upon a Creator, whereas He necessarily exists in Himself.\textsuperscript{256}

These are the words of their Imām. Would that they contented themselves with them! He has mentioned in this text the largest meanings with the most succinct expressions, brought up the proofs of the mutakallimūn against this heretic (māriq) [Ibn Taymiyya] in the best and clearest terms, and never ordered what that sect [the Ḥashwiyya] orders.\textsuperscript{257}

\textsuperscript{256} Hamawiyya (p. 271-272) = Majmu’ al-Fatāwā (5:26-27) cf. al-Karmi, Aqāwil al-Thiqāt (p. 234) and Ibn Qudāma in Lam’at al-l’tiqād (Ryadh ed. p. 9) and his Taḥrīm al-Nāzar fi Kutub al-Kalām (p. 38), all citing Imam Aḥmad but only the bracketed segment is verbatim from him while the rest is Ibn Taymiyya’s very free paraphrase, which the author quoted.

\textsuperscript{257} Ibn Jahbal made a mistake as the above words are actually those of Ibn Taymiyya except for the bracketed first two phrases, even if their contents are actually a loose paraphrase of Ibn Qudāma’s reports from Imām Aḥmad in Lam’at al-l’tiqād and Taḥrīm al-Nāzar and al-Karmini’s in Aqāwil al-Thiqāt.
Mālik and al-Shāfi‘ī’s
Understanding of Tawḥīd

Al-Shāfi‘ī said:

I asked Mālik about tawḥīd and he said: “It is absurd to think that the Prophet taught his Community hygiene but did not teach them tawḥīd. He said: ‘I was ordered to fight people until they say lā ilāha illallāh.’”

Mālik showed thereby that what is required of people in tawḥīd is the meaning illustrated by this hadīth. He never said that part of tawḥīd is to believe that Allāh is in the upward direction.

---

258 Narrated from al-Muzānī by al-Sulāmī cf. Siyar (Risāla ed. 10:26). See note 253 on the ḥadīth. Similarly, Abū Ḥanīfah said in the Fīqḥ al-Akbar: “The root of the affirmation of Divine unity and sound conviction is to say, ‘I believe in Allāh, His angels, His Books, His Messengers, resurrection after death, the foreordination of good and evil by Allāh Most High, the Reckoning, the Balance, paradise and hell, and that all these are real.’” And in the Wasiyya: “The believer is truly a believer and the unbeliever is truly an unbeliever. […] People are in three classes: the believer sincere in his faith; the unbeliever upholding his unbelief; and the hypocrite dissembling his hypocrisy.”

259 Similarly, Ahmad said in one of the narrations of his ‘Aqīda: “The Believer from Abī al-Sunna wa-l-lamā‘a is someone who bears witness that there is no god but Allāh alone without partner whatsoever, and that Muḥammad is His servant and Messenger.” Ibn Abī Ya‘lā, Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābillah (1:293).
Al-Shāfi‘ī was asked about the Divine Attributes. He said:

It is forbidden for minds to represent Allāh. It is forbidden for the imagination to conceive limits for Him. It is forbidden for speculation to presume anything about Him. It is forbidden for souls to think about His Essence. It is forbidden for consciences to deepen reflection about Him. It is forbidden for thoughts to grasp other than what He described Himself with, as conveyed by His Prophet ﷺ.

260 Similarly, Ahmad said: “Truly, we concede whatever those hadīths say even if we have no knowledge of their explanation (fa-inā nusallim lahā wā-in lam na’lam tafsirahā). We do not discuss them. We do not dispute about them. We do not explain them. Rather, we narrate them exactly the way they came to us, we believe in them, and we know that they are truth, just as the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said.” Ibn Abī Ya‘lā, op. cit. (1:311).


262 Similarly, Ahmad said: “We believe and confirm the hadīths of the Attributes without ‘how’ and without meaning (wa-lā kayf wa-lā ma‘nā).” Narrated from Hambal ibn Ishāq through al-Khallāl by Ibn Qudāma in Dhamm al-Ta’wil (p. 22) and Lam’at al-l‘tiqād (p. 9) as well as Ibn Bāṭa in al-Ībahā (3:58).

263 Narrated from al-Rābi’ ibn Sulaymān by Ibn Qudāma in Dhamm al-Ta’wil (p. 20-21 §34).
The Ash‘aris are Closer to the Salaf
Than the Ḥashwiyya

Whoever investigates and searches carefully will find that the habit of the Companions, the Successors, and the early generations was to refrain from probing into these matters. They never mentioned them in gatherings, nor did they instill them into the general public, nor did they bring them up on the pulpits. They did not provoke misgivings in the hearts of people that would spread like wildfire. This is known of necessity from the accounts of their lives, and upon it we have built our doctrine and based our creed. If Allāh wills, our conformity with the Salaf will become apparent to the reader, as well as the straying of the objector from their path, even if he claims to follow them. In fact, he treads nothing other than the path of innovation.

[41] As for the claim that the Salaf did bring up these topics, and his rhetorical question that “the Prophet ﷺ taught everything – even relieving oneself – but did not teach this important matter?”: such a statement is a fake currency that does not pass muster with a trained money-changer. Does he not know that everyone needs to relieve himself, perhaps more than once a day? But what need do common people have to probe the Divine Attributes? All that they need to know about tawḥīd is made clear in the hadith “I was ordered to fight people until...”
Moreover, the above claim, by itself, destroys the claimant's edifice and brings down his foundations. For the Prophet ﷺ evidently taught about relieving oneself, but he did not teach people that Allāh Almighty was in the upward direction. As for what is narrated about the Throne and heaven concerning ʾistiwā’, the claimant has devised his construction and propped up the branches of his claim with the thesis that the Throne and heaven both signify one thing – the upward direction. Therefore, what this claimant said, the Prophet ﷺ never taught, although he ﷺ taught even how to relieve oneself. According to him, it follows that the common people must be taught about the upward direction, which the Prophet ﷺ himself never taught!

As for us, we say that such a matter is not to be probed. One keeps silent about it just as the Prophet ﷺ and his Companions did. Whatever was sufficient for them is sufficient for us. Consequently, none of us is found ordering common people in any way to probe the Divine Attributes. But those people [the Ḥashwiyiyah] have made it their habit to enter into the subject and order others to do likewise. I wonder which of us are the closest to the Salaf?

We now turn to state the doctrine of Ahl al-Sunna.
We say: Our doctrine is that Allah is pre-eternal and pre-existent (qadim azali). He does not resemble anything nor does anything resemble Him. He has no direction nor place. He is not subject to time nor duration. Neither “where” (ayn) nor “at” (hayth) applies to Him. He shall be seen, but not as part of a face-to-face encounter, nor in the sense of a face-to-face encounter (yurā lā 'an muqābala wa-lā 'alā muqābala).\footnote{Al-Qārī said in Šarḥ al-Fiqh al-Akbar (p. 180): “One must not pay any attention to what the innovators imagine on rational bases, and the commentator of al-Ṭahāwî’s Aqīda [i.e. Ibn Abī al-Izz in Šarḥ al-Aqīda al-Ṭahāwīyya (p. 195)] committed a mistake in this regard when he said: ‘Can any vision be rationally conceived without a face-to-face encounter? And in it there is a proof for His elevation (‘ulūw) over His creatures.’ It seems that he applies the upward direction to his Lord, whereas the doctrine of Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā‘a is that He – exalted is He – is not seen in any direction. The Prophet’s saying: ‘You shall see your Lord just as you see the moon on the night it is full’ [Narrated from Abū Hurayra by al-Tirmidhî (hasan gharîb) and Abū Ḥanîfa in his Musnad and, in a slightly different wording, from Jarîr ibn ‘Abd Allâh al-Bajâlî by al-Bukhârî and Muslim] is a simile (tashbih) between two types of sightings generally speaking, not a simile between two objects of vision from all perspectives.” Ibn Abī al-Izz – purportedly a Ḥanâfî – said in Šarḥ al-Aqīda al-Ṭahâwîyya (p. 195): “Whoever claims that Allah is seen without direction, let him verify his sanity!” Note the latter’s casual dismissal of – and deviation from – Imâm al-Ṭahâwî’s position in the Aqīda (§35: “The Seeing of Allah by the People of the Garden is true, without their vision being all-encompassing and without the manner of their vision being known.” §38: “He is beyond having limits placed on Him, or being restricted, or having parts or limbs. Nor is He contained by the six directions as all created things are”) and Imâm Abû Ḥanîfa’s position in al-Wâṣiyya (p. 3-4): “The meeting (liqâ) of Allah with the dwellers of Paradise is without modality nor simile nor direction” (Liqâ’ Allah ta’âlā li-ahl al-janna bil-ru’ûn ba-shariyya billâ kayf wa-lâ tashbih wa-lâ jihâ, cited by al-Qârî in Šarḥ al-Fiqh al-Akbar (p. 176-177).}
He was when there was no place, He created place and time, and He is now as He ever was. This is the madhhab of Ahl al-Sunna and the doctrine of the shaykhs of the [Sufi] Path – may Allāh be well-pleased with them.  

Al-Junayd said: “When does He Whom nothing and no one resembles nor compares to, ever join (yattaṣīlu) with one whom something resembles and to whom something compares?”

Yaḥyā ibn Muʿādh al-Rāzī was asked: “Tell us about Allāh Almighty.” He replied, “He is One God.” The questioner asked: “What is He like (kayfa hū)?” He replied: “The Owner Who is Mighty.” The questioner asked: “Where is He?” He said: {[[Lo! Your Lord is in the lookout} (89:14). The questioner said: “I was not asking you about that.” Al-Rāzī replied: “All else is an attribute of the created. As for His own attribute [of whereabout], I was not informed about it.”

Imām al-Ḥaramayn said in al-Iṣḥād (p. 167): “Among their [the Muʿtazila’s] insinuations are claims that stem, in fact, from pure speculation, such as their saying: ‘one who sees must be facing opposite what he sees, or virtually facing; We say to them: Do you know for certain what you are claiming, or do you know it on speculative bases? If they claim that they know it for certain and accuse whoever disagrees with them of denial, their credibility collapses and their untruth becomes manifest. The same reasoning applies to the anthropomorphists [...]. And the Creator sees His creation without direction, therefore it is possible that He be seen without direction.”

Cf. “Allāh is Now as He Ever Was” in our Sunna Notes series.

365 Narrated by al-Qushayri from al-Sulami from Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Fārisī, from Ibrāhīm ibn Fātik, from al-Junayd. Al-Sulami’s Shaykh (for about thirty reports in Taʻbaqāt al-Sūfiyya) Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Fārisī Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm is unknown. Ibrāhīm ibn Fātik ibn Saʿīd al-Baghdādī was al-Hallāj’s servant. He accompanied al-Nūrī and al-Junayd and the latter used to treat him with generosity.” In Ḥallāj, Ṣawāsīn (p. 206). Ibn Taymiyya cites it in his Istiqāma (Madina ed. 1:184) from al-Qushayri without contesting its authenticity and approves it. Paragraphs 25-31 are from al-Qushayri’s Risālā (p. 42-45).

367 Also translated {Verily, Your Lord is ready at ambush}.

368 Narrated by al-Qushayri from al-Sulami from Abū al-Faraj ʿAbd al-Wāḥid ibn Bakr al-Warthānī (d. 372) from Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Bardāʿī from Ṭāhīr ibn Ismāʿīl al-Rāzī, from Yaḥyā. Abū Nuʿaym (1984 ed. 10:60) narrates it from Ibn Bakr with
Similarly, Ibn Shāhīn asked al-Junayd about the meaning of “being-with” (ma‘). He said: “Being-with has two meanings. The first is ‘with the Prophets in terms of aid and protection.’ Allāh said: {I am with you twain, hearing and seeing} (20:46). The second meaning is ‘with the world in terms of knowledge and awareness.’ Allāh said: {He is with them wheresoever they may be} (58:7).” Ibn Shāhīn said: “The likes of you point the Community toward Allāh.”

Dhū al-Nūn was asked about the saying of Allāh: {The Merciful established Himself over the Throne} (20:5). He said: “He affirmed His Essence (dhāt) and negated His place. He is existent in His Essence, while all things are subjected to His wisdom just as He likes.”

the same chain. Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā ibn Mu‘ād al-Rāzī al-Naysabūrī (d. 258) is the Imām, preacher, and hadith Master who said: “Son of man, your religion will remain in tatters as long as your heart clings to love of the world.”

Narrated by al-Qushayri without chain. At the time al-Junayd was accused of heresy by the anthropomorphists of Baghdād, his student Abū al-Hasan al-Nūrī (d. 295) was asked by the chief judge in the presence of the Caliph, al-Mutawakkil: “Where is your Lord in relation to you?” He replied: “He is, in relation to me, wherever I am in relation to Him, since He said: {He is with you wheresoever you are} (57:4). That is: He is with us in whatever way we are with Him. If we are with Him with obedience, He is with us with help and guidance; if we are with Him with heedlessness, He is with us with His will; if we are with Him with disobedience, He is with us with His delay; if we are with Him with repentence, He is with us with acceptance; if we are with Him with abandonment of His commands, He is with us with punishment.” In Ibn ‘Ajība, Iqāṭ al-Himam (Beirut: al-Maktaba al-Thaqāfiyya) p. 397. Cf. also further below, §71-72 (for a similarly figurative interpretation of muzāl) and especially n. 335, 341, chapters 3-4 and notes. Ibn Shāhīn is the trustworthy hadith master Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar ibn ʿAbd al-Malik (d. 385) who, despite his imperfect Arabic and poor fiqh, authored 330 works in tafsīr, hadith, history, and morals cf. al-Suyūṭī, Tabaqqat al-Huffāẓ (1:393).

Narrated by al-Qushayri without chain. Abū al-Fayd Dhū al-Nūn al-Misrī (d. 245) the ascetic Imām of the Sufis in Egypt from whom Mālik and others narrated hadith. Among his sayings: “I never ate to satiation except I purported some sin.”

166
Al-Shibli was asked about the same verse and said: "The All-Merciful exists from pre-eternity while the Throne was brought into being, and the Throne was established and made firm (istawa) by the All-Merciful."  

Ja'far ibn Nusayr said about that verse: "His knowledge applies equally (istawa) to all things, and nothing is closer to Him than something else."  

---

271 Cited by al-Qushayri in his Risâla and by Ibn Farhûn in al-Dibaj al-Mudhahhab (p. 116), both without chain while Ibn Taymiyya cites it in his Istiqâma (Madinah ed. 1:189) from al-Qushayri but contests both its authenticity and content. Yet Abû Hanîfa in the Wasïyya ("Allah established Himself on the Throne without his having need for it and without settlement on it as He is the Preserver of the Throne and other than the Throne"), al-Ash'ârî in some versions of the Ibâna ("The Throne does not carry him, rather the Throne and its carriers are carried by the subtleness of His power"), and Shaykh Muhîy al-Dîn Ibn 'Arâbî in his 'Aqîdâ (§143: "He established Himself over His Throne just as He said and in the meaning that He intended; the Throne itself and everything else was established through Him") all confirm al-Shibli's words. See our article, "Allah is Now As He Ever Was" in our Summa Notes series. Abû Bakr Dulaf ibn Jahdâr al-Shibli al-Baghdâdi al-Mâlikî (d. 334) was one of al-Junayd's foremost students, a Sufi master, hadith scholar, and jurist. Among his sayings: "I know one who did not enter into this matter until he spent all he owned, wore out seventy book-satchels with his handwritings, memorized al-Muwafta, and was able to recite in so many canonical readings" - meaning himself. When asked what the mark of the Knower of Allah was he replied: "His chest has been expanded, his heart wounded, and his body cast off."  

272 Narrated by al-Qushayri without chain while Ibn Taymiyya frantically inveighs against it in his Istiqâma (Madinah ed. 1:190): "This is more frivolous than the figurative interpretations of the esotericist Qârmaqîs, for the original wording [of the verse] does not contain anything that suggests such a meaning whatsoever! And Ja'far ibn Nusayr is nobler than to commit such a corruption of meaning (tahfrîf) the like of which does not come except from some of the extremists among the Râfîdis, the Qârmaqîs, and the atheists who question the Qur'ân!" Yet al-Ashtarî's Ibâna states: "He is above the Throne and the Heavens and above everything to the limits of the earth with an aboveness which does not bring Him nearer to the Throne and the Heavens, just as it does not make Him farther from the earth. Rather, He is Highly Exalted above the Throne and the Heavens just as He is Highly Exalted above the earth. Yet He is near to every entity and is nearer to [the worshipper] than his jugular vein and He witnesses everything." Abû Muhammîd Ja'far ibn Muhammîd ibn Nusayr al-Khulî (d. 348) is the trustworthly Imam of hadith and tasawwuf who accompanied al-Junayd and authored books. Abu al-'Alî 'Abîdîn said: "As for the Khulaf, when the innovations and heresies appeared they resigned the interpretation of those [verses and narrations of the Attributes] and allegorized them out of fear of disbelief. So they chose the innovation of ta'wil, that is, free
Ja'far al-Ṣādiq said: "Whoever claims that Allah is in (fī) something or from (min) something or on (ʿalā) something has committed idolatry. For if He were in something, He would be surrounded (maḥṣūr); if He were on something, He would be carried; if He were from something, He would be brought into being."

rein in it (al-tawassuʿ fīh) over the kufr of taking the words literally in a way that suggests anthropomorphism and likeness. So they said that 'istawā means istawlā or that it means that 'the creation of the Throne and that of a mosquito are on a par (istawlā) to Him, or that 'His knowledge of the Throne and of everything else is on a par, and that 'the Hand means the power and 'the descent means the descent of mercy.' Whoever finds in himself the capacity to tread the way of the Salaf, let him do it, otherwise, let him follow the Khalaf and beware of destruction." Cited by al-Ghawṣī in his notes on Ibn Jamāʿa’s Ḥadāth al-Daʿīl (p. 57).

273 Cited by Imām al-Qushayrī in the Risāla, Shaykh Ahmad al-Rifāʿī’s (512-578) in al-Burhān al-Mulayyad (p. 19), and al-Tīlīmānī in Naṣīḥ al-Ṭīb (5:290), all without chain, while Ibn Taymiyya cites it in his Istiṣaʿa (Madina ed. 1:190) from al-Qushayrī without contesting its authenticity. Cf. [1] Abū ʿIṣāmah’s al-Fiqh al-ʿAbsat: “If someone says, ‘Where is Allah?’ The answer for him is that Allah existed when there was no ‘where,’ no creation, nothing! And He is the Creator of everything.” [2] Al-Ṭabari, Tafsīr (Sūrat 2:29): “He is high and elevated over the heaven with the height of sovereignty and power, not the height of displacement and movement to and fro.” [3] Taḥawwīyya: “He is beyond having limits placed on Him, or having boundaries, or having parts, limbs, or organs; nor is He contained by the six directions as all created things are.” [4] Qushayriyya: “Do you subject the Absolute to ‘where?’ (taftīl maʿa al-ʿayn ayn?)” [5] Al-Bayhaqī, Manāqib al-Shafiʿī (1:396-398): “The Prophet addressed the slave-girl [in the hadith ‘Where is Allah?’] according to her ability and understanding. For she and the likes of her, before Islam, used to believe in idols as gods on earth. Accordingly, he wanted to know what she believed and asked her, ‘Where is Allah?’ Had she pointed to the idols, it would have been known that she was not a believer. When she said, ‘in the heaven,’ it became known that she had abandoned idols and that she was a believer in Allah [Who in the heaven is God, and in the earth God] (43:84) or he gestured, as she gestured, to the literal wording of what was mentioned in the Book.” [6] Al-Nawawī after Qadī ʿIyād, Sharḥ Sahih Muslim (5:24-25): “Not that He is circumscribed in the heaven nor that He is circumscribed in the direction of the Kaʿba! Rather, this is because the heaven is the orientation (qibla) of those who supplicate, just as the Kaʿba is the orientation of those who worship.” [7] Ibn Hajar, Fath al-Bāri (1959 ed. 13:412): “Al-Kirmānī (d. 668) said: ‘The literal meaning of “the one who is in the heaven” is not meant, for Allah is transcendent beyond indwelling a place. However, since the direction of elevation is nobler than any other direction, Allah predicated it to Himself to indicate the loftiness of His Essence and Attributes.’ Others than al-Kirmānī addressed in similar terms the expressions that
Muḥammad ibn Maḥbūb, Abū ʿUthmān al-Maghribī’s servant, said: “Abū ʿUthmān said to me one day: ‘Muḥammad! If someone asked you: Where is the One you worship, what would you answer?’ I said: ‘I would answer: He is where He never ceased to be.’ He said: ‘What if he asked: Where was He in pre-eternity?’ I said: ‘I would answer: Where He is now.’ That is: He was when there was no place, and He is now as He ever was. ‘Abū ʿUthmān was pleased with my answer. He took off his shirt and gave it to me.’

came down concerning aboveness (fawqīyya).” [8] Al-Qārī, al-Mīrqāt (orig. ed. 3:492): “When she said: ‘in the heaven’ – in another narration she made a sign toward the heaven – it was understood she was a believer in oneness. He meant by this line of questioning the disavowal of the gods of the earth (naḥī al-ʿālika al-ardiyya) which are the idols, not the establishment of the heaven as a location for Allāh Most High!” [9] Ibn Rushd the grandson [Averroes], Faṣl al-Maqāl (p. 52-53): “The reason behind it [the Prophet’s command] pertains to that category of people to whom belief is inconceivable without visualization. They do not believe in the existence of a thing except if they can imagine it and it is difficult for them to believe in the existence of a thing that cannot be compared to something one can visualize. This [reasoning] also applies to those who cannot understand from such ascription [i.e. istiwa' and nuzūl] other than a place (makān). They assault the first category incompetently for their denial of corporeality. This is why the proper answer for them is to tell them that such [verses and hadiths] are among the ambiguities (al-mutashahbihāt).” See more below (notes 296, 326) and the discussion on aboveness in our article, “The Ḥadith of the Mountain Goats” in our Summa Notes series. Abū ʿAbd Allāh Jaʿfar al-Šādīq ibn Muḥammad al-Bāqir ibn Zayn al-ʿAbidīn ibn al-Husayn al-Hāshimī al-Qurashi (80-148) is the Truthful Imām of the Tābi’in from whom narrated Abū Ḥanīfah, Mālik, and others.

274 Narrated by al-Qushayrī from Ibn Fārāk, from Muḥammad ibn al-Maḥbūb. This and the following paragraph are from al-Qushayrī’s Risāla (p. 37-38). See also our article, “Allāh is Now as He Ever Was” in our Summa Notes. Abū ʿUthmān al-Maghribī, also known as Ibn Shaʿbān and Abū ʿUthmān al-Qayrawānī, Saʿīd ibn Sallām al-Maghribī al-Manṣūrī al-Qayrawānī al-Naysābūrī (d. 373), was one of the Sufi masters. Among his sayings: “Retreat (al-iʿtikāf) is the guarding of limbs under the commands.” “The sincere one’s knowledge of his sincerity is invalid until he knows his self-display and parts with it, for one does not know something until he knows its opposite.” “The Sufi is he who owns things by choice, and nothing owns him by force.” “There is a time for the knower when the lights of ‘ilm enlighten him so that he can see the wonders of the unseen.” “The hearts of the people of truth are present, and their hearings are open.”
Abū `Uthmān al-Maghribī said: “I used to believe something of the doctrine of direction for Allāh, but when I came to Baghdad this went away from my heart, whereupon I wrote to my companions in Makka that I had embraced Islām anew.” At that time everyone who followed him renounced their belief in direction for Allāh ۳۴۰۲.

The above are the words of the most eminent authorities in tawḥid and the Imāms of the massive majority of the Community, except for this misguided band. The books of our Imāms are replete with such statements and with their almost countless refutations of those evil insinuators. Our purpose is not to imitate them – for this is forbidden in the foundations of belief.۳۴۱۳ I mentioned their words only so that it will be understood that the doctrine of Ahl al-Sunna is what we showed above.

---

275 Narrated by al-Qushayrī from Ibn Fārak, from Abū `Uthmān al-Maghribī.
276 This never means one is free to formulate his or her own creed independently. What is meant is that each must have a firm personal conviction and belief in the generalities of transcendence concerning Allāh Most High and His Names and Attributes. As for the precise formulations of that doctrine, they remain outside the province of the commonality and are left to the authorities to whom Allāh Most High gave competence in the matter, such as al-Ash‘arī, al-Māturīdī, and those Ibn Ḥabīl cited. Thus, insofar as formulation is concerned, it is not only permissible but obligatory to imitate them in order to preclude heterodoxy from oneself and others. On this the Ash‘arīs and the Māturīdīs agree, contrary to the Mu‘tazilīs who require knowledge of the (rational) proof for every article of faith, and not faith alone. This squarely contradicts the way of the Prophet ﷺ who only required faith. Cf. Abū `Adhaba (d. 1172), al-Rawdat al-Bahiyya fina bayn al-Ash‘āra wal-Māturidiyya in Bassām `Abd al-Wahhāb al-Jābi, al-Masā'il al-Khilāfiyya bayn al-Ash‘āra wal-Māturidiyya (Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2003) p. 102-106.
The Requisites of Transcendence
(Waṣṣāf al-Taqdis) 277

We continue by saying that whosoever hears the verses and reports that touch upon the Divine Attributes has the following duties:

- To uphold Divine Transcendence.
- To believe in what came from Allāh ﷻ and from His Prophet ﷺ in the sense that He meant and the sense that the Prophet ﷺ meant.
- To confirm and admit one's inability [to comprehend it].
- To keep silent and refrain from paraphrasing the original terms [of these verses and reports].
- To put an end to any mental reflection upon them.
- To hold firmly that whatever is hidden from one’s understanding concerning them is not hidden from Allāh nor from His Prophet ﷺ.

The elaboration of the above duties is forthcoming, if Allāh wills.278

277 Taken from al-Ghazzālī's Iljām ad-‘Awāmm. See Chapter Eleven: "Ethics of Tawḥīd."
278 Cf. §225-245.
Would that I knew in what respect we [Ashʿaris] contravene the Salaf! Is it because we say: “He was when there was no place?” Or because we say: “Allāh created place”? Or because we say: “He is now as He ever was”? [44] Or because we say: “The Real is Transcendent beyond corporeality and anything remotely resembling it”? Or because we say: “It is obligatory to declare true whatever Allāh said and whatever the Prophet ﷺ said, in the sense that Allāh meant and the sense that the Prophet ﷺ meant”? Or because we say: “It is obligatory to admit incapacity to comprehend it”? Or because we say: “We must keep silent and not ask questions nor probe what we are incapable of knowing”? Or because we say: “It is obligatory for the tongue to refrain from modifying the letter of the texts, neither adding nor subtracting anything”?

Would that I knew in what respect they [the Ḥashwīyya] conform with the Salaf! Is it in their invitation to probe this subject and their insistence on delving into it in the company of gullible juveniles and uneducated mobs who cannot even wash their backsides correctly or fulfill the necessary pillars of ṣalāt? Or did they conform with the Salaf in the latter’s upholding of Divine Transcendence and freedom from direction? Did they ever hear it said in the Book of Allāh, or related from the Salaf as an article of knowledge, that the latter described Allāh Most High as being in the upward direction (jihāt al-‘ulūw)? Or that anyone that does not so describe Him is misguided and leading others astray, and is “an offshoot from the philosophers and the Hindus and the Greeks”? [See how they invent lies about Allāh! That of itself is flagrant sin] (4:50).

279 The author is quoting Ibn Taymiyya’s astonishing accusation, which he addresses further down cf. §44 and n. 378.
REFUTATION OF IBN TAYMIYYA’S CLAIMS

PRELIMINARIES

We now turn to destroy his arguments, after which we establish the proofs of the negation of direction and likeness for Allâh in relation to all his claims. In Allâh is our recourse! First, he claimed that he says “what Allâh said, His Prophet ﷺ, and the First and Foremost (al-sâbiqûn al-awwalûn) among the Emigrants and the Helpers.”

This is not true in the least. As for the Book and the Sunna, we shall show that he contradicts them both. As for the First and Foremost among the Emigrants and the Helpers, his mention of them in this place is purely for show. Apart from that, he did not produce a single word of theirs, whether denying or confirming him. This can be known from what he says – unless what he means by “the First and Foremost among the Emigrants and Helpers” is the Shaykhs of his own doctrine at the exclusion of the Companions!  

\[\text{280} \text{ Fatwâ Ḥamawiyya (p. 194-195) = Majmû’ al-Fatâwâ (5:5-6).} \]

\[\text{281} \text{ “Ibn Taymiyya’s habit is to take something he found one scholar saying and make it a universal rule of his own.” Al-Kawthari, al-Ḥâwî fi Sîrat al-Imâm Abî Ja’far al-Tahâwî (p. 28).} \]
[45] After this claim, he launched into praising the Prophet ﷺ and his Religion, saying that his Companions are its most knowledgeable figures. The truth is as he said and more than what he said, for how can praise render justice to the Prophet’s merits? Yet his words are, as the Commander of the Believers ‘Ali ibn Abi Ṭalib ﷺ said, “Words of truth spoken to support falsehood!” (kalimatu ḥaq yurādu bihā bāṭil).

After this he started reviling the Imāms of the Community and its leading scholars for admitting incapacity to comprehend Allāh Almighty.

Yet, the Master of Messengers ﷺ said: “I cannot sufficiently extol Your praise! Verily You are just as You have glorified Yourself.” Similarly the Trusted and Truthful one [Abū Bakr al-Şiddiq] ﷺ said: “Incapacity to attain comprehension is comprehension.” So then this impostor has the audacity to claim complete knowledge in the matter. Now, the children of menstruating women can know the exact nature of Him Who is

284 Hamawīyya (p. 204-213) = Majmū’ al-Fatāwā (5:9-11).
286 Attributed – without chain – to Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq by al-Sulami in al-Muqaddima fil-Taṣawwuf (p. 36) and subsequent Sufi sources such as ‘Ayn al-Qudāt al-Hamadhānī’s Shawkat al-Gharib, and Ibn ‘Arabi and his commentators cf. also al-Suyūṭī’s Sharḥ Sunan al-Nasā’i (1:105 §169), al-Munawwī’s Fayād al-Qadir (6:181) under the hadith man ‘alima anna Allāha rabbahu wa-amīr nabiyyuh, and al-Qārī at the very beginning of his Risāla fī Radd Wahdat al-Wujūd (p. 54), all without chain.
without beginning! There is no delusion nor ignorance greater than such a claim. We seek refuge in Allāh ﷻ from downfall!

After this he described the lineage of the doctrine of the massive majority of the Community of Muḥammad ﷺ as being an offshoot of the doctrines of the philosophers, the followers of the Greeks and the Hindus!\(^{287}\) \footnote{\textit{Their testimony will be recorded and they will be questioned!} (43:19).}

Then he said: “The Book of Allāh from beginning to end, the Sunna of His Prophet ﷺ from beginning to end, the totality of the words of the Companions and the Successors, and the words of the rest of the Imāms are replete either with explicit stipulations (\textit{nass}) or literal expressions (\textit{zāhir}) that Allāh is above everything (\textit{fawqa kulli shay'}) and on top of everything (‘\textit{alā kulli shay}'), and that He is above the Throne (\textit{fawq al-’arsh}) and above the heaven (\textit{fawq al-samā‘}).”\(^{288}\) In the course of this statement and again towards the end, he said: “He is literally (\textit{haqiqatan}) above the Throne.” Elsewhere he attributed the same words to the Salaf.\(^{289}\)


\(^{288}\) Ḥamawīyya (p. 216) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:12).

\(^{289}\) Ḥamawīyya (p. 232) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:15). Abū Zahra said in Tārikh al-Madhāhib al-İslāmiyya (p. 320-322): “The ‘Salafis’ and Ibn Taymiyya assert that settledness takes place over the Throne [...]. Ibn Taymiyya strenuously asserts that Allāh descends and can be above (\textit{fawq}) and below (\textit{taḥt}) ‘without how’ [...]. and that the school of the Salaf is the literal affirmation of everything that the Qur’ān stated concerning aboveness (\textit{fawqiyah}), belowness (\textit{taḥtīyah}), and establishment over the Throne.”
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purpose is precisely to effect such an interpretation. For he has
redefined “explicit” to mean other than what is patent, by mis-
representing his own terms as constituting explicit texts. Now,
which verse in the entire Book of Allāh forms an explicit text for
his viewpoint?
CHAPTER ONE

The Fallacy of His “Proofs from the Quràn”
and the Ḥashwiyya’s Self-Contradictions

The first proof he forwarded is the saying of Allāh ﷺ: {Unto Him the good word ascends (yasʿ adu)} (35:10).290 [46] Where in the verse, I ask, is the “explicit text” that says Allāh is in the heaven or on the Throne?

Moreover, the practical purpose of his using this verse for a proof is that it indicates the height (ʻuluw) implied by ascent (ṣuʿūd).291 How far off the mark! The dunce of scholasticism has tumbled in the mire. For how can ascension literally apply to words when the literal meaning of ascension can only be the attribute of bodies? Therefore, the sense of ascension here is none other than acceptance (al-qabūl), without an inkling of boundary or location.292

290 Ḥamawiyya (p. 216) = Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā (5:12).
291 “Allāh has made Himself exalted over the heaven (ʿalāʿ alayhā) with the ʻuluw of sovereignty (mulk) and authority (sulṭān), not movement (intiqāl) or displacement (zawāl).” Al-Ṭabarî, commentary on the verse: [Then turned He (thumma istawā) to the heaven] (2:29).
292 See article “Unto Him the Good Word Ascends” in our Sunna Notes series.
Then he followed up with the saying of Allāh ﷻ: \textit{I am gathering you and raising you (rāfī'uka) unto Me} (3:55).\textsuperscript{293} I do not know how he inferred the idea that Allāh is above the Throne from this verse. Was this inference on the basis of sameness (muṯābaqa), or implication (taḏammun), or logical necessity (iṅlīzām)? Or is it something he obtained through miraculous unveiling (kašf) or inspiration in his innermost (al-naṣṭhu fil-rū')? Perhaps he believes that elevation (al-rafi‘) can only be in the upward direction? If this is what occurred to him then this, also, is inconceivable except in corporeal and dimensional terms. If he holds other than that, then his inference is not on a literal basis at all. If he actually asserts corporeality and dimensionality, then there is no need to point out his error. Perhaps he never heard of elevation being used in the sense of rank and the attainment of status in the language of the Arabs and in common usage. Perhaps he never heard the phrase “Allāh raised So-and-so’s state.”\textsuperscript{294}

\textsuperscript{292} Hamawiyya (p. 216) = Majmū' al-Fatāwā (5:12).
\textsuperscript{293} The commentaries indicate that the sense of \textit{raising you unto Me} is: “raising you to My heaven.” Cf. the Tafsīrs of al-Ṭabarī (aḥkāmhu ilā ma‘a ‘inda... fa huwa ‘inda hu ‘indahu fil-samā‘), al-Qurtubi (rafa‘ahu ilā al-samā‘), al-Nasafi (“raising you to My heaven and to the abode of My angels”), al-Bayḍāwī and Abū al-Sū‘ū’d (“to the place of My munificence and the abode of My angels”). Al-Tha‘alibī said: “It denotes his being moved from lowness to height (min suflin ilā ‘ulūw) but its ascription unto Allāh is an ascription of honor. In any case, it is categorically known that Allāh Most High is not circumscribed in any direction.”
Then he followed up with the saying of Allāh  ﻷ: \textit{(Have you taken security from Him Who is in the heaven that He will not cause the earth to swallow you)} (67:16), restricting the meaning of “him” to Allāh alone.\footnote{Hamawiyya (p. 216-217) = Majmū' al-Fatāwā (5:12-13).} Perhaps he does not allow that its meaning is the angels of Allāh. Perhaps he denies that the angels do such things, and that Gibrīl  ﻷ caused the earth to swallow the people of Sodom. Consequently he used this verse for his proof, and it may be the “explicit text” he was referring to.\footnote{Al-Mahalli in Tafrīr al-Jalālayn: \textit{(From Him Who is in the heaven)}: “From Him Whose authority and power are in the heaven.” Al-Qurṭubi: “From the Creator of those who are in the heaven.” Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Tafrīr (3:69): “It is the anthropomorphists who used this verse to claim that Allāh Himself is in the sky.” Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalūsī said the same thing in his Bahr al-Muhīt (8:302) and Nahr al-Mādī (2:1131-1132). Al-Nawawī in his commentary on Ṣaḥīh Muslim agreed with al-Qāḍī ʿIyād that the words “in the heaven” are interpreted figuratively. Al-Zamakhsharī: “From Him Whose sovereignty is in the Heaven.” When “Whose sovereignty” is omitted the pronoun “Him” remains instead. There are many instances of this turn of speech in the Qurʾān: “And ask the town,” that is: “And ask the people of the town”; “And your Lord came,” that is: “And your Lord’s order came” cf. “Interpreting Allāh’s Words ‘He Who is in the Heaven’” in Islamic Beliefs and Doctrine According to Aḥl al-Sunnah (p. 144-148). See also above, n. 273 and below, §78 and n. 326.}

Then he followed up with the saying of Allāh: \textit{(The angels and the Spirit ascend (ta’ruju) unto Him)} (70:4).\footnote{Hamawiyya (p. 217) = Majmū' al-Fatāwā (5:13).} Ascension (ʿurūj) and ascent (suʿūd) are one and the same meaning. There is no proof in this verse that the ascension is to a heaven or to a throne or to any of the things which [47] he has claimed whatsoever. For the literal meaning of “ascension” used in the language of the Arabs refers to the displacement appropriate to material bodies (al-aqṣām). The Arabs do not know any other meaning of the word. Would that he had openly declared the material sense and relieved himself from the trouble of covering it up!
Then he followed up with the saying of Allāh: \{They fear their Lord from above them (min fawqihim)\} (16:50). This also fails to provide a proof for him pertaining to a heaven or a throne, least of all in literal terms.

Aboveness (fawqiyya) is used in two senses:

(a) As a relation between one material body and another, one being higher and the other lower, so that the bottom of the higher one is above the top of the lower one. This sense of aboveness is never invoked by non-anthropomorphists. If we suppose it applied – without saying that Allāh is a body – then why would it not be possible to say that “above them” modifies “they fear”? The sense would then be: “They fear from above them their Lord.” That is, they fear what comes from above them and whatever punishment may come from that direction.

(b) In the sense of rank (al-martaba) just as it is said: the caliph is above the sultan, and the sultan above the emir. It is also said: So-and-so sat above So-and-so; knowledge stands above deeds; the dyeing process is above the tanning process. This sense applies in the saying of Allāh: \{And We have raised some of them above (fawqa) others in rank\} (43:32), in which case they did not mount one another’s shoulders. Again, in His saying: \{We are in power over them (fawqa-hum)\} (7:127), the Copts were not mounted atop the shoulders of the Israelites nor on their backs.²⁹⁹

²⁹⁸ Ḥamawīyya (p. 217) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:13).
²⁹⁹ “He is high and elevated over the heaven with the height (‘ulūw) of sovereignty and power.” Al-Ṭabarī, commentary on the verse \{Then turned He (thummā istawā) to the heaven, and fashioned it as seven heavens\} (2:29). See also the discussion on aboveness in our article, “The Ḥadith of the Mountain Goats” in Sunna Notes.
He followed up with the saying of Allāh ﷻ: {The Merciful established Himself over the Throne} (20:5). This has been mentioned in six other passages of the Book of Allāh and forms the main and strongest basis on which the anthropomorphists stand. They even wrote it above the entrance of the mosque in Hamadhan. We now turn our efforts to clarifying the issue.

We say: [48] Either they set reason aside in every aspect of every case, ignoring what is called understanding (fahim) and comprehension (idrāk), which is quite acceptable if they merely say: {The Merciful established Himself over the Throne} (20:5). But if they trespass this point and venture to say: "He is established over the Throne" (innahu mustawin ‘alā al-‘arsh), then fie upon them! For Allāh ﷻ never said it. Add to this that there is near agreement among the rhetoricians (‘ulamā’ al-bayān) that the verbal noun is more affirmative in meaning than the verb. If the Hashwiyya say: "The verse indicates that He is above the Throne," then they have abandoned their own precondition [of not probing meanings] and indulged in contradiction, caprice, and impudence.

Should they say: "We do retain the role of reason and we do understand the meaning of the verse," we ask them: What is the meaning of istiwa‘ in the language of the Arabs? If they say: "Sitting (al-julūs) and settlement (al-istiqrār)," we reply: The Arabs do not know this meaning except in relation to bodies,

---

300 Hamawiyya (p. 217) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:13).
302 In strict conformity with the rule of the Salaf, “its explanation is its recitation” without adding anything else.
303 E.g. the verbal noun mustawin is more affirmative than the verb istawa‘. However, the claim that Allāh ﷻ is mustawin is forbidden because His Names and Attributes are non-inferable. See our articles "The Divine Names are Tawqīfiyya: Ordained and Non-Inferable" and "Istiwā’ a Divine Act" in our Sunna Notes series.
therefore go ahead and say: A body established itself on the Throne. If they reply: “It is a type of sitting and settledness that is attributed to the Essence of Allāh just like sitting is attributed to a body,” then the Arabs do not know this meaning. Therefore, it cannot be the literal meaning.

The Arabs also understand *istiwā’* as the straightness of the arrow-shaft and the antonym of crookedness. The Ḥashwiyiyya invoke this meaning to exonerate themselves of the charge of attributing a body to Allāh. At the same time, they close the door to any explanation other than “sitting.” Yet they do not close the door when it comes to the saying of Allāh: {And He is with you wheresoever you may be} (57:4) and {We are nearer to him than his jugular vein} (50:16). So you Ḥashwiyyya should not say that Allāh is with us “with His knowledge.” If you say that, then why do you allow this [interpretive method] one time and you forbid it the next? And how do you know that *istiwā’* is not one of His acts in connection with the Throne? If they say: “This is not in the language of the Arabs,” then we reply: Neither is the meaning of *istawā’* which you yourselves forward – unless we apply it to a body. 304

Then the impostor tried hard to extricate himself from the snare of anthropomorphism by claiming that Allāh is in a direction [49] but that He established Himself over the Throne “with a kind of establishment that befits His Majesty.” 305 We say to him: You have moved to our position concerning *istiwā’*; but as for direction, it does not befit His majesty.

304 Cf. Ibn al-Jawzi in *Daf’ Shubah al-Tashbih* (1998 al-Kawthari repr. p. 23): “Whoever interprets {and He is with you} (57:4) as meaning ‘He is with you in knowledge,’ permits his opponent to interpret *istiwā’* as ‘subduing’ (al-gahr).”
Then he criticized the saying of the Scholars of kalâm that if Allāh were in a certain direction, He would be either greater, smaller, or equal to something, all of which possibilities are absurd. He said: “They [the Scholars of kalâm] did not grasp the meaning of {over the Throne} except as the meaning they assert for any material body over any other body whatsoever. What they cited as an inevitable consequence stems only from that understanding. But an istiwa’ which befits His Majesty does not necessitate any such consequence.”

We answer: Are you from Tamîm one day and from Qays another? If you assert an establishment which befits His Majesty, then this is the position of the kalâm scholars. But if you are speaking of an establishment that consists in settledness and a specific direction as opposed to another direction, then that will not in any way help deliver you from what we already said [about its consequences being anthropomorphism], nor from the [Ash‘arî] explanation of the establishment as “establishing dominion” (istiţâ’).

I bear witness before Allâh concerning this verse, that it never came down to us except to reveal Divine magnificence, power, dominion, and sovereignty! The Arabs use istiwa’ as a metonymy (kinâya) for sovereignty (mulk), for they say: “So-and-so established himself on the royal throne,” even if he never once sat on it, for they mean sovereignty thereby.

As for the saying of the Ḥashwiyya: “If you explain istiwa’ as istilâ’ then the specific mention of the Throne becomes irrelevant, for the establishment of His dominion is true over all things created, without restriction to the Throne,”

---

307 These names denote two different sets of grammatical rules in Arabic.
308 Cf. words attributed to al-Ash‘arî, Ḥamawiyya (p. 504-505) = Majmû‘ (5:96-97), but see Imâm Ahmad’s explanation below (notes 342, 371).
to this is: Because the Throne encompasses all things created, it is precisely then that the establishment of dominion over it is the establishment of dominion over all of them. No other object possesses this quality. Moreover, the Arabs' use of it as a metonymy – as we just said – makes this the most probable explanation.

As for their objecting: "The meaning of 'establishing dominion' (isti̇lā') can only be over something which one defends from attack." We reply: The meaning of 'sitting' can only apply to a body, and yet you said that you do not hold He is a body.

If they had described Him [50] in terms of "the Establishment over the Throne" (al-isti̇wā' ‘alā al-'arsh) we would not have objected to them for it, but we would consider this merely to resemble tashbih or coming dangerously close to it. And Allah is the Grantor of success.

The impostor then produced, as another one of his proofs, the saying of Allah reporting Pharaoh's words: {O Hamān! Build for me a tower that haply I may reach the roads, the roads of the heavens, and may look upon the God of Mūsā} (40:36-37).

I truly wonder how he understood from Pharaoh's words that Allah Almighty is above the heavens and above the Throne so that the God of Mūsā can be looked upon! For Allah did not mention that the God of Mūsā is in the heavens. Let us hypothetically say that this can be understood from Pharaoh's words. How can he produce as a proof Pharaoh's idea and

---

309 This objection was made by Dāwūd al-Zāhirī and was rejected by al-Rāghib, Ibn Baṭṭāl, and Ibn Hajar among others cf. our article "Isti̇wā' is a Divine Act" in Sunna Notes.
310 I.e. just as you hold that He is not a body although He sits, so do we hold that He is not facing any defense despite His istilā'. On the interpretations of isti̇wā' as istilā' by Ash'aris and as "sitting" (ja'ilū) by the anthropomorphists, see "Isti̇wā' is a Divine Act."
311 Because "the Establishment" implies anthropomorphism more remotely than to say "the Establishment of Allah." In addition, the latter is an inadmissible inference, since the Attributes are non-inferable.
312 Hamawiyya (p. 217) = Majmā' al-Fatāwā (5:13).
understanding, concerning whom Allāh said that {the evil that he did was made fair-seeming unto Pharaoh, and he was debarred from the right way, and his plot ended but in ruin} (40:37)?

Also, when Pharaoh asked Mūsā: {And what is the Lord of the worlds?} (26:23), Mūsā did not broach the concept of direction. He only mentioned the most specific of Attributes, namely, the power of Allāh to invent and create.313 If direction were established as true, it would have been more appropriate to make it known! For sensory indications are among the strongest means of cognition, both in terms of sensory perception and common usage.

Furthermore, Pharaoh asked his question in terms of “what.” Therefore, a reply addressing dimensionality (al-taḥayyūz) would have been more to the point than the one that mentions the aforesaid Attribute.

The extent of his [Ibn Taymiyya’s] understanding of this verse, whence he produced his proof, is Pharaoh’s understanding.314 The support of that doctrine is the fact that Pharaoh came up with it, and he is its ultimate authority. I wonder why he did not openly attribute it to him. This would be in keeping with his statement about the doctrine of the leaders of the Community of Muhammad ﷺ – who contravened his beliefs in the matters of dimensionality and direction and whom he counted among the Jahmiyya – that it came from Labid ibn al-ʿAm, the Jew who cast a spell on the Prophet ﷺ.315

313 Mūsā’s reply in the next verse is: {He said: Lord of the Heavens and the earth and all that is between them, if you had but sure belief} (26:24).
314 This is identical to Qādī Ibn al-ʿArabī al-Mālikī’s blaming of the anthropomorphists as those whose imām is Pharaoh: “Your conclusion shows that you are indeed the followers of Pharaoh, who believed that the Creator lies in a certain direction, and so he desired to climb up to Him on a ladder. He congratulates you for being among his followers and he is your imām!” Ibn al-ʿArabī, ʿArīḍāt al-Ahwadḥī (2:235).
315 Narrated from ʿAishah by al-Bukhārī, Muslim, and in the Sunan and Musnads. Labid is
[51] He concluded his review of the noble verses which he pro-
duced as proofs with the sayings of Allâh ﷻ: {A sending-down
tanzîl) from the Wise, the Owner of Praise} (41:42) and {Sent
down from your Lord in truth} (6:114). In neither of these two
verses is there any mention of a Throne (‘arsh), or a Seat of Au-
thority (kursî), or a heaven, or an earth. All that is mentioned is
the sending-down and no more. I have no idea from what evi-
dence the impostor inferred them. One does not infer the
heaven from the sending-down, since the latter can be from the
heaven or from somewhere else.

Indeed, how can one infer from the sending-down of the
Qur‘ān a descent (nuzûl) which consists in displacement from
above to a lower point? The Arabs certainly do not conceive of
such displacement in relation to words, whether the word is an
accident (‘arad) or not. Just as they apply “descent” to mean
displacement, they apply it to mean otherwise also. This agrees
with what was mentioned in the Book of Allâh: {And We sent
down iron, wherein is mighty power} (57:25) and {He has sent
down for you of cattle eight kinds} (39:6). No one sighted a piece
of iron coming down airborne from the sky, nor a camel
gliding down from the heaven to the earth. Therefore, just as he

identified as the source of Jahmî doctrine by the scholars, cf. Ibn Kathîr, al-Bîdâya wal-
Nihâya (9:382, 10:21). By categorizing the Ash‘arîs together with the Jahmiyya, Ibn
Taymiyya in his Fatawâ (and Ibn al-Qayîm in al-Nâmîyya) purports to cast the leading
authorities of Ahl al-Sunna as Jewish infidels. See below, n. 343, 376 and 378. He followed
in this Ibn Ḥazîm’s rabidly anti-Ash‘arî stance cf. al-Dhahabi, Siyar A‘lâm al-Nubalâ’
(Fiqh ed. 13:131) and Ibn al-Subki, Ṭabaqât al-Shâfi‘iyya al-Kubrá (3:384-385, 399-423;

317 I.e. whether words are the created words of human beings or the Divine uncreated
Speech, in both cases they do not move about in space. And Allâh knows best.
318 Iron does come down from the sky according to the theory of nucleosynthesis,
invisibly to the naked eye. Nevertheless, this is not what verse 57:25 means since the
“sending down” means the same Divine act of creation as in 39:6 as per Ibn Jahbal’s
demonstration.
allowed that "descent" here means other than displacement from high to low, let him allow it there also.

This is the last of the evidence he produced from the Glorious Book. He had claimed, first of all, that he but said what Allâh ﷻ said, and that the verses that he mentioned were proofs to that effect either as an explicit stipulation (naṣṣan) or as a literal meaning (zâhiran). If the reader considers this claim of his [52] then carefully scrutinizes what we said, examining these verses one by one, he will not find in them a single word which conforms with what he claimed – neither as an explicit statement, nor as a literal meaning. A fortiori, every matter after the Book of Allâh ﷻ is subject to falsification.
CHAPTER TWO

The Fallacy of His
“Proofs From the Sunna”

He then produced as a proof from the Sunna the ḥadīth of the Prophet’s Ascension (al-Mi’rāj). But at no point in the ḥadīth of the Ascension does it literally say that Allāh is above the heaven or the Throne. There is not one word in the ḥadīth to that effect! He did not even attempt to quote the ḥadīth of the Ascent nor show with clarity the supposed proof so that we could answer him on it. If he had clearly shown the place of his inference, we would have let him know the clear answer to it.

319 Ḥamawīyya (p. 218) = Majmū’ al-Fatāwā (5:13). “If it is asked: Does the event of Mi’rāj indicate that the Exalted Who is worshipped is in the above direction, since He raised him up in the direction of aboveness? The answer is: There is no such indication in it. Rather, the Pre-Eternal One does not have a ‘towards’ nor a limit (layṣa lāhu nauṭwān wa-lā hadd). Nor is there any link (ittīsāl) between Him and creatures, nor any separation (infiṣāl) from them. Being in a place with relation to Him is an absurd impossibility (muḥāl). He was – Exalted is He! – when there was no place, and He is now exactly as He ever was. He is the One Whom no injury overtakes and to Whom no distance applies.” Al-Qushayrī, al-Mi’rāj (p. 70). See also al-Mālikī’s comments in Wa-Huwa bil-Uṣūq al-A’lā, chapter titled “al-Mi’rāj wa-Shubhāt al-Makān” etc. (p. 246-251).

320 Much of tafsīr thrives on a similar imprecision with regard to the evidence. Instead of being provided with clear proofs, the reader is tasked with imagining them himself through the anthropomorphic grid. This process can be observed in page after page of Ibn Taymiyya’s discourse on the Divine Attributes.
Then he adduced as a proof the descent of the angels from the Divine Presence. The answer to this is that the descent of the angels from the heaven is only due to the fact that the heaven is their abode. As for their being-in-the-Divine-Presence (al-‘indiyya), it does not indicate that Allāh is in the heaven. For it is also said, concerning human Messengers: “They come from Allāh” (innahum min ‘ind Allāh), although they did not descend from the heaven. This said, “being in the presence of Allāh” may mean superlative honor and eminence. Allāh said: {Lo! he [Dāwūd] had access to Our presence and a happy journey’s end} (38:25). ‘Ind is also used in another sense, as the Prophet said, quoting his Lord: “I am according to (‘ind) My servant’s opinion of Me.”

Then he mentioned the ascent of the angels once more, apparently strengthening his spine and raising his hopes with the wording {unto their Lord} (6:38, 6:51, 6:108) where “unto” (ilā) presumably signifies arrival at one’s destination in the sense of crossing a distance. This tacit assumption of his shows that he does not speak the language of the Arabs. For the Arabs do not understand distance except as that through which bodies move, whereas he claims they do not say that. Also, the Intimate Friend (al-Khalil) of Allāh said: [I am going unto my Lord] (37:99) but this, by general agreement, is not in the sense of arrival which the impostor meant. How then does he dare bring up such a meaning in relation to the Book of Allāh as would not be acceptable even for a lone-narrated report?

321 Ḥamawiyya (p. 218) = Majmū’ al-Fatāwā (5:13).
322 Narrated from Abū Hurayra by al-Bukhārī, Muslim, al-Tirmidhī, and Ahmad; and from Wāthila ibn al-Asqa’ by Ibn Hibbān (2:401-405 §633-639), al-Ṭabarānī in al-Kabīr (22:210) and al-Awsat, and others.
323 Ḥamawiyya (p. 218) = Majmū’ al-Fatāwā (5:13).
Then he mentioned the saying of the Prophet ﷺ: “Do you not trust me when I am trusted by the one/those who is/are in the heaven (man fil-samā’), and news from him/them comes to me morning and evening?”

The meaning of man fil-samā’ is not Allāh Almighty, nor did the Prophet ﷺ mention that it was. He did not specify Allāh ﷻ. How then did the impostor decide that what was meant by man is not [53] the angels? For they are the greatest of all creatures in knowledge and the most apprised of the nearness of Allāh ﷻ. They know well that the Prophet ﷺ is trusted, and he holds that rank among them. Let the impostor know that there is nothing in the hadith to contradict this, nor is there anything in it to support what he claimed.

Then he mentioned the ḥadīth of the invocation for healing (ruqya): “Our Lord, Allāh, in the heaven hallowed be Your Name! Your command comes to pass in the heaven and the earth, just as sustenance from You is in the heaven.”

---

325 Cf. §51 above.
326 Ibn Hajar said: “Al-Kirmānī (d. 668) said: “The literal meaning of (the one who is in the heaven) is not meant, for Allāh is transcendent beyond indwelling a place. However, since the direction of elevation is nobler than any other direction, Allāh predicated it to Himself to indicate the loftiness of His Essence and Attributes.” Others than al-Kirmānī addressed in similar terms the expressions that came down concerning aboveness (jawqiyya). Fath al-Bāri (1959 ed. 13:412). See the discussion on aboveness in our article, “The Hadiths of the Mountain Goats” in the Sunna Notes series.
327 A very weak ḥadīth because of its narrator Ziyād ibn Muḥammad al-Miṣrī who is “discarded” (ma‘rūk). Narrated from Abū al-Dardā’ by Abū Dāwūd, al-Ṭabarānī in al-Kabīr, al-Ḥakīm (1:344 and 4:218 with a very weak chain as indicated by al-Dhahabī), and al-Bayhaqī in al-Azmi (al-Ḥashidī ed. 2:327 §892) thus: The Prophet ﷺ said: “Whoever among you is afflicted by something or is told by his brother of the latter’s affliction, let him say: ‘Our Lord, Allāh, in the heaven hallowed be Your Name! Your command comes to pass in the heaven and the earth. As Your mercy is in the heaven, let it be on earth. Forgive us our trespasses and our sins. Verily You are the Lord of the Righteous.”
that this hadith is authentic, then what the Prophet ﷺ mentioned is: “Our Lord, in the heaven hallowed be Your Name.” He did not stop after “in the heaven.” On what basis, therefore, should we stop after it and make “hallowed be Your Name” a new clause? Did the Prophet ﷺ do this or order it?

Accordingly, the impostor finds no other issue but to say: “The Name of Allāh ﷻ is hallowed both in the heaven and the earth, so why specify heaven?” But we also ask him: Why did you yourself specify the heaven in your argument?

Further, what is the meaning of “hallowed” (taqaddasa)? If it is a declaration of Transcendence (tanzih), then that is neither in a heaven nor on earth. For the declaration of Transcendence is the negation of defects – meaning something unrelated to man-giness and dust. The meaning would be that creatures hallow [Him] and declare [His] Transcendence. There is no doubt that the inhabitants of the heaven absolutely all declare His Transcendence, just as there is no doubt that some among the inhabitants of the earth do not. Instead, the latter set up rivals for Him and describe Him with what does not befit His Majesty. Therefore, the distinction of “the heaven” in relation to the hallowing is because of the distinction of the totality of its inhabitants in declaring Divine Transcendence. Allāh ﷻ singles Himself out in His sovereignty on the Day of Judgment, without any of those who imagined that they possessed sovereignty, and says: [Owner of the Day of Judgment] (1:4). Similarly, He said, after the

Send down a mercy from Your mercies and a cure from Your cure on this ailment.’ Then he will be cured.” Ḥāmid (17:183 §23839) and al-Ḥākim (4:243) narrate something similar, mursal from Fadlā ibn ʿUbayd al-Anṣārī. All these narrations have weak or very weak chains, as does al-Nasāʾī’s from Fadlā from Abū al-Dardāʾ in the Sunan al-Kubrā (6:257) and ʿĀmal al-Ŷām wal-Layla. Al-Nawawī left it out of the Adhkār while Ibn al-Qaysarānī included it in his index of forgeries, Tadhkirat al-Mawdūʿāt (§756). Ḥamawiyya (p. 220-221) = Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā (5:13).
destruction of those who claimed sovereignty and wealth: {Whose is the sovereignty this Day? It belongs to Allāh, the One, the Almighty} (40:16).

Then this impostor repeated what he said from the start until he stated: “Therefore, let one say: ‘Our Lord Who is in the heaven.’” [54] He said this, stopping at the Prophet’s words “in the heaven.” I ask, did any of the Scholars of Islām say or hold that it was permissible to do such a thing? Or is this anything other than a deluded suggestion that the master of Prophets actually said: “Our Lord is Allāh Who is in the heaven”?  

Concerning the hadith of the mountain goats (ḥadīth al-aw’al) and its wording whereby “the Throne is above all this, and Allāh is above all this,” this is a narration with which they frequently deceive the common people by claiming that they only say what the hadith says. They inject it into their rhetoric and do not leave a single propaganda-session of theirs (da‘āwī-him) except that they grace it with it. We shall make it very clear that they do not, in fact, subscribe to a single letter of it, nor do they have a firm basis upon which they can say that Allāh is literally above the Throne. On the contrary, they contradict that proposition.

328 See below, §120-126.
CHAPTER THREE

Parenthesis: His Understanding of the Withness (ma‘iyya) and Height of Allah

What makes their contradiction manifest is the conclusion of the impostor’s discourse, which we quote by jumping ahead:

Let no one think that this contradicts the literal (zāhir) meaning of the saying of Allah: {And He is with you wheresoever you may be} (57:4) or that of the Prophet’s saying: “Whenever one of you stands to pray, [let him know that] verily, Allah is in front of him,” and the like. That would be an obvious mistake. For Allah is both literally with us (Allah ma‘anā haqiqatan) and literally above the Throne (fawqa al-‘arshi haqiqatan) [!]. He has coupled (jama‘a) the two facts

330 Narrated from Ibn 'Umar by al-Bukhārī and Muslim. The continuation of the hadith states, “Therefore let no one spit in front of him in prayer.” Al-Khaṭṭābī said, as cited by al-Bayhaqī, Asma‘ (Kawthari ed. p. 465-466; Hāshīdī ed. 2:397-399) and al-Nawawī, Sharḥ Sahīh Muslim (5:38): “Meaning, the direction which Allah has enjoined upon him to face in prayer is before his face.” Al-Bayhaqī, op. cit.: “Meaning, the reward of Allah for that worshipper descends upon him from the direction he is facing.” Ibn Ḥājar, Fath al-Bārī (1989 ed. 1:669): “The hadith also constitutes a refutation of those who say that Allah is on the Throne ‘in person.’” Cf. al-‘Iraqī, Tarḥ al-Tahrīb (2:380-386).

331 This is a leitmotiv of Ibn Taymiyya. Elsewhere in his Fatāwā he states: “Allah is with us in reality, and He is above His Throne in reality (Allāhu ma‘anā haqiqatan wa huwa fawqa al-‘arshi haqiqatan)[...]. Allah is with His creation in reality and He is above His
together by saying: [He it is Who created the heavens and the earth in six days, then He established Himself over the Throne. He knows all that enters the earth and all that emerges therefrom and all that comes down from the sky and all that ascends therein; and He is with you (ma'akum) wheresoever you may be. And Allâh is Seer of what you do] (57:4).  

85 The impostor then blurted this out with his own mouth, without any concealment or hesitation: “Allâh has therefore informed us that He is above the Throne and is with us wherever we are, just as the Prophet said in the hadîth of the mountain goats: ‘And Allâh is above the Throne and He knows what you do.’”  

86 The reader can see that this impostor has claimed that Allâh is “above the Throne in reality” and has produced as his proof the verse: {Then He established Himself over the Throne} (57:4), construing it as a statement from Allâh that He is above the Throne. Whereas [55] any person of sound intellect and upright mind knows that the wording {established Himself over the Throne} is not literally synonymous with the wording “above the Throne.” We demonstrated that previously.  

87 Nor is there anything in the verse indicating the coupling (al-jam’) which he claimed [i.e. “both above the Throne and with us”], nor did he explain the concept by which this coupling provides a proof. All he did was to quote a verse from the Book of Allâh – one does not know whether he memorized it or copied it from a volume of the Qur’ân. Then he compared the Throne in reality (Allâhu ma’a khalqihi haqiqa wa-huwa fawqa al-‘arshi haqiqa)!” Majmû’ al-Fatîwâ (5:103).  


333 Hamawiyya (p. 519) = Majmû’ al-Fatîwâ (5:103). None of the more than twenty-three versions of the hadith has the wording “Allâh is above the Throne” except al-Ajurris in al-Shari’a (p. 298 §676). See note 329 above and the article, “The Hadîth of the Mountain Goats” in our Sunna Notes series.  

334 Cf. supra, §54 to §65.
probative force of the verse in question with the hadith of the mountain goats – in his own words – “just as the Prophet ﷺ said: And Allāh is above the Throne.” But the reader can see that there is nothing in this hadith indicating [His] being-with-us (al-

ma‘īyya), nor even the least mention of the word “with” (ma‘a) to begin with.

He said:

If “with” is used in the absolute sense, then its literal meaning in the Arabic language is none other than “association” (al-

muqārana) in the absolute sense, without necessity of contact or being-alongside, whether from the right or from the left. 335

When “with” is restricted to a given meaning, then it stands for association within that meaning. For example, it is said: “All during our trip the moon was with us and the stars were with us.” 336 It is also said: “These effects are with us,” in the sense that they accompany you, even if they are located above your head. Therefore, Allāh is not with His creation

---

335 This premise is at noticeable variance with the definitions of the lexicographers and grammarians which suggest materiality as the fundamental tenor of such association. Among the lexicographers, al-Fayruzābādī in al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ gives the two primary meanings of mu‘a as the conjoining or combining of something with something (damn al-shay‘ ilā al-shay‘) and accompaniment (al-muṣāhāba), both of which suggest “contact or being-alongside,” while Ibn Manzūr in Līfīn al-‘Arab states an identical definition: “A word which combines something with something else, it is a noun which means companionship” (kalīmatun taqūmmu al-shay‘ ilā al-shay‘i wa-liyya ismun mu‘a nāhu al-suḥba).

Among the grammarians, al-Mālaqī (d. 702) in Rāṣf al-Mābānī (p. 394) states that its meaning is “accompaniment” (al-muṣāhāba), while al-Mu‘ādī (d. 724) in al-Fanā al-Dānī (p. 306) states it as “a noun for the place or time of the act of accompaniment according to whatever befits the construct” (ismun li-makān al-‘istihlāb aw waqti‘ alā hasab mā yaliqu bi-mudāf ‘ilayh). Ibn Taymiyya’s deviation from these definitions is exposed by Ibn Jahbal (§98).

336 Another leitmotiv of Ibn Taymiyya, used in his ‘Aqīda Wāṣītiyya and elsewhere, where he compares Allāh Most High to the moon and the sun in order to prove that the reading of the being-with-us of Allāh to mean “with His knowledge” is a literal and not a figurative interpretation. Cf. his discussion of the verses of ma‘īyya (57:4, 58:7, 20:46, 9:40 etc.) §84-97. Ibn Jahbal then refutes these views (§98-103).
except in reality, and He is not above His Throne except in reality. This said, “being-with-something” has different stipulations according to context. Allāh said: {He knows all that enters the earth and all that emerges therefrom and all that comes down from the sky and all that ascends therein; and He is with you wheresoever you may be. And Allāh is seer of what you do} (57:4). The literal meaning of this discourse indicates that the stipulation of this “being-with” and its requirement is that He is aware of you and knows about you. Hence, the meaning of the Salaf’s statement: “He is with them in His knowledge.” And that is both the letter of the text and its real sense (żāhir al-khiṭāb wa-ḥaqīqatuḥu).

He continued:

Similarly, this applies to the sayings of Allāh ﷻ: {There is no secret conference of three but He is their fourth, nor of five but He is their sixth, nor of less than that or more but He is with them wheresoever they may be} (58:7), [56] {Grieve not. Lo! Allāh is with us} (9:40), {Lo! Allāh is with those who keep their duty unto Him and those who are doers of good} (16:128), {Lo! I am with you twain, Hearing and Seeing} (20:46). A boy’s father may say to him from the top of the roof: “Do not be afraid, I am with you!” These are all cases of “being-with” that dictate stipulations according to context.

Let the observer understand well the manner of this impostor in the preceding instances and note the glibness of his language in promoting his goals.

---

337 Ḥamawīyya (p. 519-520) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:103).
338 Ḥamawīyya (p. 520-521) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:104).
339 Ibn Jahbal points to Ibn Taymiyya’s mixing together true premises (cf. al-Junayd’s and al-Nūrus’s explanations of ma‘īyya above, §27 and n. 269) and false ones (cf. §88, §86) in order to reach outlandish conclusions.
Then he said: “There is a difference between ‘being-with’ on the one hand and, on the other, what is essentially understood from its meaning, which varies according to different contexts.” Let the observer understand this sentence which is neither in Arabic nor in a non-Arabic language. Glory to Him Who is glorified in various tongues!

Then he said: “The term ‘with’ has been used in different places of the Book and the Sunna, each place dictating something which the other did not dictate.” These are his exact words. “Therefore,” he said, “either the proofs that ‘with’ provides differ according to these different contexts, or they form a combined single value shared by all its contexts, even if each one differs from the other in something specific.” Go then and understand this impostor’s subdivisions and circumvolutions! Then he said: “In either case, its exigence (muqtaḍāḥā) is never that the Divine Essence be intermixed with creation in order that one must say: it is diverted from its literal meaning.”

Then he said further down:

Whoever realizes that ‘with’ is used in construct with [the name for] every different kind of creature – just as, for example, lordship is used in construct with [the name for] every different kind of creature – while īstīwā’ over something is

---

341 Ḥamawīyya (p. 521) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:104). Ibn Qudāma similarly claimed that the literal meaning (zākīr) of “with” in such verses was “with His knowledge,” “with His protection,” “with His support,” etc. so that these meanings can no longer be called figurative interpretations (ta‘wil). Then he conceded that even if they were, they are only in reiteration of the Salaf’s ta‘wil. Dhamm al-Ta‘wil (p. 43 §93-97). Thus the Hanbalis concede that the Salaf practiced ta‘wil in certain cases, although they prefer not to give it that name. To the Ash‘arīs, these are all clearcut cases of figurative interpretation (ta‘wil) without need for apology and confirmed by Arabic usage, as indicated by Ibn Jahbal.
used for the Throne and nothing but the Throne;\textsuperscript{342} and that Allah is described with literal height (‘uluw) and aboveness (fawqiyya), never lowliness (sufül) nor belowness (taḥtiyya) – neither real nor figurative – will realize that the Qur’ān means just what it means (al-Qur‘ān ‘alā mā huwa ‘alayh) without distortion (taḥrīf).\textsuperscript{343}

94 Let the observer understand well these dogmatic premises [57], these composed, assertive expressions, as restricting istiwā‘ to the Throne is something no rational person ever held save an ignorant one!

95 Then he said: “Whoever imagines that Allah is in the heaven in the sense that the heaven surrounds and contains Him is a liar if he claims to report it from someone else and misguided if he believes it of his Lord. We never heard anyone understand it thus from those words, nor saw anyone report it from anyone else.”\textsuperscript{344} Let the observer be notified that understanding can be heard!

\textsuperscript{342} Compare this with Imam Aḥmad’s lofty explanation of istiwā‘ whereby “[Allah] is above everything and He is exalted over everything but He specified the Throne because of its particular significance which makes it different from everything else, as the Throne is the best of all things and the most elevated of them.” Ibn Abī Ya‘lā, Tabaqāt al-Hanābila (2:296–297). Cf. below, note 371.

\textsuperscript{343} Ḥamawiyya (p. 523) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:105-106). This is a rhetorical platitude, as everything “means just what it means” anyway. The actual aim here is to bring up the word taḥrīf, the Qur’ānic word used in relation to those who distorted the Scripture revealed to them (2:75, 4:46, 5:13, 5:41). By this device Ibn Taymiyya assimilates figurative interpretation to the act of Christian and Jewish interpolators. This is similar to his conflating the interpretation (ta‘wīl) of Ash‘arīs with the nullification (ta‘fīl) of Mu‘tazilis and their subsects or his reference to Labīd; the important thing for him being to represent Ash‘arīs as non-Sunnīs. This is the method revived by Muḥammad Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb and parroted by the “Salafīs” in our time.

\textsuperscript{344} Ḥamawiyya (p. 523) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:106).
He said:

If all Muslims were asked whether they understand from the words of Allāh and those of His Prophet that “Allāh is in the heaven” in the sense that it contains Him, each one of them would hasten to say: “Such a thing would have never occurred to us.” If this is the case, then it is abnormal to make the literal meaning of an expression mean something absurd which no one thinks it means, and then turn to interpret it figuratively. Rather, the Muslims hold that Allāh is in the heaven and that He is on the Throne in one and the same sense, for by the heaven is meant nothing other than height. The meaning is therefore that Allāh is in the heights, not at the bottom.

Thus spoke the impostor. Let the observer read and reread the above enormity (fal-yuthni al-nāzi’u ‘alā hādhihi bil-khanāṣir) and bite upon it with his very jaws, and know with certainty that the folk {ruin their houses with their own hands and the hands of the believers} (59:2). He said:

The Muslims have long since known that His kursī – exalted is He! – encompasses the heaven and the earth, and that the kursī, in comparison to the ‘arsh, is like a ring thrown into a desert, and that the Throne is but one of the creations of

---


347 Narrated with very weak chains as part of a long ḥadīth from Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudri by Ibn Hibbān (2:77 §361 isnād da’if jādīdan), Abū Nu‘aym (1:166-168), al-Bayhaqī in the Sunan (9:4), and Abū al-Shaykh in al-‘Azhama (2:547, 2:570, etc.) but Ibn Ḥajar in Fath al-Bārī (13:411) said Sa‘īd ibn Mansūr narrated it in his Sunan (3:951 §425) with a sound mursal chain from Mujāhid – a maqṭū‘ report.
Allāh unrelated to <other than>\textsuperscript{348} His Might and Magnificence. How then can anyone imagine, after all this, that something created can confine or contain Him? Allāh said: \{\textit{I shall crucify you “in” (fī) the trunks of palm trees}\} (20:71), and \{\textit{Do but travel “in” the earth}\} (3:137, 16:36), [both] in the sense of “on.” There are other such examples, and this an Arabic idiom used in the real sense, not figuratively. [58] This is well-known by those who know the literal meanings of words \textit{(haqāiq ma’nā al-ḥurūf)}, and the fact that they\textsuperscript{349} are at par \textit{(mutawāṭi‘ā)} for the most part.\textsuperscript{350}

Here ends his reasoning.

\textsuperscript{348} \textit{Ilā}. This word was apparently blanked out from the original text of the \textit{Hamawiyya} as indicated in al-Tuwayjirī’s critical apparatus and must have existed in some copies exclusively of others cf. below, §115-116. The \textit{Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā} has “and that the ‘Throne is but one of the creations of Allāh, not a pointer to His Might and Magnificence” (lā nisbatan ilā qudratillāhi wa-‘azamatih) while al-Tuwayjirī amends it to read, “and that the Throne is but one of the creations of Allāh which has no relation to His Might and Magnificence” (lā nisbata lahu ilā qudratillāhi wa-‘azamatih).

\textsuperscript{349} \textit{I.e.} literal meanings and the words that stand for them, a literalist creed applied by Ibn Taymiyya to the prepositions “with” (\textit{ma‘}), “over” (\textit{‘alā}), “above” (\textit{fawq}) etc. See notes 335 and 341 above.

\textsuperscript{350} \textit{Hamawiyya} (p. 524) = \textit{Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā} (5:106).
His Peculiar Understanding of "with," "in," "above" and "on"

First, we ask: What is the meaning of your statement: "The word 'with' (ma‘) in the Arabic language is for 'association' (al-muqārana) in the absolute sense, without contact or being-alongside?" What is "association?" If one does not understand, by that word, anything but automatic corporeality (al-jismiyya), then the purpose [of anthropomorphism] has been reached. And if one understands other than that, then let us know so, and see for yourself whether the Arabs understand corporeality from the word muqārana or not.

To his statement "When 'with' is restricted to a given meaning, it stands for 'association' within that meaning" we reply, who has decreed such a rule in such a case?

To his claim that in all these passages "association" denotes knowledge we reply, from where did you deduce this? If he says that he deduced it from the saying of Allāh: {There is no secret conference of three but He is their fourth} (58:7), claiming that this verse indicates "association" in the sense of knowledge, and claiming that the "association" is nevertheless real, we reply: You
have allowed yourself plenty of room to maneuver, so do the same for us! Know that just as the word “above” (fawq) is used for height in a certain direction, similarly, it is used for height in rank, authority, and sovereignty. The same applies with “establishment” (istiwa’). These dual senses go hand in hand, exactly as you said.\(^\text{351}\)

Take, for example, the statements of Allāh: \{He is the Omnipotent over (fawq) His slaves\} (6:18, 6:61); \{The Hand of Allāh is above (fawq) their hands\} (48:10); in the mouth of Pharaoh’s people: \{We are in power over (fawq) them\} (7:127); and \{We have raised some of them above (fawq) others in rank\} (43:32). It is known that the direction of height is not meant here. Therefore, look into the matter a second time and say, also, that “above the Throne” \(^\text{59}\) is in the sense of establishing dominion (istiwa’).

The same applies with the hadith of the mountain goats. Whatever you did with “with” (ma’), do it with “above” (fawq) also. Bring out these meanings here as you have brought them out there, or else leave everything alone.

To his saying: “Whoever realizes that ‘with’ is used in construct with [the name of] every different kind of creature, just as, for example, ‘lordship’ is used in construct with [the name of] every different kind of creature, while istiwa’ is over the Throne and nothing but the Throne,” we reply: Give us only a glimpse, in support of what you say, of a single person that uses “with” and knows – without evidence – all that you say. For you have certainly not established any proof for the above. All you did was to loudly assert a wording whereby fawq positively signifies istiwa’ in the sense of height. I wonder, how do you know that “association” in the sense of “knowledge” is a literal sense,\(^\text{352}\) and

\(^{351}\) Cf. article, “The Ḥadith of the Mountain Goats,” in our Sunna Notes.
\(^{352}\) As opposed to a metaphorical sense.
that the verse of *istiwā‘* over the Throne and the hadith of the
mountain goats point to the Attribute of Lordship as real
aboveness? O Allâh, forgive me! Such knowledge can only come
from miraculous unveiling (*kashf*)! Otherwise, the proofs which
Allâh has brought forth to make known His Essence, His Attri-
butes, and His Laws – of such proofs the impostor has not cited
a single letter in support of whatever he claims. He has no firm
foothold except in the abyss.

As for his saying that “Allâh is not described with lowliness
nor belowness whether real or figurative” – O wonder! Whoever
made such a claim in the first place that he should busy himself
discussing it?

As for his saying further: “Whoever imagines that Allâh is in
the heaven in the sense that the heaven surrounds and contains
Him is a liar if he claims to report it from someone else and
misguided if he believes it of his Lord.” O impostor! Say what
you understand, and understand what you are saying. Address
people rationally and in the speech of rational persons so that
you will benefit them and benefit from them. If you yourself are
trying to infer the meaning of direction from the word “in” (*fî*),
and interpret it in its real sense, then is anything other than the
quality of place understood from it, or some related meaning?
And since this is the case, does any thinking person conceive of
the quality of place as separate from the concept of surround-
ing – whether in part or in whole – or whatever presupposes it?
Was this ever heard of?

Or [has anyone heard] of one who ventures that “in” is lite-
rally in a certain direction, but that neither containment nor
encompassment, in part or in whole, is understood thereby? If
your purpose is to have people suspend the use of their brains
so that you alone can speak while they imitate you blindly and acquiesce, then expect that one of those in charge of punishing [60] the violators of this Community will summon you for your act and convict you of wrong-doing!\footnote{353}

As for your saying: “If all Muslims were asked whether they understand from the words of Allāh and those of His Prophet that ‘Allāh is in the heaven’ in the sense that it contains Him, each one of them would hasten to say: ‘Such a thing would have never occurred to us.’” We reply: What do you mean by the above? If you mean to say that this expression does not yield that meaning, then I defy you to ask an expert in the language of the Arabs about it.\footnote{354} He will certainly not confirm your claim that this expression does not yield that meaning, since “in” is a circumstantial preposition which, in its real or proper sense (‘alā haqīqatihi), denotes direction.

But if you mean to say that rational minds reject such a representation of Allāh ٱللَّهُ, then we agree with you only in affirming the same, and in rejecting all that may falsely suggest imperfection with regard to Allāh Almighty.

As for your saying: “The Muslims hold that Allāh is in the heaven and that He is on the Throne in one and the same sense,” you must not attribute that discourse to anyone besides yourself and those from whom you have received this disgraceful belief. Do not, through such speech, misrepresent the Muslims as perpetrating absurdities.

\footnote{353} This prediction proved true, as it was written before the series of trials and imprisonments to which Ibn Taymiyya was subjected until his death.

\footnote{354} Ibn Taymiyya believed himself a greater expert in the Arabic language than Sibawayh, for which the grammarian Abū Hayyān abandoned him cf. Ibn Ḥajar’s notice on Ibn Taymiyya in al-Durar al-Kāmīna (1:153).
CHAPTER FIVE

His Understanding of the Heaven to Mean “the Height”

Then you used—as your proof that Allāh being “in the heaven” and His being “on the Throne” are one and the same sense—the claim that “by ‘the heaven’ is meant nothing other than height, meaning that Allāh is in the heights, not at the bottom.” Tell me: Did Allāh ﷺ, His Prophet ﷺ, or the First and Foremost among the Emigrants and Helpers ﷺ ever say such a thing as “Allāh is in the heights, not at the bottom?”

In fact, everything you said from the beginning of the introduction to the end, if it were conceded to you, its gist would be that Allāh ﷺ said of Himself that He established Himself over the Throne, and that Allāh ﷺ is above the Throne. As for the claim that by the heaven is meant the height, you were not so fortunate as to substantiate it with narrations from the authorities.

As for your saying: “The Muslims have long since known that His kursī encompasses the heaven and the earth, and that [61] the kursī, in comparison to the ‘arsh, is like a ring thrown into a desert”—I wonder: if the ḥadīth of the mountain goats indicates
to you that Allah ﷻ is above the Throne, then how do you reconcile it with the ascent of the angels to the heaven where Allah is? And how can He be, at the same time, in the heaven in reality?

Perhaps you will say: “What is meant by the two is the direction of height, which reconciles the two.” In this case I ask: After such a reconciliation (tawﬁq) which is devoid both of Divine prescriptiveness (tawqif) and success (tawﬁq), how can you say that Allah ﷻ is literally (haqiqatan) in (ﬁ) the heaven, and literally above (fawq) the heaven, and literally in (ﬁ) the Throne, and literally on (‘alà) the Throne?

Further, the real sense of “heaven” (al-samā’) is this visible phenomenon which one calls by its name without in the least thinking in terms of altitude (al-sumū). As for the derivation [al-samā’ < al-sumū], then the heaven has no particular distinction for it over “the roof” or “the clouds.”

Then there is your subsequent saying: “The Throne is but one of the creations of Allah unrelated to other than the Might and Magnificence of Allah.” Our copy indeed states “unrelated to other than the Might and Magnificence of Allah” (lā nisbata lahu illā qudrat Allāh wa-‘azamatahu). If this is correct, then you have denied the existence of the Throne and claimed that “direction” is in fact “Might and Magnificence.” Your words would then mean: “The direction of Allah is His Might and Magnificence.” Now you have become incoherent; and no one ever said this.

But if what you actually said was “unrelated to the Might of Allah and His Magnificence” (lā nisbata lahu ilā qudratillāh wa-‘azamatihi), then you have spoken fairly and truly, for whoever said otherwise?355 Upon my life! We have overhauled this passage for you and taught you how to improve it.

355 I.e. the Throne, despite being the greatest of all creations, does not compare with Allah’s uncreated Attributes.
Then you said: “Can anyone imagine, after all this, that something created can confine or contain Him?” Precisely! And from where or what does all our trouble come if not from those who claim confinement or suggest it?

Then you said: “Allâh said: [I shall crucify you “in” (fî) the trunks of palm-trees] (20:71).” Have you not understood that placement in the sense of settledness (al-tamakkûn al-istiqrârî) definitely takes place on the crucifixion trees? So the placement of the crucified on the tree-trunk [62] is like a circumstantial placement (katamakkun al-kâ’in fil-zarf). The same rule applies to the saying of Allâh ﷺ: {Do but travel “in” the earth} (3:137, 16:36).

What we have mentioned so far is a reply to the hadîth of the mountain goats, the hadîth of the seizure of the soul, and the hadîth of ‘Abd Allâh ibn Rawâha ﷺ.

356 I.e. it can never be compared with a Divine Attribute.
357 See above, §§83-87, 102-103, 112.
358 “[…] The soul exits [the body] then is taken up to heaven and its gates are opened for it […] until it ends up in the heaven where Allâh is (al-samâ al-latî fîhâ Allâh).” Narrated from Abu Hurayra by Ibn Mâjah and Ahmad with a sound chain. Cited in Ibn Taymiyya, Hamawiyya (p. 226).
359 A dubious report adduced by Ibn Taymiyya in his Hamawiyya (p. 227) that the Companion ‘Abd Allâh ibn Rawâha ﷺ pretended reciting to his wife, as if from the Qur’ân, the poetic verses: “I bear witness that the promise of Allâh is true and that the Fire is the abode of the disbelievers / and that the Throne hovers on top of the water and on top of the Throne the Lord of the worlds.” Then the Prophet ﷺ supposedly heard of it and approved. Narrated by Ibn ‘Asâkir (28:112-115) with weak, broken (munqâtî) chains missing up to three links and/or containing liars or raconteurs (ikhbârî) cf. al-Dhahabi in his Ulûw (Saqqâf ed. p. 202 §64=p. 42; not found in Mukhtaṣar al-‘Ulûw) and Siyar (Risâla ed. 1:238) while Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr cites it without chain in al-Iṣti‘âb (3:900-901=2:296) as well as Ibn Qudâma in al-Mughni (9:314, 10:411) and al-‘Ulûw (p. 145-150) and Ibn al-Qayyîm in his apology of anthropomorphism entitled Îfîmâ’ al-Juyûsh al-Islâmiyya (p. 121-122). Al-Dârâqutni’s version in his Sunan (1:121) does not contain any of the above wording nor does Ibn al-Jawzi’s in al-Adhkyâ’. See also al-Kawthârî’s comments in his marginalia on al-Sayf al-Ṣaqîl (p. 125).
As for the report of Umayya ibn Abī Ṣalt and what he said in poetic verses:

*Give laud to Allāh for He deserves laud!*
*Our Lord is in the heaven ever magnified!*

((Majjīdū-l-Lāhā fahwa lil-majdi ahlū Rabbunā fil-samāʾi amsā kabīrā))

Our answer to the impostor is: If you narrate the above only up to “is in the heaven” without following up with “ever magnified,” then perhaps it will suggest exactly what you are claiming – except that both the meter and the rhyme will disappear! Therefore, since Umayya said “Our Lord is in the heaven ever magnified,” say, also, just what he said. In the latter case, one cannot tell whether it is as you said or rather as he said, namely, that Allāh is truly magnified in the heaven.

Now, if you say: “He is also magnified on earth, so why was the heaven singled out?” We reply: It is a kind of emphasis to which we have already referred. Its meaning is that the glorification of the inhabitants of the heavens is greater than that

---

350 Narrated without chain higher than al-Asma’ī (fl. 216) by Ibn ‘Asākir (9:277) although Ibn Taymiyya in the Ḥamawiyya (p. 228-229) attempts to concatenate it with the sound narration from al-Sharīd ibn Suwayd in Muslim that Sharīd recited to the Prophet up to one hundred lines of poetry by Umayya. Ibn Ḥajar said in al-Isāba (1:133 §549): “There is no contest among the authorities in history that Umayya ibn Abī Ṣalt died an unbeliever.” Ibn al-‘Arabi said in ‘Āridat al-Ahwadhī (2:235): “They say: What about Umayya ibn Abī al-Ṣalt who said: ‘Glory to Him Whom creatures are unable to know in the way He deserves to be known, Who is on His Throne, One and One Alone, Sovereign and Possessor over the Throne of Heaven, unto Whose Majesty faces are humbled and prostrate?’” and he had read the Torah, the Bible, and the Psalms.’ We say: It is just like you and your ignorance to cite as proof, first Pharaoh, then the discourse of a pre-Islamic Arab supported by the Torah and the Bible, which have been distorted and changed! And of all of the creation of Allāh, the Jews are the most expert in disbelief and in likening Allāh to creation.”

351 See above, §80-81.
of those on earth. For there is none among the angels who makes sculptures out of stone for worship, nor are there any perennialists (dahriyya) among them, nor nullifiers-of-the-Attributes (muʿattila), nor anthropomorphists.

Umayya was addressing the Arab pagans who had taken Hubal, Manāt, al-Lāt, al-ʿUzzā, and other deities for worship, and the same Arabs knew that the inhabitants of the heaven were more knowledgeable than them. They even held in authority the utterances of the oracle who would seize from the jinn whatever news the latter pilfered from the angels, to which the oracle would add a hundred lies. Therefore, their belief in the angels goes without saying. This is not far-fetched nor is there any other definitive explanation of the poetic verse.  

[63] Then he said: “It must be obligatorily known that the Prophet ﷺ, who is conveying the call on behalf of Allāh, has imparted to his Community – who are summoned [to that call] – that Allāh ﷺ is on the Throne and that He is above the heaven.”

We reply: This is not authentic in the explicit evidence. What the Prophet ﷺ imparted to his Community is that Allāh ﷺ established Himself over the Throne. That is what has been mass-transmitted from the conveyance of the Prophet ﷺ.  

---

362 There is also a relevant narration in Abū Nuʿaym, Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa (p. 376-379 §275) containing the words: “Allāh – in the heaven is His Throne and on earth His dominion […]”

363 Ḥamawiyya (p. 231) = Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā (5:15). This claim comes straight from ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd al-Dārīmī (d. 280) book against the Jahmiyya as shown in the following note.

364 Al-Dhahabi reiterated this position in the Siyar: “In his book al-Naqd he [ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd al-Dārīmī] said: “The Muslims all agree that Allāh is above His Throne, above His heavens.’ I say: The clearest thing on this topic is the saying of Allāh: (The Merciful established Himself over the Throne) (20:5). Therefore, let it pass as it came, just as we learned to do from the school of Salaf.” Siyar (10:643).
As for the reports to which this impostor is referring, they are solitary reports (āhād) which do not command the authenti-
cating authority of a massive gathering of narrators. There is no
proof for him in such reports.365 This is very clear to whoever
has heard the Prophet’sﷺ words and construes them according
to Arabic usage and linguistic precedents, without introducing
foreign elements into them.

Then you said: “Just as Allāh has created innocent the totality
of nations, both Arabs and non-Arabs, in the time of Ignorance
and in Islām, except those whom the devils seduced away from
innocence.”366 This talk is objectionable from beginning to end
because it is tendentious and insidious.367

Then you said: “The Salaf have spoken, concerning this, what
amounts to hundreds or thousands of statements if I were to
gather them.”368 We reply: If you mean by Salaf the predecessors
of those who liken Allāh to creation – as shown further in your
discourse – then perhaps this is the case. But if by Salaf you
mean the pious Predecessors of this Community, then no, not
one letter nor the tip of a letter! We are going to follow your
trail, passage by passage, topic by topic, with the Help of Allāh
and His Might.

Then you said: “There is not, in the Book of Allāh, nor in the
Sunna of His Messenger ﷺ, nor in the reports from any of the
Salaf of the Community – whether the Companions or the Suc-
cessors – a single letter that contradicts this, neither as an expli-
cit text (naṣṣ), nor as a literal one (zāhir).”369

367 I.e. these are loaded terms by which Ibn Taymiyya depicts himself in optimal terms
while demonizing those who contradict him.
368 Ḥāmawīyya (p. 232) = Majmūʿ al-Fatawā (5:15).
369 Ibid.
We reply: What you are claiming is not found anywhere in them, whether as an explicit text or a literal one.

You had begun by saying that you are merely repeating what Allāh ﷻ, His Prophet ﷺ, and the First and Foremost among the Emigrants and Helpers ﷺ said. Then it became apparent that what you meant by “the First and Foremost among the Emigrant and Helpers” was the teachers of your doctrine. So you have divested the Ten [who were promised Paradise] and the veterans of Badr [64] and al-Hudaybiya from their foremostness as well as the Successors from their Successorship! Yet no less than Allāh has taken them all as Friends. {Allāh knows best with whom to place His Message} (6:124).

Then you said: “None of them ever said that Allāh ﷻ is not in the heaven (fīl-sama), nor that He is not on the Throne (‘alā al-‘arsh), nor that He is in every place, nor that all places are the same in relation to Him,” nor that He is ‘neither inside the

---

370 See above, §39 and §110.
371 The belief of the Hashwiyya is that the greater the altitude, the nearer one is to Allāh. ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd al-Dārimī al-Sijzī (d. 280) said in his Naqd al-Jahmiyya (Cairo, 1361/1942 p. 100): “Who told you that the top of the mountain is not closer to Allāh than its bottom? [...] The top of the minaret is closer to Allāh than its bottom.” Al-Kawtharī wrote in his Maqalāt (p. 314) “According to the author the tall man is closer to Allāh than the short one, and so is the one who flies a plane in comparison to those on the ground. The nearest to Him would then be the astronauts. However, this is contrary to the teaching of our religion, whereby the servant of Allāh is closest to Him when in prostration.” Al-Ash‘arī said: “He is above the Throne and the Heavens and above everything to the limits of the earth with an aboveness which does not bring Him nearer to the Throne and the Heavens, just as it does not make Him further from the earth. Rather, He is Highly Exalted above the Throne and the Heavens, just as He is Highly Exalted above the earth. Yet He is near to every entity and is nearer to [the worshipper] than his jugular vein and He witnesses everything.” Al-Ash‘arī, al-Ibāna, (Maḥmūd ed. 2:21= Sabbāgh ed. p. 35). This passage is missing in its entirety from the original 1321/1903 Hyderabad edition and the ‘Uyūn edition. The same meaning is reported from Imām Ahmad. Abū al-Fadl al-Tamīmī related that Imām Ahmad said: “Allāh is ever Exalted (‘āli) and Elevated (ra‘ī) without beginning, before He created the Throne. He is above everything (huwa fawqa kulli shay), and He is exalted over everything (huwa al-‘āli ‘alā kulli shay). He only specified the Throne because of its particular significance which makes it
world nor outside it nor connected (muṭṭaṣil) nor separate (munfaṣil).”

We reply: you have overreached yourself in this claim and said something that lies beyond the compass of your knowledge. We have already mentioned to you sufficient material in the reports from Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, al-Junayd, al-Shibli, Jaʿfar ibn Nuṣayr, and Abū ʿUthmān al-Maghribī. If you cast aspersions on the veracity of our transmissions or on these Masters, then we also cast aspersions on the veracity of your transmissions, especially those reported from persons known to support your doctrine. For no one besides them supports your doctrine.

Furthermore, it is you who have said what Allāh never said, nor His Messenger, nor the First and Foremost among the Emigrant and Helpers, nor the Successors, nor the Teachers of the Community, who do not come up with fancies. None of them uttered one letter saying that Allāh is in the direction of height. You have said and declared and discussed and understood that whatever was found to the effect that He is “in the heaven,” “above the heaven,” “on the Throne,” and “above the Throne,” actually all means the direction of height! Tell us, who ever said such a thing? Did Allāh say it, or His Prophet, or the First and Foremost, or the excellent Successors? Then why do you try to intimidate us with gibberish? In Allāh is our Help!

different from everything else, as the Throne is the best of all things and the most elevated of them. Allāh therefore praised Himself by saying that (He established Himself over the Throne) (20:4), that is, He exalted Himself over it (ʿalayhi ʿalā). It is impermissible to say that He established Himself with a contact or a meeting with it. Exalted is Allāh above that! Allāh is not subject to change, substitution, nor limits, whether before or after the creation of the Throne.” Ibn Abī Yaʿlā, Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila (2:296-297).


See above, $25-34.

See above, §96.
Then he produced as proof for the permissibility of sensory signaling (*al-ishāra al-hissiyā*) towards Allāh with fingers and the like, the sound report of the Prophet's words in the 'Arafāt sermon: "Have I not conveyed the Message?" To which they replied yes; whereupon he raised [65] his finger toward the heaven then pointed it at them saying: "O Allāh! Bear witness," and he did so more than once.\(^{375}\)

But how does this ever prove that it is permissible to point to Him? Was anything reported from the Prophet \(\的喜爱\) other than that he raised his finger and then pointed it at them? Is there in this any proof that when he raised his finger he was indicating the direction of Allāh \(\喜爱\) with it? To claim so only shows the extent to which talk about direction has seized hold of this man's mind. It has reached a point where, if he hears some difficult question about the laws of inheritance, or wills, or the rulings concerning menses, he will say: "This indicates direction!"

\(^{375}\) Narrated from Jābir by Muslim, Abū Dāwūd, and Ibn Mājah. *Hamawiyya* (p. 233) = *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (5:15). "He meant by this to take Allāh to witness over [the acknowledgment of] the people." Ibn al-Athir, *al-Nihāya* (5:111). This is similar to the moving of the forefinger towards the Ka‘ba in *tashahhud* in which the Muslim "proclaims tawḥīd with his hand, his tongue, and his heart" (al-Nawawi). Other versions from Abū Bakra al-’Thaqafi, Ibn ‘Umar, Abū Sa’id al-Khudri, Ibn Mas‘ūd, Jābir, Abū Ghāḍiya, and others in the *Sahihayn, Sunan*, and Ahmad omit mention of the raising of the finger toward the heaven.
His Rhetoric
Against the Mutakallimûn

Then he committed his foulest enormity and darkest deed yet. He said:

If the truth really is what those aforementioned deniers\(^{376}\) are saying, who use those expressions and similar ones\(^{377}\) quite apart from what is understood from the Qur’ân and Sunna explicitly or literally, then how can it be possible for Allâh, for His Prophet ﷺ, and for the Elite of the Community to speak constantly in explicit and literal utterances that contradict the truth? How can they not ever disclose the truth in which it is obligatory to believe, nor ever point to it, neither explicitly nor literally? How can they leave it to the Nabateans among the Persians and Byzantines and to the seedlings of the Hindus\(^{378}\) to expound true Islamic doctrine for the

---

\(^{376}\) *I.e.* the scholars of *kalâm*. Ibn Taymiyya imitated Ibn Hazm in deliberately conflating the Ash’aris with non-Sunnis and non-Muslims as we pointed out (n. 220, 315 and 343).

\(^{377}\) *I.e.* in figurative interpretation.

\(^{378}\) The Tuwayjiri edition of the *Hamawiyya* has “the Jews” instead of “the Hindus” but does have Ibn Taymiyya’s comparison of the Muslim theologians to “the Hindus and Greeks, the heirs of the Zoroastrians and pagans, the wayward Jews and Christians, the
benefit of the Community and represent it as the belief that is obligatory for every legally responsible and wise person?

Truly, if this were the case, then obligatory belief would be what those artifical scholars of kalām say, who became the slaves of their minds, and the habitual rejection, on the basis of their rational guidelines, of whatever the Book and the Sunna show explicitly or literally. In that case it would be preferable to leave the people without the Book or the Sunna! That would be of greater guidance and benefit to them in such a scenario. Nay, the mere existence of the Book and the Sunna would be a source of pure harm [66] in the foundations of the Religion! For the truth of the matter, according to what they say, would be thus: “O host of the servants of Allāh! Do not seek to know Allāh Almighty, nor whatever behooves Him of Attributes – those He may not possess and those He must possess – from the Book and the Sunna and the Predecessors of the Community. Rather, see for yourselves. Then, whatever you find unsuitable for Him according to your wits, do not describe Him as such.”

Then he said:

They are two parties. Most of them say: “Whatever your minds cannot prove firmly, deny it!” while some of them say: “Neither confirm nor deny it.” They say: “Whatever the guideline (qiyās) of your minds rejects and {over which you

Sabeans, and their likes [...] the Brahmans, the philosophers – the pagan ones, the Zoroastrians, and some of the Sabeans” elsewhere (p. 214-215 and 237). These passages are typical blind defamations of the Muslim scholars who contradict Ibn Taymiyya in doctrine, specifically Ashʿarīs such as al-Rāzī and Ibn al-Juwaynī then, more generally, non-literalist or anti-literalist scholars of kalām including the Māturidis and Muʿtazilis. In the next section he assimilates them to the Christians.

are in disagreement) and disquiet among yourselves – more than any other disagreement on the face of the earth – then deny it. Always refer to the guideline of your minds in the Lawgiver’s presence, for verily that is the Truth wherewith I chose that you should worship Me. Whatever is mentioned in the Book and Sunna in contradiction of that guideline of yours, or in affirmation of something your minds are unable to grasp – as applies with most of them – then know that I am testing you by revealing it to you. This is not in order that you take guidance from it, but so that you should exert yourselves in elucidating it in the light of linguistic oddities and outlandish terms and rarities of speech, without resigning (muḥawwīdīn) knowledge of it to Me <and, at the same time, negate that it signifies anything in connection to the Attributes>.” And that is the truth of the matter concerning the stance of the scholars of kalām.

That is what he said, in the place where he fell into a fit and {the devil prostrated him by his touch} (2:275).

---

380 An implicit comparison to the Christians (cf. Qurʾān 3:55, 5:48, 8:165, 16:92, 22:69, 43:63), as is the phrase “more than any other disagreement on the face of the earth.”

381 At this point the text shifts to free indirect discourse.

382 Ḥamawiyya (p. 236) = Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā (5:17). Ibn Jahbal omitted the bracketed segment but the meaning is clear: to Ibn Taymiyya, anyone who resigns the meaning of the Attributes to Allāh Most High without understanding them according to externalities is a nullifier (muʿtātil). He intensifies the detraction of the scholars of kalām to comic excess: They resemble everything except Muslims (“Nabateans”, “Greeks”, “Hindus”, “Zoroastrians”), are the most divided sect in existence (“more than any other disagreement on the face of the earth”), are dull-witted for the most part (“as applies with most of them”), and both pedantic (“linguistic oddities and outlandish terms”) and presumptuous (“without resigning knowledge of it to Me”), and have replaced the Qurʾān and Sunna with their minds. The Ashʿari School after Ibn Taymiyya threw most of this elaborate demonization right back at him.
CHAPTER SEVEN

The Absurdity of His Literalism

We say to him: What do you say concerning the mention of the “several eyes” (aʿyun),[383] the mention of the “flank” (janb),[384] the

[383] {Build the ship under Our Eyes and by Our inspiration} (11:37); {Make the ship under Our eyes and Our inspiration} (23:27); {Surely you are before Our Eyes} (52:48); {That sailed before Our Eyes} (54:14). Cf. ʿAlaʾal-Dīn al-Bukhārī’s commentary on al-Pazdawī’s Kāshf al-Asrār (1:60): “Allāh is described with the Attribute of Face and that of Hand, together with the upholding of His Transcendence (tanzīl) beyond having a form (ṣūra) and a limb (jāriḥa).” Also: Al-Bayhaqī: “The meaning of ‘The All-Seeing’ (al-Baṣīr) is He Who perceives the objects and colors which creatures perceive with their sights, without His having the organ of eye.” Al-Asmāʿ wal-Ṣifāt (al-Kawthari ed. p. 45; Hāshidi ed. 1:122-123). Al-Ghazzālī: “He sees without pupil or eyelids” as quoted in the Reliance of the Traveller (p. 820). Al-Qurtubī: “We know from the saying of Allāh [and there is nothing whatsoever like Him] (42:11) that His Eyes do not consist in pupils.” Al-Asnāf fi Sharḥ Asmāʿ Allāh al-Husnā (2:79). Al-Qurtubī’s “Salaf” editor comments: “Rather, we assert two eyes for Allāh without saying how, and this is the doctrine of the Salaf.” The doctrine of the “two eyes” is also asserted by Ibn ʿUthaymin in his commentary on Ibn Taymiyya’s al-Waṣifa. On the contrary, the Salaf let the verses pass according to their actual wordings without altering them, in this case, to read “two eyes.” Al-Khaṭīb said: “As for what pertains to the Divine Attributes, whatever is narrated in the books of sound reports concerning them, the position of the Salaf consists in their affirmation and letting them pass according to their external wordings while negating from them modality (kayfīyya) and likeness to things created (tashībih) [...]. We do not say that they are organs (lā naqūlu innaḥā jawāriḥ).” Narrated by al-Dhahabi with his chain from Muhammad ibn Marzuq al-Zaʿfarānī in Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ (13:598) and Tadhkīrāt al-Huffāz (3:1142-1143) from al-Khaṭīb’s epistle al-Ṣifāt. We quoted something similar from al-Baghwā’s Sharḥ al-Sunnah in our note on tafwīd (supra, note 11). Ibn Ḥaẓm said, “To say that He has two eyes is null and void and part of the belief of anthropomor-
mention of the single “shin” (ṣāq), and the mention of the anthropomorphists […]” Ibn Ḥazm, al-Fīṣāl fil-Mītal (2:166). Today’s anthropomorphists continue to insist on the attribution of two eyes without proof, adding the Prophet’s statement, “The Antichrist (al-dajjāl) is one-eyed whereas your Lord is not one-eyed” [Narrated from Ibn ‘Umar in al-Bukhārī, Muslim, and the Sunan], but ignoring or pretending to ignore that Aḥl al-Sunnah explained this statement metaphorically to mean that Allāh is exempt of defects and of the attributes of creatures while the Antichrist is both created and imperfect cf. Ibn Ḥajar, Fatḥ al-Bārī and al-Nawawī, Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim. Ibn al-Jawzī said of the anthropomorphists: “They affirm that Allāh has a form and a face in addition to His Essence, two eyes, a mouth, a uvula, molar teeth, a physiognomy, two hands, fingers, a palm, a little finger, a thumb, a chest, thighs, two legs, and two feet.” Daf’ Shubāh al-Tashbīḥ (beginning).

[Cf. Alas, my grief that I was unmindful of the side of Allāh] (39:56). Al-Bayhaqī in al-Asmā‘ wal-Ṣifāt (2:209 §772) narrates with a sound chain from Mujāhid the explanation of this verse as: “What I wasted of His commands.” Al-Bukhārī cited this explanation in his Ṣaḥīḥ in the book of Ḥanā’īs, chapter on the merit of following a funeral. It is also the explanation given for ḟanj (“flank” or “side”) by al-Rāghib al-Asfahānī in Muṣrūdāt Aḥfāz al-Qur‘ān. Al-Dhahabi in the Siyar (13:368-369 §3988) criticized the anthropomorphic understanding of the Mālikī Abū ‘Umar al-Ṭalāmankī (d. 429) who mentioned the verse in a chapter named “The Side of Allāh” in his book on doctrine: “I saw a book of his on the Sunna in two volumes, most of which is good, but in some chapters is found what none would ever agree with, for example: ‘Chapter on the Side of Allāh in which he mentioned: Alas, my grief that I was unmindful of the side of Allāh,’ This is a scholar’s lapse!” The latter phrase alludes to a hadith narrated from Abū al-Dardā’ whereby the Prophet said: “I fear three things for my Community most of all: the lapse of the scholar, the disputation of a hypocrite about the Qur‘ān, and those who deny Divine Foreordained Destiny.” Al-Haythami said in Majma‘ al-Zawā‘id: “Al-Tabarānī narrates it in al-Kabīr but its chain contains Mu‘āwiya Ibn Yahyā al-Ṣadafi, who is weak.” There are several other weak narrations for this hadith. In the year 425 fifteen jurists witnessed against al-Ṭalāmankī that he was a Khārijī. He was saved from execution in extremit by the Qāḍī of Saragossa and died four years later, Tadhkirit al-Ḫuffās (3:1099).

[Cf. the Qur‘ānic verse The Day that the shin shall be bared] (68:42). Ibn ‘Abbās explained: “This is a day of affliction and hardship” and in another version: “It means the Day of Resurrection due to its hardship.” Narrated by al-Ṭabarānī in his Taṣfīr (28:38-42), al-Hākim (2:499-500 ḫannā saḥīh=1990 ed. 2:542), al-Bayhaqī in al-Asmā‘ wal-Ṣifāt (Kawthārī ed. p. 345-346=Ḥāshidī ed. 2:183-185 §746-748) with two fair chains and one sound chain according to Ibn Ḥajar in Faṭḥ al-Bārī (1959 ed. 13:428), Ibn Ḥibbān (16:382) with a fair chain according to al-Arna‘ūṭ, al-Qurtībī (18:248-249), al-Ṣaḥābānī (3:310) and al-Shawkānī (5:275-278) and in the Taṣfīrs. Cf. Pickthall’s ad sensum translation: “On the day when affliction befalls them in earnest.” Ibn Qutayba in Muḥtālif al-Ḫadīth states that the baring of the shin is a metonymy for travails in which one hitches up one’s lower garments, barring the legs. Ibn al-Jawzī in Daf’ Shubāh al-Tashbīḥ (p. 15) and Zād al-Masā‘ir (8:341) cites Ibn Qutayba and relates from Ibn ‘Abbās, Mujāhid, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha‘ī, Qatāda, “and the vast majority of the scholars,” the same meaning.
“several hands” (aydī)?\(^{386}\) If we take these literally then we must affirm a being that has one face with many eyes, a single side, many hands, and a single shin! What being on earth [67] is possibly uglier? And if you take the liberty of interpreting this and that to be dual or singular, then why does Allāh ﷺ not mention it, nor the Prophet ﷺ, nor the Salaf of the Community?

Concerning the saying of Allāh ﷺ in the glorious Book, \{Allāh is the Light of the heavens and the earth\} (24:35): every reasonable person knows that the light which is seen on walls, roofs, roads, and courtyards, is not Allāh ﷺ. Even the Zoroastrians never claimed such a thing. If you now take it to mean that Allāh ﷺ is actually the Bringer of guidance and light to the heavens and the earth, then why does not Allāh ﷺ say so, nor His Prophet ﷺ, nor the Salaf of the Community?

There is also His saying, {We are nearer to him than his jugular vein} (50:16) which [taken literally] would require that Allāh ﷺ be located inside the epiglottis! So why does Allāh ﷺ not explain it, nor His Prophet ﷺ, nor the Salaf of the Community?


\(^{386}\) Among the things which Our Hands have fashioned (36:71); We have built the heaven with Hands (51:47). “Hands” (aydī) signifies strength as in Lisān al-ʿArab, Mukhtār al-Sīḥāḥ, Mufradāt Alfāţ al-Qurʿān, and al-Nihāya. See “The Hand of Allāh” in SUNNA Notes.
also said, 'But prostrate yourself and draw near (unto Allāh) (96:19). It is known that “drawing near,” direction-wise, is but a known distance. Why then did Allāh not ordain His Prophet, nor the Salaf of the Community? And He also said, ‘Wheresoever you turn, there is the countenance of Allāh’ (2:115), ‘And your Lord shall arrive’ (89:22), ‘visited their building at the foundations’ (16:26), and ‘Nevs there unto them a new reminder from their Lord’ (21:2).

And the Prophet said, reporting from his Lord: ‘Whomever near Me one hand-span (shibrān) I come near him it (dhirā’an). If he comes near Me one cubit I come near arm’s length (bā’an). If he comes to Me walking, I come running.’

He also said, as authentically related in the Hadith, ‘I find the breath (nafās) of the Merciful coming from the right hand of his Lord: ‘I have furnished you with a strong chain and a chain of trustworthiness’ (al-'A‘lā, 4:273).

Another report states it was narrated from Umar ibn al-Khattāb (10771-10772) and declared it sabih. Ibn Kathīr explained the term: ‘The Prophet said: ‘Mukhtalaf al-Hār wa-Bayānuh’ (198).


Narrat from Isbān in al-Tāhirī (p. 68),
right hand of Allâh on earth.” He also said, reporting from his Lord: “I sit with him who remembers Me.”

With all the above [texts], do you feel secure that the one who attributes a body to Allâh will not tell you, “[Texts with] these outward meanings are in countless abundance, many times the number of the narrations that pertain to direction”?

Therefore, if it is really the case that there is no anthropomorphism, although nothing in all this evidence apparently shows otherwise – not on the part of Allâh, nor on that of the Prophet, nor on that of the Salaf – then the anthropomorphist with the words “your Lord” instead of “the Merciful” from Abû Hurayra by Aḥmad with a strong chain and al-Ţabarâni in Musnâd al-Shâmiyyîn (2:149 §1083) and al-Awsât with a chain of trustworthy narrators per al-Haythami (10:56) and Ibn Abî ‘Âsîm in al-Âhâd wal-Mathânî (4:263). The Ulema saw in this narration a reference to Uways al-Qarâni. Another report states: “Do not curse the wind for it is part of the breath of the Merciful.” Narrated from Ubay ibn Ka‘b by Ibn Abî Shayba, al-Nâsâî in al-Sunan al-Kubrâ (6:232 §10771-10772) and ‘Amal al-Yawm wal-Layla (p. 521), al-Ḥâkim (1990 ed. 2:298) who declared it sahih, and al-Bayhaqi in the Shu‘ab. Ibn Qutayba, Ibn Fârâk, and others explained the term “the Merciful’s nafâs” to mean his rescuing wind respectively in Ta‘wil Mukhtalaf al-Ḥadîth (1972 ed. p. 212=1995 Dâr al-Fikr ed. p. 195) and Mushkal al-Ḥadîth wa-Bayânîh (1985 ed. p. 198).


will give you a dose of your own medicine and say to you, "If you are right, then people would be better guided without the Book or the Sunna!"

If you say, "What is generally established clearly shows meanings other than the outward meanings of the aforesaid texts," then we do not find, in what is generally established, anything that negates anthropomorphism except it also negates direction.

Further, do you feel secure that some reincarnationist (tanāsukhi) will not infer supporting evidence for his doctrine from the saying of Allāh ﷺ, {Into whatsoever form He wills, He casts you} (82:8)? Do you feel secure that some nullifier (muʿāttil) will not infer supporting evidence for what he wants from the saying of Allāh ﷺ, {Of that which the earth grows} (2:61, 36:36)?[^391] In such cases, you would find no way out of that avalanche except through proofs obtained outside the wordings themselves. [69]

The upshot of your words is that the position of the Shāfīʿīs, the Ḥanafis, and the Mālikis makes it inevitable that the people are better guided without the Book and without the Sunna. Do you think they will pronounce you an apostate for suggesting this?

[^391]: *I.e.* by saying that it is by necessity Allāh Most High Who grows it and not the earth. This is correct, but could qualify as nullification of external meanings according to Ibn Taymiyya's method, and his mandatory acceptance of such interpretations could then allow nullifiers to interpret any other verse they wish figuratively, without rules.
CHAPTER EIGHT

His Calumnies Against
the Sunnī Theologians

Then you misconstrued the sayings of the *mutakallimūn* as presupposing that Allāh ﷺ, His Prophet ﷺ, and the *Salaf* of the Community neglected the doctrine of Islām until those [*mutakallimūn*] came along and expounded it. Tell us, then, how did Allāh ﷺ, His Prophet ﷺ, and the *Salaf* expound it? Tell us exactly where they say, as you are saying, that “Allāh ﷺ is in the upward direction, not downwards,” and that it is permitted to point to Him with sensory gestures!

If you do not find this in the *Book of Allāh* ﷺ, nor in the discourse of His Prophet ﷺ, nor in that of any of the Ten [that were promised Paradise], nor in the discourse of any of the First and Foremost among the Emigrants and Helpers, then blame yourself in the strongest terms and say: “I have convicted the scholars through an inconclusive argument.” And even if the argument were conclusive against them, you would be the first to stand convicted.

Then you claimed that the *mutakallimūn* say, “Whatever conforms to a rational criterion, affirm it; otherwise, deny it.”
But they never said that. They only said that it is obligatory to affirm the Attribute of perfection for Allāh ﷺ and that it is obligatory to negate any imperfection with regard to Him.

Just as Imām Ahmad ﷺ said, the [Ash'ari] Ulema said, “Whatever came from Allāh ﷺ and His Messenger ﷺ, examine it in the light of the language of the Arabs, which Allāh ﷺ sent forth Muhammad ﷺ speaking, as He said, {And we never sent a Messenger save with the language of his folk} (14:4). Therefore, whatever the Arabs understood, understand it also; and whoever comes your way bearing something different, toss out his words like an old shoe – into a ditch with the dry weeds.”

If Allāh wills, we shall devote a separate section, after thwarting his satanic insinuations, to the context of revelation that applies to these verses according to the latter [linguistic] directive.

In truth, he has only snatched up all his insinuations against the Congregation of the Muslims and his defamations of the Community of Islām from the dregs of the atheists who attack the Qur’ān. We shall expose their heresy, if Allāh wills. It will be known, at that time, [70] exactly who is one of “the seedlings of the philosophers and the Hindus!”

Indeed, if that heedless person felt any shame, he would have known the status of the people of learning and knowledge in our Community – Allāh have mercy on them. Has he seen anyone else refute the philosophers, the Hindus [or: “the Jews”], the Christians, and the Persians, besides those very ones he calls their seedlings?

And did they ever rely, in their refutations of these sects, on a type of scholar that possesses no mind, no insight, and no understanding? Did they ever put such scholars in charge of proving the existence of Allāh ﷺ in debates with atheists merely

392 A reference to literalist scholars of hadith of which Ibn Taymiyya is the archetype.
through transmitted reports? Or [debating] those that deny Prophethood merely through transmitted reports, so that their adversaries pounce on them and devour them, scoff at them and deride them, and so that enemies might jeer, to the delight of enviers? There is a lesson for the wise in the story of al-Ḥasan ibn Ziyād al-Lu’lu’ī.³⁹³

After this he turned to say that if [outward] meanings were precluded from generalities, they would become ambiguous proofs. We reply: this is just as the anthropomorphists would say to you: “Taking generalities as proofs for negating anthropomorphism is an invitation to double-entendre (ilghāz)!”

Then he went on to say, “O Glory to Allāh! Why did the Prophet ﷺ never say, even one day in his life, nor did any of the Ṣalaf of our Community ever say: Do not believe in what these verses and ḥadiths indicate?”³⁹⁴

The reply to him is: And what, pray, are they indicating, so that they should say not to believe in it? This is the most disgraceful insinuation imaginable! Further, the anthropomorphist

³⁹³ Abū 'Alī al-Ḥasan ibn Ziyād al-Lu’lu’ī al-Kūfī al-Anṣārī (d. 204), one of the major pious and learned Imāms of fiqh who narrated from Abū Ḥanīfa cf. al-Kawthari’s monograph al-Imtā’ bi-Sirat al-Imāmīn al-Ḥasan ibn Ziyād wa-Ṣāḥibīni Muḥammad ibn Shujā’ and the end of his Tuḥf al-Khaṭṭāb. The Shāfi‘ī is relate that one of them asked him: “What if someone, while praying, falsely accuses a married woman of adultery?” Al-Lu’lu’ī replied: “He must repeat his prayer.” The Shāfi‘ī asked: “What about his ablution?” Al-Lu’lu’ī said: “It is still valid.” The Shāfi‘ī said: “What if he bursts out laughing while in prayer?” Al-Lu’lu’ī said: “He must repeat both his prayer and his ablution.” The Shāfi‘ī said: “So the calumny of married women inside prayer is a lighter matter than laughing?” At this point al-Lu’lu’ī stood up and left. Narrated by al-Bayhaqī in Faḍā’il al-Shāfi‘ī (1:217) and Ibn al-Subki in Taḥāqāt al-Shāfi‘īyya al-Kubrā (2:80). But the Ḥanafi position is taken from a Prophetic stipulation that wudū’ is invalidated by uncontrolled laughter (qahqaha) inside prayer and — regardless of the grading of the qahqaha narration — stipulations connected with worship are beyond the province of analogy (cf. al-Lacknawī, al-Fawā'id al-Bahiyya p. 105-106) by Consensus. The point Ibn Jahbal is making by citing this episode is that if even an Imām of fiqh such as al-Lu’lu’ī can become tongue-tied in a debate, then a fortiori those untrained in other than ḥadith narration. And Allāh knows best.

³⁹⁴ Ḥamawiyya (p. 240) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:19).
can also ask you, “O Glory to Allah! Why did the Prophet ﷺ never say, nor did any of the Salaf of our Community ever say that Allah ﷺ is not a body? ﴿Nor did they ever say: Do not believe the apparent meaning of the narrations that suggest anthropomorphism?\rightend{}

[71] Then he invoked, as his proof, the saying of the Prophet ﷺ in which he described the Saved Group as “Whoever clings to my present path and that of my Companions.” ﴿The

395 Ibn Taymiyya would agree with the hypothetical anthropomorphist since he himself actually said in the book he wrote against Imam Fakhr al-Din al-Razi: “It is well-known that the Book, the Sunna, and the Consensus nowhere say that all bodies (ajsām) are created, and nowhere say that Allah Himself is not a body. None of the Imams of the Muslims ever said such a thing. Therefore, if I also choose not to say it, it does not expel me from religion nor from the Sharī‘a.” Ibn Taymiyya, al-Tasīs Radd Asās al-Taqdis = Bayān Talbis al-Jahmiyya (1:11) cf. Minhāj al-Sunnah (Ed. Muhammad Rashid Salim, Mu‘assasat Qurtuba, 1986) 2:205. He also claims in the latter (2:220) that the first to say that Allah is not a body were the Jahmiyya and Mu‘tazila. Al-Ash‘ari in Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyin (p. 211) says precisely the contrary: “Ahl al-Sunnah and the people of Hadith said that Allah ﷺ is not a body.” Similarly al-Kalībādhi in al-Tā‘arruf li-Madhhab al-Taqdis (p. 34-35). Ibn Taymiyya knows this cf. Minhāj (2:326): “Al-Ash‘ari and his early disciples said [...] He is not a body.” Al-Kawthari in his Maqālāt (p. 350-353) comments on the Ta‘sis statement: “These words are complete impudence. What did he do with all the verses declaring Allah ﷺ to be far removed from anything like unto Him? Does he expect that the idiocy that every single idiot can come up with be addressed with a specific text? Is it not enough that Allah ﷺ said: [There is nothing whatsoever like Him] (42:11)? Or does he consider it permissible for someone to say: Allah ﷺ eats this, chews that, and tastes this, just because no text mentions the opposite? This is disbelief laid bare and pure anthropomorphism.” In another passage of al-Ta‘sis (1:101) = Bayān Talbis al-Jahmiyya (1:444) Ibn Taymiyya says: “You [Ash‘aris] say that He is neither a body, nor an atom (jawhar), nor spatially bounded (mutaḥayyīz), and that He has no direction, and that He cannot be pointed to as an object of sensory perception, and that nothing of Him can be considered distinct from Him. You have asserted this on the grounds that Allah is neither divisible nor made of parts and that He has neither limit (hadd) nor end (ghāya), with your view thereby to forbid one to say that He has any limit or measure (qadr), or that He even has a dimension that is unlimited. But how do you allow yourselves to do this without evidence from the Book and the Sunna?” Al-Kawthari comments: “The reader’s intelligence suffices to comment on these heretical statements. Can you imagine for an apostate to be more brazen than this, right in the midst of Muslim society?” See also n. 127 and 209.

396 A sound narration from ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Amr by al-Tirmidhi (hasan gharib),
impostor said: “Why did he not say: ‘Whoever clings to the literal meaning of the Qur'ān concerning the verses of Islamic Doctrine, he is misguided; your only guidance is to refer to the criteria of your minds’.”

Let the observer take note of his embellished calumny and deluded harping. For it is established beyond doubt that the way of the Prophet ﷺ and his Companions is the suspension (kaff) of such [explanations], nor do we pursue them. It is he who does not keep silent because his method is kalām and the pursuit of disaster by attempting to describe Allāh ﷺ with directional upwardness and allowing that He be pointed to with sensory gestures. I truly wonder, then, exactly who is in conformity with the Prophet ﷺ and his Companions. The poet spoke true who said, “She shot me with her bane and slinked away.”

Further, an anthropomorphist can put to him the very same question that he put to us, word for word.

We can ask him: Why did not the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ say: “Salvation consists in saying that Allāh ﷺ is in the upward direction and that it is permissible to point to Him with sensory gestures?” If he claims, “But this is the way of the Salaf and the Companions,” we reply: How did you reach this conclusion? Moreover, every innovating heretic can make the same claim.

Muḥammad ibn Ṯaṣr al-Marwazi in al-Sunna (p. 23), Ibn ‘Asākir, Abū Nu‘aym in Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥāba, al-Ṭabarānī in al-Ṣaḥīḥ, and al-Ḥākim (1:129=1990 ed. 1:218), with chains containing ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ziyād al-Ifriqi, who was declared weak by some but fair in his narrations by others, and from Anas by al-Ṭabarānī in al-Awsat. Al-Lālikā‘i declared this hadīth sound (ṣaḥīḥ) in his Sharh Usūl l‘tiqād Ahl al-Sunna (1:100) and it was included – with its variant versions – by al-Kattānī in his Naẓr al-Mutanāthir (p. 45-47) and Ibn al-Athir in Jāmi‘ al-Uṣūl (10:408).

398 Ibn Daqiq al-‘Id squarely described Ibn Taymiyya as a person who loves to talk, literally “he loves kalām” cf. note 27 above.
CHAPTER NINE

His Attribution of Unbelief and Heresy to the Ulema

Then the impostor claimed to trace this doctrine [Ash'arism] back – he said – to the disciples of the Jews, the pagans, and “the wayward among the Sabeans”! He said:

The first one on record to formulate this teaching is al-Ja‘d ibn Dirham, from whom Jahm [72] ibn Ṣafwān took it then disseminated it, whereupon the doctrine received the name of the Jahmiyya. Al-Ja‘d himself had taken it from Abān ibn Sim‘ān, who took it from Ṣulāḥ the maternal nephew of Labīd ibn al-As‘am, from whom Ṣulāḥ took it. Labīd is the Jew who cast a spell on the Prophet ﷺ. They say that al-Ja‘d came from Ḥarrān.399

399 Hamawīyya (p. 243–246) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:20–21). Actually Ja‘d was the first to claim that the Qur’ān was created cf. Ibn Kathīr, Biyāḥa (9:382, 10:21), which has nothing to do with the discussion at hand but typifies Ibn Ṭaymiyya’s name-calling rhetoric. He and those who follow him apply this pseudo-genealogical construction to the Ash‘āris and the Jahmīs interchangeably in fluid fashion. Another way in which they typically misrepresent the Ash‘āris is by mixing together Ash‘ārī and other positions indistinctly cf. his phrase “nor that He is in every place” (§131): the Ash‘āris deny that Allāh is on the Throne or in the heaven in the anthropomorphic sense but the doctrine that “He is everywhere” has nothing to do with them and is a purely Jahmī claim. As a polemicist Ibn
The answer for him is: O you who claim that this doctrine is taken from the disciples of the Jews! In doing so, you have contradicted what must be known obligatorily by the Muslims. It is no secret to the elite in its entirety, and to many of the general public, that the Jews are anthropomorphists who liken Allāh to creation and that the root of idol worship is anthropomorphism. How then can the negation of anthropomorphism be attributed to Jews?

As for the pagans, they worshipped idols, and the Imāms have demonstrated that idol worshippers are the pupils of those who liken Allāh to creation, and that the root of idol worship is tashbīh. How then can the negation of tashbīh be taken from the pagans?

As for the Sabeans, their country or area of geographical origin is well-known. Do we come from there? Do our opponents?

As for Jaʿd ibn Dirham being from Ḥarrān, this origin is correct. As for the sequencing of this chain of transmission he cited, then Allāh shall ask him about it. Allāh is in the watch-tower seeing all he does! (Allāhu min warāʾihī bil-miṣrād).

Would that he went on to cite the chain of transmission for his claim and his belief also – namely, that Pharaoh held Mūsā’s God to be in the sky.

Taymiyya’s goal is to blur such lines between the Ashʿarīs and known innovative sects so as to defame them in the course of debating them cf. notes 220, 315, 343, 376, 378.

400 As is Ibn Taymiyya.

401 Cf. §§ 66-70 and n. 314 and 360.
Then he attributed the doctrine [of the Ashʿarīs] to Bishr al-Marrīsī\textsuperscript{402} and mentioned that these are the same figurative interpretations which the Imāms declared to be invalid, and he refuted Bishr concerning them. Then he stated that what the Teacher Abū Bakr ibn Fūrak and the Imām Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī mentioned – Allāh sanctify their souls! – is the same as what Bishr had said. This is a hollow claim that does not stand up to careful scrutiny and upright reflection. It would be inconceivable that the Imāms would object to Bishr on the grounds that he said just what the Arabs say; and these two Imāms did not say other than what the Arabs said. The criticism against Bishr is limited to that in which he contradicted the Arabic language and said what the Arabs had never said.

\textsuperscript{402} \textit{Hamawiyya} (p. 251) = \textit{Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā} (5:22). A repeat of the previous claim, since Bishr al-Marrīsī upheld Jahm's doctrine and held that Allāh \textsho{is} in every place cf. al-Dhahabī, \textit{al-ʿUlūm} (p. 417).
CHAPTER TEN

His Unreliable Manner of Quoting the Salaf

[73] Then he tried to buttress his claimed affiliation to the Emigrants and the Helpers and proceeded to relate their position in the following terms.

He said: “Al-Awzā‘ī said, ‘We would say, at a time the Tābi‘ūn were everywhere, that Allāh is above (fawq) His Throne.’”

We reply to him: You begin with al-Awzā‘ī and his synchronous layer, followed by the succeeding layer. Where are the First and the Foremost of the Emigrants and the Helpers?

Hamawiyya (p. 299-300) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:39). Narrated by al-Bayhaqi in al-Asmā‘ wal-Ṣifāt (Kawtharī ed. p. 408 = Ḥāshidi ed. 2:304 865 isnād layyin) with a weak chain containing Muhammad ibn Kathīr al-Miṣṣīṣī who is ḍā‘if cf. al-Arna‘ūt, Tahrīr Taqrib al-Tahdhib (3:310) while Muhammad ibn ‘Alī al-Jawhari is unknown. Yet Ibn Hajar grades its chain “good” (isnād jayyid) in the Fath (13:406) while Ibn Taymiyya claimed the chain was sound (ṣaḥīḥ) in the Hamawiyya and Bayān Talbis al-Jahmiyya (2:38); as did Ibn al-Qayyim in his Ijmā‘ al-Juyūsh (p. 69) while in al-Ṣawā‘iq (2:211) he says, “Its narrators are all trustworthy Imāms!” As for al-Dhahabi his case is the strangest of the four as he declares the chain sound in Tadhkira al-Ḥufūz (1:181-182) although he himself states of al-Miṣṣīṣī in the Siyar (Fikr ed. 9:113): “His narrations can be written but, as for providing any proof, they are not up to it.” On al-Awzā‘ī see our Four Imāms and Their Schools.
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You have also contradicted al-Awzā‘ī’s saying and have not said the same as he. For you said that Allāh ﷺ is not above His Throne, since you determined that what is meant by the heaven and the Throne is nothing other than the upward direction (jihat al-‘ulūw). You said, “What is meant by ‘above His Throne’ and by ‘the heaven’ is the heights.” So you have obviously diverged from al-Awzā‘ī’s saying.

This is not to say that your position is in the least coherent. For you have also determined that the heaven, in comparison to the Throne, is like a ring thrown into a desert; how then can the heaven also be the Throne?

Finally, when did you ascertain the authenticity of this report from al-Awzā‘ī?

Even if we were to concede to you all of the above, it remains that al-Awzā‘ī never said, “Allāh ﷺ is above the Throne literally (haqiqa).” From where did you obtain this addition?

Then he related from Mālik ibn Anas, al-Thawrī, al-Layth, and al-Awzā‘ī that they said of the narrations of the Divine Attributes: “Let them pass exactly the way they came to us.”

---

404 Hamawijjya (p. 524) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:106).
405 Cf. 997 and §112.
406 Hamawijjya (p. 303) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:39). Narrated with a sound chain from al-Walid ibn Muslim by al-Bayhaqī in the Asma‘ (Hashidi ed. 2:377 §955=Kawthari ed. p. 453) and al-I’tiqād (p. 118=p. 57), al-Ajurri in al-Sharā‘a, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr in al-Tamhid (7:158), al-Lālikā‘ī (3:527 §930), Ibn Quḍāma in Dhamm al-Ta‘wil (p. 18 §24), and others. Also narrated from al-Zuhri by al-Bayhaqī in the Asma‘ (2:377 §954) and al-Lālikā‘ī (§735). Sufyān ibn Sa‘id ibn Masrūq Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Thawrī al-Kūfī (d. 161), Amīr al-Mu‘minīn fil-Hadith, was the Imam of the world in his time together with Abū Ḥanīfa in the estimation of Ibn al-Mubāarak, of scrupulous Godwariness, simple living, and learning from whom narrated 1,000 muḥaddiths. Al-Laythi ibn Sa‘d ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Abū al-Ḥārith al-Fahmi (94-175) was the foremost Imam of Egypt of famous generosity and learning, greater than Mālik in fiqh in the estimation of Ibn al-Mubāarak, al-Shāfi‘i, Sa‘d ibn Abī Ayyūb, and Yahyā ibn Bukayar. Ahmad praised the high authenticity of his hadith narrations. On both of them see our Four Imams and Their Schools.
The question for him is: Why did you not do exactly as the Imāms ordered? Instead, you described Allāh with the upward direction, when not one report came to us to that effect - and even if you were to spend the earth’s weight in gold in order to hear such a thing from a true knower of his Lord, still, you would never be happy! Not until you did as you pleased and transmitted it in the way your fancy dictated, without letting it pass, without acknowledging it, and without adhering to the guidelines you yourself reported from the Imāms!

He narrated the saying of Rabi‘a and Mālik: “Istiwa’ is not unknown.”

I wonder who ever said that istiwa’ was unknown. Rather, it is you who claimed a specific meaning for it and you want to attribute this claim to the two Imāms, but we are not going to let you!

[74] Then he related from Mālik that the latter replied to the questioner: “Belief in it is obligatory and asking about it is an innovation. And I do not believe you are anything but an innovator!” Then Mālik gave the order that he be taken out.


408 Ḥamawīyya (p. 308) = Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā (5:40-41).
The answer for him is: I wonder which is the one that followed Mālik's guidelines! Is it we [Ashʿarīs] who did as he did, by our ordering everyone to refrain [from discussion] and by restraining non-scholars (wa-aljamnā al-ʿawāmm)\(^{409}\) from probing such topics, or is it the one who made it his area of expertise, tossing it about, piecing it together haphazardly, imparting it to others, writing about it, teaching it, and ordering the uneducated public to plunge into it? Did such a person ever express disapproval of the questioner on this specific issue and order that he be taken out as Mālik did on the same specific issue? If one considers this, one knows that what he [Ibn Taymiyya] related from Mālik is a proof against him, not for him.

Then he related from ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Abī Salama al-Mājishūn (d. 164) that, when he was asked about what the Jahmiyya had rejected, he replied:

To proceed: I have understood the following from what the Jahmiyya and those who disagreed with them have said concerning the Attribute of the Lord of Might. His magnificence is beyond description or estimation; tongues will sooner dry up than account for His nature (ṣīfa); minds are at an end before they begin to know His power; His magnificence has turned back the minds to their point of departure, \{weakened and made dim\} (67:4). For they were ordered only to examine and reflect upon what He created with perfect measure; and "how" is asked only of what used not to be and then was. As for Him Who never changes, never ceases to exist, has always existed without beginning, and like unto Whom there is nothing and no one: no one knows "how" He is except He. <How could He be known as He is, Who has no beginning, does not die, and does not turn to dust? How can the

\(^{409}\) A reference to al-Ghazzālī's \textit{Ijām al-ʿAwāmm} which the author cites below.
attribute of anything of His possess a limit (hadd) or an endpoint (muntahā) that anyone might get to know or the extent of which he might define? Yet He is the manifest Truth, truer than Whom there is none, and nothing stands more manifest than He.> The proof that minds are powerless to ascertain His nature (ṣifā) is that they are powerless to ascertain the nature of the smallest one of his creatures. You can hardly see it move or disappear due to its smallness while its hearing and sight are completely imperceptible, <not to speak of what goes on [75] in its mind, which is even far more removed and hidden from you than what can be observed of its hearing and sight.>"  

Blessed be Allāh, the best Creator, the Creator of creators, Master of masters and Lord of all!

---

410 The same negation of limit for Allāh is held by Suﬁyān al-Thawrī, Shuʿba, Ḥammād ibn Zayd, Ḥammād ibn Salama, Sharīk, Abū ʿAwāna, Ahmad, al-Tustari, Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālisi, Ibn Kullāb, Abū Ḥātim, al-ʿAshʿarī, Jaʿfar al-Ṣadiq, Mālik, al-Ṭahāwī, Ibn Kathīr, Ibn Fūrak, Ibn Hibbān, al-Khaṭṭābī, al-Qushayrī, and al-Bayhaqī. Cf. our *Four Imāms*, chapter on Imām Ahmad. The anthropomorphists try to annul this axiom with the claim that “He has limits which He knows” although the *Salaf* never said such a thing but the contrary. In other words, al-Mājishūn says, “How can the attribute of anything of His possess a limit or an endpoint that He or anyone might know or the extent of which He or anyone might define?”
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Then he related from al-Mājishūn the ḥadīths that concern the Attributes and he mentioned the saying of Allāh ﷻ, {The whole earth is His handful on the Day of Resurrection, and the heavens are rolled in His right hand} (39:67). Al-Mājishūn continued:

By Allāh! No sooner does He indicate to them the vastness of what He described of Himself and what His handful encompasses, than the minisculeness of their own selves shows, and the realization that they only know what was inspired to them to know, and what was created according to what their hearts can know. Therefore, just as He described or named Himself as taught to us by His Prophet ﷺ, that is also how we describe or name Him, exactly as He did. We do not burden ourselves with additional attributes or this or that other than what He told us, and we do not burden ourselves by seeking to know what He did not describe [of Himself].

Then al-Mājishūn expanded on this. We say to him who related those words: You have adduced an excellent proof – for us! And you have provided the best weapon – for your foes.

Concerning the words of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ﷺ and what he said about the magnificence and greatness of Allāh ﷻ which boggle the minds and surpass all understanding: this is exactly what all the learned people of knowledge have said in verse and in prose. As for you, you have ridiculed and mocked the great Masters and Imāms of the Religion who are the most eminent figures in the Community, no later than in the second page of your incitement to evil. Because they have admitted helplessness and incapacity [to understand], you reproached them and took them to task as if it were a sin, whereas it is you who must be rebuked, and they who must be excused.
You took the saying of 'Abd al-'Azīz as a proof but he said, concerning the handful of Allāh 的性格，exactly what the mutakallimin have said in every page of theirs. [76] 'Abd al-'Azīz ordered that the Lord be described only in the terms in which He described Himself and that one keep absolutely silent otherwise. This is precisely what we say, what we do, and what we hold firmly to be our belief.

You, on the other hand, described Him with directional up-wardness when He never thus described Himself. You declared it permissible to point to Him with sensory gestures, which He never mentioned. We have passed on the Attributes exactly as they came to us, while you have joined together the Throne and the heaven as meaning directional altitude and you said, “in the heaven literally” and “on the Throne literally.” Glory to Him Who granted us rational minds! Truly, such a phenomenon was inscribed into the Book as destined to take place.

Then he mentioned, as related from Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, the agreement of the jurists in describing the Lord [only] in the terms that came to us in the Qur’ān and the narrations of the Attributes.412

412 “The jurists from East to West agree that we should believe in the Qur’ān and the ḥadiths that the trustworthy transmitted from the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ in regard to the Divine Attributes, without tafsīr, nor description, nor tashbih, and whoever explains something of this today has come out of what the Prophet ﷺ followed and parted with the Congregation. For they neither described nor explained but only responded with what is in the Book and the Sunna then kept silent. Therefore, whoever speaks like Jahm has parted with the Congregation for He has described Him as a nonexistent entity.” Ḥamawiyyya (p. 332) = Majmu’ al-Fatāwā (5:50 cf. 5:143). Narrated from Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan by al-Lālīkāʾī in his Sharḥ al-Uṣūl (3:432 §740) with a chain of complete unknowns and from Ibn Qudama in Dhamm al-Ta’wil (p. 11-12 §13) with the same chain further marred by variations in the names of four of the narrators. Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī (d. 189) was the foremost companion of Imām Abū Ḫanīfa with Abū Yūsuf whom he succeeded as the head judge in the service of the Caliph Ḥarūn al-Rashīd. He was a teacher to Imām Aḥmad, cf. our Four Imāms and Their Schools.
We say to him: Nor do we deny a single letter of the above, but it is you who said, "I describe the Almighty Lord as being in the upward direction and I declare permissible to point to Him with sensory gestures." Where is this found in the Qur’ān and the reports of the trustworthy narrators? You have not benefited us with any fatwā in the matter.

Then he related from Abū ‘Ubayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām Ḥ that he said, "If asked about their explanation [i.e. the verses and narrations of the Attributes], we do not explain them," and that he said, "We have not seen nor heard of anyone that explained them."

We say to him: Praise belongs to Allāh! Our goal is met. But I wonder who it is that explained the heaven and the Throne? Who is it that said they mean the upward direction? And who is it that relinquished explaining them and let them pass just as they came to us?

Then he related that [‘Abd Allāh] Ibn al-Mubārak Ḥ said, "Our Lord is known to be above (fawq) His heaven, over (‘alā) His Throne, distinct (bā‘īm) from His creation, and we do not say, as the Jahmiyya claim, that He is right here on earth (ḥāhunā fil-ard)."

---

413 Ḥamawiyya (p. 333-335) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:51). Narrated with a sound chain by al-Bayhaqi in al-Asmā‘ (Ḥāshidī ed. 2:198 §760) and a weak chain by al-Dhahabi in al-‘Uluw (p. 451=Mukhtasar p. 186). On al-Qāsim ibn Sallām see the chapter on Imām Aḥmad in our Four Imāms and Their Schools.

414 Ḥamawiyya (p. 337) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:51-52) adding that this was also the position of Imām Aḥmad but Ibn Ṭaymiyya altered the wording as shown in the next note. Narrated with a sound chain by al-Bukhārī in Khaqā AF ‘al-‘Ibād (p. 31), al-Bayhaqi in al-Asmā‘ wal-Sifāt (Kawthari ed. p. 427; Ḥāshidī ed. 2:336), and others. On Ibn al-Mubārak see the chapter on Imām Abū Ḥanifa in The Four Imāms and Their Schools.
We say to him: ‘Abd Allāh clearly stipulated that Allāh ﷺ is “above His heaven, over His Throne;” did ‘Abd Allāh ever say: “The heaven and the Throne are one, namely, the upward direction?”

Al-Bayhaqī narrated that Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayyālīsī said: “Sufyān al-Thawrī, Shu’ba, Hammād ibn Zayd, Hammād ibn Salama, Sharīk, and Abū ‘Awāna did not hold [that Allāh ﷺ had] a limit nor a likeness nor a similitude. They would narrate the hadiths [of the Attributes] without saying ‘how’. If asked, they would answer with whatever was transmitted. And this is also our position.” Al-Bayhaqī continued: “As for the report to which cling those who believe that Allāh ﷺ has a direction, whereby ‘Ali ibn al-Ḥasan said: ‘I asked ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Mubārak, ‘How (kayf) do we know our Lord?’ He replied, ‘In the seventh heaven on His Throne.’ I said, ‘The Jahmiyya also say He is such.’ He said, ‘We do not mean it like the Jahmiyya. We mean He Himself (huwa huwa).’ I said, ‘With a limit (bi-ḥadd)?’ He said, ‘Yes, by Allāh, with a limit!’” [Narrated mostly in anthropomorphist works: ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ahmad’s al-Sunna, ‘Uthmān ibn Sa’id al-Dārimi’s al-Radd ‘alā al-Marrāsi and al-Radd ‘alā al-Jahmiyya, al-Dhahabī’s al-Ustw, and Ibn Taymiyya’s Hamawiyya.] – ‘Abd Allāh only meant by ‘limit’ the limit dictated by transmission (ḥadd al-sam’), namely, that the truthful report stated that {He established Himself on the Throne} (20:5), so He is on the Throne as He related. By saying this, he meant to belie the Jahmiyya who claimed that He is in every place. His other report confirms this, and Allāh knows best. From ‘Ali ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Shaqiq: ‘I heard ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Mubārak say, ‘We know our Lord to be above (fiwāq) seven heavens, He established Himself over His Throne, distinct (ba’in) from His creation, and we do not say as the Jahmiyya said, that He is right here’ – and he pointed to the ground (ḥātunā fil-arr).’ By the term ‘distinct’ he means, as he explained directly afterwards, to negate the claim [of intermixing (intizāj)] of the Jahmiyya, not to suggest direction on the opposite side. He means what the Law said in absolute terms, and Allāh knows best.” Al-Asmā’ī waš-Šifāt (Kawtharî ed. p. 426-427; Ḥāshidi ed. 2:334-336). Al-Kawahiri pointed out that nowhere in the Qur’ān and Sunna are the terms “in the seventh heaven” applied to Allāh ﷺ nor the term “on His Throne” other than exactly as the verse of istsi’ā’ said and that that report from Ibn al-Mubārak is therefore munkar regardless of its chain. When Imām Ahmad was told one time; “Ibn al-Mubārak never said such and such,” he replied: “Ibn al-Mubārak did not descend from heaven!” In Ibn al-Jawzī, Daf Shubuh al-Tushbūh (Saqqāf ed. p. 111).
[77] Then he related from Ḥammād ibn Zayd that he said: “Those Jahmiyya are only trying to say that there is nothing in the heaven.”

Again, we say to him: You have followed the example of the Jahmiyya, for you explicitly said that the heaven (al-samā) is not really the heaven itself but a derivative meaning of height (al-sumū), which you explained to mean the upward direction. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to apply to yourself what Ḥammād applied to the Jahmiyya.

Then he related from Ibn Khuzayma that “whoever does not say that Allāh ﷺ is above His heavens, over His Throne, distinct from His creation, must be summoned to repent. If he does, well and good. Otherwise he must be executed and his body thrown on a garbage heap so that neither Muslims nor Dhimmis shall be harmed by it.”

---

416 Hamawīyya (p. 337-338) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:52). Narrated from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad in the Musnad and Abū Nu‘aym (6:258) cf. al-Bukhārī in Khaqāl Af al-Tbād (p. 31), al-Dhahabi in al-Gūtaw (p. 405), and others. Also reported from Ayyūb al-Sakhtyāni cf. Hilya and Ḫulw (p. 383). Ḥammād ibn Zayd ibn Dirham Abū Ismā‘īl al-Azdī (98-179) was one of the Imāms of the Salaf and a contemporary of Abū Ḥanīfa and Mālik of whom ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī said, “People (al-nās) in their time were four: Ḥammād ibn Zayd in al-Baṣra, al-Thawrī in al-Kūfah, Mālik in al-Ḥijāz, and al-Awzā‘ī in al-Ṣaḥm.”

417 Al-Ṣayyid Yūsuf al-Rifā‘ī wrote in the forty-seventh advice of his Advice to the Scholars of Najdi: “You accuse the Muslims who differ with you of being deviant Nahwī, or Mu‘tazilīs. The truth is, you are the Jahmiyya because you agree with them in some of their doctrines and you are the Mu‘tazila because you concur with them in denying sainthood and saints as well as their miraculous gifts, the life of the dead, and the arbitration of reason in matters of the unseen in religious issues.” They also, like the Mu‘tazila and Jahmiyya, partly deny the most honorable status of the Prophet ﷺ and his intercessorship.

418 Hamawīyya (p. 339-340) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:52). I.e. by its unwanted presence in their respective burial grounds. See note 228 above, in Shaykh Ghāwījī’s introduction and on Ibn Khuzayma, our Four Imāms and Their Schools.
Let him know that the answer to the like of the above has been given already. Moreover, both the experts and the non-experts are quite aware of Ibn Khuzayma’s talk in the field of doctrines and of his book devoted to anthropomorphism (al-tashbīh) which he named al-Tawḥīd. The Imāms of the Religion have refuted it in numbers greater than can be surmised. They said about him just what he had said of others and this is known.

Then he related from ‘Abbād al-Wāsiṭī, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī, and ‘Āṣim ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Āṣim something similar to what he related from Ḥammād [ibn Zayd] and which we clarified.419

After that, he mentioned the authentic narration from Anas ibn Mālik whereby he said: “Zaynab [bint Jaḥsh] used to boast to the other wives of the Prophet saying, ‘You were married off by your families but I was married off by Allāh from above seven heavens.’”420

We reply: there is no evidence in this hadith that Zaynab said that Allāh was above seven heavens. Rather, it was her marrying off by Allāh that took place above seven heavens.

[78] Then he related from Abū Sulaymān al-Khaṭṭābī what he had related before from ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Mājišhūn.421 We have

419 Ḥamawiyya (p. 341-345) = Majmū’ al-Fatāwā (5:52-53). The report of ‘Abbād al-Wāsiṭī is narrated by ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ḥamd in al-Sunna (Dammām ed. 1:126-127 isnād da’īf) with a very weak chain because of Yahyā ibn Ismā‘īl al-Wāsiṭī [omitted in al-Khalīl’s chain from ‘Abd Allāh in al-Irshād (3:830)] cf. al-Bukhārī’s Ṭarīkh al-Kabīr (1:208), al-Kāmil, Mizān, Mughnī etc.: the report of Ibn Mahdī is narrated by al-Bayhaqī in al-Asma’ with a weak chain because of ‘Amr ibn ‘Abbās al-Bāhili; the report of ‘Āṣim is not found anywhere and is cited in al-‘Ulūm also without chain.

420 Narrated by al-Bukhārī and Muslim, an allusion to the Divine injunction to the Prophet to marry her specifically in the verse {We gave her unto you in marriage} (33:37). Ḥamawiyya (p. 346) = Majmū’ al-Fatāwā (5:54).

asserted our complete agreement with the latter and his [i.e. Ibn Taymiyya’s] contravention of what Ibn al-Majishūn stated.

He stated the same positions from al-Khaṭīb, Abū Bakr al-İsmā‘îlî, Yaḥyā ibn ‘Ammār, Abū İsmā‘îl al-Harawi [al-Anṣārî], and Abū ‘Uthmān al-Şâbûnî.422

parties. The first [the Mu‘tazila and their sub-groups] altogether disavow this kind of ḥadīth and declare them forged outright. This implies their attributing lies to the scholars who have narrated them, that is, the Imāms of our religion and the transmitters of the Prophetic ways, and the intermediaries between us and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. The second party [the literalists] give their assent to the narrations and apply their outward meanings literally, in a way bordering on anthropomorphism. As for us, we steer clear from both views and accept neither as our school. It is therefore incumbent upon us to seek for these hadiths, when they are cited and established as authentic from the perspectives of transmission and attribution, an interpretation (ta‘wil) derived according to the known meanings of the foundations of the Religion and the schools of the scholars, without rejecting the narrations outright, as long as their chains are acceptable and narrators trustworthy.423 Ma‘ālim al-Sunan (Ḥims. ed. 5:95) in al-Būṭî, al-Salafîyya (p. 140).

He also cited from Abū Nu‘aym al-Asbahānī that the well-established narrations concerning ʿistiwaʿ are adopted by the scholars and their contents affirmed without saying “how” nor drawing comparisons nor likening anything with anything created, to the effect that He is established (huwa mustawin) over His Throne in His heaven, with the exclusion of His earth. He also cited this from Maʿmar al-Asbahānī.423

We have made it clear to the reader more than once that he [Ibn Taymiyya] actually contradicts that position and that he never held it in the least except he immediately nullified it! For

adds much material which is not found in the Munārīyya text: “and the Ulema of the Ummah etc.”] Nevertheless, such a statement is not found in the long Waṣiyya of al-Ṣābūrī – cited in full by Ibn al-Subkī in Tabaqāt al-Shāfiʿīyya al-Kubrā (4:285-292) – which states: “Allāh is much exalted beyond what both the negators (al-muʿattila) and anthropomorphists (al-mushabbihī) claim. Regarding the verses that mention the Attributes of the Creator 56 and the authentic Prophetic narrations in that chapter... I] tread the path of the pious Predecessors and the Imāms of the Religion in accepting them and narrating them after ascertaining the soundness of their transmission chain, citing them in their external wordings, confirming them, fully assenting to them, but guarding against any belief of modality or anthropomorphism in them, avoiding what leads to rejecting them or altering them through reproved figurative interpretation (tawil) for which Allāh never gave authority, nor did the Companions, Successors, and pious Salaf say anything like it.”

423 Ḥamawīyya (p. 372-378) = Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā (5:60-61). Ibn Taymiyya attributes two chainless statements to Abū Nu‘aym – a staunch Ashʿarī – possibly referencing the first to his Ḥilyat al-Awliyāʾ – where there is no trace of it – and the second to Mahājīyat al-Wāḥiqīn wa-Madraṣāt al-Wāḥiqīn of which he alone apparently had knowledge, cf. also Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā (18:71) and al-Saffārīnī in Lawāmīr al-Anwār al-Bahiyya (1:196). Al-Dhahabi cites the first statement, also without chain, in his Ulūw (p. 544 cf. Mukhtāsar p. 261) but references it to a book he names al-Iʿtiqād while in his Tadhkira (p. 1097) he calls it al-Muʿtaqad. No one else apparently knows it except Ibn al-Qayyum and it is established that Abū Nuʿaym was Ashʿarī in doctrine – see on him our Ashʿarī School. As for the purported citation from Maʿmar, it is chainless just as in al-ʿUlūw (p. 545 cf. Mukhtāsar p. 262) and there is confusion as to his identity. Al-Dhahabi identifies him as Maʿmar ibn Aḥmad [Ibn Muḥammad] ibn Ziyād Abū Maḥṣūr al-Asbahānī al-Sufi and says he died in 418 cf. al-Nujūm al-Zāhira (4:268) while Ibn al-Subkī in Tabaqāt al-Shāfiʿīyya al-Wustā ʿ (Kubrā (5:331) cites al-Silafi (474-576) as identifying another Maʿmar as his Shaykh, Maʿmar ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿUmar Abū Maḥṣūr al-Lubnānī al-Asbahānī al-Sufi who died in 489.
the heaven, according to him, is other than what is commonly believed. To him, neither the heaven nor the Throne bear any meaning other than the upward direction.

He cited from ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlī [i.e. al-Gilānī] (471-562) that he said: “Allāh ﷺ is in the upward direction (bi-jihat al-‘ulūw), established (mustawīn) over His Throne.”

I truly wonder why he used his words as proofs and left out those of such as Ja’far al-Šādiq, al-Shibli, al-Junayd, Dhū al-Nūn al-Miṣrī, Ja’far ibn Nuṣayr, and their likes – Allāh ﷺ be well-pleased with them!

As for what he cited from Abū ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, both the elite and general public know the man’s position and its disapproval by the Ulema. The Mālikīs’ condemnation of it, from the first to the last of them, is well-known. His contravention (mukhālaifa) of the Imām of North Africa, Abū al-Walīd al-Bājī, is famous. It reached a point where the eminent people of North Africa would say: ‘No one in North Africa holds this position except he and Ibn Abī Zayd (310-386)’ although some of the people of knowledge cited an excuse for Ibn Abī Zayd in the text of the great Qādī Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Wahhāb [ibn ‘Alī ibn Naṣr] al-Baghdādī al-Mālikī (d. 422) – Allāh have mercy on him.


425 See “The ‘Descent’ of Allāh” in our *Sunna Notes* series and *The Ash’ari School*.

426 Imām Abū al-Walīd al-Bājī, Sulaymān ibn Khalaf al-Mālikī al-Qurṭūbī, see our *volume The Ash’ari School*.

To proceed, he [Ibn 'Abd al-Barr] said, “Allāh ﷺ is in the heaven, on the Throne, above seven heavens”\footnote{Hamawīyya (p. 479) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:86). Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Tawāhid (7:129).} but he did not pin down what is meant by “in the heaven, on the Throne, above seven heavens” (lā ya’qīl mā ma‘nā fil-samā‘ al-‘arsh min fawqī sab‘i samāwāt).

[79] Further, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr neither interpreted those terms figuratively, nor said anything like the impostor’s claim that what is meant by the Throne and the heaven is but the upward direction.

Then he cited from al-Bayhaqī – Allāh have mercy on him! – something unrelated to the discussion, after which he reiterated the statements of those who were mentioned previously.\footnote{Hamawīyya (p. 482-487) = Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (5:87-89). Ibn Taymiyya cites al-Bayhaqī’s narrations of the hadiths affirming the Hand and Hands in al-Asmā‘ wal-Ṣifāt but omits to show the Imām’s emphatic rejection of any anthropomorphic interpretation of these texts. Al-Bayhaqī said in that chapter: “Some of the keenest scholars have said that the Right (al-yāmīn) signifies the Hand (al-yād), and the Palm (al-kaff) likewise, in the sense that the hand for Allāh is an Attribute, not a limb. Thus, every passage that mentions it in the Book and the authentic Sunna carries a meaning in connection with the object of mention such as folding up, taking, seizing, spreading, sweeping, accepting, giving, and other acts connecting the personal Attributes to what those attributes entail, without touch nor contact. There is never in all this any likeness between Allāh ﷺ and creation whatsoever. Others have said that the handfull (al-qabda) [in the verse \textit{The whole earth is His handfull on the Day of Resurrection} (39:67)] may be by means of a limb – exalted is Allāh beyond that! – while others said that it may mean dominion (al-nulūk) and power (al-qudra) [...] as in His saying: {From among those whom your right hands possess} (30:28) which signifies property. It was also said that by the verse \textit{And the heavens are rolled in His right hand} (39:67) is meant that the heavens are bound to disappear according to his oath. That is, He swore an oath to abolish them. [...] About the Prophet’s ﷺ hadith: ‘No one spends something good in charity – and Allāh accepts nothing but good – except the Merciful takes it with His right hand (yaminih), if only a date; it increases in the palm of the Merciful (kaff al-Rahmān) until it exceeds the size of a mountain, just as one of you makes his parcel of land productive’ [narrated from Abū Hurayra by Muslim, Aḥmad, al-Nasā‘ī, Ibn Mājah, and al-Tirmidhī who said it is hasan saḥīh]; his saying ‘The Merciful’s palm’ (kaff) means His dominion and sovereignty according to the keenest scholars.” Al-Asmā‘ wal-Ṣifāt (Kawthari ed. p. 330-331; Hāshidī ed. 2:159-160).}
After this, he mentioned our Shaykh, Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Ali ibn Ismā‘il al-Asḥarī and his words: "{The Merciful established Himself over the Throne} (20:4) and we do not make bold before Allāh in our speech but simply say ‘He established Himself,’ without asking how."

These words which he related from our Shaykh are our creed and our doctrine. However, I do not view his citing them as other than a ploy designed to falsely suggest that the Shaykh subscribes to the doctrine of upward direction for Allāh. If this is indeed the case, then he truly went far in calumny!

430 *Hamawiyya* (p. 496) = *Majmu‘ al-Fatāwā* (5:92). In al-Asḥarī, *Maqālat al-Islāmiyyin* (1:211). Imām al-Asḥarī is ‘Ali ibn Ismā‘il ibn Abī Bishr Ishāq ibn Salīm, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Asḥarī al-Yamānī al-Baṣrī al-Baghdādī (260-324 or 330), a descendent of the Yemeni Companion Abū Mūsā al-Asḥarī. In the first half of his scholarly career he was a disciple of the Mu’tazilī teacher Abū ‘Ali al-Juḥānī, whose doctrines he abandoned in his fortieth year after asking him a question al-Juḥānī failed to resolve over the issue of the supposed Divine obligation to abandon the good for the sake of the better (al-ṣalīh wal-aṣlāh). At that time he adopted the doctrines of the shafi‘iyya, those of Abī al-Sunnah who assert that the Divine Attributes are obligatorily characterized by perfection, unchanging, and without beginning, but He is under no obligation whatsoever to abandon the good for the sake of the better. [Cf. al-Shahristānī, *al-Milal wal-Nihal* (1:93=1961 ed. p. 118-119); Ibn al-Subki, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shafi‘iyya al-Kubrā* (3:356), and Nur al-Dīn Ahmad ibn Maḥmūd al-Sābūnī (d. 1184), *al-Bidāya min al-Kitāb fi Usūl al-Dīn.*] He left Baṣra and came to Baghdad, where he took fiqh from the Shafi‘i jurist Abū Ishāq al-Mawzā (d. 340). [Abū Ishāq al-Isfārāyini and Ibn Fūrak considered al-Asḥarī a Shafi‘ī in fiqh cf. Ibn Qādī Shuhba, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shafi‘īyya* (1:115) while Ibn Abī al-Wafā in *al-Jawāhir al-Muḍṭiya* (p. 247) deems him Ḥanafī.] He devoted the next twenty-four years to the refutation of “the Mu’tazila, the Rāṣīda, the Jahmiyya, the Khawārij, and the rest of the various kinds of innovators” in the words of al-Khaṭīb in *Tārīkh Baghdad* (11:346). His student Bundār related that his yearly expenditure was a measurer seventeen dirhams. The founder of the Egyptian "Salafi" Press, Muḥir ‘Abdūh Aḥṣāw wrote in his *Nanūdhaq min al-A ṭā’l al-Khayriyya* (p. 131-134): "Al-Asḥarī became the signpost of Sunnī Knowledge in his time until his word became synonymous, since his time, with the position of Ahl al-Sunnah waṭal-Jamā‘a." More in our volume on the Ash‘arī School in shā Allāh.
The actual words of the Shaykh in this regard are as follows: “He was when there was no place; then He created the Throne and the kursî without ever being in need of place, and He is, after creating place, exactly as He was before creating it.” His and his companions’ statements in declaring false [the concept of direction] can hardly be numbered.

Then he [Ibn Taymiyya] cited something similar from the Qâdî Abû Bakr [ibn al-Bâqillânî] and Imâm al-Ĥaramayn. Then he clung to the fact that hands are raised [upwards] towards the heaven.

But that is only because the heaven is the place of blessings and all good things, for light descends from it, as well as rain. When human beings become accustomed to obtaining benefits from a certain side, their natures will incline to it. That is the sense which makes it a requirement to raise our hands to the heaven, and Allâh ﷻ said: [And in the heaven is your providence and that which you are promised] (51:22).

431 Al-Ash’ârî as narrated by Ibn ‘Asâkir in Tabyîn Kadhib al-Muftarî (Saqqâ ed. p. 150). During one of his trials Ibn Taymiyya quoted from this book and said it was peerless: Majmû’ al-Fatâwâ (3:182 cf. 3:224) and Ibn ‘Abd al-Hâdi’s al-‘Uqûd al-Durrîyya (p. 250).
432 Ḥanawiyya (p. 508-516) = Majmû’ al-Fatâwâ (5:98-100). Ibn Taymiyya quotes selected paragraphs from Ibn al-Bâqillânî’s lost al-Îbâna then from the Nizâmîyya epistle of Ibn al-Juwaynî. These two Ash’ârî Ulema could not be further away from the doctrine Ibn Taymiyya attempts to defend but his method is to adduce a barrage of citations from anyone and everyone beginning, of course, with the Qur’ân and Sunna, then “to clamor a lot about following the Salaf” (al-Nabhâni, Shawâhid al-Haqq p. 207). “Salafis” are also fond of constructing a “Salafi” version of the great Sunni mutakallimûn and speak of the “repentence” of Imâm al-Ghazzâli from Ash’ârîm, the “repentence” of al-Ĥâzî, Ibn al-Juwaynî, al-Ash’ârî, etc., whereas there is no such repentence on record except for Ibn Taymiyya himself [see our biographical introduction]. See on them our Ash’ârî School, Al-Qârî said in Mirqât al-Majâtîh (1892 ed. 2:137=1994 ed. 3:300): “A whole group of them [the early Muslims], as well as later scholars, said that whoever believes Allâh ﷻ to be in a particular physical direction is an unbeliever, as al-’Irâqî has explicitly stated, saying that this was the position of Abû Ĥanîfa, Mâlik, al-Shâfi’î, al-Ash’ârî, and [Ibn] al-Bâqillânî.” Al-Qârî reiterates this fatwâ in Sharh al-Fiqh al-Akbar (1984 ‘Ilmiyya ed. p. 57) and Sharh ‘Ayn al-‘Ilm (1989 ed. 1:34).
Furthermore, he sufficed himself with the likes of this evidence in [one of] the issues of the foundations of Islamic doctrine. Does he have surety that no [80] claimant should put forth a claim that Allah is in the Ka‘ba on the grounds that every worshipper directs his face to it and says, [I have turned my face towards Him Who created the heavens and the earth] (6:79)? Or that some claimant should say that Allah is in the earth since He said: [But prostrate yourself, and draw near (unto Allah)] (96:19) when it is known that drawing near by prostrating, distance-wise, can only be to the earth? Further, the Prophet said: “The nearest [to Allah] that a servant can be is in his prostration.”

Then he mentioned the parts of the narration of the mountain goats to which we already responded. Then he mentioned something that has no bearing on the issue whatsoever.

After that, he asserted that he had reported from the Salaf the same as his own position. In fact, he did not, so far, report from anyone anything that supports his position – not from the Salaf, and not from the Khalaf. The only exception is ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlī and some of what Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said. From the Ten that were promised Paradise and the remainder of the Companions, he did not cite so much as a whisper.

Then he launched into sermons and supplications unrelated to the issue, after which he began to insult and revile the theologians. No barking ever harmed the moon!

---

433 At the onset of prayer according to the Shāfi‘i madhhab.
451 Narrated from Abū Hurayra by Muslim, Abū Dāwūd, and al-Nasā‘ī with the continuation “Therefore, make abundant [your] supplications [at that time].”
More to the point, it is evident that this eminent savant, this proof of the Religion peppers his pronouncements with loud claims that he only says “what Allāh said as well as His Prophet and the First and Foremost among the Emigrants and Helpers.” Yet he could not convey the doctrine he holds from a single Companion!

We have now concluded our demonstration that his words are false. We have exposed his deceit, brought an end to his equivocations, confuted his conclusions, and turned his purported signposts upside down. Let us proceed with our business and clarify our own creed. And with Allāh comes all success!
CHAPTER ELEVEN

Imām al-Ghazzālī’s Ethics of Tawḥīd

We hold that whoever hears the verses and reports that pertain to the Divine Attributes has duties which we mentioned before.\(^{225}\) They are:

1. to uphold Divine transcendence (taqdis);
2. belief (İmān);
3. confirmation (tasdīq);
4. admission of inability [to comprehend] (al-iʿtirāf bil-ʿajz);
5. keeping silent (sukūt);
6. refraining from paraphrasing the original wording (al-imsāk ʿan al-tašarruf fil-alfāz al-wārida);
7. stopping all mental reflection upon such verses and reports (kaфф al-bāṭin ʿan al-taṣaffur fī dḥālik); and
8. holding firmly that whatever is unknown to us concerning them [81] is not unknown to the Prophet ﷺ nor to al-Ṣiddīq ﷺ nor to the eminent senior Companions ﷺ.

Let us now turn to the elucidation of the finer details enfolded within those duties, and in Allāh is all our help!

\(^{225}\) Cf. §35.
Upholding Divine Transcendence (*al-Taqdis*)

To uphold Divine transcendence consists in the firm belief, for every verse and every report, in a meaning (*ma‘na*) that befits the immense majesty of Allāh ﷺ.

An example of this is when one hears the saying of the Prophet ﷺ: “Allāh descends every night to the nearest heaven.” “Descent” (*nuzūl*) applies to a phenomenon that requires a body (*jism*) in a high position, a body in a low position, and a body that undergoes displacement from high to low, cessation (*zawāl*) being the displacement of a body from the height to a low ground.\(^{436}\)

“Descent” is also applied in a different sense which requires neither displacement nor the motion of a body, as in the saying of Allāh ﷺ: *{He has sent down (anzala) for you of cattle eight kinds}* (39:6) although the cattle, of course, did not descend from the heaven but are definitely created in the wombs. “Descent” here undoubtedly bears a sense other than the motion of a body.

The latter sense is illustrated by the saying of al-Shāfi‘ī, “I entered Egypt and they did not understand my discourse so I came down; then I came down some more; then I came down even more.” He did not mean by that a displacement from a high to a low ground.

\(^{436}\) See “Allāh’s ‘Descent’” in our *Sunna Notes* series.
Let the listener be sure, therefore, that "descent" does not apply in the first sense in relation to Allâh ﷺ. For corporeality (al-jism) is inconceivable in relation to Him. And since [His] nuzûl is not understood as displacement, we can say to the listener, "Whoever is incapable of understanding the descent of the camel [in the verse cited above] is even less able to understand the descent of Allâh ﷺ." There are allusions to this fact in the words of 'Abd al-‘Azîz al-Mâjishûn previously quoted.

The same applies with the term "above" (fawq) which comes up in the Qur’ân and the reports. Let it be understood that "above" sometimes refers to corporeality (jismiyya) and sometimes to status (martaba) as already mentioned.

In conclusion, let it be emphasized, first of all, that corporeality is inconceivable of Allâh ﷺ; secondly, "above" has a sense that befits His immense majesty. [82]

Belief (al-Imân) and Confirmation (al-Taṣdîq)

Belief and confirmation consist in knowing that the Messenger of Allâh ﷺ is truthful in his description of Allâh ﷺ in these reports and that what he said is the undoubted truth in the sense that he meant and the exact manner in which he said it, even if one cannot determine its actual meaning (wa-in kâna lâ yaqifu 'alâ ḥaqiqatihi).

Beware, lest someone fall prey to Satan and say: "Why should I consider truthful a matter of a general nature, the specifics of which I am not aware of?" Instead, let one put Satan to shame and reply, "Just as if a truthful person were to tell me that there is an animal in the house and I would know its presence there even if I had not experienced it specifically, the same applies here."
Admission of Incapacity (al-I' tirāfu bil-' Ajz)

Further, let the skeptic know that the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said: "I cannot render count of Your Glory! (lâ uḥṣī thanā‘an ‘alayk) You are just as You have glorified Yourself." The Master of the Truthful Saints similarly said: "Incapacity to attain comprehension is comprehension" (al-‘ajzu ‘an darki al-idrāki idrākun).

It is obligatory upon anyone who has not come to know the true sense of these expressions to admit incapacity. If one claims knowledge, one will be held accountable for such a claim. As much as any person of knowledge may know, what they know not is more!

Keeping Silent (al-Sukūt)

Keeping silent is obligatory for the general public (al-‘awāmm). Their enquiring exposes them to something they cannot bear. If they ask an ignoramus about it, the latter will increase the questioner's ignorance; if they ask a person of knowledge, the latter cannot make the questioner understand, just as an adult cannot make a child understand sexual pleasure or the management of domestic affairs. The only way to make a child understand [husbandry] is through practice.

 Narrated from 'Āisha and 'Alī in the Nine Books except al-Bukhārī and Dārīmi.
 See note 286.
Therefore, if a person who is unlearned in the Religion (‘āmmī) asks about the like of this, he must be reprimanded and deterred. Tell him, “This is not for you – shoo!” Thus did Mālik order his questioner to be taken out with the words, “I think you are nothing but an evil-monger!” And Mālik said so after becoming drenched in sweat.

Similarly did ‘Umar treat anyone who dared enquire about the ambiguous verses of the Qur’ān. The Prophet said: “Those before you perished only because they asked too many questions.”

We have been ordered to refrain from investigating the foreordained Decree of Allāh – then what about the Divine Attributes!

439 During ‘Umar’s caliphate a man from Iraq named Šabīgh ibn ‘Isl came to Madīna and began to ask about the meaning of the ambiguous verses (mutashābihāt) of the Qur’ān. ‘Umar summoned him. When he came he asked him: “Who are you?” He replied: “I am the servant of Allāh, Šabīgh.” ‘Umar said: “And I am the servant of Allāh, ‘Umar.” Then he struck him on the head with a birch, sending Šabīgh into a daze. He went on until his head bled. Then Šabīgh said: “Commander of the believers, stop! No trace remains of what was in my head.” Narrated from Sulaymān ibn Yāsār with a sound chain by al-Dārīmī and cited by al-Qurtubī in his commentary on the verse [He it is Who has revealed unto you (Muḥammad) the Scripture wherein are clear revelations; they are the substance of the Book; and others (which are) allegorical. But those in whose hearts is doubt pursue that which is allegorical seeking (to cause) dissension by seeking to explain it] (3:7). Imām Mālik narrated in his Mawātī from Ibīn Shihāb al-Zuhrī, from al-Qāsim ibn Muḥammad who said: “I heard a man asking ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbash about the spoils of war. The latter answered: ‘Horses are part of the spoils of war, and the battle-gear and property carried by the enemy killed in battle (al-salāb).’ Then the man asked the same question again and Ibn ‘Abbash gave the same answer. Then the man said: “The spoils Allāh mentioned in His Book, what are they?” and he did not stop asking him until he almost created a nuisance for him. Then Ibn ‘Abbash said: ‘Do you know what this man’s similitude is? He is like Šabīgh whom ‘Umar beat up.’” All those who invent litmus tests of all denominations in order to examine and berate other Muslims are similar, such as “Where is Allāh?” (Wahhābīs), “What do you think of Mu‘āwiyah [ṣLF]?” (Shī‘īs), “Is not the Prophet omnipresent?” (Barelwīs), “Did the Sahāba celebrate Mawlid?” (Deobandīs), “Is not jihād obsolete?” (pacifists), “Are women not equal to men?” (feminists) “Is it not time for a moratorium on Shari‘a?” (secularists), etc.

440 Narrated from Abū Hurayra by Muslim, al-Nasa‘ī, and Ahmad as part of a longer ḥadīth.
Refraining from Paraphrasing (al-İmsâk ‘an al-Taşarruf)

To refrain from paraphrasing those reports and verses means to quote them exactly as spoken by Allâh ™ and His Prophet ﷺ without paraphrasing them, neither through explanation (tafsîr) nor interpretation (ta‘wîl), nor rephrasing them through grammatical derivation (tašrîf). 441

Qur‘ânic explanation must not substitute the wordings of expressions with different words nor may they stand in place of one another. For a word can be used metaphorically in a given expression at the exclusion of another, and can have a shared meaning within a certain expression at the exclusion of another. Substitution will cause discourse to become inflated by the cancellation of the metaphor and the assumption that one of the shared meanings is actually meant.

Qur‘ânic figurative interpretation (ta‘wîl), on the other hand, dismisses the external meaning (al-ţâhir) and adheres to what is considered the less likely meaning (al-marjûh). The layman who does this has plunged into a sea without shores and cannot swim. As for the learned person, he may not do this unless he fulfills the necessary conditions of figurative interpretation. He

441 An example of forbidden tašrîf is to derive from the verses of istiwa‘ the inference that Allâh Most High is mustawin or “established” over the Throne. Such an Attribute is not ordained by Allâh ™ (ghayr tawqîfî) even if inferred from the Divine act of istiwa‘. Someone actually compiled a book on the Divine Names in which he entitled one of his chapters “The Wrathful Obliterator” (al-Mudamdim) which he derived from the verse “fa-dadmama ‘alayhim rabbuhum” (91:14)!
must not discuss it with a layman as the latter is incapable of comprehending it.

Ceasing Cogitation (Kaff al-Bātin)

Ceasing to think about it [the meaning of the Attributes] is so that one not be preoccupied with something that may amount to disbelief and which one may become unable to dismiss – nor can anyone else dismiss it from him.\[^{442}\]

Believing Firmly in the Knowledge of the Prophet ﷺ
(I‘tiqād ʾIlm al-Nabī ﷺ)

Let one know with firm conviction that the Prophet ﷺ knows all this [i.e., the meanings]. Let none compare himself to the Prophet ﷺ, nor to his Companions, nor to the major Ulema [in this respect]. Hearts are vessels of varying capacity and gems of varying intensity.

\[^{442}\] Most helpful here is the rule spelled out toward the end of Imām Abū Ḥanīfa’s al-Fiqh al-Akbar: “If someone experiences difficulty with the subtleties of the science of Divine unity, it is incumbent upon him to believe (without further investigation) what is correct in the sight of God Most High until he finds a scholar to consult. He should not delay in seeking such a scholar, for hesitation and suspension of judgment may result in unbelief.” (Translation by Hamid Algar.)
CHAPTER TWELVE

Kalām Dialectic in the Qur'ān
and the Rejection of Imitation

We proceed with two points. The first is the upholding of transcendence beyond any notion of direction. We have seen that the literalists have searched in vain in the narrations and reports. The reader is well apprised of what is in them. They have not been able to find one Companion nor one Successor who says what they say. Even so, men are known by the fact that they hold fast to the truth. Truth is not known by discovering what men hold.

Abū Dāwūd narrated in his Sunan from Mu‘ādh [84] that the latter said: “Accept the truth from whoever states it, even if he is a disbeliever” (kāfir) – or he said: “even if he is a transgressor” (fāsiq) – “and beware the error of the wise man.” They asked: “How will we know that the disbeliever is telling the truth?” He replied: “Truly, light shines over the truth.” He spoke the truth – may Allāh be well-pleased with him!

443 The second point is mentioned in §281.
444 More than that, as our teacher Dr. Nūr al-Dīn ‘Itr says, when asked about Ibn Taymiyya: “The mistakes of the great are the greatest mistakes.”
445 Narrated from Mu‘ādh mawqūf with a sound chain by Abū Dāwūd but with the word “hypocrite” (munaﬁq) rather than “disbeliever” or “transgressor;” al-Hākim (4:466 sahīh per Muslim’s criterion), and al-Bayhaqī in the Sunan al-Kubrā (10:210).
Indeed, if the necklace of imitation were placed on every neck, we would no longer be safe lest some disbeliever bring us whatever is held in great esteem in his community and tell us, “Know the truth by this.”

Now that the reader realizes that those [literalists] cannot be relied upon for pure transmission, know that Allah ﷻ addresses none other than those who possess minds, hearts, and insights. The Qur’an is replete with this affirmation. The mind is the appraiser of the existence of Allah ﷻ and His Oneness, and the mind is the demonstrator of the Message of His Prophet ﷺ. For there is no way to establish all this through transmission. Hence, the Law has declared the mind trustworthy and accepted its testimony, and Allah ﷻ has used the mind as a proof in certain passages of His Book.

For example, Allah ﷻ used the fact of man’s original creation as a [rational] proof for man’s [forthcoming] resurrection. He said: {And he has coined for Us a similitude and has forgotten the fact of his creation, saying: Who will revive these bones when they have rotted away? Say: He will revive them Who first produced them!} (36:78-79). With these verses Allah ﷻ destroyed the findings of the philosophers who deny bodily resurrection.

Allah ﷻ also used the mind as a proof for absolute Divine Oneness when He said, {If there were therein Gods beside Allah, then verily both the heavens and the earth would have been disordered} (21:22). He also said, {Nor is there any God along with Him, else would each God have assuredly championed that which he created, and some of them would assuredly have overcome others} (23:91). He also said, {Have they not considered the dominion of the heavens and the earth?} (7:185). And He said, {Say: Behold what is in the heavens and the earth!} (10:101). [85]
And He said, "Say: I exhort you unto one thing only: that you awake, for the sake of Allāh, in pairs and singly, and then reflect" (34:46). And He said, "We shall show them Our portents on the horizon and within themselves" (41:53).

Therefore, woe to them who reject a witness Allāh Himself accepts, and invalidate a proof put up by Him! For they cancel all such proofs and refer to the positions of their teachers! Should one of those teachers be asked about [the proof for] his Religion, he would not have the wherewithal to establish it. Should he be confronted in the dialectical battlefield he would fall silent after saying, "I heard the people say something and so I said it." The narration of the sun's eclipse in al-Bukhārī's Sahih describes what such people say in their graves.446

This is why reason plays its role. It is the criterion upon which legal responsibility hangs and because of which Allāh ﷻ holds people to account. Allāh ﷻ has accepted its testimony and upheld it, establishing with it the foundations of His Religion.

At the same time, reason bears witness to the corruption of that school of thought [i.e. literalism] which has sunk to the point of describing Allāh ﷻ as endowed with defects and imperfections. Exalted is He beyond what the wrongdoers claim!

446 Narrated from 'Āisha by al-Bukhārī and Muslim.
CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Warnings of the Great Sufi Shaykhs against Literalism

The Shaykhs of the Path have warned about the same thing to which reason bore witness and about which the Qur’ān spoke. They did so in a manner comprehensible to the elite yet without alienating the general public. The exposition of what they said has several aspects.

A first demonstration is gathered from him of the pure lineage and high origin, the Master of the Ulema and inheritor of the best of Prophets, Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq ☪ who said: “Were Allāh in something (fi shay’), he would be surrounded (mahṣūr).”

[86] What this evidence stipulates is that if He were in a direction and one could point at Him, it would follow that He must have limits. For if He were in a given direction as opposed to another, then He “takes place” (ḥasala) in that direction exclusively of another. His having limits could not bear any other meaning. But everything endowed with limits is contingent (kullu mutanāhin muḥdath), because its confinement to particular boundaries necessarily supposes someone to specify them.

447 Cf. §31 above.
Through this proof – which is self-evident to the mind – appears the further proof that the attribution of direction [to the Deity] makes it necessary for the Creator to be created, for the Lord to be governed, and for His Divine Essence to be controlled (mutaṣarrafun fiḥā), subject to addition and subtraction – greatly exalted is Allāh beyond the claims of the oppressors!

A second demonstration is gathered from the words of al-Shiblī, the Shaykh of the Path and standard of verification, who said: “The All-Merciful exists from pre-eternity while the Throne was created, and the Throne was established and made firm (istawā) by the All-Merciful.”

What this statement stipulates is that the specific direction Allāh possesses according to them – exalted is He beyond such a thing! – and which they named “the Throne,” is either nonexistent or existent. That it should be nonexistent is impossible by agreement. Further, direction can be pointed at with sensory gestures, and sensory gesture to something nonexistent is absurd. So it is existent. If it is existent, then [it is either with or without beginning]. If it is without beginning together with Allāh, then something other than Allāh and His Attributes has been found for us that is without beginning, so we cannot know which comes first! And this is the repulsiveness of this doctrine. And if it has a beginning, then spatial confinement (al-tahayyuz) has taken place for Allāh and He is therefore subject to contingent self-attributes (ṣifāt napsiyya ḥāditha) – exalted is Allāh beyond any such notion!

[87] A third demonstration is gathered from the spokesman of the Path, standard-bearer of the truth, physician of hearts and signpost of the Beloved, Abū al-Qāsim al-Junayd who said:

Cf. §29 above.
“How could He Whom nothing and no one resembles or compares to, ever join (yattaṣilu) with one whom something resembles and to whom something compares?"\textsuperscript{449}

What this demonstration shows is that, if He were in a direction, He is either larger, equal, or smaller [than that direction], together with the requirement of its surrounding [Him]. If He is larger, then the extent of Him that overlaps it differs from the extent of Him that lies beyond it. It follows that He is made up of parts and segments, which is impossible. Every complex thing is in need of its constituent units and its units are other than it, so every complex thing is in need of other than it, and something that is in need of something else is not a God. If He has the same extent as the direction when the latter is divisible – since it is possible to point sensorily to its constituent parts – then whatever is on par with something divisible is also divisibl.e. If He is smaller – greatly exalted is Allāh beyond such a notion! – then He equals at least an indivisible atom (jawharin jardin), for they have satisfied themselves that their God is the size of an atom. No reasonable person, however, believes such a thing – although no reasonable person subscribes to their School in the first place. But such an elementary notion even an ignorant Zanzibārī would find laughable. Yet, if He is larger, then He is divisible. Look at this creed of theirs and see its conclusions! Exalted is Allāh beyond such notions.

A fourth demonstration is gathered from Jaʿfar ibn Nuṣayr.\textsuperscript{450} When he was asked about the saying of Allāh \textit{ัส} {The Merciful established Himself over the Throne} (20:4), he said: “His knowledge applies equally (istawā) to all things, and nothing is closer to Him than something else.”\textsuperscript{450}

\textsuperscript{449} Cf. §25 above.
\textsuperscript{450} Cf. §30 above.
REFUTATION OF HIM WHO ATTRIBUTES DIRECTION TO ALLAH

[88] What this demonstration shows is that the attribution of directions to Him is undifferentiated (‘alā al-taswiya); therefore, it is impermissible that He lie in a certain direction.

What plainly shows that the attribution of direction to Him is undifferentiated is the fact that direction, as we have already seen, is something existent, and that if such existence is without beginning together with Allāh  سبحانه وتعالى, it would necessarily follow that there are two pre-existent entities that are discrete in their essences (lazima wujūdu qadimayni mutamayyizayni bi-dhāṭayhimā). If they were not discrete in their essences, then the direction would be Allāh  سبحانه وتعالى and Allāh  سبحانه وتعالى would be the direction—exalted is Allāh beyond such notions!

But if direction is not pre-existent, then to specify it for Him is either because His Essence requires it, in which case the Essence affects the Attributes of self (yalzamu kawmu al-dhāti fā‘ īlatan fil-ṣifāti al-nafsiyya); or because such specification is not through the Essence. In the latter case, the attribution of direction to Him is undifferentiated and to deem any direction likelier than another is a matter extraneous to His Essence which would make Him necessarily dependent on other than Him in the matter of that specification.

Further, to possess a specific direction is unmitigated spatial confinement (al-ikhtīṣāsu bil-jiha huwa ‘ayn al-taḥayyuz). Such an attribute is subsistent in the essence of what is spatially confined. This would make it necessary for Him, in His very Essence, to depend on someone else, which is impossible for Allāh  سبحانه وتعالى!
CHAPTER FOURTEEN

Leave Qur’anic Exegesis to its Experts

To conclude, know that the demonstrations we have just enumerated after receiving them from the Shaykhs of the Path they themselves only inferred from the Glorious Book. But not everything that is in the Glorious Book can be known by one and all. Each can only scoop up what his vessel can contain, no more and no less.

The Predecessors used to extract from the Glorious Book the foreknowledge of numerous wars and tribulations. Ibn Barrajân [Abû al-Ḥakam ‘Abd al-Salām ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad al-Andalusī al-Iṣḥabī (d. 536)] – Allāh have mercy on him! – inferred [from Sūrat al-Rūm] the conquest of al-Qudus at the hand of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and the year he would conquer it [583]. A later scholar inferred from Sūrat al-Rūm the indication of something that would take place in the year 673. Ka‘b al-Aḥbār inferred from the Torah that ‘Abd Allāh ibn

451 Cf. al-Nu‘aymī (d. 978), al-Dāris fi Taʾrīkh al-Maḍāris (Shams al-Dīn ed. 1:174); al-Dhahabī, Siyār (Risāla ed. 21:360); Ibn Kathīr, Bidāya (12:326-328); al-Suyūṭī, Taʾrīkh al-Khulāfa’ (p. 454); Ibn Khallikān, Waḥayāt al-Aʿyān (4:230); Ibn ʿImād, Shadharat (2:337-338); etc.
Qilāba would enter \textit{many-columnned Iram} (89:7) and that none other would enter it.\textsuperscript{452} He would infer from it much of what was to happen to the Companions \( \mathbb{O} \) and what the armies of Shām were to face. This is a well-known fact.

\[89\] Allah Most High revealed in His Book that from which one of His servants might understand many things while another might not understand a single one of those things.

\[271\] [Similarly,] levels and ranks differ in the ability to extract rulings from the words of the jurists and meanings from the compositions of the poets.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

Qur'anic Proofs
Negating Direction

As for what the Glorious Book said in negation of direction, it is known to the elite and the common public does not feel aversion to it. Take, for example, the verse {there is nothing whatsoever like Him} (42:11). If a certain direction contained Him, He would be like something contained in that part. Similarly, the verse {Know you one that can be named like Him?} (19:65). Ibn 'Abd Allah said [it means]: “Do you know anyone like Him (hal ta’lamu lahu mithlan)?”

The same is understood from His Name {al-Qayyūm} (2:255, 3:2, 20:111...) with its emphatic form, meaning that He is Self-Subsistent while everything other than Him subsists through Him. If He lay in a direction, He would subsist through something else.

The same is understood from His saying, {al-Muṣawwir} (59:24). If He were in a direction He would be fashioned, either by Himself or by another, both of which are impossible.

453 Narrated from Ibn 'Abd Allah by Ibn Abi Ḥātim in his Tafsīr as cited by Ibn Ḥajar in Fath al-Bārī (6:168) and from Mujähid by al-'Ṭabari in his Tafsīr (16:106).
The same is understood from His سُبْحَانَهُ saying, *{and eight will uphold the Throne of their Lord that day, above them}* (69:17). If He were literally on the Throne, He would be carried.

The same is understood from His سُبْحَانَهُ saying, *{Everything will perish save His countenance}* (28:88). The Throne is doomed to perish, and if He سُبْحَانَهُ were initially not in a direction, then entered into a direction, then departed from that direction, He would be subject to change, which is impossible for Allāh سُبْحَانَهُ.

[90] Since the impostor realizes fully that the Qur’ān is replete with these facts and signs, he claims: “The probative tenor of these facts is like double-entendres (alghāz)!”

Did this deluded man not realize that the secrets of doctrinal beliefs, which are a closed book to the minds of the common public, remain inaccessible except in such fashion? And where in the Qur’ān is the negation of anthropomorphism found except in the form of double-entendres?

Do sharp minds take pride in anything other than the inference of hidden meanings? For example, al-Shāfi‘ī شَافِعِي inferred Consensus (al-ijmā‘) from the saying of Allāh سُبْحَانَهُ, *{And whosoever opposes the Messenger after the guidance (of Allāh) has been manifested unto him, and follows other than the believers’ way, We appoint for him that unto which he himself has turned, and expose him unto hell – a hapless journey’s end!}* (4:115). Juridical analogy (qiyyās) was inferred from His saying, *{So learn a lesson, O you who have eyes}* (59:2). Similarly, al-Shāfi‘ī inferred the option [of post-purchase competing negotiations] as long as the transactors have not parted (khiyār al-majlis), from the Prophet’s سُلْطَان interdiction that “no man should enter competitively into a transaction which his brother is already conducting.”


Narratted from Ibn ʿUmar and Abū Hurayra by al-Bukhārī and Muslim.
The gist of the matter is that the Prophet ﷺ never held the public responsible for any doctrine other than *Lā ilāha illAllāh Muḥammadun Rasūlullāh*, as Mālik replied to al-Shāfiʿī.⁴⁵⁶ He ﷺ left the rest to Allāh ﷻ. Never were any but a few limited words heard from him and his Companions on that subject. This is an example of something hidden which is intimated through double-entendre.

⁴⁵⁶ Cf. §18.
CHAPTER SIXTEEN

Qur‘ān and Sunna Yield No Evidence for Anthropomorphists

The second point\textsuperscript{457} is the invalidation of the misrepresentations of the impostor concerning the position of the \textit{mutakallimūn} that the Qur‘ān and Sunna contain things that outwardly suggest aspects from which Allah ﷻ is exempt and exalted.

We say that Allah ﷻ said: \textit{He it is Who has revealed unto you (Muḥammad) definite [i.e. unabrogated and unambiguous] verses (āyāt muḥkamāt) which are the substance of the Book and others which are ambiguous (mutashābihāt). But those in whose hearts is deviance pursue the ambiguous, seeking (to cause) disension by seeking to explain it. None knows its explanation save Allah (∗) – and those who are of sound instruction, they say: We believe therein; the whole is from our Lord; but only possessors of understanding really heed} (3:7).\textsuperscript{458}

\textsuperscript{457} Continuation of the first point mentioned in §246.

\textsuperscript{458} "The vast majority consider that a pause comes at the Name (∗), and have declared it a mandatory pause (\textit{waqf lāzim}). This is the literal meaning, for \textit{ta‘wil} is the meaning which Allah ﷻ meant, and in reality none knows that meaning except Allah ﷻ, and there is no God beside Him. Whosoever speaks concerning its meaning is speaking only according to what is shown to him, and no one can say: 'This interpretation is what Allah
This verse indicates that the Qur'ān contains both what is clear and what is ambiguous. Servants are instructed to turn over the interpretation of the ambiguous to {Allāh and those who are of sound instruction}.

This said, we can add that the reason Prophethood did not provide textual stipulations or elucidations for the ambiguities (lām taʿti al-nubuwwatu bil-naṣṣī zāhīran ʿalā al-mutashābih) is only [91] because the greatest part of the objective of Prophethood is the right guidance of humanity as a whole. Since most [of the Qur'ān] is unambiguous and since we have curbed the uneducated public from probing the ambiguities, the objective is met, except when Allāh ﷺ foreordains for them a devil that tempts them and leads them to destruction. If the ambiguities were all brought to light (lāw uṯhīra al-mutashābih), the minds of people would be incapable of comprehending them.

Also, among the benefits of the ambiguities is [to bring out] the loftiness of the ranks of the Ulema one over another – as Allāh ﷺ said, {and over every possessor of knowledge there is one more knowing} (12:76) – and the obtainment of additional rewards by striving to understand them for oneself and explain them to others, learning them and teaching them.

meant categorically,” Al-Qārī, Mīrqaṭ al-Maqāṭīḥ (1892 ed. 2:136-137 = 1994 ed. 3:298-301). As al-Qārī goes on to say, the majority stop at the name of Allāh but both readings are possible, as stated by al-Suyūṭī in al-Itqān (1:264), al-Rāghib in Muḥraddū Afṣāf al-Qur'ān, Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī in al-Muṣāṣid li-Taḵāḥīs mā ṣīḥ-Murshīd (p. 45), al-Dānī in al-Muḳtafa (p. 195-197), and others. The Prophet ﷺ defined those who are firmly grounded in knowledge partly as “Those whose oaths are kept, whose tongues are truthful, whose hearts are upright, and whose stomachs and genitals are abstinent. They are among those who are firmly grounded in knowledge.” Narrated from Abū al-Dardāʾ, Abū Umāma, Wāḥīlī, and Anas by al-Ṭabarānī in al-Kabīr (8:152 §7658).
Furthermore, if these ambiguities were absolutely plain and self-evident, people would not need to learn all the sciences. They would have been abandoned. The Book would have been clear by itself and none of the auxiliary sciences would have been needed to understand His Speech.

Furthermore, the discourse that uses ambiguities refers to things people hold in tremendous esteem and respect, although the matter is greater yet. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Mājishūn referred to this with regard to the handful (al-qabdā) [in the verse {The whole earth is His handful on the Day of Resurrection} (39:67)].

The same holds for the saying of Allāh ﷻ concerning the bliss of the people of Paradise:

\{Among thornless lote trees and clustered plantains, and spreading shade, and water gushing, and fruit in plenary, neither out of reach nor yet forbidden, and raised couches – Lo! We have created them a (new) creation and made them virgins, lovers, friends, for those on the right hand.\} (56:28-38)

All this is held in tremendous esteem and respect, although there is in Paradise greater than that.

These blessings are just as the Prophet ﷺ said on behalf of Allāh ﷻ: “I have prepared for My righteous servants what no eyes have ever seen, nor ears ever heard, nor minds ever wandered upon!"  

---

459 Cf. §185.
460 Narrated from Abū Hurayra by al-Bukhārī, Muslim, al-Tirmidhi (ḥasan ṣaḥīh), Ibn Mājah, Aḥmad, and al-Dārīmī, and from Sahl ibn Sa‘d al-Sā‘īdī by Muslim and Aḥmad. Cf. the sound saying of Ibn ‘Abbās: “There is nothing of Paradise in the lower world except the names.” Narrated by Ibn Abī Ḥātim in his Tefsīr, al-Bayhaqi with a good chain according to al-Mundhiri, al-Ḍiyā’ al-Maqdisī in al-Mukhtāra and others.
We ask Allāh the Almighty to let our final abode be in Paradise, to enlighten the vision of our hearts and eyesights, and to let this work serve solely for His most noble Countenance.

We are keeping a close watch for any other misrepresentations and corruptions of his that he might produce in the future so that we might expose his wayward paths and recalcitrance and so that we might \textit{strive for Allāh with the endeavor which is His right} (22:78). And praise belongs to Allāh, Lord of the worlds!
APPENDIX I

Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya

Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr ibn Saʿd, Shams al-Dīn Abū `Abd Allāh al-Zur‘ī al-Dimashqī al-Ḥanbālī, known as Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751), was a specialist in tafsīr, ḥadīth, fiqh and its principles, Arabic philology and grammar who became the foremost student and follower of Ibn Taymiyya, whose anthropomorphic and anti-taqlīd teachings he helped perpetuate.

Ibn al-Qayyim followed the same path as his teacher in his infamous poem entitled al-Qaṣīdat al-Nūniyya (“Ode Rhyming in the Letter N”). This lengthy poem on the tenets of faith is filled with corrupt suggestions about the Divine Attributes, which Shaykh al-Islām al-Taqī al-Subkī analyzes in detail in al-Sayf al-Ṣaqīl fil-Radd ‘alā Ibn Zafīl (“The Burnished Sword in Refuting Ibn Zafīl” i.e. Ibn al-Qayyim). Al-Subkī gave the verdict that the anthropomorphisms of the Divinity in the poem were beyond the pale of Islām. The poem could not be circulated openly in Ibn al-Qayyim’s lifetime but he never abandoned it, for the Ḥanbālī historian Ibn Rajab heard it from its author in the year of his death.⁴⁶¹

⁴⁶¹ As stated in his Dhayl Ṭabaqāt al-Ḫiṣab (2:448).
Today, some “Salafi” followers quote this poem indiscriminately, heedless of the deviations it promotes.\textsuperscript{462}

The Ulema found other problems with Ibn al-Qayyim’s positions, among them the following innovations in the various branches of the Islamic sciences:


- In Uṣūl al-fiqh: see ‘Allāma Ḥabīb al-Kirānawī’s 100-page point-by-point refutation – excerpted below – titled al-Dīn al-Qayyim in which he blasts Ibn al-Qayyim’s anti-taqlīd theses and revilement of the Fuqahā’ over the issue in Tīlām al-Muwaqqītīn. In the latter book, Ibn al-Qayyim claims that Imām Aḥmad said “Whoever says there is such a thing as Ijmāʾ has lied” yet goes on to say there is Ijmāʾ about ten or more matters in the same book alone! It is not actually true that Imām Aḥmad said this but it is only claimed by Ibn Ḥazm that he said something interpretable as this.\textsuperscript{463} (The same Ibn Ḥazm authored a large book on all the positions that form Ijmāʾ in Islām.)

\textsuperscript{462} See Shaykh Nūh Keller’s remarks in his Reliance of the Traveller (p. 1058).


- In Ḥadīth: His slant in ʿaqīda caused him to endorse forgeries and Isrāʿīliyyāt and declare as saḥīh weak reports beyond reasonable boundaries in his book Ijtīmāʿ al-Juyūsh al-Islāmīyya in the same fashion as his Shaykh in the latter’s Fatwā Ḥamawiyya, Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyya, and other works, which detracted from both their ranks in Ḥadīth scholarship as is known among its experts. See on this Imām al-Lacknawi’s words on Ibn Taymiyya in al-Rafʿ wal-Takmil with Shaykh ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda’s notes. An example: “From Ibn Wahḥ, from Yahyā ibn Ayyūb, from Abū Hind, from Anas who said: The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said: ‘Honor the cow, for truly she is the leader of the beasts of burden, she did not raise her eyes to the heaven out of shame before Allāh Most High since the calf was worshipped’.” “I [Ibn al-Qayyim] say: Attributing it to the Prophet ﷺ is not firmly established (ghayr thābit) because Abū Hind is unknown (majhūl). The point is that this [i.e. believing that Allāh is on top of the sky] is the primordial disposition instilled by Allāh, even in animals, and even the dumbest of them which is used to illustrate dumbness, namely, the cow”! The true verdict is not that the narration is “not firmly
established because Abū Hind is unknown” as Ibn al-Qayyim claims but rather that it is fabricated by ‘Abd Allāh ibn Wahb al-Fasawī [or Nasawi] whom Ibn Hībān named a dajjāl and forger as in al-Dhahabi’s al-Mughni fil-Du‘afā’ and Mizān al-I’tidāl. The above narration was therefore included among the forgeries by the Masters of hadith, most of them agreeing that ‘Abd Allāh ibn Wahb had fabricated it.464 Ibn al-Qayyim ignores or pretends to ignore that verdict, diverts the discussion to Abū Hind, giving the innocuous verdict “not firmly established” while nevertheless proceeding to promote his anthropomorphist doctrine on the very grounds of that narration, which is his primary purpose.

In the same vein, Ibn al-Qayyim strenuously defends the authenticity of a long unknown-chained (musalsal bil-majāhil), disclaimed (munkar) narration on the end of times which contains the wording “In the morning, your Lord roamed the earth, all of which had been dispopulated” (fa-aṣbaḥa rabbuka yaṫūfu fil-arḍi wa-khalat ‘alayhi al-bilād).465


465 Narrated by ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ahmad in al-Sunna (Qahtānī ed. 2:486=Zaghloul ed. p. 176-179 §951) and his Ziyādāt to his father’s Musnad (Risāla ed. 26:121-128 §16206), Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim in al-Sunna (p. 287), and al-Ṭabarānī in al-Kabīr (19:211-213 §477) while al-Hākim (4:560-564) omits the offending passage. Cf. Ibn al-Qayyim, Zād al-Ma‘ād (3:54-57=3:588-599). Albānī twice states that its chain is “weak” in his edition of Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim (p. 231 and p. 289) whereas its optimal grading is “very weak” as implied by Ibn Kathir’s expression “gharib jiddan, fi ba’di al-fuṣūl nakāra” in the Bidāya (5:80-82) and Ibn Ḥajar’s identical terms in Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb (5:75 s.v. ‘Āṣim ibn Laqīṭ). In addition, al-Arna’ūṭ in his Musnad marginalia (26:128) mentioned that “one of those who affiliate themselves to the craft of hadith in our time” (ba’du man yanataḥhulu šinā‘ at al-ḥadith fi ‘uṣrinā‘), i.e., al-Albānī, adduced it to upgrade another weak hadith to the rank of ḥasan in his Sīlahā Sahīha (§2810) in violation of the rule that very weak reports cannot be used to upgrade others.
In the course of his discussion he tries to boost his documentation by citing ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ahmad, Ibn Abī ‘Āsim, al-Ṭabarānī, Ibn Mandah, Ibn Mardūyah, Abū al-Shaykh, and Abū Nu‘aym. As Abū Ghudda points out, “he knows better than anyone else that their books are replete with weak, disclaimed, and forged reports.” Another time, Ibn al-Qayyim adduces this very passage to support his and his teacher Ibn Taymiyya’s creed that Allāh “comes to earth on the Day of Resurrection without ceasing to remain above His heavens on His Throne” (wa-kadhālikka maji’uḥu ilā al-arḍi... yawma al-qiyāma... hādhā wa-huwa fawqa samāwātihī ‘alā ‘arshih). Imām ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-Ishbīlī had warned two centuries earlier: “His saying ‘your Lord roamed the earth’ is only a periphrasis to explain (taqrīb wa-tasfīḥ) that everyone on earth will die and that it shall remain deserted.”

Nevertheless, Zād al-Ma‘ād is an impressive mine of information and contains shining pages on jihād al-nafs as does his Fawāʾid. Shaykh Muhammad ʿAkilī served the Ṭibb al-Nabawī part of Zād al-Maʿād with his translation titled Prophetic Medicine. Al-Manār al-Munīf on weak and forged hadiths received a thoroughly researched edition by Abū Ghudda. Madārij al-Sālikin, Rawḍat al-Muḥibbin, and Miftāḥ Dār al-Saʿāda contain benefits on taṣawwuf. The late Shaykh ʿAbd al-Ghanī ʿAbd al-Khāliq made use of Iʿlām al-Muwaqqiʿīn in his Hujjīyyat al-Sunna from which our monograph The Binding Proof of the Sunna was adapted.

466 Abū Ghudda, marginalia on al-Lacknawi’s al-Ajwibat al-Fādila (p. 131).
468 'Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Ishbīlī, al-ʿAqība (p. 259).
469 To be published as the third volume of our Sunna Notes series in shā Allāh.
Ibn al-Qayyim’s “Book of the Soul” (Kitāb al-Rūḥ) ranks among the best books on the subject of the Islamic understanding of life after death according to the Qur’ān, the Sunna, and the doctrine of the Salaf and the Four Imāms, establishing without doubt that the dead hear the living and know of them. Since this hearing of the dead is a contradiction of the fundamental Wahhabī tenet that the dead cannot hear the living, mumblings are sometimes heard about the authenticity of his authorship of the book among the “Salafīs.” However, the book is undoubtedly by Ibn al-Qayyim and is attributed to him by over two dozen scholars both in his time and after. It also contains internal proofs of his authorship, such as his mention of his own book – now lost – entitled Ma’rifat al-Rūḥ wal-Nafs and his identifying two of his direct teachers as Abū al-Ḥajjāj (al-Mizzī), and Ibn Taymiyya:

“Our shaykh Abū al-Ḥajjāj, the ḥadīth Master, used to say that.”

“I heard Shaykh al-Islām, Ibn Taymiyya stress this…”

---

470 Cf. Albānī’s remark in his notes on al-Alūsī’s al-‘Āyāt al-Bayyināt (p. 22): “See the book al-Rūḥ attributed to Ibn al-Qayyim, for it contains the strangest and oldest narrations and opinions!” But there is virtually nothing in al-Rūḥ which cannot also be found or confirmed in al-Qurtubī’s al-Tadhkira, Ibn Rajab’s Ahwāl al-Qubūr, ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq ibn al-Kharrāz’s al-‘Aqība, al-Suyūṭī’s Shahr al-Ṣudūr, Ibn Abī al-Dunyā’s al-Qubūr, etc.

471 Al-Dhahābī (d. 748) in al-Mu’jam al-Mukhtass bil-Muḥaddithin (fo. 145), al-Ṣafādī (d. 764) in A’yān al-‘Āsr (fo. 129) and al-Wafī bil-Wafayāt (2:170-172), al-Ḥusaynī (d. 765) in Dhayl al-‘Ibar (5:282), Ibn Kathīr (d. 774) in al-Bidāya wal-Nihāya (14:234), Ibn Raṭīf (d. 774) in al-Wafayāt (2:6-7), Ibn Rajab (d. 795) in Dhayl Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila (2:447), Ibn Nāṣir al-Dīn (d. 842) in al-Raḍī al-Wafīr (p. 68), Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852) in al-Durar al-Kāmina (3:400), al-Bīqā’ī (d. 885) in Sīr al-Rūḥ (introduction), etc.


“Our shaykh said: ‘The sun itself does not descend from the heaven, and the sunrays that are on earth are neither the sun nor its attribute, but an accident (‘arad) caused by the sun and the mass (jirm) opposite it.’”\(^{475}\) This is taken verbatim from Ibn Taymiyya’s notorious “Explanation of the ḥadith of the descent of Allāh.”\(^{476}\) Another internal proof is Ibn al-Qayyim’s lapsing into excessive criticism of Ashʿarīs and misattributions of spurious positions to them as is typical of him and his teacher,\(^ {477}\) although in much of his book he cites from \textit{al-Tadhkira}, a book by the Ashʿarī scholar al-Qurṭubī.

Ibn al-Qayyim violently attacked adherence to the Four Schools of Law among traditional Sunni Muslims and voiced his anti-	extit{madhhab} stance in a two-volume work on the principles of the Law entitled \textit{Iʿlām al-Muwaqqiʿīn}. In the latter book he rejects the evidence that the Companions and great Imāms endorsed imitation as inapplicable to later generations and instead advocates a kind of populist \textit{iḥtiād} in which every Muslim is his own Imām and is urged to apply his or her own mind toward interpreting the Qurʾān and Sunna independently, untrammelled by the burdensome qualifications in jurisprudence, language, ḥadith methodology, and the Qurʾānic sciences that are required for \textit{iḥtiād}. It is enough refutation of this Islamically-veiled Protestantism that Imām Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaʿī said: “If the Companions had made ablution to the wrists I swear I would have done the same, even as I read the verse of ablution as stating \{to


\(^{476}\) Ibn Taymiyya, \textit{Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā} (5:438).

\(^{477}\) “This is a position rejected by the Book, the Sunna, the Consensus of the Companions, as well as the evidence given by reason, common sense, and Pristine Disposition, and is the position of one who does not know his own soul let alone the souls of others!” Ibn al-Qayyim, \textit{al-Rūḥ} (1975 ed. p. 111=1998 ed. p. 286).
the elbows} (5:6)." More explicitly, al-Shâtibî said: "The fatwâs of the mujtahids are to the laymen what the Shari'a evidences are to the mujtahids."  

The Indian jurist and hadîth scholar Ḥabîb Aḥmad al-Kirânawî blasted Ibn al-Qayyim's theses in a 100-page epistle entitled al-Dîn al-Qayyim in which he states:

[Ibn al-Qayyim] said: "Your claim that the imitator (muqallid) is closer to being right by imitating those who are more knowledgeable than he is, than by exerting his own reasoning (ijtihâd) is an empty claim. For the muqallid is like a blind man who does not know whether what fell into his hand is a stick or a viper. Whereas he who leaves taqlîd is a mujtahid who has two rewards if he is correct and one reward if he is incorrect. How then can the blind man's being right and his supposed reward compare with the seeing man's being right, who exerts every effort?"

The ignorance, inanity, arrogance, and hostility of the preceding words are not hidden to anyone. For he has equated the muqallid with a blind man and the one who leaves taqlîd with a seeing man although the latter is blinder than the muqallid. If sight consisted in leaving taqlid it would follow that he who most assiduously follows his own opinion must be the most sighted of people, for he is as far from imitation as can be. And if taqlid were blindness then the most assiduous follower of the Messenger of Allâh would be the

---

478 Ibrâhîm al-Nakha`i as cited by Ibn Abî Zayd al-Qayrawâni in al-Jâmi` fil-Sunan (p. 150 §18).
479 As cited by Dr. Salâh al-Šâwi in his al-Thawâbit wal-Mutaghayyirât (Cairo: al-Muntadâ al-Islâmi, 1994) p. 66.
480 Included in full in his Fawa`id fî `Ulûm al-Fiqh in the second volume of the general introduction to al-Tâhânawî's I`lâm al-Sunan (2:1-99). This epistle is probably one of the most comprehensive rebuttals of "Salafi" anti-madhhabism.
blindest of people, for he is a pure imitator! Whereas the sighted one sees the truth as does the imitator, while the blind one does not see it, nor does the one who leaves imitation, following his own guidance despite the fact that he is blind and castigating anyone who might imitate the sighted and follow the latter’s guidance.

As for exerting every effort, if reward depended on exerting every effort in absolute terms, then the muqallid has exerted every effort toward following the truth, having realized that he is incapable to do more than to imitate the knowledgeable person. How then could he be committing a sin and be deprived of reward? But if reward depended on exerting every effort in other than absolute terms then how could he who leaves taqlid be rewarded when he is cutting wood in the dead of night? Is this anything but absurd?

Whoever knows the conditions for being qualified to give legal responses in the Religion of Allāh according to the statements of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal,482 al-Shāfiʿi,483 and Ibn al-Mubārak,484 does not doubt at all that those who leave taqlid without having achieved those conditions are not allowed to give fatwā on the basis of their opinion and what they have understood of the Book and the Sunna. The reason is that their knowledge is virtually no knowledge. This is a far cry from possessing sight and obtaining reward while being wrong. For theirs is only the bane of the iftihād of the non-mujtahid.

482 See chapter on Imām Ahmad in our Four Imāms and Their Schools.
483 See Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s Adab al-Mufti wal-Mustafti printed before his Fatāwā wa-Masā’il (1:5-133).
484 He [Ibn al-Mubārak] did not give fatwā except upon the strength and on the basis of transmitted reports.” ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Ṣaqqāq as cited by Ibn Abī Ḥātim in his introduction to al-ṣaḥīḥ wal-Ta’dīl (p. 262). Ibn al-Qayyim, op. cit.
He [Ibn al-Qayyim] also said: “The muqallid is closer to being right only when he knows that the correct position is with the one he is imitating exclusively of others. At that time he is not a muqallid for him but a follower of the evidence (mattabi' lil-ḥujja). But if he does not know this at all, then how can you claim that he is closer to being right than he who has exerted his every effort and applied all his strength in searching for the truth?”

This objection is spurious because the reason that the muqallid is closer to being right is that he is led by the guidance of his Imām who is a mujtahid. His being right is through his Imām’s being right, and his being wrong is through his Imām’s being wrong. This is other than the one who leaves taqlid, whose being right is through his own person’s being right, and whose being wrong is through his own person’s being wrong. Now the error of the mujtahid is less probable than that of the non-mujtahid just as his being correct is more probable than that of the non-mujtahid. It follows that the muqallid is closer to being right than the one who leaves taqlid as is readily apparent. This puts to rest what is being claimed by this man without understanding the meaning of what he uses for evidence.

He [Ibn al-Qayyim] also said: “The one who is nearest to being right when the Ulema are in dispute is he who adheres to the Divine command [{refer it to Allāh and the Messenger} (4:59)] and refers to the Qur’ān and the Sunna whatsoever they dispute about. As for whoever refers the matter to the

485 This reasoning is at the origin of the invented terminology of “Salafi” whereby one “should be a mattabi’ and not a muqallid,” and their barefaced prohibition of taqlid as reported of 'Id 'Abbāsi by al-Būtī in al-Lāmadhhabiyya (p. 99-108).
486 Ibn al-Qayyim, op. cit.
one he follows exclusively of others, how can he be closer to being right? 487

This is worthless sophistry. It is those who are in dispute who are commanded to refer to Allāh ﷺ and the Messenger ﷺ. So when the Ulema dispute, it is incumbent upon them to refer to Allāh ﷺ and the Messenger ﷺ. But if the ignorant dispute, such as the muqallid and other than the muqallid, then their referring to Allāh ﷺ and the Messenger ﷺ cannot take place except through referral to the ‘ālim who knows the Book and the Sunna – not to the Book and the Sunna themselves, for they are ignorant of them. Else, it would necessarily follow that the ignoramus is the arbiter among the Ulema, and nothing is more patently false than such a claim. It is all-too-apparent that what he said is pure sophistry, and it stems from failing to meditate on the Qur’ān. 488

In his Dawābit al-Maṣlaḥa, Dr. Saʿīd al-Būṭī showed that Ibn al-Qayyim blatantly contradicts himself in Iʿlām al-Muwaqqīʿīn by violently rejecting khulʿ as a legal loophole (hila sharʿiyya) – in order to avoid the finality of a triple divorce – yet, a few pages later, he recommends the very same loophole.

Ibn al-Qayyim wrote much on taṣawwuf, with which he evidently felt strong affinities. In Miftāḥ Dār al-Saʿāda he states:

‘Ilm al-yaqīn is the first level of the levels of certitude and consists in its knowledge and full awareness. It is an unveiling of the object of knowledge to the heart, by which the latter beholds it without the least doubt, just like the unveiling of the visible to the eye. ‘Ayn al-yaqīn is a second

487 Ibn al-Qayyim, op. cit.

REFUTATION OF HIM WHO ATTRIBUTES DIRECTION TO ALLAH

level, but related to the eye, just as the first level is related to the heart. Ḥaqq al-yaqīn is a third level consisting in the direct apprehension of the object of knowledge and its full, complete experience.489

He wrote an extensive commentary on al-Harawī al-Anṣāri’s slim Sufi manual entitled Manāzil al-Sā‘irin ilā al-Ḥaqq which he named Madārij al-Sālikīn and in which he said:

Religion is all moral character (khuluq), and whoever bests you in moral character, bests you in Religion. It is the same with taṣawwuf. Al-Kattānī said: Taṣawwuf is moral character, and whoever bests you in moral character, bests you in Religion [...] Truly, the hardest thing for human nature is the modification of the moral qualities and traits with which the selves have been stamped. Those who earnestly engaged in harsh discipline and arduous strivings worked on nothing else. Most of them did not succeed in changing the self, but the latter became fully employed in those exercises and thus unable to wield its influence [...] One day I asked Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyya – may Allāh have mercy on him! – about this matter and how to eliminate defects and occupy oneself with the cleansing of one’s path. The gist of his reply was that the self is like a garbage pile: the more you dig in it, the more of it comes out to the surface; if you can pave a pathway over it and go past it, do so, and do not preoccupy yourself with digging into it for you shall never reach its bottom! [...] Taṣawwuf is one of the cornerstones (zawāyā) of true way-faring (al-sulūk al-ḥaqīqī) and the purification and disciplining of the self (tazkiyat al-nafs wa-tahdhibuhā) so that it may

489 Ibn al-Qayyim, Mīšāh Dār al-Sa‘āda (p. 149).
prepare itself for its journey to the company of the Highest Assembly and for being together with its beloved. For "one is with the one he loves" as Sumnūn stated: "The lovers of Allāh have gained the honor of both the world and the hereafter, for 'one is with the one he loves.'" And Allāh knows best.

491 Ibn al-Qayyim, Madārij al-Sālikīn (2:307). A Wahhābī bowdlerized this work and republished it as Tuhdhib Madārij al-Sālikīn.
APPENDIX II

Shaykh Wahbi Sulaymân Ghâwji al-Albânî
A Brief Bio-Bibliography

Shaykh Wahbi ibn Sulaymân ibn Khalil Ghâwji al-Albânî was born in 1932 CE (1343) in Skudera, the former capital city of Albania. He attended classes and learnt the Qur'an and what is called "the science of states, 'Ilm al-Ḥāl, which includes the books of doctrine and morals for us Ḥanafis." His first teacher and certifier in the Islamic Sciences was his father Shaykh Sulaymân, who narrates from the Shuyūkh of Albania.

His secondary studies came to an end when King Aḥmad Ṭūghû made it the law for students to wear the barettâ.493 He said: "We migrated to Shām, after which, my father sent me to Egypt and I stayed there for ten years. I learnt Arabic and received a degree from the Faculty of Shari‘a and a specialized degree in Islamic judgship. I attended the courses of Imām Muḥammad Zāhid al-Kawtharî (in exile from Turkey) whose

493 From the French béret, a round, flat-shaped hat still worn nowadays by many Muslims in the Balkan region, similar to the type Atatürk made compulsory for the Turkish population when he took over and forbade the turban and fez.
hand I was honored to kiss and who handed me his *thabat* or record of authorities (*al-Tahrīr al-Wajīz fī-mā Yabtaghīhi al-Mustajīz*). However, I narrate from him only through the intermediaries of Shaykh Muḥammad ʿAlī al-Murād al-Ḥamawī and Shaykh ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda al-Ḥalabī. Allāh have mercy on all of them!” He described al-Kawtharī as “a Sign of Allāh in learning, modesty and abstinence, as if he were a king walking in the street.” This is how we see Shaykh Ghāwji also.

In 1948 CE he was appointed as a religious teacher in the governmental schools in Damascus, a post he retained until 1980 CE, at which time he left Syria and moved to the Hījāz. After several years in al-Madīnat al-Munawwara he moved to the United Arab Emirates where he was appointed a lecturer at the Faculty of Islamic Studies and Arabic in Dubai. In 2000 CE he returned to Damascus where he has been living since, teaching at Maʿḥad al-Fath al-Islāmī and striving to support *daʿwa* in Albania.

Among Shaykh Ghāwji’s teachers beside those already mentioned:

Shaykh ʿInāyat Allāh Nābī al-Shahīr al-Askūbī who narrates from his Macedonian and other *Shuyūkh*;
Shaykh ʿAbd al-Wāhḥāb Dīb wa-Zayt al-Ḥimṣī,
Shaykh Muḥammad Muḥammad al-Ḥamīd, and
Shaykh Saʿd al-Dīn al-Murād al-Ḥamawī from their Syrian and other *Shuyūkh*;
Sayyid Muḥammad al-ʿArabī ibn al-Tubbānī the author of *Barāʾāt al-Hanifiyyīn* (published as *Barāʾāt al-Ashʿariyyīn*) and
Sayyid Muḥammad ibn ʿAlawī al-Mālikī from their Meccan and other *Shuyūkh*;
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Muftī Muḥammad Shafi‘ al-‘Uthmānī,
his son Muftī Muḥammad al-Taqī the continuator of Shibbīr Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī’s Fatḥ al-Mulhim ‘alā Sharḥi Muslim,
Muftī ‘Āshiq Ilāhī al-Murtahinī al-Madānī, and
Sayyid Abū al-Ḥasan al-Nadwī from their Indo-Pakistanī and
other Shuyūkh.

Among the works Shaykh Ghāwwī authored and published in Damascus and Beirut:

Abū Ḥanīfata al-Nu‘mān Imām al-A‘immat al-Fuqahā‘, a four-
hundred page biography with an edition of the Fiqh al-Akbar
which received over a half dozen editions at Dār al-Qalam. It
was translated into Persian and published in Teheran in
2003.

Arkān al-‘Imān on the branches of faith at Mu‘assasat al-Risāla.
Arkān al-‘Īslām on the fiqh of the Five Pillars according to the
Ḥanafī School, in two volumes at Dār al-Bashā‘īr al-
Islāmiyya.

Al-Ḥayāt al-‘Ākhira: Aḥwāluhā wā-Aḥwāluhā wā-Husn ‘Āqibati
al-Muttaqīnā fīhā bi-Faḍl Allāh wā-Raḥmatih at Dār al-
Bashā‘īr, on the states of the hereafter.

Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allāh: Saḥābiyyun Imāmun wā-Ḥāfizun Faqīh, a
biography at Dār al-Qalam.

Kashfū Shubuhātī Man Za‘ama Ḥilla Arbāḥī al-Qurūd al-
Maṣrafiyya in refutation of those who declared licit bank
interests on loans.

Kalimatun ‘Ilmiyyatun Hādiyyatun fil-Bid‘ati wa-Aḥkāmihā at
Dār al-Imām Muslim, a fine, concise study of the Sunni
definition of innovation.
Maqālatun fil-Ribā wal-Fā‘idat al-Maṣrafiyya at Mu‘assasat al-Rayyān and Dār Ibn Ḥazm, against the legitimization of usury in all its forms.

Al-Mar‘atu al-Muslima: {Wa-Laysa al-Dhakaru kal-Unthā} which received many editions at Mu‘assasat al-Risāla and Dār al-Qalam, a study on the rulings pertaining to women in Islām.

Masā’il fī ‘Ilm al-Tawḥīd, published in al-Shāriqa, which is epitomized at the fore of this volume and is the redacted version of his introduction to Īḍāḥ al-Dalīl [see below].


Al-Ṣalātu wa-Aḥkāmuḥā at Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, on the second pillar of Islām.

Al-Shahādatān wa-Aḥkāmuḥā at Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, on the first pillar of Islām.

Al-Ṣiyāmu wa-Aḥkāmuḥ at Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, on the fourth pillar of Islām.

Al-Taḥdhīr min al-Kabā‘ir at Amman’s Dār al-Bashīr.

He also wrote important marginalia:

Al-Ta‘liq al-Muyassar on Shaykh Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī’s (d. 956) recension of Ḥanafi fiqh, Multaqā al-Abhur.

Muqaddima fi ‘Iml al-Tawhīd, a long introduction to ʿIdāh al-Dalīl fi Qaṭ‘i Ḥujajjī Ahl al-Ta‘tīl by the Shāfi‘ī Egyptian Qādī Badr al-Dīn Ibn Jamā‘a (694-767), at Cairo’s Dār al-Salām, a defense of Sunni doctrine against over-interpreters and anthropomorphists.


On al-Kawtharī’s (1296-1391) Maḥq al-Taqawwul fi Maṣ’alat al-Tawwassul and Ḥāfīz Muhammad ‘Abid al-Sindī’s (d. 1257) Ḥawla al-Tawwassul wal-Istighātha at Dār al-Bashā‘ir, both of them written to clarify the Sunni ruling on using intermediaries and intercessors as opposed to the neo-Mu’tazilīs who deny or downgrade this ruling.

He also wrote prefatory material for the following works:

ʿAbd al-Karīm Tattān and Muḥammad Adib al-Kilānī’s Sharḥ Jawḥarat al-Tawhīd in two volumes at Dār al-Bashā‘ir, together with Shaykh ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Rifā‘ī.

Khalīd Makkhūṭa’s 600-page Aḥwāl al-Abrār ‘inda al-Iḥtiḍār at Dār al-Bashā‘ir, on the states of the pious at the threshold of death, which vastly expands on al-Raba‘ī’s (d. 379) slim Waṣṣāyā al-ʿUlamā’ ‘inda Ḥuḍūr al-Mawt.
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The translator was honored to read with Shaykh Ghāwji the Fiqh al-Akbar, the Waṣiyya, the Taḥawiyya, and the Nasafiyya. May Allah preserve him and continue to benefit the Umma with him, and to Allah the Lord of the worlds belong all praise and thanks.
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Accept the truth from whoever states it (Mu‘ādh), 265
After being burnt to the bone (umtuhisī) they will be taken out, 45
Allāh descends every night to the nearest heaven, 258
Allāh – in the heaven is His Throne and on earth His dominion, 211
Allāh is above the Throne, 196, 197
Allāh is now as He ever was (‘Ali), 141
Allāh places the heavens on a finger..., 122
And I bear witness to the same, 158
Are you not praying?, 43
[The] balance is in the hand of the Merciful, He elevates a people while he abases others, 122
[The] best of generations are my century, 108
Beware the error of the wise man (Mu‘ādh), 265
[The] Black Stone is the depository of the covenant of human souls (‘Ā‘ishah), 225
[The] Black Stone is the right hand of Allāh on earth, 224-225
[The] Black Stone shall appear with two eyes and a tongue on the Day of Resurrection, 225
[The] corner of the Black Stone is the Right Hand, 225
Dajjāl is one-eyed whereas your Lord is not one-eyed, 222
Do not curse the wind for it is part of the breath of the Merciful, 225
Do not indulge in mutual praise for it is nothing short of butchery, 155
Do you not trust me, when I am trusted..., 191
[The] forearm of Allāh is stronger, 121
Give laud to Allāh for He deserves laud (Ibn Abī Ṣalt), 210
Hadith of the Mountain Goats, 197, 205, 208, 209
Have I not conveyed the Message?, 215
He maims camels, 121
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His kursî encompasses the heavens and the earth, 92
His kursî is His knowledge (Ibn 'Abbâs), 117
How can even the most eloquent tongues describe Him ('Ali), 136
I am according to My servant's opinion of Me, 190
I am as My servant thinks of Me, 224
I cannot render count of Your Glory!, 260
I cannot sufficiently extol Your praise, 174
I fear three things for my Community most of all, 222
I find the breath of the Merciful coming from Yemen, 224
I have prepared for My righteous servants what no eyes have ever seen, 281
I sit with him who remembers Me, 224, 225
I was hungry and you did not feed Me, 120
I was married off by Allâh from above seven heavens (Zaynab), 247
I was ordered to fight people until they say lâ ilâha illallâh, 157, 160, 162
If he comes to Me walking, I come to him running, 224
If he mentions Me in himself I mention him in Myself, 224
Incacity to attain comprehension is comprehension, 174, 260
Invite them to the testimony that there is no God but Allâh and Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allâh, 89
It is not the sword but the saʿīd [forearm]! (Zubayr), 121
Let no one spit in front of him in prayer, 195
Light shines over the truth (Muʿādh), 265
Mounts are not to be saddled but to travel to three mosques, 53
My Community shall divide into seventy-three sects, 73
My servant! I was sick and you never visited Me, 120
[The] nearest to Allâh a servant can be is in his prostration, 254
No one always keeps his ablution except a believer, 65
No one spends something except the Merciful takes it with His right hand, 251
None should compete with his brother's transaction, 276
O Allâh! Bear witness, 215
O Transformer of hearts! Make firm our hearts in Your Religion, 122
Only a hypocrite has hatred for you, 43
Our Lord, Allâh, in the heaven hallowed be Your Name, 191, 192
[The] Prophet ﷺ walked away, slapping his thigh and saying {Man disputes much), 43
Sharid recited to the Prophet ﷺ up to one hundred lines of poetry by Umayya, 210
Some people claim that 'Allâh uncovers His Shin' (Saʿīd ibn Jubayr), 223
[The] soul exits the body then is taken up to the heaven, 209
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That is some sword! (Zubayr), 121
There is no heart except it lies between the two fingers of the Merciful, 122
There is nothing of Paradise in the lower world except the names (Ibn `Abbās), 281
Thickness of the skin of the disbeliever will be forty cubits, 123
Truly, ṣadaqa falls into the palm of the Merciful, 122
[The] upper hand is better than the lower hand, 122
Verily You are just as You have glorified Yourself, 174, 260
Whenever one of you stands to pray, 195
Where is Allāh?, 168-169
Whoever among you is afflicted by something, 191
Whoever clings to my present path and that of my Companions, 230
Whoever comes near Me one hand-span I come near him one cubit, 224
Whoever visits me in al-Madīna anticipating reward, I shall be for him a witness and an intercessor, 60
Whoever visits my grave, my intercession is guaranteed for him, 52, 59-63
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You are just as You have glorified Yourself, 174, 260
You shall see your Lord just as you see the moon on the night it is full, 164
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‘Abd Allāh ibn Rawāhā, 209
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‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Mahdī, 117, 246-247
‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Ziyād al-İfriqī, 231
‘Abd al-Razzāq, 174
‘Abd ibn Humayd, 223
Abū ‘Awāna, 241, 245
Abū ‘Uthmān al-Maghribī, 169-170, 214
Abū al-‘Ala’ ‘Abidīn, 167
Abū al-Bakhtārī, 174
Abū al-Dardāʾ, 191, 192, 222, 280
Abū al-Faḍl al-Tamīmī, 128, 213
Abū al-Ḥasan ibn al-Bukhārī, 11
Abū al-Layth al-Samarqandi, 16
Abū al-Shaykh, 201, 287
Abū al-Su‘ūd, 178, 223
Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq, 43, 174
Abū Bakrah, 215
Abū Dāwūd, 19, 73, 193, 215, 245, 254, 265
Abū Ghādiya, 215
Abū Ghudda, 33, 35, 58-60, 66, 285, 287, 298, 301
Abū Ḥanīfā, 16, 38, 50, 128, 131, 132, 137, 156, 160, 164, 167-169, 229, 238, 243, 244, 246, 253, 263
Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, 241
Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalusī, 65, 126, 127, 179, 206
Abū Hurayra, 73, 85, 120, 122, 123, 164, 190, 209, 223-225, 251, 254, 261, 276, 281
Abū Ḥūṣayn al-Marwazi, 252
Abū Mūsā al-‘Ash‘ari, 117, 252
Abū Nu‘aym, 136, 166, 201, 211, 225, 231, 239, 246, 249, 287
Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, 85, 191, 201, 215, 223
Abū Umāma, 122, 280
Abū Ya‘lā al-Ḥanbālī, 21, 132, 140
Abū Ya‘lā al-Mawsili, 73, 193
Abū Yūsuf, 243
Abū Zahrā, 91, 93, 96, 99, 175
‘Adawi, 149
‘adhān, 63
Adhkyyā’, 209
Advice to the Scholars of Najd, 246
Aghā (Munir ‘Abduh), 252
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āhād, 212
Āhād wal-Mathānī, 225
Āḥādīth wal-Āthār al-Mutazā‘īda fi anna al-Ṭalāq al-Thalātha
Wāhida, 49
Ahkām al-Qur‘ān, 82
Ahmād ibn Ḥanbal, 18, 21, 36, 43, 50, 59, 65, 70, 73, 77, 78, 88, 92, 121-123, 128, 129, 131, 132, 136, 158-161, 190, 192, 193, 200, 209, 213, 215, 224, 225, 228, 238, 241, 243-245, 251, 261, 281, 284, 291
Ahl al-Sunnah, 22, 24, 64, 81, 85, 91-92, 101, 102, 105, 106, 113, 123, 124, 133, 152, 154, 157, 160, 163-165, 170, 179, 186, 222, 230, 252
'Āisha, 63, 174, 185, 225, 267
'Ajlūnī, 60, 225
'Ajurrī, 193, 196, 238
Ajbūwa al-Makkīyya, 53
'Alā‘ al-Dīn al-Bukhārī, 19, 32, 48
'Alā‘ī, 27, 28, 66, 70, 71, 77, 78, 139
Albānī, 62, 90, 91, 136, 284, 286, 288
Albānī and His Friends, 14, 77
al-ghāz, 276
'Ali ibn Abī Ṭalīb, 42, 43, 136, 141, 155, 174, 260
'Ali ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Shaqīq, 136, 245
Alūsī (Mahmūd), 112, 116, 274
Alūsī (Nu‘mān), 23, 58, 77, 288
'Amāl al-Yawm wal-Layla, 192, 225
Amālī al-Mahāmīli, 174
'āmmī, 111, 261
'Amr ibn 'Abbās al-Bāhili, 247
Anas, 60, 73, 122, 224, 225, 231, 247, 280, 285
angels, 15, 20, 160, 178-179, 190, 191, 208, 211
anthropomorphism, 14, 15-21, 80-83, 100, 124, 153, 156, 168, 182-184, 203, 209, 226, 230, 234, 247-249, 276, 283
Aqāwī al-Thiqāt, 158, 159, 223
'Aqīda Wāṣītiyya, 39, 197, 221
'Aqīdat Aḥl al-Īmān fi Khalqī Ādām ala’ Ṣurat al-Rahmān, 14
'Aqīdat al- İslāmiyya Bayn al-Salafiyya wal-Mu‘tazila, 108
'Aqīdat al-Salaf, 248
'Aqīdat Ibn ‘Arabī, 167
'Aridat al-Āhwāth, 185, 210, 239
Arna‘ūt (Shu‘ayb), 222, 237, 241, 286
'Āsim ibn ‘Ali ibn ‘Āsim, 247
'Āsim ibn Damra, 174
Aṣmā‘ī, 19, 93, 210
Aṣās al-Taqādīs, 22, 83
Asbāb al-Nuzūl, 15
Asmā‘ wal-Sīfāt, 16, 86, 91, 117, 126, 132, 191, 195, 221, 222, 224, 237-239, 244, 245, 247, 251
Asnā‘ī fi Sharh Asmā‘ Allāh al-Husnā, 221
Asrār al-Marjū‘a, 20
Atābikīyya, 11
Āthār al-Ḫaṭṭīyya fil-Maktabat al-Qādiriyah fi Bayḥdād, 37
atheists, 154, 167, 228
Athram, 241
‘awāmm, 240, 260
‘Awāsim min al-Qawāsim, 123
‘Awn ibn Abī Juḥayfah, 174
Awzā‘ī, 50, 237, 238, 246
ayd, aydī, 223
Ayyūb al-Sakhtyānī, 246
‘Azhama, 117, 201
azāli, 164
ba‘in, 135-138, 244, 245
Bad al-‘Ilqa bi-Labs al-Khirqa, 45
Bādirā‘iyya, 11-12
Baghawi, 18, 112, 116, 118, 221, 239
Baghdādī (Abū Mansūr Abd al-Qāhir), 19, 37, 83, 93, 141
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Bahr al-Muhīṭ, 127, 179
Bāği, 224, 250
Bājūrī, 108
Bara‘āt al-Asch’ariyyīn, 86-89, 298
Barda‘i, 165
Bārnibārī, 127
Bayādī, 38
Bayān Talbīs al-Jahmiyya, 81-83, 132, 230, 237
Bayān Zaghī al-’Ilm, 34, 68, 69
Baydawī, 117, 178, 223
Bazzār (Abū Bakr), 31, 58-59, 225
Bazzār (‘Umar), 31, 58
Belief of the People of Truth, 153
bid’ a, 50, 97-99, 109, 141
Bidāya min al-Kifāya fi Uṣūl al-Dīn, 252
bi-dhāhil, 21, 91, 135, 137, 248
Birzālī, 12, 94
Bishr al-Marrīsī, 83, 130, 135, 235, 245
Brahmans, 134, 218
Bughyat al-Ahlām, 56
Bukhari, 43, 64, 76, 79, 85, 116-117, 120, 122, 123, 156, 157, 164, 174, 185, 190, 191, 195, 222-225, 246, 247, 260, 267, 276, 281
Bundār, 252
Burhān, 30
Burhān al-Mu‘awyyad, 168,
Burhān al-Shāmī, 12
Būtī (Sa‘īd), 16, 68, 103, 108, 292, 293
Byzantines, 217
Christians, 15, 64, 111, 134, 217-219, 228
Consensus, 123, 28, 46, 48, 50, 67, 72, 74, 80, 84, 91, 114, 130, 134, 229, 230, 276, 289
Copts, 180
Daw‘ al-Lāmī, 33
Diya‘ al-Maqdisi, 60, 281
Daf‘ Shubah al-Tashbih, 21, 182, 222, 245
Dār al-Ḥadīth, 11
Dar‘ Ta‘āruf al-‘Aql wal-Naql, 82, 130, 239
Dāraquṭnī, 59-61, 117, 209
Dārīmī (‘Abd Allāh), 65, 174, 225, 260-261, 281
Dārīmī (‘Uthmān), 83, 129, 135, 211, 213, 245
Daf‘ Shubah Man Shabbaha wa-Tamarrad wa-Nasāba Dhālika ilā al-Imām Ahmad, 21, 39, 40
Dahlān, 56, 87
dahrīyya, 211
dajjal, 222, 286
Dala‘il al-Nuburwwa, 211
Dānī, 280
Dāris fi Tarīkh al-Madāris, 273
Dāwūd al-Zāhirī, 184
Dhakhā‘ir al-Qāṣr fi Tarājīm Nubala‘ al-‘Aṣr, 28
Dhamm al-Kalām, 136, 137
Dhamm al-Ta‘wil, 18, 161, 199, 238, 243, 248
Dhayl Tabaqāt al-Hanābila (Ibn Rajab), 32, 36, 37, 64, 66, 78, 95, 128, 284, 288
Dhimmitis, 246
Dhū al-Nūn, 166, 250
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Dībaj al-Mudhahhab, 167, 250
Diobandiyya, 14
divorce, 28, 48-50, 66, 74, 84, 293
Diwan al-Sababa, 154
Durar al-Kamīna, 12, 40, 41, 66, 67, 94, 206, 288
Durra al-Manthur, 112, 116, 117, 223
Durra al-Fakhira, 44
Durra al-Mu'diyya fil-Radd 'alā Ibn Taymiyya, 22, 31, 48, 72, 73, 84, 85
Durra al-Yatimiyya fil-Sirat al-Taymiyya, 35
expiation for perjury (kafrat yamin), 28
Fadail al-A'mal, 60
Fadail al-Shafi'i, 229
Fadala ibn 'Ubayd, 192
Fadani, 150
Farsi, 165
Farisq fil-Shiat, 248
Fasl al-Maqal, 169
Fatwā al-Ramāl, 22
Fatwā Ḥadithiya, 23, 73, 77
Faṭr al-Qadīr, 117, 274
Fawwād al-Bahiyya, 229
fawq, fawqiyya, 14, 17, 37, 93, 96, 135, 169, 175, 180, 191, 195, 196, 200, 202, 204, 208, 213, 237, 244, 245, 251, 259, 287
Fayd al-Qadir, 174
Fayruzabadi, 12, 197
Fiq al-Abasa, 38, 168
Fiq al-Akbar, 16, 38, 128, 160, 263, 302
Fiṣal fil-Milal, 17, 222-223
Four Imams and Their Schools, 18, 77, 78, 109, 131, 157, 237, 241, 243, 244, 291
Futūh al-Ghayb, 46

Futūhāt al-Makkiyya, 44
Ghawji, 107, 168, 297-302
gheyā, gheyāt, 81, 139, 230
Ghayat al-Muntahā, 51
Ghumari, 57, 60, 127, 284
Ghunya, 250
Gibril, 179
Gila̱ni (ʿAbd al-Qadir al-), 45-46, 250
greve, Prophet's, 50-52, 57, 60, 62, 63, 77, 102
Greeks, 172, 175, 217, 219
ḥadd, 16, 81, 128, 139, 189, 230, 241, 245
Ḥajj, 155
Ḥajji Khalifa, 33, 65, 127
Ḥakim, 73, 117, 122, 137, 138, 191-193, 222, 225, 231, 265, 280, 286
Ḥalabi (Nur al-Din), 56
Ḥallaj, 165
Ḥammād ibn Salama, 136
Ḥammād ibn Zayd, 90, 136, 241, 245-247
Ḥaqiqat al-Jaliyya fil-Radd 'alā Ibn Taymiyya fi Rama Awdahu fil-Fatwa al-Ḥamawiyya li-Ibni Jahbal, 151
haqiqa, 21, 37, 93, 195-196, 208, 238
Harawi al-Anṣari, 136-138, 248, 294
Ḥārūn al-Rashid, 243
Ḥasan al-Baṣri, 155, 157
Ḥasan ibn Ṣyād al-Lu'lu'i, 229
Ḥashwiyya, 101, 153-154, 156, 157, 159, 162, 163, 172, 177, 181-183, 213
Ḥawī fi Sirat al-Imām Abī Ja'far al-Taḥawi, 173
Ḥawwas, 134
Haytamī, 23, 58, 60, 73, 77, 149-150
Haythami, 59, 117, 158, 222, 225
Hidâyat al-Sālik ilâ Ma'rifat al-
Manāsik, 56
Ḥikam al-Rifāi \(^7\), 5
Ḥilāyat al-Awliyā', 136, 166, 201, 239, 249
Ḥimyarī ('Isā), 57, 103, 104, 136
Hindus, 134, 172, 175, 217, 219, 228
Ḥiṣnī (Taqi al-Din), 21, 39
Ḥubaysī, 151
Hudūth, 94
Ḥujjat Allāh 'alā al-Ālamīn, 57
Ibāna, 167, 213, 300
Ibānat Ibn al-Baqqallāni, 253
'Ibar fi Khabarī Man 'Abar, 11, 35
Iblis, 153
Ibn 'Abbās, 76, 112-113, 116-118, 155, 222, 225, 261, 275, 280, 281
Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, 50, 109, 209, 239, 230, 251, 254
Ibn 'Abd al-Hādī, 31, 35, 45-46, 49, 50, 57-58, 61, 62, 253
Ibn 'Abd al-Salām, 22, 100, 101, 112, 141, 153, 223
Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, 87, 95-97, 135, 136, 200
Ibn Abī 'Āṣim, 193, 225, 286, 287
Ibn Abī Ḥātim, 112, 116, 275, 291
Ibn Abī 'l-Izz, 85, 86, 164
Ibn Abī Shayba (Abū Bakr), 174, 225
Ibn Abī Shayba (Abū Ja'far), 117
Ibn Abī 'Umar, 225
Ibn Abī-Wafā, 252
Ibn Abī Ya' tā, 160, 161, 200, 214
Ibn Abī Zayd, 239, 250, 290
Ibn 'Adī, 59, 225
Ibn 'Ajība, 166
Ibn 'Arabī (Shaykh Muḥyī al-Dīn), 44, 167, 174
Ibn al-'Arabī (al-Mālikī), 82, 120, 185, 210, 239
Ibn 'Asākir, 11, 60, 63, 141, 209, 210, 225, 231, 253
Ibn al-Athir, 215, 231
Ibn al-Baqillānī, 141, 253
Ibn Barrajān, 273
Ibn Baṭṭa, 18, 90, 161, 241
Ibn Baṭṭāl, 129, 184, 223
Ibn Bāz, 54, 61, 133, 134
Ibn al-Dubaythī, 59
Ibn Farhūn, 167, 250
Ibn Fāṭik, 165
Ibn Fūrak, 141, 156, 169, 170, 223, 225, 235, 241, 252
Ibn Ḥāzm, 17, 32, 67, 84, 186, 217, 221-223, 284
Ibn Ḥibbān, 60, 89, 122, 138, 156, 174, 190, 201, 222, 225, 241, 248, 286
Ibn Hubayra, 50-51
Ibn al-Ḥumām, 22, 111, 142
Ibn 'Imād, 41, 79, 273
Ibn Jamā'ah, 17, 56, 71, 74, 107, 141, 168
Ibn al-Juwaynī, 22, 30, 141, 218, 253
Ibn Khāfif, 68, 241
Ibn Khahlūn, 274
Ibn Khallīkān, 273
Ibn Khūzayma, 61, 117, 136-138, 193, 246-247
Ibn Kullāb, 79, 141, 241
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Ibn al-Kutbi, 12
Ibn al-Labbân, 22
Ibn Mahdi al-Tabari, 126, 136
Ibn Mâjah, 60, 65, 73, 122, 155, 193, 209, 215, 224, 225, 251, 281
Ibn al-Mâjishân, 240-242, 247, 248, 259, 281
Ibn Manzûr, 197
Ibn Mas‘ûd, 108, 122, 215
Ibn al-Mihrad. See Ibn ‘Abd al-Hâdi (Yûsuf)
Ibn al-Mubârak, 136, 238, 244-245, 291
Ibn Mutiîh, 48, 51
Ibn al-Munayyir, 22
Ibn al-Mundhir, 50, 223
Ibn al-Naqib, 11
Ibn al-Nu‘mân al-Tilimsânî, 56
Ibn al-Qâ‘î Shuhba, 70, 71, 252
Ibn Qatî‘ân al-Fâsî, 50
Ibn al-Qawwâs, 11
Ibn al-Qaysarânî, 192
Ibn al-Qayyîm, 21, 31, 46, 64, 75, 78, 83, 94, 126, 134, 186, 209, 237, 249, 283-295
Ibn Qudâma, 18, 45-46, 48, 51, 159, 161, 199, 209, 238, 243, 248
Ibn Qutayba, 154, 222, 225
Ibn Rajab, 32, 36, 37, 46, 49, 64, 66, 78, 283, 288
Ibn Rushd, 169
Ibn al-Salih, 291
Ibn al-Sam‘âni, 247
Ibn Sha‘ban, 169
Ibn Shâhin, 166
Ibn al-Subki, 14, 32, 37, 41, 74, 75, 138, 150, 151, 186, 229, 249, 252
Ibn al-Tubbâni, 86-89, 100, 285, 298
Ibn Tulûn, 28, 78
Ibn ‘Uthaymin, 133-135, 161, 221

Ibn al-Wardî, 35
Ibrâz al-Ghayî fi Shifa‘ al-‘Ay, 57, 62, 302
Ibrahîm al-Tawîl, 132
Idâh al-Dalî, 17, 107, 125, 141, 168
Ihyâ‘ Ulûm al-Dîn, 22
Ijmâ‘ ‘inda A‘immât Ahl al-Sunna al-Arba‘a, 50
Ikîl fil-Mutashâbih wal-Tâwil, 18-20
‘Ilal al-Mutanâhiya, 193
‘Ilân wal-Tawbikh, 32, 34, 69, 70
Ilghâz, 229
Iljâm al-‘Awâmûr, 138, 171, 240
‘Imâd ‘Abd al-Salâm Ra‘ûf, 37
Imâm al-Hâramayn. See Ibn al-Juwaynî
Imtâ‘ bi-Sirat al-Imâmayn, 229
Intizâj, 245
Inba‘ al-Ghumr bi-A‘mâr al-‘Umâr, 49
‘Indiyya, 190
Insâsal, 189
Iqi‘z al-Himam, 166
‘Iqîd al-Farîd, 154
Iqnî‘ fi Masâ’il al-Ijmâ‘, 50
‘Iraqî, 53-54, 73, 195, 253
Irshâd, 165
Iṣfarâyîni (Abû Isbâq), 75, 104, 252
Ishâq ibn Râhîyah, 90, 136
Ishâra ilâ al-Ihâz fi Ba‘d Anwâ‘ al-Majâz, 112, 223
Ishârât al-Maram, 38
Islamic Beliefs and Doctrine
According to Ahl al-Sunna, 179
Ismâ‘îlî (Abû Bakr), 92, 248
Israelites, 180
Istî‘âb, 209
Istîlâ‘, 110, 112, 115, 125, 183-184, 204
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Istiğâma, 165, 167-168
istiwa', 18-19, 92-93, 110, 112, 115, 125-126, 163, 169, 181-184, 199-200, 204-205, 239, 245, 249, 262
Ithâf al-Kâ'inât bi-Bayân Madhhab al-Salaf wal-Khalaf fil-Mutashâbihât, 141
Ithâf al-Sâdat al-Muttaqin, 22, 31
l'tiqâd, 238, 249
l'tiqâd A'immat al-Ḥadîth, 248
l'tiqâd al-Sunna, 248
Itqân fi 'Ulûm al-Qur'ân, 280
ittiṣâl, 115, 189
Jâbir, 215, 225, 299
Ja'd ibn Dîrham, 233-234
Ja'far al-Sâdiq, 168, 169, 214, 241, 250, 269
Ja'far ibn Nuṣayr, 167, 214, 250, 271
Jahm ibn Šafwân, Jahmiyya, 81-83, 109, 111, 114, 129, 130, 134, 185, 186, 211, 230, 233-235, 240, 243-246, 248, 252, 284
Jalâ' al- Aynayn bi-Muḥâkamat al-Ăhmâdayn, 23, 58, 77
Jalâl al-Dîn al-Ĥanâfî, 13
Jâmi' al-Šâghîr, 60, 225
Jâmi' al-Uṣûl, 231
Jâmi' fil-Sunan, 239, 290
Jânâ al-Dânî, 197
Jânî, 221-222
jâriha, jawârih, 19, 221, 248. See "anthropomorphism."
Jârîr al-Bajâlî, 164
Jawâhir al-Mudîyya, 252
jawhar, 81, 230, 271
Jawharat al-Tawhîd, 108
Jews, 15, 16, 76, 111, 134, 136, 210, 217, 228, 233, 234
jiha, jihâd, 14, 18, 20, 75, 139, 140, 152, 164, 172, 238, 250, 272
jism, jismiyâ, 20, 23, 72, 75, 76, 203, 258, 259. See "anthropomorphism."
Jubbâ'i, 252
julús, 18, 181, 184
Junayd, 156, 165-167, 198, 250, 270
Ka' b al-Ĥâbah, 225, 273
kaff, 121, 231, 251, 257
kâfîr, 22, 48, 55, 65, 75, 84, 104, 265
Kalâbâchî, 81, 230
kalâm, 24, 35, 68, 86, 102, 183, 217-219, 231, 265-267
Kâmil fil- Du'afâ', 59, 225, 247
Karmî, 159, 223
Karrâmîyya, 14, 22, 109
kashf, 44, 45, 178, 205
Kashf al-Asrâr, 19, 221
Kashf al-Zunûn, 33, 127
Kashkûl, 154
Kathîr ibn Nimr, 174
Kattâni, 94, 150, 157, 231, 294, 295
kayf, kayfiyya, 18-19, 90-92, 161, 164, 165, 221, 239, 245
Khâfîjî (Aḥmad), 56
Khâfîjî (Mâhmûd), 108
Khalîlî, 247
Khalq Âf  āl al-'Ibâd, 244, 246
Khaṭîb, 59, 117, 221, 225, 248, 252
Khaṭîbî al-Subkî, 141
Khaṭṭâbî, 19, 20, 132, 195, 223, 241, 247
Khawârij, 96, 99, 109, 154, 155, 252
Khûṭurât al-Qawli bil-Jiha, 38
Kîbriṭ al-Ăhmâr, 23
kinâya, 120, 183
Kîrmânî, 168, 191
Labîd ibn al-As' am, 185, 200, 233
REFUTATION OF HIM WHO ATTRIBUTES DIRECTION TO ALLAH

Lacknawi, 57, 60, 61, 229, 285, 287, 302
Lajin, 13
Lalikāi, 231, 238, 239, 241, 243
Lam'at al-l'tiqād, 18, 159, 161
Latā'if al-Ishārāt, 223
Lawāmi' al-Anwār al-Bahiyya, 249
Layth, 238
Lisān al-'Arab, 197, 223
Lisān al-Mizān, 60, 131, 138, 139
Lughz, 158
Luma' al-Adilla fi Qawā'id 'Aqā'id Ahl al-Sunnah, 22
Ma'alim al-Sunan, 20, 248
Ma'ārif, 154
Ma'bad al-Juhaanī, 155
Madkhāl al-Ahmād, 51
Madina, 11, 19, 51, 60, 63, 93, 239, 261, 298
Maḥfijat al-Wāhiqān wa-Madrajat al-Wāmiqīn, 249
Maḥallī, 179
Maḥmūlī, 174
Mahmūd al-Warrāq, 154
ma'iyya, 112, 118, 125, 133, 195-199
mājīl, 138, 239, 285
Majma' al-Zawā'id, 158, 222
Majmū' at-Rasā'il al-Munīriyya, 248
Majmū' at-Rasā'il, 16, 21, 92
makān, 90, 130, 169, 197
Makdisi (George), 45
Mālaqī, 197
Mālik, 18, 19, 50, 60, 82, 92, 93, 132, 136, 160, 166, 169, 238-241, 246, 253, 261, 277
Mālikī (Muḥammad 'Alawi), 57, 285, 298
Ma'mar ibn Ahmad al-Asbahānī, 249
Ma'mar ibn Ahmad ibn Muḥammad al-Lunbānī, 249
Mamdūh, 59-61, 89
Makāhil al-'Irshād, 119, 125
Masāqib al-Shāfi'i, 168
Masāzil al-Sā'irān, 138, 294
Masbūjī (Nasr al-), 44
Maqālīt al-Islāmiyya, 81, 141, 230, 252
Maqālīt al-Kawthari, 33, 38, 80, 83, 140, 213
Maqbarat al-Shīfīya, 11
Mardāwī, 48, 51
Mar'i ibn Yūsuf, 51, 84
Ma'rīfat al-Qurrā' al-Kibār, 248
Ma'rīfat al-Ṣaḥāba, 231
Marrisi, see Bishr al-Marrisi.
Mashhūr Salmān, 18, 82
Mas'ūd ibn 'Abd al-Wāḥid, 248
Māturidī, 16, 141, 170
Māturīdis, 17, 218, 300
Māwardi, 117
maqāṣīf, 117, 225, 265
Mīlal al-Nihāl, 252
Mīnān al-Kubrā, 23
Minhāj al-Sunnah, 53, 62, 81-82, 86, 91, 130, 230, 285
Mi'rāj, 5, 141, 189
Mirqāt al-Mufātih Sharh Mishkāt al-Masābīth, 114, 115, 119, 169, 253, 280
Miṣbah al-Zalām fi Mustaghīḥin bi-Khayr al-Anām, 56
Mizān al-ī'tidal, 117, 131, 139, 155, 241, 247, 248, 286
Mizzī, 32, 288
Mu'ādh, 88, 89, 265
mu'allaq, 117
mu'attīl, mu'attila, 19, 211, 219, 226, 249
Mu'awiya, 73, 155, 261
Mu'awiya ibn Yahyā al-Ṣadafī, 222
mubtadi', 22, 34, 69, 74
Mudāwi, 60
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Mufradāt Al-fāż al-Qurān, 222, 223, 280
Mughnī fil-Du‘ afā’, 247, 286
Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Jawhari, 237
Muḥammad ibn al-Hasan, 243
Muḥammad ibn Kathīr al-Miṣṣiṣī, 237
Muḥammad ibn Maḥbūb, 169
Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Marwazī, 231
Muḥammad ibn Šāliḥ ibn Hāni’, 138
Muḥammad Saʾid ibn ʿAbd al-Qadīr al-Baghdādī, 37
muḥādith, 74, 269
Muḥājīd, 112, 113, 201, 222, 275
Muʿjam al-Awsaṭ, 59, 158, 174, 225, 231
Muʿjam al-Buldān, 274
Muʿjam al-Kabīr, 59, 117, 190, 191, 222, 225, 286
Muʿjam al-Saghīr, 231
Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth, 222
Mukhtār al-Sīḥāḥ, 223
Mukhtar, 281
Muktaṣar al-ʿUlūw, 90-91, 136, 137, 209, 244, 248-250
Muktaṣār, 280
Muḥfaẓ fi l-Tiqād Ahl al-Ḥaqq, 101, 141, 153
Munāwī, 60, 174
Mundhirī, 281
munfaṣīl, 214
Muntaqā, 224
Muntaqā fi Sharaf al-Muṣṭafā, 22
Muqaddima fil-Taṣawwuf, 174
Muqaddimat Ibn Kathalūn, 274
muqārana, 197, 203
Muqṣīd li-Talkhis mā fil-Murshid, 280
Murādī, 197
Mūsā, 16, 184-185, 225, 234
muṣḥaba, 197
Musayyara, 22, 111, 112, 115, 142
mushabbiha, 16, 249
Mushkal al-Ḥadīth wa-Bayānūh, 223, 225
Mushkīl al-ʿAḥadīth al-Wārida anna al-Ṭalāq al-Thalātha Wāhida, 49
Muslim, 12, 18, 43, 79, 120, 122, 123, 157, 164, 174, 185, 190, 191, 195, 215, 222-224, 247, 251, 254, 261, 265, 267, 276, 281
Musnad ʿAbd ibn Ḥumayd, 223
Musnad Abī Ḥanīfah, 164
Musnad al-Shāmīyīn, 225
Musnad Ibn Abī Ḥumayd, 225
Mustaṣfā, 93
mustahayyīz, 81, 230
mutakallīmūn, 87, 159, 217, 227, 243, 253, 279
Muʿtaqad, 249
mutashābīh, mutashābihāt, 17, 19, 20, 92, 93, 123, 169, 261, 279, 280
Mutawākkil (Caliph), 166
Muʿtazī, Muʿtazīl, 19, 29, 79, 81, 100, 109, 155, 165, 170, 200, 217, 218, 230, 246, 248, 252, 301
mustaṣīl, 214
Muwāfaqat al-Maʿqūl, 82, 130
Muwaṣṣa, 60, 167, 261
Muzani, 160
Nabateans, 217, 219
Nabhānī, 18, 21, 23, 35, 37, 54, 57-58, 64, 75, 77, 105, 253
nadhr, 53
Naʿf al-Tīb, 168
Nahr al-Mādī, 127, 179
Nakhaʾi, 223, 289, 290
Namūḏhaj min al-Aʾmāl al-Khayriyya, 252
Naqḍ al-Fahmiyya, 83, 129, 135, 211, 213
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Nasāʾi, 43, 122, 174, 192, 225, 251, 254, 261
Nasafi, 178
Nāṣīhā Dhaḥabiyya, 68-70
nass, 119, 175, 187, 212, 280
Naṣṣ, Sāmir, 78
Nasr al-Maḥāsin, 22
Nawawi, 18, 82, 93, 100, 122, 156, 168, 174, 179, 192, 195, 215, 222, 224
Nāzim al-Mutanāthir, 157, 231, 295
Nihāya, 215, 223
Nizāmiyya, 253
Nuʾaymi, 273
Nuʾjūm al-Zāhirah, 249
Nūnīyya, 21, 46, 78, 126, 186, 283-284
Nūrī, 165, 166, 198
Nusrat al-Imām al-Subkī, 58
nuzūl, 134, 166, 169, 186, 258, 259
Pazdawi, 17, 19, 221
Persians, 217, 228
Pharaohn, 184-185, 204, 210, 234
philosophers, 36, 68, 102, 172, 175, 218, 228, 266Pickthall, 222
qabda, 251, 281
Qabjaq, 13
qabul, 177
Qādiʾ ʿAbd al-Wahhab, 250
Qādiʾ ʿIyād, 168, 179
Qadarīyya, 43, 155
qādim, 29, 113, 164, 272
Qahgaha hadith, 229
Qāʾidā fi-Jarḥ wal-Taʾdil, 139
Qānūn al-Muḥtir, 197
Qarāmīta, 154, 167
Qarī, 20, 55, 114, 115, 119, 128, 164, 169, 174, 253, 280
Qāsim ibn Muḥammad, 261
Qāsim ibn Sallām, 244, 301
Qāsimī (Jamāl al-Dīn), 12, 115
Qatāda, 112, 174, 223, 224
Qawāʿid al-ʿAqāʿid, 21
Qawāʿid al-Kulliyā, 45
Qawāʿid al-Tāḥidīth, 12
Qinnawī, 58
qiyās, 218, 276
Qurtubī, 15, 113, 116, 117, 141-142, 178, 179, 221, 222, 261, 274, 288-289
Qushayrī, 5, 16, 141, 156, 165-170, 189, 223, 241
Rabiʿ ibn Sulaymān, 161
Rabiʿa, 239
Radd Mabānī al-Āyāt al-Mustashābīhāt ilā Maʾānī al-Āyāt al-Muḥkamāt, 22
Rafs al-Ishtibāḥ fi Istihālat al-Jiha ʿalā Allāh, 23, 37
rāfīqa, 64, 154, 252
Rāghib al-Asfahānī, 184, 222, 280
Ramlī (Shihāb al-Dīn), 22
Rāqi, 41
Rafs al-Mabānī, 197
Rāzi (Fakhr al-Dīn), 15, 16, 22, 80, 83, 115, 179, 218, 223, 230, 235, 253
Reliance of the Traveller, 221, 225, 284
Rifāʿī (Imām Aḥmad), 5, 168
Rifāʿī (Sayyid Yusuf), 57, 148
Risāla Qudsiyya, 21
Risāla Qushayrīyya, 16, 113, 141, 165, 167-169
Risāla Sharīfa fi-Mā Yataʾllaq bi-kam al-Bāqi min ʿUmr al-Dunyā, 75, 104
Rudūd wal-Taʾaqqubāt, 18, 82
Rūḥ, 134, 287-289
Rūḥ al-Maʾānī, 112, 274
ruqya, 191
Sabeans, 218, 233, 234
Şabîğh ibn ʿIsl, 261
Şâbûnî (Abû ʿUthmân), 248
Şâbûnî (Nûr al-Dîn Aḥmad ibn Maḥmûd), 252
Şadr al-Dîn ibn al-Muraḥhal, 11
Şadr ibn al-Wakîl, 11
Saffârînî, 249
Shahl ibn Saʿd al-Sâʿîdî, 281
Saʿîd ibn Abî Ayûb, 233
Saʿîd ibn Jubayr, 117, 223
Saʿîd ibn Maḥsûr, 201
Salhâwi, 32-34, 60, 62-63, 69-70, 225
Salaflîs, Salaflîyya, 14, 24, 58, 96, 98, 104, 109, 175, 200, 253, 288, 292
Şalâh al-Dîn, 273
Salâhîyya School, 11
Salama ibn Nufayl, 225
Samannûdi, 58, 60, 87
Şan′âni, 75, 84, 104, 222
sâq, 222
Saqqâf, 138
Şârîm al-Munkî, 57-58, 61
Sayf al-Dîn Jâʿân, 13
Sayf al-Şaqîl, 18, 21, 72, 127, 209, 283, 284
Sayr al-Ḥâṭîh ilâ ʿIlm al-Talâq al-Thalâtî, 49
Shadharât al-Dhahab, 79, 273
Şâfîʾi, 36, 50, 131, 160, 161, 174, 238, 253, 258, 276, 277, 291
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