

# مَجْمُوعَةُ الْفَتَاوَى

لِشَيْخِ الْإِسْلَامِ

تَقِيِّ الدِّينِ أَحْمَدَ بْنِ تَيْمِيَّةَ الْحَرَامِيِّ

المتوفى سنة ٧٢٨ هـ

# MAJMU'U' AL-FATAWA

Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ḥalīm Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 a.h.)

مجموع الفتاوى لشيخ الإسلام ابن تيمية رحمه الله

# MAJMŪ' AL-FATĀWĀ

Authored by

**Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ĥalīm Ibn Taymiyyah**

The Shaykh of Islām (d. 728 a.h.)

Compiled by

**'Abd Ar-Raḥmān ibn Qāsim**

The great scholar of Islam (d. 1392 a.h.)

English-Adaptation by

**Ṭāhir Munīr**

Student in the Faculty of Hadith—The Islamic University of Lahore

Volume 2

**Tawḥīd ar-Rubūbiyyah (Oneness of Lordship)**

  
PUBLISHERS

**Copyright © Tahir Munir Publishers | All rights reserved.**

No part of this publication may be reproduced for any monetary benefit without prior written permission of the publisher. The contents of this work cannot be attributed to the publisher if they are altered or cherry-picked in any form. Besides these two points, this work and all works of this publisher can be used and spread for all beneficial Islamic purposes.

**Author:** Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 a.h.) (may Allāh have mercy upon him)

From the great scholars of the 8th Century AH.

**Translator:** Ṭāhir Munīr (may Allāh forgive him and his parents)

Student in the Faculty of Hadith | The Islamic University of Lahore

**Edition:** 1<sup>st</sup> [2025 CE | 1446 AH]

**Arabic edition relied upon** is the Shamila version.

**Note:** The typing, editing, formatting, designing, finalizing etc. is all done by the translator alone. It is very likely that there are mistakes in my works. Please inform me of these mistakes—of any nature—so I can immediately correct them, may Allāh bless you. May Allāh abundantly reward everyone who contributes to proofreading my works.

To learn more about the publisher and read his articles, visit:

 [tahirmunir.com](https://tahirmunir.com)


To access the PDF version of the publisher's works, visit [and join]:

 [t.me/tahirmunirbooks](https://t.me/tahirmunirbooks)

To contact the publisher for any purpose, contact:

 [tahirmunircontact@gmail.com](mailto:tahirmunircontact@gmail.com)

To purchase the paperback/hardback works of the publisher, visit:

 [amazon.com/author/tahirmunir](https://amazon.com/author/tahirmunir)

  
P U B L I S H E R S



## Arabic Alphabet And Transliteration Guide

Arabic Letter	Transliteration with Diacritics	Notes
ا	ā (long vowel) / a (short vowel)	Alif
ب	b	Bā'
ت	t	Tā'
ث	th	Thā'
ج	j	Jim
ح	ĥ	Ĥā'
خ	kh	Khā'
د	d	Dāl
ذ	dh	Dhāl
ر	r	Rā'
ز	z	Zāy
س	s	Sīn
ش	sh	Shīn
ص	ṣ	Ṣād
ض	ḍ	Ḍād
ط	ṭ	Ṭā'
ظ	ẓ	Ẓā'
ع	'	'Ayn
غ	gh	Ghayn
ف	f	Fā'
ق	q	Qāf

ك	k	Kāf
ل	l	Lām
م	m	Mīm
ن	n	Nūn
ه	h	Hā'
و	ū (long vowel) / w (consonant)	Wāw
ي	ī (long vowel) / y (consonant)	Yā'

### Additional Notes:

**Hamza (ء):** Represented as ' (e.g., سَأَلَ = sa'ala). Hamza can appear on its own or on a 'chair' (e.g., أ، إ، ؤ، ئ).

**Tā' Marbū'ah (ة):** Transliterated as—ah or—at depending on context (e.g., جَنَّةَ = jannah, سُنَّةَ = sunnah).

**Shadda (ّ):** Represents gemination (doubling of a consonant). It is marked by doubling the letter (e.g., رَسُولٌ = rasūl, حَقٌّ = ḥaqq).

**Sukūn (◌):** Indicates the absence of a vowel. It is not explicitly marked in transliteration unless necessary (e.g., مَكْتُوبٌ = maktūb).

**Tanwīn (◌ٌ ◌ٍ ◌ٍ):** Represented as—an, —in, or —un (e.g., كِتَابًا = kitāban, رَسُولٌ = rasūlun).

**Alif Maqṣūrah (ى):** Transliterated as ā (e.g., مُوسَى = Mūsā).

**Tā' Marbū'ah at the End of Words:** Often pronounced as—ah in pausa (e.g., جَنَّةَ = jannah).



## Table Of Contents

A Foundational Principle	9
Laying the Foundation of First Principles and Establishing the Proofs	17
The Subsistence of Contingent and Originated Beings Through the Necessary, Eternal One, and Its Explanation	22
Completing the Refutation of the Negators and the Deniers (Al-Mu'at'ilah)	27
A Principle Regarding the Basis of Affirmation and Negation, Love and Hatred	32
Regarding the Deviants Who Resemble the Sabians	40
Regarding the Perfection of the Soul, and the Differing of People Concerning That	61
Regarding the Reality of the Doctrine of the Itti'hādiyyah	64
Question About Those Who Gathered Upon Various Matters of Corruption	68
Whoever Claims Prophethood and Permits Forbidden Things is a Disbeliever	72
One who denied the creation of the servants' actions, and the saying of Ahl al-Sunnah regarding it	73
A book that appeared among the people containing falsehoods contradicting what is in the Book of Allāh	79
The Reality of the Doctrine of Itti'hādiyyah and Waḥdat al-Wujūd	87
Understanding The Doctrine Of The Itti'hādiyyah Is Sufficient To Show Its Corruption	89
The Reality Of The Doctrine Of Itti'hādiyyah	90
Regarding What Is Built Upon The Foundation Of Their Doctrine: That The Existence Of Created Beings Is The Very Essence Of The Existence Of The Lord	91
The First Position: The Position Of Ibn 'Arabi, Author Of Fuṣūṣ Al-Ḥikam	92
Regarding Ibn 'Arabi's Statement That The Existence Of The Essences Is The Very Self And Essence Of The Existence Of The Truth, And The Invalidity Of That	102

Regarding The View Of Aṣ-Ṣadr Al-Fakhr Ar-Rūmī, Who Did'nt Hold Existence To Be Additional To Essence, And His Statement In Which He Explicitly Stated Disbelief	103
Those Who Did Not Differentiate Between Essence and Existence, Nor Between Absolute and Specific/Determined	108
The Positions Of Those Who Oppose Ahlus-Sunnah, Part Of Which Is Derived From The Statements Of The Philosophers	109
The Doctrine Of The Ittiḥādiyyah Is Composed Of Three Materials	112
Refutation Of The Doctrine Of Ittiḥādiyyah	114
Clarifying Some Terms Of Ibn 'Arabī's Beliefs That Explain His Doctrine	129
Some Matters That Reveal Their Disbelief And The Corruption Of Their Reasoning	153
One Of The Greatest Principles Of The Ittiḥādiyyah: 'Allāh Was, And There Was Nothing With Him, And He Is Now As He Was'—The Latter Part Is A Lie Against Allāh	167
Claim Of The Ittiḥādiyyah About The Faith Of Pharaoh And The Refutation Against Them	171
Those Who Claimed, Based On Texts, The Doctrine Of Ḥulūl And Ittiḥād, And Used Predestination As A Justification For Sins	175
What Was Mentioned From The Saying Of Ibn Isrā'īl: Command Is Of Two Types: Command Through An Intermediary, And Command Without An Intermediary	193
The Heresy In The Book Fuṣūṣ Al-Ḥikam	216
What The People Of Knowledge And Faith Are Upon	225
The Necessity Of The Believer's Heart Being Established In The Knowledge And Love Of Allāh	227
Two Distinct Essences Do Not Become One Entity Unless They Transform Into A Third Essence	230
The Hadiths And Verses Regarding Nearness Do Not Imply Ittiḥād	232
Regarding Two Meanings Which Are the Reality of Religion, Certainty, and Faith	235
Regarding Some Who Were Overcome By Spiritual State And Fell Into A Type Of Ḥulūl Or Ittiḥād	236
When The Doctrine Of Specific Ittiḥād Is Known From What Resembles Ḥulūl And Ittiḥād In Which There Is Some Element Of Truth, What Is Contained Within The Absolute [Ittiḥād] Regarding That Also Becomes Clear	238
Regarding Error In That [Matter]	241

Just As Lordship Bears Witness, So Does General Divinity	242
The Exposition Of Pure Falsehood In Ĥulūl And Ittiĥād	244
How The Disbelief Of The Proponents Of Ĥulūl And Ittiĥād Regarding The Object Of Worship Leads Them To Worship Some Created Beings Based On The Specious Argument Of Ĥulūl And Ittiĥād	248
The Ittiĥād Of One Essence With Another Is Invalid	259
The Negation Of Offspring From Allāh, And The Negation Of His Being A Father	267
How The Ittiĥādiyyah Go Beyond [The Claim Of] Allāh Taking A Son To [The Claim Of] The Lord Uniting With Him	269
A Letter From The Imām To Abū Al-Faĥ Naĥr Al-Manbijī	270
Regarding Al-Ĥallāj And One Who Claims To Hold His Beliefs	285
Is One Who Says ‘There Is Nothing Except Allāh’ A Disbeliever?	289
Regarding The Prophet’s Saying: ‘Do Not Curse Time (Ad-Dahr), For Indeed Allāh Is Time (Ad-Dahr)’	291



## A Foundational Principle

In the Name of Allāh, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful

Praise be to Allāh alone, and prayers and peace be upon the one after whom there is no prophet:

Shaykh al-Islām Aḥmad ibn Taymiyyah—may Allāh sanctify his soul—said:

In the Name of Allāh, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful. Praise be to Allāh, Lord of the worlds. I bear witness that there is no god worthy of worship except Allāh alone, with no partner, and I bear witness that Muḥammad is His servant and His Messenger. May Allāh send prayers and abundant peace upon him and his family.

### A Foundational Principle

Indeed, the origin of divine knowledge, its source, and its primary evidence according to those who have believed is: faith in Allāh and His Messenger. And for the Messenger (peace be upon him), it is the revelation of Allāh to him, just as the Seal of the Prophets said: 'I have been commanded to fight the people until they testify that there is no god but Allāh (Lā ilāha illā Allāh) and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh; if they do that, they have protected their blood and their wealth from me, except by its right.' And Allāh Almighty said to him: {Say, 'If I should err, I would only err against myself. But if I am guided, it is by what my Lord reveals to me.'} [Saba': 50]. And He said: {And He found you lost and guided [you].} [Ad-Ḍuḥā: 7]. And He said: {We relate to you, [O Muḥammad], the best of stories in what We have revealed to you of this Qur'ān although you were, before it, among the unaware.} [Yūsuf: 3].

So He informed that he was among the unaware before it. And He said: {And thus We have revealed to you an inspiration of Our command. You did not know what is the Book or [what is] faith, but We have made it a light by which We guide whom We will of Our servants.} [Ash-Shūrā: 52]. And in Saḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī, in the sermon of 'Umar when the Prophet (peace be upon him) passed away, there is speech whose meaning is—that Allāh guided your Prophet with this Qur'ān, so hold fast to it, for indeed you...<sup>1</sup>

The establishment of the proof in the Qur'ān through the Messengers is

<sup>1</sup> Blank space in the original.

Shaykh Nāṣir ibn Ḥamad Al-Fahd (p. 19) said: The place of the blank space is the remainder of the words of 'Umar (may Allah be pleased with him) which Al-Bukhārī narrated in his Saḥīḥ—and the Shaykh (may Allah have mercy on him) mentioned its meaning here. Its wording as in the Saḥīḥ from the narration of Anas from 'Umar is: 'If Muḥammad (peace be upon him) has indeed died, then Allah Almighty has placed among you a light by which you may be guided by that with which Allah guided Muḥammad (peace be upon him).' And in the narration of Ibn Ḥibbān: 'For Allah has placed among you a light by which you may be guided, so hold fast to it, [and] you will be guided to that to which Allah guided Muḥammad (peace be upon him).'

frequent. Like His saying: {[We sent] messengers as bringers of good tidings and warners so that mankind will have no argument against Allāh after the messengers.} [An-Nisā': 165]. And His saying: {And never would We punish until We sent a messenger.} [Al-Isrā': 15]. And His saying: {And if We had destroyed them with a punishment before him, they would have said, 'Our Lord, why did You not send to us a messenger so we could have followed Your verses...'} [Āhā: 134]. And His saying: {And never would your Lord have destroyed the cities until He had sent to their mother [city] a messenger reciting to them Our verses.} [Al-Qaṣā': 59]. And His saying: {Every time a group is thrown into it, its keepers will ask them, 'Did there not come to you a warner?'} [Al-Mulk: 8]. And His saying: {And those who disbelieved will be driven to Hell in groups until, when they reach it, its gates are opened and its keepers will say to them, 'Did there not come to you messengers from yourselves...?'} [Az-Zumar: 71]. And His saying: {O company of jinn and mankind...} [Al-An'ām: 130].

For this reason, a group of the imāms who compiled the Sunan arranged by topic, when they gathered various types of knowledge therein, began with the origin of knowledge and faith. Just as Al-Bukhārī began his Saḥīḥ with the 'Beginning of Revelation' and its descent; thus, he informed about the manner of the descent of knowledge and faith upon the Messenger first, then followed it with the 'Book of Faith', which is the affirmation of what he brought, then with the 'Book of Knowledge', which is the understanding of what he brought. So he arranged it in the true sequence. Likewise, Imām Abū Muḥammad Ad-Dārimī, author of the Musnad, began his book with the 'Proofs of Prophethood' and mentioned a good portion regarding that. And these two men are far superior to Muslim, At-Tirmidhī, and their like; this is why Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal used to greatly respect these two and others like them, because they were jurists in Hadith, in its principles and branches.

And since the origin of knowledge and guidance is faith in the Message, which encompasses the Book and Wisdom, the mention of the path of guidance through the Message—which is the Qur'ān and what the Messengers brought—is extremely frequent. Like His saying: {That is the Book about which there is no doubt, a guidance for those conscious of Allāh} [Al-Baqarah: 2], and His saying: {This is a clear statement for mankind, and a guidance and instruction for the righteous} [Āl 'Imrān: 138]. And His saying: {Indeed, this Qur'ān guides to that which is most suitable} [Al-Isrā': 9]. And His saying: {And He sent down the Tawrah and the Injil} {Before, as guidance for the people} [Āl 'Imrān: 3-4]. And His saying: {A Book which We have revealed to you, [O Muḥammad], that you might bring mankind out of darknesses into the light by permission of their Lord} [Ibrāhīm: 1]. And His saying: {Then if there comes to you guidance from Me, then whoever follows My guidance will neither go astray [in the world] nor suffer [in the Hereafter].} {And whoever turns away from My remembrance—indeed, he will have a depressed life,} {And We will gather him on the Day of Resurrection blind.} [Āhā: 123-124]. And His saying: {And indeed, [O Muḥammad], you guide to a straight path—} {The path of Allāh} [Ash-Shūrā: 52-53]. And Allāh Almighty said: {And how could you disbelieve while to you are recited the verses of Allāh and among you is His Messenger?} [Āl 'Imrān: 101]. So it is known that the verses of Allāh and the Messenger prevent disbelief, and this [theme] is abundant.

Likewise, His mention of guidance and success being attained by the believers,

to the exclusion of others, fills the Qurʾān. Like His saying: {a guidance for those conscious of Allāh} {Who believe in the unseen...} [Al-Baqarah: 2-3]. Then He condemned those who disbelieved and those who were hypocrites. And His saying: {By time;} {Indeed, mankind is in loss;} {Except for those who have believed and done righteous deeds} [Al-Aʿs: 1-3]. And His saying: {Then We return him to the lowest of the low;} {Except for those who believe and do righteous deeds} [At-Tin: 5-6]. So He passed judgment upon the entire species and the whole of humanity with loss and utter degradation, except for the righteous believers.

Similarly, the inhabitants of Paradise are designated as the people of faith, and the inhabitants of the Fire as the people of disbelief, in countless verses as Allāh willed, until that has become known with widespread, consecutively transmitted, necessary knowledge from the religion of the Messenger for everyone whom his message has reached.

And He linked happiness, along with the rectitude of deeds, to it [faith] in verses like His saying: {Whoever does righteousness, whether male or female, while he is a believer—We will surely cause him to live a good life} [An-Naḥl: 97]. And His saying: {But whoever desires the Hereafter and exerts the effort due to it while he is a believer—it is those whose effort is appreciated [by Allāh].} [Al-Isrāʾ: 19]. And He nullified righteous deeds with its absence [i.e., absence of faith] in verses like His saying: {But those who disbelieved—their deeds are like a mirage in a lowland} [An-Nūr: 39]. And His saying: {The example of those who disbelieve in their Lord is [that] their deeds are like ashes} [Ibrāhīm: 18]. And His saying: {The example of what they spend in this worldly life is like that of a wind containing frost which strikes the harvest of a people...} [Āl ʿImrān: 117]. And His saying: {And We will regard what they have done of deeds and make them as scattered dust.} [Al-Furqān: 23], and similar examples are numerous. And He mentioned the state of all the guided nations, that they were likewise, in His saying: {Indeed, those who believed and those who were Jews or Christians or Sabians [before Prophet Muḥammad]—those [among them] who believed in Allāh and the Last Day and did righteousness...} [Al-Baqarah: 62].

For this reason, He commanded people of intellect to ponder it and people of hearing to listen to it. So He called therein to contemplation, reflection, remembrance, reasoning and understanding, and to listening, observing, paying close attention, and being affected with awe, weeping, and other [responses]. And this is a vast topic.

And since acknowledging the Maker is innate—as the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: {Every child is born upon the fitrah...}—for indeed, the fitrah encompasses acknowledging Allāh and turning repentantly to Him, and this is the meaning of *Lā ilāha illā Allāh* (there is no god worthy of worship except Allāh); for the *Ilāh* (deity) is the One who is known and worshipped. I have elaborated on this meaning elsewhere. And since the objective of daʿwah is for the servants to reach what they were created for—worshipping their Lord alone, without associating any partner with Him—and worship (*ʿibādah*) fundamentally is the worship of the heart, which the limbs follow, for the heart is the king and the limbs are its soldiers. And it is the lump of flesh which, if it is sound, the entire body is sound for it, and if it is corrupt, the entire body is corrupt for it. And since that [soundness] is through its knowledge and state,

this principle, which is the worship of Allāh through knowing Him and loving Him, was the foundation of the call in the Qurʾān. Thus, Allāh Almighty said: {And I did not create the jinn and mankind except to worship Me.} [Adh-Dhāriyāt: 56].

And He said at the beginning of [Sūrah] Al-Baqarah—after classifying creation into three types: believer, disbeliever, and hypocrite—He said after that: {O mankind, worship your Lord, who created you and those before you, that you may become righteous} [Al-Baqarah: 21]. And He mentioned His blessings which encompass His favor and His power. Then He followed that by establishing Prophethood with His saying: {And if you are in doubt about what We have sent down upon Our Servant...} [Al-Baqarah: 23].

The Mutakallim (theologian) considers such a composition admirable and esteems it greatly, thinking that this aligns with his Kalām method in examining rational propositions first: establishing Lordship, then establishing the Message, then receiving revelation-based matters from Prophethood. This is the well-known Kalām method of the Muʿtazilah, Karrāmiyyah, Kullābiyyah, and Ashʿariyyah. And [also] those who follow this path in proving the Maker first, based on the origination of the universe, then proving His attributes—negating and affirming—through rational analogy—despite the agreement and disagreement among them regarding it, whether in the issues or the proofs. Then after that, they discuss the revelation-based matters concerning the return, reward, punishment, caliphate, preference, and faith in a general way. Indeed, the core and bulk of Kalām according to them are those propositions they call ‘rational matters’, which are the foundations of their religion. They have built them upon analogies that necessitate rejecting much of what the Sunnah brought; thus, blame befell them due to the weakness of the analogies upon which they built, and due to their rejection of what the Sunnah brought. And they are two types: a type who built upon these rational, analogical principles the theoretical foundations but not the practical ones, like the Ashʿariyyah. And a type who built upon them both the theoretical and practical foundations, like the Muʿtazilah, to the extent that these [latter] take the common factor in actions between Allāh and His servants, such that what is good from Allāh is good from the servant, and what is bad from the servant is bad from Allāh; for this reason, people called them ‘those who liken [Allāh’s] actions [to creation’s]’ There is no doubt that these are the Mutakallimūn condemned by the Salaf due to their extensive building of religion upon corrupt Kalām analogy and their rejection of what the Book and Sunnah brought. As for the others [Ashʿariyyah], since they shared with them [Muʿtazilah] in some of that, they incurred blame and fault proportionate to their agreement with them; this involves their agreement in many of their proofs by which they claim to establish the foundations of religion and faith, and in a range of their issues wherein they oppose the Sunnahs, the narrations, and what the people of sound intellect and religion are upon. The purpose here is not to detail their conditions, for we have written things about that elsewhere. Rather, the purpose here is that the way of the Qurʾān came, regarding the foundations and branches of the religion—in proof and issues—with the most perfect of methodologies.

The Mutakallim thinks that through his method—in which he is unique—he has agreed with the way of the Qurʾān: sometimes in proving Lordship, sometimes in proving Oneness, sometimes in proving Prophethood, and

sometimes in proving the Return. However, he is mistaken in much or most of that, such as in this instance. For the Mutakallim has erred in his assumption that the way of the Qur'an agrees with his way, for several reasons.

Among them: That the proof for the Maker in the Qur'an is through His very signs, the knowledge of which necessitates knowledge of Him, just as knowledge of the sunbeam necessitates knowledge of the sun, without needing a universal syllogism in which it is said: 'And every originated thing must have an originator'; or 'Every contingent thing must have a specifier'; or 'Every motion must have a final or efficient cause'; and without needing to ask: 'Is the reason for the need for the Maker solely origination—as the Mu'tazilah say? Or contingency—as the majority say?'—such that they base upon it [the conclusion] that the second [contingency] is a remaining state needing the Maker according to the second, correct view, unlike the first. Indeed, I have elaborated on this point elsewhere and clarified what is true: that the very essences of created beings are in need of the Maker, and that their poverty and need for Him is an intrinsic attribute of these created existents, just as self-sufficiency is an intrinsic attribute of the Creator Lord. And that there is no cause for this need other than the essence itself and the very existence, just as there is no cause for His self-sufficiency other than His own essence. So you may say: There is no cause for their poverty and His self-sufficiency, since not every matter has a cause; just as there is no cause for His existence and self-sufficiency, there is no cause for their non-existence if He does not will their being, nor for their need of Him if He wills their being. Or, if you wish, you may say: The cause of this poverty and this self-sufficiency is the essence itself and the very reality. What indicates this is that a person knows his own soul's poverty and need for its Creator without it crossing his mind that it is contingent—meaning that which accepts existence and non-existence—or that it is originated—meaning preceded by non-existence. Rather, he might doubt its pre-eternity or even believe in it, yet he knows its poverty and need for its Maker. So if the only cause for the need for the Maker were contingency or origination, it would not be permissible to know the need for Him until one knows this cause; since, according to them [the Mutakallimūn], there is no proof for the need for an effector except this. In that case: knowledge of the needy essences themselves and the compelled existences necessitates knowledge of their need for their Maker and their poverty towards Him; this is why Allāh called them signs.

So these are two stages [in Kalām reasoning]: First: That it [creation] is in need of the effector, the necessitator, or the originator, due to these two causes [contingency/origination]. Second: That everything in need of the effector, the necessitator, or the originator, must have one. This [second stage] is correct in itself, but the path [to knowing the Creator] does not require it, and it involves lengthiness and obstacles that distance one from the objective. As for the first stage: knowledge of its [creation's] poverty does not require proof for that based on contingency or origination. As for the second: the fact that it is in need of Him does not require proving it with a universal syllogism, such as: 'Every contingent thing must have a necessitator,' or 'Every originated thing must have an originator.' Because it [creation] is a sign for Him, it is impossible for it to exist without Him or for it not to be a sign for Him. The heart, by its innate nature, knows this, even if the attributes of contingency and origination do not cross its mind. The subtle point is: The attributes of contingency and origination are not

necessary for the heart to consider, neither regarding the poverty of their essences nor regarding their being a sign for their Maker, even though they are established attributes. They are also a valid proof, but the individual contingent beings are signs for their specific Creator, the One {like Whom there is nothing} [Ash-Shūrā: 11], such that it is impossible for any partnership to occur regarding Him.

As for our saying, 'Every contingent thing has a specifier,' and 'Every originated thing has an originator,' it only indicates an originator and a specifier, which is a universal description that accepts partnership. This is why rational analogy does not indicate a specific entity, but only indicates the absolute universal; therefore, specification is necessary. So, analogy is proof for an absolute, universal quality. Furthermore, when one deduces the Maker from the attribute of its [creation's] contingency or origination, or both, this does not require a universal syllogism like saying: 'And every originated thing must have an originator,' or 'Every contingent thing must have a specifier,' let alone establishing these two premises. Rather, the heart's knowledge of the need of this contingent thing and this originated thing is like its knowledge of the need of that contingent thing and that originated thing. So, knowledge of the ruling concerning specific individuals is not derived from the universal knowledge encompassing them; rather, knowledge of the ruling concerning a specific individual may exist in the intellect before knowledge of the universal, general ruling. Just as knowing that ten is double five is not dependent on knowing that every number that has a half is double its half. It is upon this basis that His saying came: {Or were they created by nothing, or were they the creators [themselves]?} [Al-Ĥūr: 35]. Jubayr ibn Mu'īn said: 'When I heard it, I felt my heart was about to split.' It is an interrogative of repudiation, saying: Were they brought into existence without an originator? They know they did not come to be without a maker, and they know they did not create themselves. Their knowledge of the ruling concerning themselves is known innately by itself; it does not need to be proven by [saying]: 'Every existing being is originated,' or 'Every contingent thing does not exist by itself, nor does it exist without an originator.' Even though this general, categorical proposition is true, knowledge of that specific, particular case, if not preceding it, is certainly not subsequent to it, nor inferior to it in clarity.

I have elaborated on this meaning elsewhere and mentioned the da'wah of the Prophets (peace be upon them), that it came via the innate path, like their saying: {Can there be doubt about Allāh, Creator of the heavens and earth?} [Ibrāhīm: 10]. And the saying of Mūsā: {Lord of the heavens and the earth} [Ash-Shu'arā': 24]. And His saying in the Qur'ān: {worship your Lord, who created you and those before you, that you may become righteous, Who made for you the earth a bed...} [Al-Baqarah: 21-22]. He clarified that these very essences are signs of Allāh, as we indicated initially, without need for those two stages [of Kalām reasoning]. And when He rebuked them, He clarified their need for the Creator through their own selves, without needing a universal premise in which they and all other members [of the category] are equal; rather, they [their own selves] are clearer [as proof]. I have established this meaning extensively elsewhere.

The second aspect regarding the divergence of the Quranic way from the Kalām way: Allāh commanded His worship, which is the perfection, rectification, goal, and ultimate end of souls. He did not limit Himself merely to acknowledging Him, as is the ultimate goal of the Kalām method. So they [the Mutakallimūn]

agreed neither in the means nor in the objectives. For the Quranic means, as we have indicated, are innate, near, and lead to the specific objective, whereas those [Kalām means] are analogical and distant, and only lead to the type of objective, not to its specific reality. As for the objectives, the Qurʾān informed of knowing Him and working for Him, thus combining the two human faculties: the cognitive and the practical; the sensory and the volitional kinetic; the perceptive and the reliant; the verbal and the active, when He said: {worship your Lord} [Al-Baqarah: 21]. For worship necessarily involves knowing Him, turning repentantly to Him, humbling oneself before Him, and needing Him; this is the objective. The Kalām method, however, only yields mere acknowledgment and recognition of His existence. If this [acknowledgment] occurs without worship and repentance, it becomes a calamity for its possessor and a source of misery for him, as mentioned in the Hadith: {The most severely punished people on the Day of Resurrection will be a scholar whom Allāh did not benefit through his knowledge.} Like Iblis the accursed; for he acknowledges his Lord and affirms His existence, but since he did not worship Him, he became the head of the miserable. And everyone who is miserable is so by following him. As He said: {I will surely fill Hell with you and with those among them who follow you, all together.} [Şād: 85]. So Hell must be filled with him and his followers, even though he acknowledges the Lord and affirms His existence. He only refused and was arrogant towards obedience and worship. The cognitive faculty combined with the practical faculty is like the agent and the goal. This is why it is said: 'Knowledge without action is like a tree without fruit.' What is meant by action here is the action of the heart, which is its turning to Allāh and its fear of Him, such that it becomes a worshipper of Him. The Messengers and the revealed Books commanded this and made it obligatory; indeed, it is the head of the call, its objective, and its foundation. The deviant auditory-practical-vocal method [referring perhaps to certain Sufi practices] agrees on the practical objective, but not through knowledge; rather, through mere sound, or stirring poetry, or a description of vague love. So just as the Kalām method involves deficient knowledge without action, this [other] method involves deficient action without knowledge. But the Prophetic, Quranic, Sunnah-based, communal way contains both knowledge and action, both complete.

Thus, the opening of the call of the Messengers is the command to worship. Allāh Almighty said: {O mankind, worship your Lord, who created you and those before you} [Al-Baqarah: 21]. And the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: {I have been commanded to fight the people until they testify that there is no god but Allāh and that Muḥammad is His servant and His Messenger.} This entails acknowledging Him and worshipping Him alone, for the Ilāh is the One who is worshipped. He did not say, '...until they testify that there is no Lord but Allāh,' because the name 'Allāh' is more indicative of the intended worship of Him, for which creation was created and which they were commanded [to perform]. Likewise, his saying to Muʾadh: {Indeed, you are going to a people from the People of the Book, so let the first thing you call them to be the testimony that there is no god but Allāh and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh.} And Nuḥ (peace be upon him) said: {That you worship Allāh, fear Him, and obey me.} [Nuḥ: 3]. Likewise the Messengers in Sūrah Al-Aʿrāf and elsewhere. And He said: {And We certainly sent into every nation a messenger, [saying], 'Worship Allāh and avoid Ṭāghūt (false deities).'} [An-Naḥl: 36]. And He said to all the

Messengers: {O messengers, eat from the good foods and work righteousness. Indeed, I, of what you do, am Knowing. And indeed this, your religion, is one religion, and I am your Lord, so fear Me.} [Al-Mu'minūn: 51-52]. And Allāh Almighty said: {For the accustomed security of Quraysh—Their accustomed security [in] the caravan of winter and summer—Let them worship the Lord of this House, Who has fed them, [saving them] from hunger and made them safe, [saving them] from fear.} [Quraysh: 1-4]. And He said: {I have only been commanded to worship the Lord of this city, who made it sacred and to whom belongs all things.} [An-Naml: 91]. And He said: {Say, 'O disbelievers, I do not worship what you worship, nor are you worshippers of what I worship.} [Al-Kāfirūn: 1-3]. And He said in Al-Fātiḥah: {It is You we worship and You we ask for help.} [Al-Fātiḥah: 5]. And He said: {So worship Him and rely upon Him.} [Hūd: 123]. And He said: {So worship Him and be patient in His worship. Do you know of any similarity to Him?} [Maryam: 65]. And He said: {And they were not commanded except to worship Allāh, [being] sincere to Him in religion, inclining to truth...} [Al-Bayyinah: 5]



## Laying The Foundation Of First Principles And Establishing The Proofs

In the Name of Allāh, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful

Shaykh al-Islām Ḥmad ibn Taymiyyah—may Allāh sanctify his soul—said:

### On Laying the Foundation of First Principles and Establishing the Proofs

This is achieved by clarifying and defining the origin of knowledge and faith—as I initially wrote concerning the origin of divine knowledge. What I am writing here is: a clarification of the difference between the Prophetic, Faith-based, Knowledge-based, Righteousness-based Way and the Sabian Philosophical Way, and the methodologies that branched off from it, such as the Kalām Way and the [deviant] Worship-focused Way which oppose the path of the Prophets and their Sunnah.

This is because the Prophets (peace be upon them) first called people to the worship of Allāh with the heart and the tongue. His worship encompasses knowing Him and remembering Him. Thus, the origin of their knowledge and action is: knowledge of Allāh and action for Allāh. And this is innate, as I have established elsewhere in two or three places, clarifying that the origin of divine knowledge is innate and necessary, and that it is more firmly rooted in the souls than the principle of mathematical knowledge, like our saying, ‘One is half of two,’ and the principle of natural science, like our saying, ‘A body cannot be in two places [simultaneously].’ For these [latter types of] knowledge are matters from which most innate dispositions may turn away, whereas divine knowledge is such that no innate disposition can conceivably turn away from it. Elaborating on this has another place besides this one.

The purpose here is rather: that Allāh—Sublime is He—since He is the First who created all beings and the Last to whom all originated things return, He is the Comprehensive Origin. Therefore, knowledge of Him is the origin and sum of all knowledge; remembrance of Him is the origin and sum of all speech; and action for Him is the origin and sum of all action. Creation has no rectification except in knowing their Lord and worshipping Him. If they attain that, then whatever is besides it is either beneficial surplus, or unbeneficial excess, or a harmful matter. Then, from the knowledge of Him branch out the various types of sciences, and from worshipping Him and intending Him branch out the various kinds of righteous objectives. The heart, through worshipping Him and seeking His aid, is holding fast, clinging firmly, having sought refuge in a strong support, and having held fast to the guiding proof and the firm evidence. Thus, it remains either in increase of knowledge and faith, or in safety from ignorance and disbelief.

The divine texts came with this [meaning], stating that through faith, people emerge from darknesses into light. He struck the parable of the believer—who is the one affirming his Lord in knowledge and action—with the living, the seeing, the hearing, light, and shade. And He struck the parable of the disbeliever with the dead, the blind, the deaf, darkness, and scorching heat. And they said regarding the Waswās al-Khannās it is the one who, when Allāh is mentioned, retreats, and when remembrance of Allāh is neglected, whispers.

Thus, it becomes clear that the remembrance of Allāh is the foundation for repelling the waswās, which is the source of all disbelief, ignorance, immorality, and oppression. Allāh Almighty said: {Indeed, My servants—no authority will you have over them} [Al-Hijr: 42]. And He said: {Indeed, there is for him no authority over those who have believed and rely upon their Lord} [An-Nahl: 99]. And He said: {And whoever holds firmly to Allāh has [indeed] been guided to a straight path} [Āl ‘Imrān: 101], and other similar texts. And in the supplication that Imām Aḥmad taught to one of his companions: ‘O Guide (Dalil) of the bewildered, guide me to the path of the truthful, and make me among Your righteous servants.’

For this reason, the generality of Ahlus-Sunnah, from our companions [Hanbalis] and others, hold that Allāh may be named Dalil (Guide). However, Ibn ‘Aqīl and many of the companions of Al-Ash‘arī forbade naming Him Dalil, based on their belief that the dalil (proof/guide) is that by which one deduces or is guided, whereas Allāh is the One Who guides (Ad-Dāll). This which they said is according to what became prevalent in their conventional usage, distinguishing between Ad-Dāll (the guider) and Ad-Dalil (the guide/proof). The response to this is twofold:

1. The word Dalil is derived from Ad-Dāll [on the morphological pattern fa‘il], emphasizing the attribute of guidance. So every Dalil is a Dāll, but not every Dāll is a Dalil [in this emphatic sense]. It is not one of the nouns of instruments (asma‘ al-ālāt) by which an action is performed, for fa‘il is not among the patterns for instruments, like mif‘al or mifāl. Rather, things used for deduction—sayings, actions, physical objects—are called proofs/guides (adillah, pl. of dalil) because they guide the one who uses them for deduction. Just as it is reported about them [metaphorically] that they guide, direct inform, know, say, answer, judge, give verdicts, narrate, and bear witness, even if they possess no intention, will, sensation, or perception in doing so, as is well-known in Arabic and other languages. So, the distinction and specification they mentioned has no basis in the language of the Arabs.

2. Even if Dalil were among the names of instruments by which an action is performed, Allāh Almighty has said, regarding what His Prophet narrated from Him about His beloved servant: ‘...through Me he hears, through Me he sees, through Me he understands, through Me he speaks, through Me he strikes, and through Me he walks.’ And the Muslim says: ‘I seek help through Allāh’ and ‘I hold fast to Him.’ If things other than Allāh among existing entities—substances and attributes—are used as proof, whether they are living or not; indeed, even non-existence is used as proof; then that the Living, the Self-Subsisting should be used as proof is more fitting and appropriate. Furthermore, what is in the transmitted supplication: ‘O Guide of the bewildered, guide me to the path of the truthful, and make me among Your

righteous servants' necessitates that naming Him Dalīl is based on His being the One Who guides (Dāll) His servants, not merely because He is used as proof, just as one might use entities, sayings, or actions that do not intend guidance as proof. Among His names is Al-Hādī (The Guide), and Al-Burhān (The Proof) has also been mentioned. This is why it is related from some [scholars] that he said: 'I knew things by my Lord, and I did not know my Lord by things.' And another said: 'He is the Proof (Dalīl) for me to everything, even if everything is a proof (dalīl) against me for Him—lest He punish me.' It was said to Ibn 'Abbās: 'By what means did you know your Lord?' He replied: 'Whoever seeks his religion through analogy will remain perpetually in confusion, deviating from the path, journeying into crookedness. I knew Him by how He introduced Himself, and I described Him by how He described Himself.' So he informed that the heart's knowledge was obtained through Allāh's introduction, which is the light of faith, and that the tongue's description was obtained through Allāh's speech, which is the light of the Qur'ān.

Another said to the Shaykh [addressing someone demanding proofs]:

*They said, 'Bring us proofs!' I said to them  
'How can a proof stand upon the Ultimate Proof?'*

And the knower said to the mutakallim: 'Certainty, according to us, are inspirations that come upon the souls, which the souls are incapable of rejecting.' He [the Mutakallim] replied that this is necessary/self-evident. And Shaykh Ismā'īl Al-Kūrānī said to the Mutakallim Shaykh: 'You say: Allāh is known by proof. We say: He introduced Himself to us, so we knew Him.' Meaning: He introduced Himself through Himself and His grace. Although the speech of these two Shaykhs contains an allusion to the [Sufi] Worship-focused Way, which I have discussed elsewhere.

So, if the Truth, the Living, the Self-Subsisting, Who is the Lord of everything and its Sovereign, the Originator of every origin, the Causer of every cause and reason, is Himself the Guide and the Proof, the First and the Origin by Whom the servant seeks guidance, to Whom he flees for refuge, and to Whom he refers all subsequent matters in knowledge—then that is the path and way of guidance. Just as actions and movements, since Allāh is their source and to Him is their return, the one who relies upon Him in his action, saying that there is no might nor power except through Allāh, is supported and aided.

The crux of the matter is: Allāh is the Guide and He is the Helper. {And sufficient is your Lord as a Guide and a Helper.} [Al-Furqān: 31]. Every knowledge requires guidance, and every action requires power. Therefore, it is necessary that He be the origin of all guidance and knowledge, and the origin of all help and power. The servant must not seek guidance except from Him, nor seek help except from Him. Since the servant is created, sustained, innately disposed, and fashioned, he returns in his knowledge and action to his Creator, Originator, Lord, and Maker. This then becomes an arrangement conforming to the truth and a composition agreeing with reality; since building the branch upon the origin and prioritizing the origin over the branch is the truth. This, then, is the correct way, conforming to the innate disposition of Allāh and His creation, and to His Book and His Sunnah. It is established in Saḥīḥ Muslim from 'Ā'ishah that {the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him), when he stood for the night

prayer, would say: 'O Allāh, Lord of Jibrā'il, Mikā'il, and Isrāfil, Originator of the heavens and the earth, Knower of the unseen and the witnessed; You judge between Your servants concerning that over which they used to differ: Guide me to the truth regarding that wherein there is disagreement, by Your permission. Indeed, You guide whom You will to a straight path.'

As for the Philosophical Kalām Way: they began with their own souls, making them the origin upon which they branch out and the foundation upon which they build. They discussed their perception of knowledge: that it occurs sometimes through the senses, sometimes through the intellect, and sometimes through both. They made sensory and self-evident knowledge, and the like, the foundation without which no knowledge can be obtained. Then they claimed that they only perceive through these means matters close to them, such as natural, mathematical, and ethical matters. They made these three the foundations upon which they build all other sciences. This is why they exemplify this in the principles of knowledge and Kalām by [saying] that one is half of two, that a body cannot be in two places, and that two opposites—like black and white—cannot coexist. These two fields [mathematics and physics] are agreed upon [as foundations]. As for ethics, such as: deeming knowledge, justice, chastity, and courage as good—the majority of philosophers and Mutakallimūn consider them among the foundations, but they are general foundations. Among them are those who do not consider them foundations, but rather branches that require proof. This is the view of most Mutakallimūn who support the Sunnah regarding the interpretation of divine decree. Thus, what they established as principles and agreed upon regarding knowledge was a matter of little benefit, meager value, dealing with lower matters.

Then, when they ascend from these premises and proofs to higher matters, they have two paths: As for the Mutakallimūn who follow the Prophethoods: their aim, generally, is only to prove the Maker of the universe and the attributes by which Prophethood is established according to their method. Then, once they establish Prophethood, they receive from it the revelation-based matters, which are the Book, the Sunnah, consensus, and their derivatives. As for the Philosophers: they generally expand upon natural matters and their implications; then they ascend to the celestial spheres and their conditions. Then, the theistic among them ascend to the Necessary Existent and to the Intellects and Souls. Among them are those who prove the Necessary Existent initially from the perspective that existence must contain a necessary [component].

These paths contain much corruption, both in terms of means and objectives: As for the objectives, their outcome—after much toil and [assuming] safety [from error]—is little good. They are like 'lean camel meat on a rugged mountain peak: neither easy to climb, nor fat enough to be worth taking' Furthermore, they cause one to miss obligatory and praiseworthy objectives that cannot be enumerated here. As for the means: these paths involve numerous premises, and those who traverse them often get cut off before reaching the goal. Their premises are generally either ambiguous, leading to disputes, or obscure, grasped only by the intelligent. This is why you rarely find two leading figures among them agreeing on all the premises of a proof. Every leader among the philosophers and Mutakallimūn has a method of deduction that differs from the method of another leader, such that the followers of one

criticize the method of the other, and each believes that Allāh cannot be known except through his own method, even if the majority of the people of the religion, indeed the generality of the Salaf, oppose him in it.

An example of this: Most Mutakallimūn believe that Allāh cannot be known except by proving the origination of the universe, then using that as proof for its Originator. Then, they have various ways to prove its origination: most of them deduce it from the origination of accidents, which are the attributes of physical bodies. Then, the Qadariyyah among the Mu'tazilah and others believe that proving the Maker and Prophethood is impossible except after believing that the servant is the originator of his own actions, otherwise the proof is invalidated—and similar principles in which the majority of Muslims oppose them. The majority of these Mutakallimūn who prove the origination of bodies through the origination of movements make this the very proof for negating what the apparent meaning of the revelation-based texts indicates, such as Allāh coming, descending, and the like. The Mu'tazilah and others make this the very proof that Allāh has no attributes—neither knowledge, nor power, nor might, nor mercy, nor anything else—because these, according to their claim, are accidents indicating the origination of the one described.

Most authors in philosophy—like Ibn Sinā—begin with logic, then natural science and mathematics, or they don't mention the latter. Then they move on to what they consider divine science. You find authors in Kalām beginning with its preliminaries concerning reasoning, knowledge, and proof—which is akin to logic—then they move on to the origination of the universe and proving its Originator. Some of them move on to classifying known things into existent and non-existent, and examine existence and its categories, as the philosopher might do at the beginning of divine science. As for the Prophets, the first part of their call is: the testimony that there is no god but Allāh and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh.

Al-Ghazālī acknowledged that the way of the Sufis is the ultimate goal, because they purify their hearts from everything other than Allāh and fill them with the remembrance of Allāh. This is the beginning of the Messenger's call. However, the Sufi who does not possess the detailed Prophetic legacy gains thereby only a general faith, unlike the possessor of the Prophetic legacy, for whom knowledge is detailed.

Therefore, contemplate the ways of knowledge and action so that the way of the People of the Sunnah and Faith becomes distinct to you from the way of the People of Innovation and Hypocrisy, and the way of knowledge and recognition from the way of ignorance and denial.



## The Subsistence Of Contingent And Originated Beings Through The Necessary, Eternal One, And Its Explanation

Shaykh al-Islām Aḥmad ibn Taymiyyah—may Allāh sanctify his soul—said:

A group from the Mutakallimūn (scholastic theologians), the Mutafalsifah (philosophers), and the Mutašawwifah (Sufis) have spoken regarding the subsistence of contingent and originated beings through the Necessary, Eternal One. And this meaning [in principle] is true; for indeed, Allāh is the Lord of everything and its Sovereign. However, they cite as evidence for that His statement: {Everything will perish except His Face} [Al-Qaṣaṣ: 88]. And they say that the meaning of the verse is: that every contingent being, in consideration of its essence, is perishing, or it is pure non-existence and sheer negation. It only possesses existence from the direction of its Lord. So it is perishing in consideration of its essence, [but] existing by the Face (Wajh) of its Lord—meaning, from His direction it is existent.

Then, among them are those who may diverge from this into the doctrine of the pantheistic (Ittiḥādiyyah) and incarnationist (Ḥulūliyyah) Jahmiyyah. So he says: that ‘Face’ (Wajh) is the existence of beings, and the Face of Allāh is His existence. Thus, His existence becomes the existence of beings, with no distinction made between the Necessary Existence and the contingent existence—as is the view of Ibn ‘Arabī and Ibn Sab‘īn and their likes. And this is a necessary consequence for anyone who posits His existence as an absolute existence not distinguished by a reality specific to Him, whether one posits it as an absolute existence conditioned by absoluteness—as Ibn Sinā and his like among the Mutafalsifah claim—or posits it as an absolute existence without condition—as the Ittiḥādiyyah say.

And they concede, regarding rational principles—from that which is known by rational necessity—what necessitates that the existent ‘conditioned by absoluteness’ only has its existence in minds, not in external realities, like the ‘absolute animal’ conditioned by absoluteness, and the ‘absolute human’ conditioned by absoluteness, and so forth. And [they concede] that the ‘absolute without condition’ has no reality other than the external and mental existence; [meaning] there is not, in existing external realities, an absolute existence apart from their specific realities, just as there is not, within this specific human and that specific human, an ‘absolute human’ beyond this specific human. Therefore, the existence of the Lord, according to the first [view—Ibn Sinā’s], becomes mental, and according to the second [view—Ittiḥādiyyah’s], the very existence of created beings.

And the statement of the Jahmiyyah, both early and late, does not depart from these two positions; and it is the reality of ta‘īl (denial [of attributes or distinct

existence]). However, they affirm Him also. So they combine negation and affirmation. Thus, they remain in confusion; and for this reason, they make confusion the ultimate point of knowledge. And they narrate from the Prophet (peace be upon him) a hadith fabricated against him: 'The most knowledgeable of you regarding Allāh is the most intensely confused among you.' And that he said: 'O Allāh, increase me in confusion regarding You.' And they combine between two contradictories, committing themselves to that.

And this is the view of the Qaramitah, the Bāṭiniyyah (esotericists), and the Ittīhādiyyah (pantheists), and it is a necessary consequence of the view of the Philosophers and the Mu'tazilah, even if these [latter groups] do not explicitly state their commitment to it; unlike the Bāṭiniyyah and the Ittīhādiyyah among the Mutaṣawwifah. For they explicitly state their commitment to it and mention that from Al-Ḥallāj.

The objective here is to say: As for the Creator's existence being the same as the creature's existence, this is explicit disbelief by the consensus of the people of faith; and it is among the falsest of falsehoods according to the self-evident reason of every human being, even if its proponents claim that it is the pinnacle of verification and knowledge. And this is elaborated upon elsewhere.

As for the creature having no existence except from the Creator—Sublime is He—then this is true. Furthermore, all beings—He is their Creator, their Lord, and their Sovereign. Nothing comes to be except by His power, His will, and His creation. He is the Creator of everything, Sublime and Exalted is He.

However, the discussion here concerns interpreting the verse with this [innovated] meaning. For meanings are divided into true and false. The false: it is not permissible to interpret the Word of Allāh with it. And the true: if it is what the Qur'ān indicated, it is interpreted with it. Otherwise, not every correct meaning can be used to interpret the wording merely due to some suitability, like the suitability between a dream vision and its interpretation; even if it falls outside the modes of the word's indication, as the Qaramitah and the Bāṭiniyyah do.

Since the indication of the word upon the meaning is conventional (sam'iyyah—based on hearing/usage): it is necessary that the word be [actually] used for that meaning, such that it has indicated the meaning through it. It is not sufficient, in that regard, merely that the word could potentially be assigned to that meaning. For the words that are suitable for assignment to meanings but have not been assigned to them: none can enumerate their number except Allāh. And this is according to those who consider suitability between the word and the meaning, like the view of a group among the people of Kalām (theology) and Bayān (rhetoric/eloquence). As for those who do not consider suitability: then every word is suitable for assignment to every meaning. Especially when it is known that the word is assigned to a meaning for which it is [actually] used; so applying it to something else merely based on suitability is a lie against Allāh. Then, if it contradicts what is known from the Sharī'ah, it is the practice of the Qaramitah. And if it is not contradictory, then it is the condition of many of the ignorant preachers and Mutaṣawwifah, who speak of 'indications' upon which the wording does not indicate, neither explicitly nor by analogy.

As for the proponents of ishārāt (subtle indications) who affirm what the wording indicates [literally] and consider the indicated meaning [i.e., the subtle

one] to be understood by way of analogy and reflection, their condition is like the condition of the jurists knowledgeable in analogy and reflection. And this is true, provided it is a sound analogy, not a corrupt one, and upright reflection, not deviant.

Since the objective here is the discussion concerning the interpretation (tafsir) of the verse, we say: Interpreting the verse according to what is transmitted and reported from those among the Salaf and the Mufasssīrūn who stated it; that the meaning is 'Everything will perish except that which was intended for His Face [i.e., done for His sake].' is better than that innovated interpretation. Rather, it is not permissible to interpret the verse with that innovated interpretation. And this is clarified by several points, some indicating preference [for the Salaf's view] and some indicating the invalidity [of the innovated view].

1. He did not say, 'Everything will perish except from His direction' or 'from His Face', but He said, 'except His Face'. And this necessitates that there are things that perish, except His Face. So if His 'Face' is intended to mean His 'Existence': it would imply that everything besides His existence is perishing. This would necessitate that created beings are [all] perishing. And the matter is not so [as some creations like Paradise and Hell will endure]. It also [poses a problem] according to the view of the Ittihādīyyah; for according to them, there is nothing there except a single existence. So it is incorrect to say, 'Everything besides His existence is perishing,' since there is nothing there about which it can be reported that it is 'besides His existence', as the foundation of their madhhab is the negation of 'otherness' and 'difference' in reality.

2. This is completed by the second point: which is that if it is said, 'What is meant by the perishing is the contingent being which has no existence from its own direction.' Then the meaning would be: 'Everything whose existence is not from itself [will perish], except Him.' It is said [in response]: Using the word 'perishing' for an existing, created thing merely because its existence is from its Lord, not from itself, is not known in the language, neither literally nor metaphorically. And the Qur'ān has differentiated in the usage of the term 'perishing' between one thing and another. So He, the Exalted, said: {If a man perishes leaving no child...} [An-Nisā': 176]. And He, the Exalted, said: {...and do not throw yourselves with your own hands into destruction...} [Al-Baqarah: 195]. And He, the Exalted, said: {And they prevent [others] from him and keep themselves far from him. And they destroy but themselves, and they perceive [it] not.} [Al-An'ām: 26]. And He, the Exalted, said: {And they say, 'There is not but our worldly life; we die and live, and nothing destroys us except time.'...} [Al-Jāthiyah: 24]. And He, the Exalted, said: {And how many a township have We destroyed! Our punishment came upon it by night or while they were sleeping at midday.} [Al-A'rāf: 4]. And He, the Exalted, said: {And how many a generation have We destroyed before them!...} [e.g., Maryam: 74, 98; Qāf: 36]. And He said: {And there is no township except that We will destroy it before the Day of Resurrection...} [Al-Isrā': 58]. And He said: {And there were in the city nine individuals corrupting throughout the land and not reforming.} {They said, 'Take a mutual oath by Allāh that we will surely attack him and his family by night, and then we will surely say to his heir, 'We did not witness the destruction of his family'...' } [An-Naml: 48-49]. And He said: {And how many generations have We destroyed after Nūh!...}

[Al-Isrā': 17]. And the angels said: {Indeed, we are destroyers of the people of this township...} [Al-'Ankabūt: 31]. And He said: {Did We not destroy the former peoples?} {Then We will follow them with the later ones.} [Al-Mursalāt: 16-17]. So these verses necessitate that 'perishing' is transformation and corruption in the existing thing, as we shall clarify, not that it means that its existence is not from itself, since all created beings share in this [latter characteristic].

3. It may be said, based on this estimation [i.e., the innovated interpretation], the meaning would be that everything besides Him is contingent, capable of non-existence, its existence not being from itself. And this meaning is not the one they intend. Rather, their intention is that everything besides Him, its existence is from Him. And between the two meanings, there is a clear difference. For informing about a thing that it is contingent, capable of non-existence, its existence not from itself, is different from informing about it that it is existent and that its existence is from Allāh.

4. It may be said, if the intent is that everything besides Him is contingent, and the pronoun refers back to the Necessary Existent—to Allāh Who created the beings—this would be a case of clarifying the clear. For it is well-known that everything besides the Necessary Existent is contingent, and that everything created by Him is contingent.

5. It may be said, the term 'Face' (Wajh) in the Book and the Sunnah is only mentioned in the context of worship directed to Him, deeds done for Him, and turning towards Him. So it is mentioned in establishing His Divinity, His worship, and obedience to Him, not in establishing the unicity of His being the Creator and Lord. And that meaning [related to worship/purpose] is the final cause, whereas this [related to creation/Lordship] is the efficient cause. And the final cause is the intended purpose, which is higher and nobler; indeed, it is the efficient cause for the efficient cause. For this reason, [the object related to the final cause] is placed first in examples like His statement: {You alone we worship, and You alone we ask for help} [Al-Fāṭīḥah: 5], and in examples like His statement: {So worship Him and rely upon Him} [Hūd: 123]. And He, the Exalted, said: {And no one has with him any favor to be repaid,} {Except seeking the Face of his Lord, the Most High.} {And he is going to be satisfied.} [Al-Layl: 19-21]. And He, the Exalted, said: {And they give food in spite of love for it to the needy, the orphan, and the captive,} {[Saying], 'We feed you only for the Face of Allāh. We wish not from you reward or gratitude.')} [Al-Insān: 8-9]. And He, the Exalted, said: {And do not drive away those who call upon their Lord morning and afternoon, seeking His Face...} [Al-An'ām: 52; Al-Kahf: 28]. Since this is the case, interpreting the term 'Face' in this verse {Everything will perish except His Face} according to what it indicates in all other verses [i.e., actions done for His sake] is more appropriate than interpreting it according to [a meaning, like 'existence from Him'] for which the term 'Face' does not indicate in anything from the Book and the Sunnah. Rather, the former [interpretation] is obligatory, not the latter; because the latter is using the word for something with which the Book has not come, whereas the Book has come with the other [meaning] wherever [the term] was mentioned.

6. The term 'perishing' is intended to mean corruption and its departure

from what is intended and desired for it. And this is suitable for that which is not [done] for Allāh, for it is corrupt, not benefited from in reality; rather, it is outside of what must be intended and desired. He, the Exalted, said: {And they prevent [others] from him and keep themselves far from him. And they destroy but themselves, and they perceive [it] not.} [Al-An'ām: 26]. He informed that they destroy themselves by their preventing [others] from the Messenger and their keeping away from him. And it is known that whoever keeps away from following the Messenger and prevents others from it—and he is the disbeliever—then his perishing through his disbelief is the occurrence of the hated punishment for him, instead of the intended bliss. And He, the Exalted, said: {If a man dies/perishes...} [An-Nisā': 176].

And he said:<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Blank space in the original.



## Completing The Refutation Of The Negators And The Deniers (Al-Mu'Attilah)

And he—may Allāh sanctify his soul—said: In the Name of Allāh, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful<sup>1</sup>

Then, it is also said: This also necessitates that each of them is not necessary in itself, self-sufficient, self-subsisting; rather, [each is] dependent on the other in its essence and attributes, just as it was dependent on it [the other] in its effects. This is because if each of them is dependent on the other regarding its effects, incapable of acting independently concerning them—since partnership necessitates this, as previously mentioned;—then either it [each partner] is capable of [attaining] the power for independence, such that this is possible for it, or it is not possible.

The second [option, that it's impossible] is untenable, because if it were impossible for something to be within the power [of] and possible for one [agent], it would be impossible for it to be within the power [of] and possible for two. For the state of a thing, in being within [someone's] power and possible, does not differ based on whether the one possessing power over it is multiple or single. Thus, if it is impossible for it to be an effect within the power of one, it is impossible for it to be an effect within the power of two. And if it is permissible for it to be an effect within the power of two—and it is possible—then it is also permissible for it to be [an effect within the power] of one. This is evident if the possibility and impossibility relate to some meaning within the possible [thing] itself—the effect over which power is held—since the attributes of its essence do not differ in this situation. Likewise, if it [possibility/impossibility] relates to

---

<sup>1</sup> Shaykh Nāṣir ibn Ḥamad Al-Fahd said (p. 20):

This section is extracted from a collection of sections mentioned in: 20/178. The references in his statement (This also), and his statement (as previously mentioned), and similar phrases, refer back to the sections mentioned before this section there. By comparing the two sections [the one here and the one in 20/178], some minor differences appear—and I have pointed out what pertains to that section when discussing Volume Twenty. As for here, the most important differences are:

1—(2/33): (This is why combination and participation in creation), while in 20/179 (in created things), which is more apparent.

2—(2/33): (even if one of them remains), while in 20/179 (even if their states/conditions remain).

3—(2/35): (And there is nothing among them that is, by itself, an established cause), while in 20/181 (what is by itself a complete cause), which is more apparent.

4—(2/35-36): (Rather, it was said: There is no cause in creation possessing a single attribute, or there is nothing in creation that is by itself a cause), while in 20/182: (since there is nothing in creation that is by itself a cause), which is more apparent.

5—(2/36): (and their dependence, and that they are from His beginning), while in 20/183: (and their dependence, and that they are under Lordship), which is correct.

The last fifteen lines here were not mentioned there, and this is further evidence—besides the differences—that the source of this section is another manuscript copy different from that copy. And Allah, the Exalted, knows best.

some meaning within the one possessing power, for the power subsisting in two does not preclude it from [potentially] subsisting in one.

Rather, the possibility of that is known by the self-evident nature of reason. Indeed, it is known by the self-evident nature of reason that attributes in their entirety—power and others—whenever their locus is unified and combined, it is more perfect for them than if it were multiple and dispersed. This is why combination and participation among created things necessitate for them a strength and power that they do not attain when they are separated and isolated, even if their individual states/conditions remain. Rather, individuals, limbs, and other dispersed bodies—a certain power subsists in each of them; if their unification and combination were supposed, that power would be stronger and more perfect, because it would attain, through unification and combination, according to possibility, what it did not possess during separation and multiplicity.

This demonstrates that the power subsisting in two—if it were supposed that those two were [instead] one thing—the power would be more perfect. So how could it not [at least] be equal to the power subsisting in two loci? And since it is known that if two distinct loci, in which two powers subsist, were supposed to be one locus, and the two powers subsisted in it, the power would not decrease thereby but rather increase; it is [therefore] known that an effect, possible and within the power of two separate agents—if it were supposed that they themselves were [instead] one agent in whom subsisted what subsisted in them both—[the power] would not decrease thereby but rather increase. Therefore, it is known that it is possible for each of them [the hypothetical partners] to be capable of [attaining] the power for independence, and that this is possible for it.

Thus, it becomes clear that it is possible, regarding partners sharing [power over] a single effect, for each of them to be [independently] capable of [producing] it. Indeed, it is possible for them to be [combined as] one thing capable of it. It therefore becomes clear that each of them can possibly be more perfect than it currently is and possess a different attribute [i.e., independence], since it is possible for the essence and attributes of each of them to change.

And it is known that it [each partner] cannot perfect itself alone and change itself, given the supposition that it is incapable of independently producing an effect separate from itself. So, is it not even more likely to be incapable of perfecting and changing itself? And if this [partner] can possibly change and become complete, yet it cannot achieve this by itself, then it cannot be necessary of existence in itself. Rather, there must be possibility and dependence on another within it. But the supposition was that it is necessary of existence in itself. [This leads to the conclusion that it is] not necessary of existence in itself, thus being [both] necessary and possible. This is a contradiction.

For that which is necessary of existence in itself, its own self is sufficient regarding the reality of its essence and attributes; it is not dependent on another in any aspect of its essence or attributes, as all of that is included within the designation of its essence. Indeed, it must also not be dependent on another in any of its actions or effects. For its actions subsisting within it are included in the designation of its self. Its dependence on another regarding some effects necessitates its dependence in its action and attribute subsisting within it, since

its effect proceeds from that [action/attribute]. If its essence were complete and self-sufficient, it would not depend on another in its action. Therefore, its dependence on another in any way whatsoever is evidence of its lack of self-sufficiency and its need for another. This [neediness] is precisely the possibility that contradicts its being necessary of existence in itself.

This is why, since necessary existence is among the unique characteristics of the Lord of the Worlds, and self-sufficiency from others is among the unique characteristics of the Lord of the Worlds, independence in action is [also] among the unique characteristics of the Lord of the Worlds, and being transcendent above having a partner in action or effect is among the unique characteristics of the Lord of the Worlds.

Thus, there is nothing among created beings that is independent regarding any effect. There is nothing among them that is, by itself, a complete cause. And there is nothing among them that is free from needing a partner regarding any effect. Rather, nothing comes into existence in the universe from some causes except with the participation of other causes alongside it. Thus, even if it is called a cause, it is [merely] a necessitating, contributory cause, not a complete cause. Each [cause/condition] serves as a condition for the other. Just as there is no cause in the universe except that it has an impediment that prevents it from acting [under certain conditions]. Therefore, everything in creation—whatever is called a cause, a means, an agent possessing power, an actor, or a manager—has a partner that acts as a condition for it, and it has an opponent that acts as an impediment and opposite to it.

And He, Glorified is He, has said: {And of everything We created pairs} [Adh-Dhāriyāt: 49]. The term 'pair' can mean a counterpart or similar, and [it can mean] an opposite or dissimilar, which is a rival. So, there is no created being except that it has a partner and a rival. The Lord, Glorified is He, alone is the One Who has no partner and no rival. Rather, whatever He wills is, and whatever He does not will is not.

This is why none other [than Him] deserves to be called Creator or Lord in an absolute sense, and so forth, because that [title] necessitates independence and sole agency regarding the effect produced. And this belongs only to Allāh alone.

For this reason—although some people have disputed whether a cause can possess [multiple] attributes, claiming that a cause can only possess a single attribute—most people have disagreed with this and said: It is permissible for [a cause] to possess [multiple] attributes. Indeed, it has been said: since there is nothing in creation that is by itself a cause. And there is no cause in creation except that which is composite, [made up] of two or more components. Thus, there is no single [simple entity] in creation from which anything proceeds, let alone [supporting the philosophical maxim] 'From the one, only one proceeds.' Rather, nothing proceeds from creation except from [a combination of] two or more [factors]. As for the One Who acts alone, He is none but Allāh.

So, just as Oneness is necessary for Him and intrinsic to Him, partnership is necessary for the created being and intrinsic to it. Oneness necessitates perfection, and perfection necessitates it. Partnership necessitates imperfection, and imperfection necessitates it. Likewise, Oneness necessitates self-sufficiency from others, self-subsistence, and necessary existence in itself. And these matters—self-sufficiency, necessary existence in itself, and self-subsistence—

necessitate Oneness. Partnership necessitates dependence on others, contingency in itself, and lack of self-subsistence. Likewise, dependence, contingency, and lack of self-subsistence necessitate partnership.

These [arguments] and their like are among the proofs and signs of the Oneness of Lordship. They are also proofs of the contingency and dependence of the witnessed created beings, and that they are under Lordship. Thus, they are among the proofs for affirming the Maker. This is because the separation, multiplicity, and partnership found within them necessitate their dependence and contingency. And the contingent, dependent being inevitably requires a Necessary, Self-Sufficient Being, otherwise it would not exist. Even if an infinite regress of contingent, dependent beings were supposed, the sum total of them remains contingent. And it is known by necessity that the contingent being depends on another for its existence. Thus, everything known to be contingent and dependent is also known to be dependent on another for its existence. Therefore, there must be One Who is Self-Sufficient in Himself, Necessary of Existence in Himself, otherwise nothing that is dependent and contingent could exist at all.

These concepts indicate both the Oneness of Lordship and the Oneness of Divinity—which is the complete, obligatory Tawhīd brought by the Qur’ān—for reasons, some of which we have mentioned elsewhere, such as [the argument that] moving things ultimately require volitional movement, and volition requires an object desired for its own sake, and that is the Deity. The created being cannot possibly be desired for its own sake, just as it cannot possibly be an agent acting by itself. Therefore, if it is impossible for there to be two agents acting by themselves, it is impossible for there to be two [objects] desired for their own sakes.

Furthermore, the Deity, who is the one desired for His own sake—if He were not also the Lord—it would be impossible for Him to be worshipped for His own sake. And one who is not a Lord and Creator cannot be invoked, sought from, or desired [even] for the sake of another; so, it is even more impossible that he should be worshipped and desired for his own sake. Thus, affirming Divinity necessitates affirming Lordship, and negating Lordship necessitates negating Divinity. This is because Divinity represents the ultimate purpose/goal, and it necessitates [the existence of] the origin/beginning, just as the final cause necessitates the efficient cause.

And each aspect—the Oneness of Lordship and the Oneness of Divinity—although known through the necessary, self-evident innate disposition and through the divine, prophetic Law, is also known through necessary analogies, which are rational arguments. However, the speculative theologians primarily dedicated themselves to establishing rational arguments for the Oneness of Lordship. This [aspect of Tawhīd], in its principle, is something none among the children of Ādam have disputed. They only disputed regarding some of its details, such as the disputes of the Magians, the Dualists, the Naturalists, the Qadariyyah, and their like among the misguided philosophers, the Mu’tazilah, and those who fall under their categories.

As for the Oneness of Divinity, this is [the area of] the general, prevalent polytheism into which various types of polytheists have fallen, even those who affirm that there is no creator but Allāh and no lord besides Him. As Allāh the

Exalted said: {And most of them do not believe in Allāh except while they associate others with Him} [Yūsuf: 106]. We have elaborated on this elsewhere.



## A Principle Regarding The Basis Of Affirmation And Negation, Love And Hatred

And Shaykh al-Islām Aḥmad ibn Taymiyyah—may Allāh have mercy on him—said:

### A Principle

I have written what relates to it in the notebook preceding this one.

The basis of affirmation and negation, and love and hatred, is the soul's perception of existence and non-existence, and suitability and repugnance.

So, when it perceives the establishment of something's essence or its attributes, it believes in its establishment and affirms it. Then, if these are attributes of perfection, it believes in its veneration and honoring, affirms [it], praises it, and extols it. And when it perceives its non-existence or the absence of attributes of perfection from it, it believes in that absence. If it perceives neither establishment nor absence, it does not believe in either of them, neither affirming nor denying. Sometimes, it might believe in the absence merely because it does not perceive the establishment, even if it also does not perceive the non-existence. There is a clear difference between perceiving non-existence and the absence of perceiving existence. This latter state is the station of ignorance from which most people are affected—those who {deny what they do not encompass in knowledge} [cf. Yūnus: 39] and those who, being ignorant of something, become hostile towards it.

Then, when it [the soul] believes in the absence [of something praiseworthy], it denies its establishment, condemns it, and criticizes it. This applies if what it perceived the existence or non-existence of was praiseworthy. If it was blameworthy, the matter is reversed.

Likewise, if it perceives what is suitable for it, it loves it and desires it. If it perceives what is repugnant to it, it hates it and dislikes it. If it perceives neither of these, or perceives something that is neither suitable nor repugnant, then there is neither love nor hatred. Sometimes, you might hate what is not repugnant simply because it is not suitable. There is a clear difference between perceiving the repugnant and the absence of perceiving the suitable. However, this [latter reaction] is praiseworthy, for what is not suitable for a person holds no benefit or advantage for him, so inclination towards it falls under futility and harm. One should turn away from it because there is no benefit in it, and inclination towards what holds no benefit is harmful.

Then, following love for a person or an action comes praying for blessings upon him and praising him. Just as following hatred comes cursing him and criticizing him. That which is neither loved nor hated is followed by neither praise nor supplication, nor criticism nor curse.

Since, in reality, there exists a Beloved, Worshipped Being, the foundation of happiness is faith in that [Being]. And the foundation of faith is the affirmation of the heart, which is assent, and the action of the heart, which is love accompanied by submission. For there is no greater suitability for the souls of the servants than the suitability of their God, Who is Allāh, besides Whom there is no god.

Since faith encompasses both these meanings, and the expression of those who defined it merely by assent was deficient and inadequate, the Ummah divided into three groups:

The comprehensive ones actualized both its meanings: affirmative speech and volitional action.

Two groups lacked one of the two meanings:

1. The speculative theologians: Their focus and discourse are predominantly on establishment and absence, existence and non-existence, and affirmative propositions. Thus, their ultimate aim is mere affirmation, knowledge, and reporting.
2. The Sufis: Their seeking and practice are predominantly in love and hatred, will and aversion, and practical movements. Thus, their ultimate aim is love, compliance, action, and will.

As for the People of Knowledge and Faith, they combine both aspects: cognitive affirmation and loving action. Furthermore, their affirmation stems from knowledge, and their action and love stem from knowledge. Thus, they are safe from the two pitfalls of the deviant speculative theologians and Sufis, and they attain the perfection that each of the [deviant] groups lacks. For each of the deviant groups has two corruptions:

1. Speaking without knowledge—if one is a theologian—and acting without knowledge—if one is a Sufi. This is what occurred in the theological and practical innovations that oppose the Book and the Sunnah.
2. The theologian neglects action, and the Sufi neglects speech and discourse.

But the People of the Sunnah, inwardly and outwardly: their speech and action, inwardly and outwardly, were based on knowledge, and each aspect, their speech and their action, was linked to the other. These are the true Muslims, remaining on the Straight Path, the path of those upon whom Allāh has bestowed favor, not of those who have evoked [His] anger, nor of those who are astray [cf. Al-Fātiḥah: 7]. For the deviant among the people of kalām bear resemblance to the Jews, and the deviant among the people of Sufism bear resemblance to the Christians. This is why the former group is dominated by the aspect of letters and the knowledge and belief they indicate, while the latter group is dominated by the aspect of sounds and the ecstasy and movement they provoke.

Complementary to this is that Allāh commanded His Prophet (peace be upon him) to call to the way of his Lord with wisdom, good counsel, and to debate with them in the way that is best [cf. An-Naḥl: 125]. These three methods are beneficial for knowledge and action, and they resemble what the logicians mention regarding demonstration, rhetoric, and dialectic. What remains [from the logicians' categories] are poetry and sophistry—which is embellished

falsehood. Allāh negated these, saying: {Shall I inform you upon whom the devils descend? They descend upon every sinful liar. They pass on what is heard, and most of them are liars. And the poets—[only] the misguided follow them} [Ash-Shu'arā': 221-224] to the end of the sūrah. So He mentioned the liars—who are the sophists—and He mentioned the poets.

Likewise, Abū Bakr Aṣ-Ṣiddīq said to 'Umar ibn Al-Khaṭṭāb, when the latter said to him, 'O Caliph of the Messenger of Allāh, conciliate the people,' he [Abū Bakr] grabbed his beard and said: 'O Ibn Al-Khaṭṭāb! A tyrant in Jāhiliyyah, yet cowardly in Islam? Upon what should I conciliate them? Upon a fabricated report or upon fabricated poetry?' So he mentioned the fabricated report and the fabricated poetry, just as Allāh mentioned the liars and the poets. The fabrication relates to the faculty of reporting (knowledge), while poetry relates to the practical, desiderative faculty. The former is error, and the latter is misguidance.

This is why one often accompanies the other, such as among religious figures like monks, corrupt ascetics, and others. Then, since poetry is derived from perception/feeling, it serves to make the soul perceive what moves it, even if it is not true. Rather, it engenders love or aversion, desire or fear, due to the imagination it contains—this is the specific characteristic of poetry. For this reason, He described them [poets] as being followed by the misguided. Misguidance is following desires, because poetry moves people with the movement of desire, aversion, joy, and sorrow, without knowledge. This is misguidance. This contrasts with fabrication, which involves misleading in knowledge, causing one to believe something contrary to its reality.

Since the soul is moved sometimes by affirmation and faith, and sometimes by poetry, and the second is blameworthy—except for what He excluded from it—Allāh, the Exalted, said: {And We did not teach him poetry, nor is it befitting for him. It is not but a reminder and a clear Qur'ān} [Yā-Sīn: 69]. The Reminder is the opposite of poetry, for it is truth and knowledge that the heart remembers, whereas poetry merely moves the soul. This is why the deviant among the Sufis predominantly substitute listening to odes and poems for listening to the Qur'ān and the Reminder. For poetry gives them merely the movement of love or other emotions, without this following from knowledge and affirmation. This is why those who prefer it do so over listening to the Qur'ān, arguing that the Qur'ān is truth descended from the Truth, while souls love falsehood. This is because true and truthful speech imparts knowledge and belief to the core of the heart, and souls inclined to falsehood do not love the truth. This is why its [poetry's] effect is superficial, spreading from the [lower] soul, for it is a branch without a root. However, it does have an effect on the soul in terms of agitation, disturbance, and impact, but not in terms of affirmation, knowledge, and recognition. This is why they call such speech a ḥādī, because it 'drives' the souls, meaning it urges and directs them, just as the camel-driver drives the camels.

As for wisdom, good counsel, and debating in the best way, these impart both affirmation and action, so they are immensely beneficial.

I only said that these three [Quranic methods] resemble in some aspects the three types of syllogisms [mentioned by logicians], namely: demonstrative, rhetorical, and dialectical. They are not identical to them; rather, they [the Quranic methods] are more perfect in many ways, for several reasons:

1. Those [methods] in the Qur'an combine both types—knowledge and action, report and request—in the most perfect manner, unlike logical syllogisms. This is because the rational, logical syllogism merely benefits in yielding affirmation regarding declarative propositions, whether action follows from that or not. If the premises of the syllogism are certain, it is a demonstration, regardless of whether they are well-known or conceded or not; it yields certainty. If they are well-known or accepted, it is termed rhetoric, regardless of whether they are certain or not. This yields belief and affirmation which lies between certainty and conjecture; it does not mean it yields only conjecture without certainty, since being well-known does not prevent a premise from being certain and yielding certainty. There is a difference between what does not necessarily yield certainty and what prevents yielding certainty. So, the well-known premise, by virtue of being well-known, yields affirmation, persuasion, and belief. Then, if it is known to be certain, it yields certainty as well. If it is known to be non-certain, it yields only conjecture. If the soul perceives neither [certainty nor non-certainty], it remains a mere belief for which certainty is neither affirmed nor denied. As for wisdom in the Qur'an, it is knowledge of the truth, speaking it, and acting upon it, as I have written its explanation elsewhere. Good counsel combines affirmation of the report and obedience to the command. This is why admonition appears in the Qur'an meaning command and prohibition accompanied by encouragement and warning. Examples include His statement: {And if they had done what they were instructed thereby} [An-Nisā': 66], His statement: {Allāh instructs you not to repeat such a thing} [An-Nūr: 17], and His statement: {So We made it an example for those before it and those after it, and an admonition} [Al-Baqarah: 66], meaning they take heed from it, become aware, and are deterred. Likewise, debating in the best way combines debate for [achieving] affirmation and for [achieving] obedience.

2. Second Aspect:—And this can be divided according to another aspect—by saying: People are of three types: Either one acknowledges the truth and follows it; this is the person [addressed with] wisdom. Or one acknowledges it but does not act upon it; this person is given counsel until he acts. Or one does not acknowledge it; this person is debated with in the way that is best. This is because debate is prone to causing anger, so when it is done in the best way, its benefit is achieved to the utmost possibility, like repelling an assailant.

3. Allāh's speech contains nothing but certain truth. It does not contain that by which rhetoric and dialectic are distinguished from demonstration: namely, the premise being [merely] well-known or conceded but not certain. Rather, when Allāh strikes an analogy containing a well-known or conceded premise, it must also be certain. As for relying merely on the opponent's concession without the premise being true, or merely on its being well-known even if not true—such premises are not contained in the speech of Allāh, which is entirely truth and veracity, and it is the truest of speech and the best of narratives. So, the possessor of wisdom calls using true premises, whether they are well-known or conceded or not, due to his perception of subtleties and following of the truth. The possessor of counsel calls using true premises that are well-known, because [the audience] may not understand subtle truths and does not dispute well-known ones. The possessor of debate

calls using true premises that the opponent concedes, whether well-known or not, since [the opponent] may not submit to what he does not concede, whether obvious or subtle, but submits to what he does concede, whether obvious or subtle. So this is how it is. The matter is not as imagined by the ignorant, misguided ones among the disbelieving philosophers and some speculative theologians, that the Qurʾān came with the rhetorical method and was devoid of the demonstrative, or contained only a little of it. Rather, everything the Qurʾān contains is the demonstrative method, while sometimes being rhetorical and sometimes dialectical, alongside being demonstrative. The rational syllogisms contained in the Qurʾān are the pinnacle in calling creation to Allāh, as He said: {And We have certainly diversified for the people in this Qurʾān from every [kind of] example} [Al-Isrāʾ: 89, also Al-Kahf: 54]. An example is a syllogism. This is why the Qurʾān contains the essence of the sound methods found in the discourse of all rational people, including theologians, philosophers, and others. Allāh has purified it from the flawed methods found in their discourse, and it contains sound methods not found in human discourse at all.

4. There is a subtle point here that should be noted, for it is beneficial. It is that the premise mentioned in the syllogism, which is an analogy, has an intrinsic description and a relative description: Its intrinsic description is that it either corresponds [to reality], thus being true, or does not correspond, thus being false. All premises mentioned in the analogies of the Qurʾān are true, and praise be to Allāh, Lord of the Worlds. As for the relative description, its being known to Zayd, or conjectured, or conceded, or not conceded: this is something variable. A premise might be certain to one person who knows it, while being unknown—let alone conjectured—to one who does not know it. So, a premise being certain or not certain, well-known or not well-known, conceded or not conceded, are relative and relational matters that arise according to a person's perception of it. This is why what was conjectured, or even unknown, to him can turn into something certain and known, and what was denied can become conceded; indeed, what was conceded can become denied. The Qurʾān is the speech of Allāh by which He warned all of creation. He did not address a specific individual such that He would address him with premises that are certain, well-known, or conceded to him. Therefore, the premises of the analogies within it are considered based on their intrinsic quality, which is their being true and right that must be accepted. As for the means of affirmation, it varies and diversifies, as one person might have means of affirming that premise which 'Amr does not, such as one knowing it through sensation and sight, while another knows it through hearing and mass transmission—like the signs of the Messenger (peace be upon him) and the story of the People of the Elephant, and so forth. When the means of its affirmation is common to people, it is possible to mention the means of affirming it, like the signs of Lordship known through constant sensory perception. When the means of its affirmation varies, each group is referred to the way by which they can affirm it. It might be said regarding such a situation: {Call to the way of your Lord with wisdom and good counsel, and argue with them in a way that is best}. For when addressing a specific individual, one might know what is certain, well-known among certainties, or conceded by him.

Through this, it becomes clear to you that the logicians' division of syllogistic premises into the certain, the well-known, and the conceded is not an inherent description of the proposition. Rather, it depends on what happens to be the case for the one affirming it. The situation might change for him. It should also become clear to you from this that when they declare something is not certain, not well-known, or not conceded, this declaration is not [absolutely] correct. For negating these applies only to specific people, not to all of humanity. Likewise, declaring it to be certain, well-known, or conceded applies only to those for whom this description holds true. Furthermore, the [Quranic] syllogism is an established, unchanging truth, whereas what these [logicians] say changes, alters, and does not endure—except, perhaps, in matters where Allāh's way has decreed common human experience, such as mathematics and natural sciences. These two fields are not the objective of the Prophetic call, nor is knowledge of them a condition for happiness or a means to attain it. The intended field is the divine science. The premises of syllogisms within it belong to the first category, where the status of premises varies relatively and relationally.

Ponder this, for it is pure, beneficial, and of great value.

This section clarifies that the Qur'an—although it is the speech of Allāh—Allāh attributed it to the Messenger conveying it, whether angelic or human. He attributed it to the angel in His statement: {So I swear by the retreating stars,} {Those that run [their courses] and disappear,} ... up to His statement: {Indeed, it is the word of a noble messenger} {Possessing power with the Lord of the Throne, secure [in position,]} {Obeyed there [in heaven] and trustworthy}. [At-Takwīr: 15-21]. This refers to Jibril, for these are his attributes, not the attributes of Muḥammad (peace be upon him). Then He said: {And your companion is not [at all] mad.} [At-Takwīr: 22]. He attributed him [Muḥammad] to us as a favor upon us, that he is our companion, just as He said: {By the star when it descends, your companion has not strayed, nor has he erred} [An-Najm: 1-2]. {And he certainly saw him on the clear horizon.} {And he is not stingy concerning the unseen.} [At-Takwīr: 23-24]. This refers to Muḥammad (peace be upon him). Meaning, he is not accused. According to the other reading: not miserly. Some philosophers claimed this also refers to Jibril, i.e., the Active Intellect from which [knowledge] emanates. This is distorting the words from their contexts, for the attributes of Jibril were mentioned previously; this is only a description of Muḥammad (peace be upon him). Then He said: {And it is not the word of a rejected devil.} [At-Takwīr: 25]. After affirming it is the word of the angel, He negated that it is the word of the devil. Just as He said regarding the poets [in Sūrah Ash-Shu'arā']: {The Trustworthy Spirit has brought it down} {Upon your heart} ... up to His statement: {And the devils have not brought it down.} {Nor is it fitting for them, nor are they able.} ... up to His statement: {Shall I inform you upon whom the devils descend?} {They descend upon every sinful liar.} {They pass on what is heard, and most of them are liars.} [Ash-Shu'arā': 193-194, 210-212, 221-223].

And He attributed it to the human Messenger in His statement: {So I swear by what you see} {And what you do not see,} {Indeed, it [the Qur'an] is the word of a noble messenger.} {And it is not the word of a poet; little do you believe.} {Nor the word of a soothsayer; little do you remember.} {[It is] a revelation from the Lord of the worlds.} [Al-Ĥāqqah: 38-43]. So He negated that it is the word of a

poet or a soothsayer, both of whom are human. Just as He mentioned at the end of [Sūrah] Ash-Shu'arā' that the devils descend upon every sinful liar, like the soothsayers to whom they pass on what they hear, and that the poets are followed by the misguided. Since He negated these two types who might resemble the Messenger from among humans, it is known that the 'noble messenger' [in Al-Ĥāqqah] is the chosen one from mankind. For Allāh chooses messengers from the angels and from mankind. Just as in Sūrah At-Takwīr, since the devil might resemble the angel, He negated that it is the word of a rejected devil, so it is known that the 'messenger' mentioned there is the chosen one from the angels.

In its attribution sometimes to this messenger [Jibrīl] and sometimes to that one [Muḥammad], there is proof that it is an attribution of conveyance and delivery, not an attribution of originating any part of it or composing it. This refutes what some innovators among the Ash'ariyyah say, that its letters were initiated by Jibrīl or Muḥammad (peace be upon him)—thereby resembling, in half of their statement, those who said it is the word of a human, like the polytheists of Arabia who claimed he composed it through his own merit and mental power, and the philosophers who claim the meanings and letters are his composition, but that they emanated onto him just as knowledge emanates onto other scholars.

The soothsayer derives from the devils. {And the poets—[only] the misguided follow them}. Both involve stylized wording: this one [soothsayer] uses rhymed prose, and that one [poet] uses meter. Both convey meanings derived from the inspiration of devils. As the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: 'I seek refuge in Allāh, the All-Hearing, the All-Knowing, from the accursed Satan. From his madness/strangulation (hamz), his arrogance (nafkh), and his poetry/spitting (nafth)}. And he said: 'His hamz is madness, his nafth is poetry, and his nafkh is pride.' His statement, the Exalted: {And it is not the word of a rejected devil} [At-Takwīr: 25] negates both aspects [soothsaying and devil-inspired poetry]. Just as in the other sūrah [Al-Ĥāqqah] He said: {And it is not the word of a poet} {Nor the word of a soothsayer}. Likewise, He said in [Sūrah] Ash-Shu'arā': {And the devils have not brought it down} [Ash-Shu'arā': 210], absolutely. Then He mentioned the sign of one upon whom the devils descend: that he is a sinful liar, and that the poets are followed by the misguided.

So, the apparent meaning of the Qur'ān does not state that devils descend upon poets, unless one of them is a liar and sinful. The liar is [so] in his speech and reports, and the sinful is [so] in his actions and commands. That, and Allāh knows best, is because poetry sometimes comes from the devil and sometimes from the self. Just as when it is true, it can come from the Holy Spirit, as the Prophet (peace be upon him) said when he supplicated for Ḥassān ibn Thābit: 'Allāhumma ayyidhu bi-Rūḥil-Qudus' [O Allāh, support him with the Holy Spirit]. And he said: 'Uḥjuhūm—aw ḥājīhim—wa Jibrā'īlu ma'ak' [Satirize them—or he satirized them—and Jibrīl is with you]. So, when He [Allāh] negated the devil's portion, He [implicitly] negated the [blameworthy] portion of the self. This is why He said: {the misguided follow them}, linking it to following desires, which are the inclinations of the souls.

This is why Abū Ḥayyān said: Whatever comes from your self, which your self loves for its own sake, is from your self, so forbid it from it. And whatever comes

from your self, which your self dislikes for its own sake, is from the devil, so seek refuge in Allāh from it. This, and Allāh knows best, is the reason for that [distinction].

As for the division into the soothsayer and the poet from the perspective of meaning, it is—and Allāh knows best—because speech is of two types: report and composition/request. The soothsayer reports about unseen matters, mixing truth with falsehood therein; they do not bring pure truth. When the devil casts something into the wishful thinking of one of them in the heart, it is not abrogated from it; rather, {most of them are liars}, as Allāh, the Exalted, stated and as the Prophet (peace be upon him) explained in the hadith about soothsayers when he said: 'They add one hundred lies to the [single true] word.' This contrasts with the Messenger, the Prophet, and the Muḥaddath (one spoken to by angels/inspired), as in the reading of Ibn 'Abbās and others: {Allāh abrogates what Satan throws in}. The common reading does not include the Muḥaddath, as it is possible for him to persist in some error, and for Satan to insert some of his suggestions into his wishful thinking which are not abrogated. This contrasts with the Messenger and the Prophet, for it is necessary that whatever Satan throws in is abrogated and that Allāh establishes His verses firmly, because he [the Prophet/Messenger] is truth. The Muḥaddath, however, is commanded to measure what he is inspired with against what the Messenger brought. This is why Satan cast suggestions to 'Umar—who was a Muḥaddath—in the incident of Al-Ḥudaybiyah, the incident of the Prophet's (peace be upon him) death, and the incident of his disagreement with Hishām ibn Ḥakīm regarding Sūrah Al-Furqān, but the light of Prophethood removed it from him.

As for the poet, his function is to stir the souls. Thus, he falls under the category of specific, incentivizing command. This is why it was said about them: {the misguided follow them}. Their harm lies in actions, not in beliefs. Whereas the harm of those [soothsayers] lies in beliefs, which then leads to [corrupt] actions. This is why He said: {sinful liar}.

The meaning [i.e., the negative characteristics] of soothsaying and poetry is found in many among the philosophers, Sufis, theologians, jurists, common folk, and ascetics who deviate from the Sharī'ah—those who speak of unseen matters based on soothsaying and stir souls with poetry and the like. They are followers of the false prophets and have support from the devils. We have often witnessed this in various types among these groups and others—for one whose chest Allāh illuminates and into whose heart He casts His light.



## Regarding The Deviants Who Resemble The Sabians

Shaykh al-Islām (may Allāh sanctify his soul) said:

Then, the deviants who resemble the *Ŝābī'ah* (Sabians) are either purely [deviant] or have deviated towards Judaism or Christianity. [These include] proponents of logic and analogy who seek knowledge and *kalām*, and proponents of action and ecstasy who seek knowledge and [spiritual] state: the people of letters and the people of sounds. Regarding the foundation of divine knowledge, they followed two paths; each group followed a path. Some might follow this path at one time and that path at another, and perhaps some combine both paths. Most of them do not know any path to Allāh except one of these two, as mentioned by groups [of scholars] like Ibn al-Khaṭīb and those who followed his way, and even the likes of Abū Ḥāmid when he limited the paths to *kalām* and philosophy—which is speculation and analogy—or to Sufism and worship—which is action and ecstasy, and did not mention other than these three types.

Indeed, when Abū Ḥāmid, in *Al-Munqidh min al-Ālāl* (Deliverance from Error) and *Al-Mufsih bi-al-Aḥwāl* (The Elucidator of States), mentioned his own states regarding the paths of knowledge and the states of the knower, he mentioned that the first thing he encountered was what obstructs their path—namely, sophistry with its well-known specious arguments. He mentioned that this disease afflicted him severely for nearly two months, during which he was upon the way of sophistry by virtue of his state, not by logic or discourse, until Allāh cured him of that illness. The soul returned to health and equilibrium, and rational necessities became accepted and trusted again with security and clarity. This did not happen through constructing a proof or arranging arguments, but rather through a light that Allāh cast into his chest. That light is the key to the greatest knowledge. He said: 'So whoever thinks that unveiling depends solely on abstract proofs has narrowed Allāh's vast mercy.'

Then he said: 'The paths of the seekers, in my view, are confined to four groups:

1. The *Mutakallimūn* (scholastic theologians): They claim to be the people of opinion and speculation.
2. The *Bāṭiniyyah* (esotericists): They claim to be the proponents of learning and exclusively receive illumination from the infallible Imām.
3. The *Falāsifah* (philosophers): They claim to be the proponents of logic and demonstration.
4. The *Sūfiyyah* (Sufis): They claim to be the elite of the Divine Presence and the people of unveiling and witnessing.

So I said to myself: The truth does not go beyond these four groups. These are

the ones traversing the paths of the way to truth; if the truth is blocked from them, then there remains no hope of attaining the truth.’

Then he mentioned that the purpose and benefit of kalām is defending the Sunnah through debate, not verifying realities; that the way of the Bāṭiniyyah is falsehood; and that philosophy is partly truth and partly disbelief, and the truth within it does not fulfill the objective.

Then he mentioned that he turned his aspiration towards the path of the Sūfiyyah and knew that it could only be attained through knowledge and action. So he began by acquiring their knowledge through studying their books, such as Qūt al-Qulūb by Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī, the books of Al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī, and the scattered sayings transmitted from Al-Junayd, Al-Shiblī, and Abū Yazīd, until he grasped the essence of their scholarly objectives.

Then he knew with certainty that they are people of states, not people of sayings, and that what could be attained through knowledge, he had attained. Nothing remained except that which cannot be reached by learning and hearing, but only by tasting and traversing the path. He said: ‘And I had acquired, from the sciences I practiced and the paths I traversed in investigating the two types of sciences—the religious and the rational—a certain faith in Allāh, in Prophethood, and in the Last Day. These three foundations of faith had become firmly rooted in my soul by Allāh, not through a specific, abstract proof, but through causes, indications, and experiences whose details are beyond enumeration. And it had become clear to me that there is no hope for the happiness of the Hereafter except through piety.’ He mentioned that he went into seclusion for ten years. ... Until he said: ‘During these seclusions, matters were unveiled to me that are impossible to count or exhaust. The extent I will mention, so that benefit may be derived from it, is that I knew with certainty that the Sūfiyyah are specifically the traversers of the path to Allāh, that their way of life is the best way, their path is the most correct path, and their character is the purest character. Indeed, if the intellect of the intelligent, the wisdom of the wise, and the knowledge of the scholars who are aware of the secrets of the Sharī‘ah were combined to change anything of their ways and character and replace it with something better, they would find no way to do so. For all their movements and stillness, in their outward and inward, are derived from the niche of the light of Prophethood, and there is no light on the face of the earth besides the light of Prophethood by which one can be illuminated. In short, what can critics say about a path whose purity—which is its first condition—is the complete purification of the heart from everything besides Allāh, and whose key is the heart’s absorption in the remembrance of Allāh?’

I say: It can be inferred from his words that the foundation of the path is the testimony that there is no god but Allāh and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh, as I have established more than once. This is the beginning of Islām, which he made the ultimate goal. I have explained the difference between the path of the Prophets and the path of the philosophers and the Mutakallimīn. However, he did not know the path of Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Ḥadīth among the knowledgeable; for this reason, he did not mention it. And it is the purely Muḥammadan path, which stands as a witness over all paths.

Al-Suhrawardī al-Maqtūl of Aleppo combined speculation and seeking divinity, but he was a pure Sabian philosopher who took nothing from Prophethood

except what agreed with his philosophy, unlike those two [Al-Ghazālī and Ibn al-Khaṭīb] and their likes.

Then, among them are those who initially know only the path of speculation and analogy, like the majority of the Mutakallimīn from the Jahmiyyah, Mu'tazilah, Ash'ariyyah, and some of the Ḥanbaliyyah. And among them are those who initially know only the path of spiritual discipline, abstraction, and Sufism, like many of the Sufis and spiritual aspirants who fell into Ittiḥād and absolute theosis, such as 'Abdullāh al-Fārisī, Al-'Afīf al-Tilimsānī, and their likes. And among them are those who may combine [paths], like Al-Ṣadr al-Qūnawī and his like.

What predominates among them is the realm of imagination/delusion. Sometimes they imagine what has reality, and sometimes they imagine what has no reality, like imagining the divinity of humans, Christian imaginings, imagining the Awaited One, and imagining the Ghawth residing in Makkah through whom the affairs of the heavens and the earth are managed. This is why Al-Tilimsānī says: 'It has been established for us through unveiling what contradicts explicit reason.' This is also why the person in seclusion is afflicted with three delusions: First, believing himself to be the most perfectly prepared of people. Second, imagining his shaykh to be the most perfect person on earth. Third, imagining that he will reach his goal without means. His primary reliance is on the imaginative faculty. Imaginations may produce effects, but they are false, like the shaykhs who did not follow the Prophetic legal paths—neither in speculation nor in practice—but followed Sabianism. Resembling these in some aspects are most of the Aḥmadiyyah, Yūnusiyyah, Ḥāririyyah, many of the 'Adawiyyah, the followers of Awḥād al-Kirmānī, and a large number of Sufis and Fuqarā' in the lands of the East. This is why antinomianism often prevails among them, so they do not believe in the obligations and prohibitions of the Sharī'ah. When they engage in absolute theosis, they do not know who their god is with heart-knowledge. If their knowledgeable heretics define it, they make it Absolute Being. Some among them deify righteous humans, their graves, and the like. Thus, they sometimes resemble the polytheists, sometimes resemble the Christians, sometimes resemble the Sabians, and sometimes resemble the atheistic deniers of the Pharaonic type and similar materialists. They are from the Sabians, but are fundamentally disbelievers. The sincere one among them worships Allāh alone, but mostly does so outside the Qur'ānic, Muḥammadan Sharī'ah. So they are deviants, either from the testimony Lā ilāha illā Allāh or from the testimony Muḥammad Rasūl Allāh. I have written about this elsewhere.

Each of the two paths—speculation and abstraction—is a path containing great benefit and immense advantage. Indeed, each of them is obligatory, indispensable, and happiness is not complete except through it. The entire Qur'ān calls to speculation, reflection, and contemplation, and also to purification, asceticism, and worship. The Qur'ān has mentioned the rectification of the theoretical, knowing faculty and the volitional, practical faculty in more than one place, such as His statement: {He it is Who has sent His Messenger with guidance and the religion of truth to make it manifest over all [other] religion} [At-Tawbah: 33; Al-Faḥ: 28; As-Saff: 9]. Guidance is the perfection of knowledge, and the religion of truth is the perfection of action. Like His statement: {possessors of strength and insight} [Sād: 45]. And His statement:

{He has inscribed faith in their hearts and aided them with a spirit from Him} [Al-Mujādilah: 22]. And His statement: {believed and did righteous deeds} [Multiple verses]. And His statement: {To Him ascends good speech, and righteous action elevates it} [Fā'ir: 10]. And in the sermon of the Prophet (peace be upon him): 'Indeed, the best speech is the speech of Allāh, and the best guidance is the guidance of Muḥammad.'

However, beneficial speculation must be based on evidence, for speculation without evidence does not yield knowledge of what is indicated. Evidence is what leads to the desired goal and guides to the objective. The complete evidence is the Message and [Allāh's] works/creation. Likewise, complete worship is doing what the servant is commanded and what the Messengers brought.

The error occurred in both paths because each, or the sum of them, was initially taken in isolation from faith in Allāh and His Messenger...<sup>1</sup> Rather, they restricted themselves in both paths merely to what the heart's speculation and its tasting attains—which sometimes conforms to what the Messengers brought and other times opposes it—relying on mere rational speculation and mere rational worship, or ascending from that to speculation based on religion and worship based on religion. What is obligatory is that both speculation and action must incorporate the rational, the religious, and the legislative. When they fell short, each of the two groups fell either into misguidance, or into deviation, or into both. Their outcome is either simple ignorance, or simple disbelief, or compound ignorance, or compound disbelief along with ignorance and oppression.

This is because the path of the people of speculation and analogy revolves around a premise that is necessary in every analogy humans employ, which is a universal, comprehensive premise that includes the object sought but also includes others, meaning it does not prevent others from entering [its scope], even if they have no external existence. Thus, it does not encompass the object sought due to its specific property, but only by the measure shared between it and others. The object sought thereby is Allāh Almighty. So they did not reach Him except through the commonality shared between Him and others in positive and negative propositions. And what is shared between Him and others is not known by its specificity at all. Thus, they did not know Allāh.

Rather, when they believed in the shared aspect regarding Him, they became polytheists thereby. They applied negative or positive judgments to the shared aspect; these are valid in general, because what is negated from the general, shared meaning is negated from the specific, distinct one, but what is negated from the specific, distinct one is not [necessarily] negated from the general one. So what you negate from 'animal' or 'prophet' is negated from 'human' and 'messenger.' But what you negate from 'human' or 'messenger' is not [necessarily] negated from 'animal' or 'prophet.' This is why his statement 'No prophet after me' negates [the possibility of] a messenger as well. Likewise, what is affirmed for the shared meaning with the quality of universality is affirmed for the specific. But what is affirmed for it with the quality of absoluteness does not necessarily have to be affirmed for the specific. So if a ruling is established for every prophet, the messenger is included. But if it is established for a prophet

---

<sup>1</sup> Gap in the original text, approximately one line.

absolutely, it does not necessarily have to be established for the messenger. A collection of negative and positive propositions may yield matters that are true only of Him and cannot correctly describe anyone else, just as if a prophet were described with a collection of attributes not found in anyone else. However, this extent [of knowledge] allows one to know the negation of anything else being Him, but as for His essence, it is not known through that collection of universal propositions. Thus, the intellect obtains from analogy regarding the Lord only knowledge of negation and absence, if the analogy is sound.

This is why the parables set forth in the Qur'ān—which are rational analogies—indicate negation, as in His statement: {He presents to you a parable from yourselves. Do you have among those whom your right hands possess any partners in what We have provided for you...?} [Ar-Rūm: 28] the verse. And like His statement: {And Allāh presents a parable of two men...} [An-Nahl: 75-76] the verses. And His statement: {O people, a parable is presented, so listen to it. Indeed, those you invoke besides Allāh...} [Al-Hajj: 73] the verse. And His statement: {Say, [O Muḥammad], 'If there had been with Him [other] gods, as they say...'} [Al-Isrā': 42] the verse. And His statement: {Allāh has not taken any son, nor has there ever been with Him any deity. [If there had been], then each deity would have taken what it created, and some of them would surely have overcome others.} [Al-Mu'minūn: 91]. And similar parables—which are analogies—whose import is the negation of the antecedent due to the negation of its consequent, or the like. This is why what predominates among the proponents of analogy from the philosophers and Mutakallimīn regarding the aspect of Lordship are only negative types of knowledge.

Then, they did not limit themselves to the extent that reason knows through analogy, but transgressed that; they negated things resembling faulty analogy, such as negating the Prophetic narrative attributes. Indeed, even the negation by philosophers and Mu'tazilah of the attributes that the theologians of affirmation affirm and call rational attributes because they affirm them through rational analogy. It is known that reason, through analogy, only negates the shared aspect, which is the meaning of the universal proposition necessary in analogy. For example, they might negate the will, mercy, or knowledge shared among the referents of this name. The shared aspect in created beings is subject to attributes that are not affirmed for Allāh Almighty. So they negate the absolute shared meaning applied to the attributes of the Truth and the attributes of creation—following from the negation of what is specific to creation—thus they commit denial (ta'tīl). Just as the proponents of anthropomorphism affirm what is specific to creation—following from the shared aspect. Both are erroneous analogies.

So regarding these attributes, and indeed regarding essences, there are three considerations:

1. What is specific to the essence and attributes of the Lord.
2. What is specific to the creature and its attributes.
3. The absolute, comprehensive meaning.

Using analogy based on the comprehensive meaning to negate the first is an error. Likewise, using it to affirm the second [for God] is an error. As for using it to affirm the third, it requires the intellect's perception of the affirmation of the

comprehensive, universal meaning. This is the foundation of analogy and proof. If the intellect does not know this affirmation by itself—or through another analogy—the analogy is not sound.

Likewise, in their affirmative types of knowledge, they only arrive at absolute, general meanings, such as affirming existence, necessary existence, or His being Lord, Maker, First, Origin, or Eternal, and similar universal concepts through which the specificity of the Lord Almighty is not known, since analogy does not indicate specificity. For if one argues that every contingent must have a necessary cause, and that every originated must have an originator, the meaning of this analogy is a general matter. I have elaborated on this elsewhere.

Similarly, the proponents of spiritual discipline and abstraction: their elite who engage in a simple remembrance like 'Lā ilāha illā Allāh'—if they do not exaggerate and restrict themselves merely to 'Allāh, Allāh', believing that to be superior and more perfect, as many of them have done. Perhaps some of them restrict themselves to 'Huwa, Huwa' (He, He), or to saying 'Lā Huwa illā Huwa' (There is no He but He). Because this innovated remembrance, which in itself conveys nothing except that it is absolute, does not contain in itself remembrance of Allāh except through the intention of the speaker. This may be joined by its proponent's belief that Lā wujūda illā Huwa (There is no existence but He), as some of them explicitly state, saying: Lā Huwa illā Huwa or Lā mawjūda illā Huwa (There is no existent but He). For the Ittīhādiyyah, this is superior to saying Lā ilāha illā Allāh because it explicitly states the reality of their Pharaonic, Qarmatian creed. Some of them even say: Lā ilāha illā Allāh is the remembrance of the worshippers, Allāh, Allāh is the remembrance of the knowledgeable, and Huwa is the remembrance of the verifiers. He makes his remembrance Yā man lā Huwa illā Huwa (O He whom there is no He but He). When one says Allāh, Allāh, it only conveys His mere affirmation. This may be joined by the negation of other-than-Him, not the negation of the divinity of other-than-Him, so its proponent falls into waḥdah al-wujūd (the Unity of Existence). Perhaps the heart's witnessing of the 'other' vanishes if one is in the station of annihilation—this is close [to acceptability]. But the belief that the existence of contingent beings is His existence—this is misguidance.

They add to this a type of purification, such as abandoning bodily desires for food, drink, and leadership, seclusion, and other types of absolute asceticism and absolute worship. Thus, they also arrive at an absolute theosis and an absolute knowledge of the affirmation and existence of the Lord, and the like—similar to what the proponents of analogy reach. Then this recognition and knowledge may fade through involvement in natural matters like food and socializing with people, for its cause was only that abstraction; when it ceases, [the state] ceases. This is why it is said: 'Every state that hunger gave you, satiety takes away.' Just as the absolute knowledge of the first group [philosophers] may fade through the heart's heedlessness of those theoretical analogies.

There is no doubt that analogy leads to knowledge according to its requirement, and that discipline and theosis lead to knowledge according to their requirement. However, it is an absolute knowledge due to a cause that may persist or may cease. It often leads to Ittīhād, Ḥulūl, and antinomianism. This is because they abstract theosis from the necessary [guidance] of righteous humans [i.e., Prophets]. When they need it [guidance/law], they turn away from

theosis. Thus, they are either gods in their own eyes, or heretics, or dissolute ones. This is why the righteous Shaykh Yūsuf, one of our companions, told me that he saw me in a dream while I was addressing them...<sup>1</sup>

The knowledge obtained through that [faith] is the knowledge that rectifies the servant's state and is obligatory upon him. However, with sincerity of seeking—through analogy or through ecstasy—one might arrive at the Message. At that point, one receives from the Message what rectifies his state and acquaints him with the complete recognition and the beneficial, obligatory knowledge—which is the Prophetic legal path that we mentioned first. Or, this may not happen, and many of them fall into dispensing with Prophethood in belief or state by turning away from what it brought. Consequently, they miss out on the faith, knowledge, and recognition—brought by the Messenger—by the loss of which one goes astray from guidance in this world and becomes wretched with the greatest wretchedness, like the state of those who disbelieve in the Messenger, even if they believe in the existence of the Lord, such as the Jews, Christians, and Sabians. For indeed, among the Muslims are those who are hypocritical regarding the Messenger, just as those others disbelieved in him openly. This hypocrisy is extremely common, both in the past and present.

Faulty analogies and faulty ecstasies may form in his heart, by whose requirements he makes faulty judgments regarding Lordship. Examples include the judgments of those deviating towards Sabianism, Judaism, or Christianity among the philosophers, Mutakallimin, and Sufis who deviated either towards denial and falsification of the attributes, or towards anthropomorphism and likening of them, or towards the belief that the Lord is Absolute Being which is undifferentiated, and that the essence of existence is the essence of the Creator, and that there is nothing else beyond the heavens and the earth; rather, all these things are merely levels of the attributes, and that Lordship and Divinity are mental, skeptical levels. Whereas in reality, there is nothing but the essence of His Self. Thus, the veiled see the levels, while the unveiled sees nothing but the essence of the Truth. They suppose—and cause many others to suppose because of them—that this tawhīd is the tawhīd of the Veracious who knew Allāh and said: 'Behold! Everything other than Allāh is futile.' Just as the deviant Mutakallim supposes that his tawhīd—which is the negation of attributes—is the tawhīd of the Prophets and the Veracious who knew Allāh. This is why polytheism occurs frequently among these [Ittiḥādiyyah], to the extent that some of them prostrate to others. Just as in the other group [legalistic extremists], the prohibition of the permissible occurs regarding contracts and permitted acts of worship. Thus, the two groups divide between them what Allāh condemned the polytheists for: polytheism and prohibiting the permissible...<sup>2</sup> This is frequently found in those who resemble the Christians. And there appears in the others [resembling Jews] burdens, shackles, denial of the truth, and hardness of hearts, which is frequently found in those who resemble the Jews. This is regarding the non-extremists among them.

As for the extremists of both types, they hold that their recognition and state are above the recognition and state of the Prophets. As Al-Tilimsānī says: 'The Qur'ān leads to Paradise, while our words lead to Allāh.' And as Al-Fārābī claims:

---

<sup>1</sup> A sentence or two seems to be missing from the original text here.

<sup>2</sup> A line is missing from the original text here.

that the philosopher is more perfect than the Prophet, and the Prophet's specialty is merely the excellence of imagining realities. [This leads] to various forms of heresy and disbelief in which they join the Ismā'īlyyah, Nuṣayriyyah, Qarāmitāh, and Bāṭiniyyah, and follow Pharaoh, Nimrod, and their likes among those who disbelieve in Prophethoods, or in both Prophethood and Lordship. This is extremely common among both these groups [philosophers and deviant Sufis].

The cause of this is the absence of a foundation in their hearts, which is faith in Allāh and the Messenger. For if this foundation does not accompany the thinker, the seeker, and the traveler in every station, he will surely suffer a manifest loss. His need for it is like the body's need for nourishment or life's need for the soul. A human being without life and nourishment can never subsist, nor can he learn or teach. Likewise, a human being without faith in Allāh and His Messenger cannot attain recognition of Allāh nor guidance to Him. And without being guided to his Lord, he can only be wretched, punished, which is the state of those who disbelieve in Allāh and His Messenger.

However, with faith in Allāh and His Messenger, if one reflects and infers, his reflection is based on evidence and proof—namely, the affirmation of Lordship and Prophethood. And if he abstracts and purifies, he possesses faith by which he tastes and finds that [reality]. Then, this reflection and this tasting attract for him what lies beyond that of various kinds of Lordly knowledge and divine ecstasies. Knowledge and ecstasy are concomitant.

That is because the Prophets and Messengers knew Allāh through revelation with the recognition that is knowledge, and they worshipped Him with the worship that is His right, according to what Allāh Almighty granted them. They are in levels in that regard. However, they knew specifics of Lordship that mere theoretical analogy cannot grasp, nor can mere volitional tasting attain it. Then they informed about that. Description and informing necessarily require mentioning the named, described entity using shared-meaning names and attributes that involve commonality and distinction from created beings by means that negate resemblance. This is because the purpose of informing and describing is to make the audience know, and the audience does not know the specificities which constitute the specific essence of Allāh and His attributes. If they were informed only of that specificity in isolation, they would not know anything; rather, they might even deny it.

So, when they are addressed with the shared meanings and the potential corruption of shared meaning is removed by what negates likeness, such as His statement: {There is nothing whatsoever like unto Him} [Ash-Shūrā: 11], and {And there is none co-equal or comparable unto Him} [Al-Ikhlāṣ: 4], and the like, then [the audience] falls into one of two categories:

Either a believer who believes in the meanings of those attributes in an absolute, general way, affirming them for Allāh in a manner that befits Him and is specific to Him, in which no creature shares. This is the utmost possible in the case of such people.

Or a person into whose heart Allāh casts from His light and His special guidance that which makes him witness something of the specificities which are the very essences of those names and attributes. He knows that not merely through analogy nor merely through ecstasy, but through a witnessing that conforms to

what the Messengers reported. The validity of his witnessing is indicated by its agreement with what the Messengers informed. He thus obtains a portion of Prophethood. For Prophethood in its completeness has ceased, but the existence of some of its parts has not ceased. He must necessarily be veiled in some matters from witnessing what the Prophet witnessed, so he affirms the Prophet's report regarding it, due to his witnessing some of what the Prophet reported. What he has witnessed serves as verification for him of the validity of what he has not witnessed. This is the state of the Veracious with the Prophets.

This is analogous to someone who was described the kingdom of a city with various attributes, then he arrived and saw some of its affairs which indicated to him the truthfulness of the informer regarding what he had not witnessed. I do not make this witnessing itself the sole basis for affirmation, for an informer may be truthful in some matters and mistaken in others. Rather, [affirmation comes] through the means of the informer's report—that is, Allāh's Messenger—and witnessing from him that which necessitates the impossibility of falsehood on his part, as is mentioned elsewhere.

If you ask: Then from where does he initially derive the validity of faith in Allāh and His Messenger, such that it becomes a foundation upon which he builds and proceeds to what comes after? For the proponents of analogy and ecstasy only exerted long effort in establishing this foundation within themselves. This is why the Mutakallimūn call everything that establishes Lordship and Prophethood 'rational matters' and 'theoretical matters', while those others [Sufis] call them 'tasting matters' and 'ecstatic matters'. They held that knowledge of Allāh and His Messenger cannot be complete without these [foundational proofs], so knowledge of these must precede [faith], otherwise circular reasoning would result. Thus, they called those [proofs] rational matters, and rational matters are attained only through rational, logical analogy.

I say: The answer to this has several aspects:

1. Counter-argument by analogy. The one traversing the path of analogical speculation or volitional tasting: from where does he know initially that traversing this path will yield him knowledge and recognition? Initially, he has nothing but the mere report of an informer that he traversed this path and arrived, or a thought that occurs in his heart to traverse this path—either deeming arrival possible, or seeking it, or otherwise—or traversing it initially with no end [in sight]. This is not specific to divine knowledge; rather, in all sciences, the seeker must initially accept certain postulates as given until they are demonstrated later. For if every seeker of knowledge had already attained that knowledge when seeking it, he would not be a seeker of it. He might know that the path he traverses leads him to knowledge, but the discussion concerns the very first beginning, the proof of proofs, and the foundation of foundations. For if, when he investigates it, he knew it was a conclusive proof, this would not be possible until he knew its connection to the conclusion. For if the proof does not entail the conclusion, it is not a proof. And knowledge of entailment depends on knowledge of the antecedent and the consequent. Thus, one does not know it is a proof for a specific conclusion until the affirmation of the specific conclusion is known, and it is known that it is entailed by it. Once that is known, one has no need to use it as proof for its affirmation; it only serves to remind him of it, not to initiate knowledge of

it. Confusion arises here because a person often knows the affirmation of something, then seeks the path to know its attributes and witness its essence, either through the senses or the heart. So he traverses a path he knows leads to that goal, because he already knew that path entails that goal whose affirmation was known beforehand. Like someone seeking to perform Hajj to the Ka'bah, whose existence he already knows. He traverses the path he knows leads to the Ka'bah, because people informed him of that, or he relies on someone he knows is familiar with that path. His traversing the path himself after knowing it is the path—to the objective—through the reports of those who arrived, or his traversing it with an expert guide—who guides him at every stage—occurs only after knowing the affirmation of the goal and the affirmation that this is the path and guide. This is also the state of those seeking recognition of Allāh, desiring Him, and journeying to Him. They knew His existence first, and they seek knowledge of His attributes or their hearts' witnessing of Him in this world. So they traverse the path leading to that through faith and the Qur'ān. Faith is analogous to a man traversing the path described to him by previous travelers, for they agree on it. The Qur'ān—affirming the Messengers in what they report—is analogous to following the guide stage by stage. Both are indispensable on the path to Allāh. As for something whose affirmation the intellect did not know initially, if one traverses a path leading to knowledge of it, he does not traverse it initially except by way of imitation and postulation—like all principles of sciences. If imitation is necessary at the beginning of the analogical and practical paths—in traversing them when one does not know it is the path or that it leads to the goal, or that the goal exists—then the path of faith, even if assumed to be similar, is not flawed thereby. Rather, it is more worthy for many reasons, some of which we will mention, Allāh willing. Indeed, there is no path except it, or what leads to it, or is joined with it. So it is definitively a condition for attaining the goal, while anything else is not a condition. Rather, the goal is attained without it, and [the other paths] may even harm the attainment of the goal, so it is not attained, or its opposite is attained, which is the greatest wretchedness. In either case, that [faith] path definitely leads [to success] and has no corruption in it, whereas anything else is frequently subject to corruption, and does not lead [to the goal] alone; rather, the path of faith is indispensable.

2. When a man traverses the analogical or disciplinary path and it leads him to recognition—if it leads him—he knows at that point that he traversed a correct path and that his goal has been attained. But before that, he does not know. So the lowest state of the faith path—and there is no lowliness in it—is to be like that. For if one accepts faith in Allāh and His Messengers as given, reflects on its requirements, and acts according to its implications, he attains his goal—recognition of Allāh and [knowledge] that the path he traversed is correct—with the slightest effort. For the very act of affirming the Messenger in what he reported about his Lord and obeying him establishes within him certain knowledge of the validity of that, far more effectively than what was mentioned first [regarding the other paths].

3. Acknowledgment of Allāh is of two types: innate and faith-based. The innate—which is the recognition of the Maker's existence—is established in the natural disposition, as Allāh has affirmed in His Book in various places. I

have elaborated on this elsewhere. So this does not require proof; rather, it is the most deeply rooted recognition, the most established knowledge, and the foundation of foundations. As for acknowledgment of the Messenger, with the slightest reflection on what he brought, or his state, or his signs, or similar aspects of his affairs, knowledge of Prophethood is attained, far stronger than what analogical and ecstatic pursuits yield regarding divine matters. Then, if one strengthens reflection on his states, necessary certainty that cannot be repelled is attained, becoming a firmly rooted foundation. Elaboration on this is mentioned elsewhere, as the purpose here is to explain the error of one who initially follows the path of analogy or discipline without faith. As for establishing the path of faith, its significance is immense, greater than what I have written here.

4. We are addressing Muslims who are characterized by faith, whose aim is the specific recognition of Allāh by which the scholars and recognizers are distinguished from the common folk. Some of them follow the path of innovated analogy of the philosophers and Mutakallimīn. Others follow the path of innovated discipline and volition of the philosophizing Sufis, turning away from what the Messenger brought regarding the details of these matters. If these people know the truthfulness of the Messenger—who conveys from his Lord, guides to Him, calls to Him, for whom Allāh perfected the religion and upon whom He revealed the Book as an explanation for everything—how can they abandon using what he brought as evidence and following his example in favor of the two paths mentioned?

5. Most of those who followed the two deviant paths did not believe that a third path existed—as mentioned by men among the eminent scholars of the world who erred in major principles. So they transition from Sabian philosophical material to Christian volitional material to Jewish theological material. Their philosophers are one day with their voluntarists and another day with their theologians, and they waver in this vacillation. As for the Prophetic, Muhammadan, religious, Sunnī, Atharī path of faith, they are not guided to it, nor do they know it, nor do they think it is a path to their goal or that it leads to their objective. This is due to the absence, in their belief, of anyone traversing it, or they suppressed their souls from it unjustly. So due to their misguidance from it, or their deviation and ignorance of it, or their oppression of themselves, they turned away from it.

If you ask: But the Qur’ān commands reflection on the signs.

I say: There is no doubt about the validity of reflection in general, and that if it is based on evidence, it leads to knowledge of the indicated. And if it is reflection on Allāh’s signs, it leads to faith in Him, which is the pinnacle of worship. Just as there is no doubt about the validity of worship and volition in general, and that if they are according to the methodology of the Prophets, they lead to Allāh’s pleasure. However, you must differentiate between signs and analogy, as we have explained elsewhere. For a sign is a marker. It necessitates by itself that for which it is a sign, without the mediation of a middle term by which an analogy comprising a universal premise is structured. Like a ray of light, for it is a sign of the sun. Likewise, vegetation in barren land is a sign of rain, and smoke is a sign of fire, even if no analogy forms in the mind. Rather, the intellect knows their concomitance by itself. Thus, from the affirmation of the sign, the affirmation of

its necessary correlate is known. Knowledge of concomitance may be innate or it may not be.

6. Those two paths are not purely false; rather, each leads to some truth. However, it is not the obligatory truth, and often falsehood is coupled with it. Thus, neither of them, merely by itself, achieves the performance of the obligatory nor the avoidance of the prohibited. Nor do they attain the objective wherein lies the servant's happiness—his salvation and bliss—after the advent of the Messenger.

As for the theoretical, analogical path: it necessarily involves inferring the Necessary from the contingent, or the Originator from the originated, or the Mover from motion. This yields [knowledge of] a great Actor in a general sense.

Likewise, the disciplinary, tasting path yields the heart's submission and humility towards the absolute Maker.

Each of them necessarily involves necessary knowledge that compels the heart to it, since the heart does not attain knowledge except of the necessary type initially, or through the mediation of the necessary. For speculation is built upon premises that ultimately lead back to what is of the necessary type, either through the mediation of sense perception or purely abstract from sense perception.

So, the analogical path yields knowledge through the mediation of necessary premises. For example, it might be said: Known existence is either contingent or necessary. The contingent does not exist except through a necessary cause. Thus, the existence of the Necessary is affirmed in either case. Or, for example, it might be said: The world is originated, or much of it is originated. The second [premise] is necessary, while the first is inferred. Then it is said: And every originated thing has an originator.

Or it might be said: There is no doubt that existence exists. It is either eternal or originated. The originated must have an eternal [cause]. Thus, the existence of the Eternal is affirmed in either case. Just as it is said: There is no doubt that existence exists. It is either necessary or contingent. The contingent must have a necessary [cause]. Thus, the existence of the Necessary is affirmed in either case.

It might also be said: There is no doubt that existence exists. It is either made or not made, or created or not created, or fashioned or not fashioned. The made, created, or fashioned must have a Maker, Creator, and Fashioner. Thus, the existence of that which is not made, not fashioned, and not created is affirmed in either case.

These lines of reasoning and similar ones indicate the existence of a Necessary, Eternal being that is not made. However, the issue lies in identifying it. For most materialists say: This [Necessary Being] is the world itself, or something inherent in it. Furthermore, the dependence of the contingent on the Necessary, the originated on the Eternal, and the made on the Maker is a necessary premise, even though a group of speculators try to provide proofs for this premise and for [the premise] that one of the two possibilities for a contingent being does not outweigh the other except through a determining factor. The majority hold that necessity is sufficient for both [premises].

The worship path yields knowledge through the mediation of spiritual discipline

and purification of the soul. For at that point, the heart attains necessary knowledge. As Shaykh Ismā'īl al-Kūrānī said to 'Izz al-Dīn ibn 'Abd al-Salām when he came to him seeking the knowledge of recognition—having followed the path of Kalām—he said: 'You [Mutakallimūn] say that Allāh is known by proof, whereas we say: He introduced Himself to us, so we knew Him.' And as Najm al-Dīn al-Kubrā said to Ibn al-Khaṭīb and his Mu'tazilī companion when they asked him about certain knowledge: 'It consists of inspirations that come upon souls, which the souls are powerless to repel.' He answered them that certain knowledge, for us [Sufis], is known by necessity, not by speculation, and this is a fine answer. For necessary knowledge is that which adheres to the servant's soul in such a binding way that he cannot detach himself from it. The reasoner, if he does not attain necessary knowledge initially, must inevitably build his speculation and analogy upon necessary premises. Only then does he attain knowledge. This is why a group of them, including Abū al-Ma'ālī al-Juwaynī, said: All sciences are necessary considering their prerequisites; after sound reasoning based on proof occurs, it yields knowledge necessarily. However, some knowledge is necessary upon conceiving the two terms of the proposition, some is necessary after contemplation and reflection, and some is necessary after reflecting on a proof with two or more premises.

So the knowledgeable Shaykh says: We find knowledge through direct experience necessarily via the path we traverse, which involves purifying the soul and rectifying the heart, the heart being the bearer and inviter of knowledge. In both cases [reasoning and discipline], Allāh pours knowledge onto his heart and sends it down upon his inner heart. However, one path does so by acquiring the knowledge concomitant with the desired knowledge, which are the premises. The other does so by rectifying the seeker of knowledge who wants to become knowledgeable—namely, the heart. This is analogous to someone courting a woman. Sometimes he beautifies himself for her and presents himself until she sees him, desires him, and proposes to him. Other times, he sends someone to her whom she feels comfortable with and obeys, who proposes to her on his behalf, and she accepts. So the effort and action of the first was in rectifying himself and presenting himself to her until she desired him. The effort of the second was in securing the obeyed messenger until she accepted. It is also analogous to someone hunting game.

However, mere speculation and practice, whether combined or separate, only yield a general matter, as is the reality. And that is correct, for the affirmation of the general matter is true. If they add to that the detailed matter known through the light of the Message, then beneficial faith is attained, and the feared evil outcome of those two paths is removed. This is the state of those proponents of theological speculation and devotional practice who align themselves with following the Messenger and believing in him, thus accepting from him and taking from him.

If neither of them adds to that what the Messenger brought, then either he adds its opposite or adds nothing. If he adds the opposite of what the Messenger brought, he falls into falsification, which is compound disbelief. If he adds nothing to it, he remains in simple disbelief, whether he is in doubt or in aversion and heedlessness.

For the state of the disbeliever is not devoid of either conceiving the Message or

not. If he does not conceive it, he is in heedlessness of it and lacks faith in it. As He said: {And obey not him whose heart We have made heedless of Our remembrance, one who follows his own lusts, and whose affair has been lost.} [Al-Kahf: 28]. And He said: {So We took vengeance on them and drowned them in the sea, because they belied Our Signs and were heedless of them.} [Al-A'raf: 136]. However, pure heedlessness only occurs for one whom the Message has not reached. And the disbelief for which one is punished occurs only after the Message has reached. This is why He linked falsification with heedlessness. If he conceives what the Messenger brought and turns away, then he is averse to it. As Allāh Almighty said: {Then whoever follows My guidance will neither go astray nor suffer misery. And whoever turns away from My remembrance, indeed, he will have a depressed life.} [Īā-Hā: 123-124]. And as He said: {you see the hypocrites turning away from you with aversion} [An-Nisā': 61]. And as He said: {And when it is said to them, 'Follow what Allāh has revealed,' they say, 'Rather, we will follow that upon which we found our fathers.}' [Al-Baqarah: 170]. If, along with that, he has no inclination—neither affirming nor falsifying, neither loving nor hating—then he is in doubt about it. As He informed about the state of many disbelievers, hypocrites and others. As He said: {Only those ask your permission [to stay behind] who do not believe in Allāh and the Last Day and whose hearts have doubted, so they, in their doubt, are wavering.} [At-Tawbah: 45]. And as Mūsā said [quoting Allāh regarding past nations]: {Has there not come to you the news of those before you—the people of Nūh, 'Ād, and Thamūd, and those after them? None knows them except Allāh. Their messengers came to them with clear proofs, but they put their hands in their mouths and said, 'Indeed, we disbelieve in that with which you have been sent, and indeed, we are in disquieting doubt about that to which you invite us.' Their messengers said, 'Can there be doubt about Allāh, Creator of the heavens and earth? He invites you that He may forgive you of your sins and give you respite for a specified term.' They said, 'You are not but human beings like us! You wish to turn us away from what our fathers used to worship. Then bring us a clear authority.' Their messengers said to them, 'We are only human beings like you, but Allāh confers favor upon whom He wills of His servants. It has never been for us to bring you an authority except by permission of Allāh. And upon Allāh let the believers rely.}' [Ibrāhīm: 9-11].

So He, Glorified is He, informed about the disbelievers' debate with the Messengers regarding Lordship first—for they were in doubt about the Allāh to Whom they were invited—and regarding Prophethood second, by their saying: {You are not but human beings like us}. This is precisely the argument of the disbelieving philosophers. If one is a falsifier of it, then it is falsification. Falsification is more specific than disbelief. Every falsifier of what the Messengers brought is a disbeliever. But not every disbeliever is a falsifier; rather, he may be a doubter if he is investigating it, or averse to it after not having investigated it. Or he may be heedless of it, not having conceived it at all. However, the punishment for this last one depends on the message reaching the one to whom it was sent.

Each of the two outcomes—adding either falsification or disbelief without falsification to the general recognition—occurs frequently among the traversers of the two paths: speculation based on mere analogy and practice based on mere worship.

An example of this is that many speculators affirmed the Necessary Existent or the Maker of the world, but then went into various doctrines regarding His identification and attributes—which this space is too narrow to detail—that are known in the books of theological opinions of those within our community and outside it: the opinions of the praying Islamists and the opinions of others. Many later worshippers also affirmed that [Necessary Being] with a general affirmation, but then imagined various types of disbelieving delusions concerning Him, which their recognizers describe.

Among them are those who imagined Him to be Absolute Being shared among existents, like the absolute human in relation to its individuals and members. So when existence becomes specific, it is not Him, since the absolute is not the specific, as Al-Šadr al-Qūnawī says.

Among them are those who imagined that the existence of contingent beings is the very essence of His existence overflowing onto them, as the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ [Ibn ‘Arabī] mentions.

Among them are those who imagine Him to be the totality of existence, and every specific entity is a part of Him, like the sea with its waves or the limbs of a human with the human. So He is not what is specific to each specific entity, but He is the sum total of beings, like Al-‘Afīf al-Tilimsānī and ‘Abdullāh al-Fārisī al-Balyānī. They say that every existent is a level among the levels of Being or a locus of manifestation among its manifestations, like the waves of the sea in relation to it, the limbs of a human in relation to him, the parts of air in relation to the air, or like this specific human and this specific animal in relation to the absolute animal and the absolute human.

Their poet, Ibn Isrā’īl, says:

*You are naught but the cosmos, nay, You are its very essence  
This secret is understood by one who tastes*

And he said:

*And I delight if my hand passes over my body  
Because I, in reality, am none other than You*

This is why, for them, man has no goal beyond himself. His goal is merely that the veil be lifted from himself, so he sees that his self is the Truth. Before that, he was veiled from it. When he witnessed the reality, he saw that he is He. As Ibn Isrā’īl said:

*What is wrong with your camel that it finds no rest?  
How long your straying, ceaselessly moving?  
You will soon know that your journey was  
Only to yourself, when you reach the destination*

And as some of them say:

*And in everything He has a sign  
Indicating that it is His essence<sup>1</sup>*

Allāh says: {Indeed, to your Lord is the return.} [Al-‘Alaq: 8]. And He says: {O mankind, indeed you are laboring toward your Lord with [great] exertion...} [Al-Inshiqāq: 6]. And He says: {Then they are returned to Allāh, their true Master.}

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibn Sīnā’s quote is missing from the original text.

[Al-An'ām: 62]. And He says: {Indeed, we belong to Allāh, and indeed to Him we will return.} [Al-Baqarah: 156], and the like.

Al-Tilimsānī, who was deeply rooted in this heresy which they named Tawhīd and Ḥaqīqah (Reality), said:

*I imagined long ago that Laylā was veiled  
And that a screen before her prevented the kiss  
Then she appeared—By Allāh, her veil was nothing  
But that my gaze was blind from love of her*

He has much poetry in this genre:

*She is the pure, eternal substance; though impurity  
Appears from her, brought by her, it is emergent  
I swore to them, naught came from her but her essence  
They said, 'Be cautious with her, for you are perjuring!'*

And he wrote:

*And say to your beloved, 'Die of passion, melt in ecstasy  
In her,' and say to reason's demise, 'Do not cease!'  
And be silent until you see her speaking in you  
Then if you find a tongue speaking, then speak!*

This is why they reach a station where they do not believe in the obligation of obligatory acts and the prohibition of forbidden things. They only see obligation and prohibition as being for the veiled, in their view, those who have not witnessed that He is the reality of the cosmos. So who is the worshipper? And who is the Worshipped? Who is the Commander? And who is the commanded? As the author of Al-Futūḥāt [Ibn 'Arabī] said at its beginning:

*The Lord is real, and the servant is real  
Would that I knew who is the obligated one?  
If you say servant, that one is dead  
Or if you say Lord, how can He be obligated?*

For them, obligation exists only at a level among the levels of the Names and Attributes, which is the level of the Tester.

Some of them said:

*The affair is but one sequence  
In it no praise and no blame  
Only custom has specifier  
And nature and the Lawgiver with judgment*

The origin of these two [groups/ideas] is from the Sabians—as becomes clear upon reflection. For the Sabians who are outside the monotheism of Allāh alone with no partner—like the polytheists and Magians—such as Pharaoh of Mūsā and Nimrod of Ibrāhīm, and other humans, acknowledge Absolute Being. This is why the best science of the philosophers is the science of metaphysics. By them, I mean the Peripatetic philosophers who follow Aristotle. For he is, in their view, the First Teacher who classified the types of teachings, including parts of logic and natural science like [works on] animals, place, the heavens, the world, and celestial phenomena. He also wrote on metaphysics—which is, for them, the pinnacle of their wisdom and the culmination of their philosophy. This is the

science that later philosophers, like Ibn Sinā, call 'Divine Science'. The subject of this science, according to its proponents, is Absolute Being and its concomitants, such as discussion of the existent and non-existent; then the division of the existent into necessary and contingent, eternal and originated, cause and effect, substance and accident, and the like. Then discussion of the types of these divisions and their rulings, such as dividing causes into the four types: agent and final—which are causes for the existence of the thing—and material and formal—which are causes for the reality of the composite. And dividing accidents into the nine categorical genera: quality, quantity, position, place, time, relation, possession, action, and passion; or making them five, according to the difference among them.

At the end of the science of metaphysics, the letter Lām [of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*]—as if it represents the final cause towards which motion occurs, just as the First Teacher proved its existence through the argument from motion—is where the First Teacher discussed the Necessary Existent in Itself with concise words, mentioning a small amount of its rulings. This is what Ibn Sinā used to say about it...<sup>1</sup> This is what the First Teacher possessed regarding the knowledge of Allāh.

As for Prophethoods and Messengers, these [early philosophers] have no known discourse on them, neither negating nor affirming. As for the later ones, when the monotheistic Abrahamic religion appeared—sometimes through the prophethood of ʿĪsā (peace be upon him), when the Christians gained dominance over the kingdom of the Sabians in the lands of Syria, Egypt, Rome, and elsewhere; then through the prophethood of the Seal of the Messengers (peace be upon him), and Allāh manifested from the light of Prophethood a sun that obliterated the light of the stars, and the Salaf lived in it for a long period. Then some of the light of Prophethood became obscured. So some books of the foreign philosophers from the Romans, Persians, and Indians were translated during the Abbasid state. Then their books were sought from the lands of Rome during the state of Al-Ma'mūn, translated, studied by people, and due to that, the innovations that appeared were mathematics like arithmetic and astronomy, or natural science like medicine, or logic. As for divine science, their discourse on it is meager, and despite its meagerness, most of it is not considered certain by them. Whereas the Muslims possess, from the divine sciences inherited from the Seal of the Messengers (peace be upon him), that which has filled the world with light and guidance.

Indeed, even their Mutakallimūn who are attributed to innovations possess, regarding divine knowledge through their derived analogies, multiples upon multiples upon multiples of what the expert philosophers possess. Then, after that, when there arose among them those who became experts according to their method in the science of metaphysics, like Al-Fārābī, Ibn Sinā, and their likes, Ibn Sinā authored books in which he added, based on shared principles, things not mentioned by the predecessors. This was named Divine Science. He discussed Prophethoods, miracles, and the stations of the recognizers with discourse that possessed nobility and loftiness relative to the discourse of the predecessors. Even though, when compared to the Prophetic divine sciences, it

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibn Sinā's quote is missing from the original text.

contains deficiency, negligence, hypocrisy, ignorance, misguidance, and disbelief that is not hidden from anyone with the slightest insight into knowledge and faith. It only gained currency among those who followed the path of the philosophers because he brought knowledge of Allāh, Prophethoods, miracles, and sainthood closer to them according to the principles of the Sabian philosophers—not according to the truth in itself—by means of the light of the Message and the proof of Prophethood shining upon their ignorance. Just as Nastūr (Nestorius) the Christian did, who lived in the time of Al-Ma'mūn and to whom Nestorianism regarding the Trinity and Ittīhād is attributed. However, due to the light of the Muslims shining upon him, he removed much of the corruption of Christian creed, yet great remnants of it remained with him. Likewise, Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī the Christian, when he philosophized, brought the Christian doctrine of the Trinity closer to the principles of the philosophers regarding the Intellect, Intellector, and Intelligible.

This is why the pure philosophers—those remaining purely upon the discourse of the Peripatetics—view Ibn Sīnā as one who compromised with the religious folk, when they saw his rapprochement. They were ignorant in what they said and lied; he did not compromise, but rather stated—based on the requirement of truth and in accordance with their rational principles—what he stated of the truth which he acknowledged. Just as the theistic philosophers, Peripatetics and others, agree on acknowledging the Necessary Existent, the survival of the soul after death, and that righteous deeds benefit after death. Many naturalist philosophers and others oppose them in this. Indeed, even among the theistic philosophers, there is disagreement on some of that. Even Al-Fārābī, who is considered the Second Teacher by them, it is said that his discourse varied on this. Sometimes he affirmed the survival of all souls, sometimes the survival of knowing souls but not ignorant ones, as he stated in Ārā' Ahl al-Madinah al-Fādīlah [Opinions of the People of the Virtuous City], and sometimes he denied both matters. And the misguided disbeliever claimed that Prophethood's specialty is the excellence of imagining spiritual realities. Their confused discourse in this domain is extensive; the purpose here is not to mention it.

Rather, the purpose is that the highest science for them and the First Philosophy is the science of metaphysics, which deals with Absolute Being and its concomitants. To the extent that those Muslim theologians who have a philosophical inclination—like Ibn al-Khaṭīb and others—discuss the principles of jurisprudence, which is a purely Islamic science, they build it upon those philosophical principles. Like the statement of Ibn al-Khaṭīb and others at the beginning of Uṣūl al-Fiqh, agreeing with Ibn Sīnā and those before him: The principles of particular sciences are not established within them, lest circularity result. For the principle of a science constitutes its foundations, and it is not known except after them [the foundations]. If its foundations were known through its issues which depend on its foundations, circularity would result. Rather, its foundations are found accepted as given and are established in a science higher than it, until one reaches the science [highest] for the speculator on existence and its concomitants. They said this regarding fields like medicine and arithmetic: The physician is only a physician who studies the body of the animal, its humors, and its organs to preserve its health if present, and restore it if lost. The animal body is part of the generated things on earth, as are its humors. Broader than this is the study of generated things from the four elements: water,

air, fire, and earth. Broader than that is the study of the transmutable body, then the absolute body. There is no science related to a subject concerning some existent entities or conceptual entities but that there is something broader than it, in which it and others share. However, including the knowledge of Allāh—which is the highest and noblest of sciences—in this framework, and making it a part of the parts of the highest science—according to them—which studies existence and its concomitants, and likewise what follows that of knowledge of His angels, His books, His messengers, and the Last Day—this is the origin of analogical misguidance. This becomes clear from several aspects:

1. Allāh, Glorified is He, is the Most High and He is the Greatest. This is why the emblem of the most perfect religions is: Allāhu Akbar in their prayers, calls to prayer, and festivals. As the Prophet said to ‘Adī ibn Hātim: ‘O ‘Adī, what makes you flee? Does it make you flee to say Lā ilāha illā Allāh? O ‘Adī, do you know of any god besides Allāh? O ‘Adī, what makes you flee? Does it make you flee to say Allāhu Akbar? Do you know of anything greater than Allāh?’ This demonstrates the correctness of those jurists who said it is not permissible to replace this phrase with our saying Allāh al-Kabīr—although clarifying this has another place. And He said: {Glorify the name of your Lord, the Most High.} [Al-A‘lā: 1]. So the Prophet said: ‘Place it in your prostrations.’ Thus, Allāh is the Most High and He is the Greatest. Knowledge corresponds to the known. Therefore, recognition of Him and knowledge of Him must be the greatest and highest of sciences.

2. Allāh—Glorified is He—is the Truth, existing by Himself. All else besides Him is a creation among His creations, subservient, subdued under His power. He is the Creator of things, the Causer of their causes. Therefore, knowledge of Him is the foundation for knowledge of what is besides Him, and its cause, just as His essence is likewise. And knowledge of the cause yields knowledge of the effect.

3. Knowing Absolute Being is knowledge of the shared aspect between Him and what is besides Him. It is knowledge of the middle term in an analogy comparing Him to His creation. It is known that this does not contain knowledge of His reality nor the reality of what is besides Him. It is only knowledge of a shared description between them. How, then, can knowledge of a shared description be higher than knowledge of the reality of each of them and all other specific characteristics of types and individuals? Likewise, knowledge of the absolute essence and whatever constitutes shared matters falls under this category.

4. Absolute Being, absolute essence, and the like: Either it refers to the specific absolute, which does not include the qualified, like saying ‘absolute water’. This has no existence externally outside the intellect and mind. Just as universal, general Being and universal, general essence have no external existence. Rather, this generality and this absoluteness apply to realities inasmuch as they are conceived in minds, not inasmuch as they are established in external realities. How, then, can the highest and noblest of sciences have as its known object mental concepts rather than existential realities? Concepts are merely dependent on those [realities]; otherwise, they would be ignorance, not knowledge. Or, it refers to the general absolute, which does not prevent anything from entering into it. It is that which is

absolute from every qualification, even from [the qualification of] absoluteness. The absolute in this sense does have external existence, according to the correct view. However, it does not exist absolutely; it only exists specifically. As for an existent that is absolute on condition of absoluteness, it has no existence—this is the specific absolute. Since the general absolute includes the qualified, it is correct that it can exist externally. If Absolute Being and its concomitants do not exist externally in an absolute manner, and only exist externally specifically, then it is impossible for [knowledge of] it to be the highest of sciences. Its known object exists only in minds, not in external realities. If it were permissible to prefer knowledge of mental concepts over external realities, it would be permissible to prefer concepts over realities, and knowledge of the Lord, angels, and prophets would be superior to the essence of the Lord, angels, and prophets—and no rational person would say this.

5. The group [philosophers] only erred because they built their entire affair in all their sciences upon analogy. Analogy necessarily requires a universal proposition and a middle term that is broader than the described subject, the predicate, the initial term, the topic. And there is no term or proposition but that there exists something broader than it. For example, one might say 'human'; broader than it is 'animal'; broader than it is 'growing body'; broader than it is 'lower body'; broader than it is 'body'; broader than it is 'substance'; broader than it is 'existent'—whether [existent] is an essential genus as some say, or an accidental description as the experts say. If it were said that the highest analogical sciences are the sciences dealing with the existent and its concomitants, because its known object is the broadest of subjects, this would have some justification. Perhaps this is their intent. However, analogical science does not, by itself, yield knowledge of the reality of any existing thing, unless it has a parallel or likeness. Then one of the two likes is known by itself, and the other by analogy with its parallel. This extent [of applicability] is absent in the knowledge of Allāh, as nothing like Him or parallel to Him exists. Then, the Mutakallimūn countered them with what is higher than existence, namely the known and the mentioned. They said: The highest of knowns and the most general of names and definitions are 'the known' and 'the mentioned,' because these include the existent and the non-existent, encompassing both types of existence—necessary and contingent—and both types of non-existence—possible and impossible. So it should have been said: The highest science is that which studies the known and its concomitants. This is broader and more encompassing. Yet, something's being known is a state that occurs to it, not an essential attribute. Likewise, its being existent, for in reality, it means its being such that a finder finds it—this is the implication of the name. Even if some mean by it its being real in itself, this is not its reality which is it, as has been established elsewhere. And whoever among the philosophers or Mutakallimīn said that the reality of the Lord is His existence or the necessity of His existence, or that they knew His reality, has erred grievously in that. This is like someone saying the reality of all other beings is their being contingent. These people are far from Allāh, veiled from knowing Him. They knew nothing of Him except a universal attribute among His attributes, yet they thought they knew His reality.

Through this, it becomes clear to you that whoever said the highest science is metaphysics, which studies existence and its concomitants, the reality of that is merely that it is highest in the mind of the one seeking knowledge of Allāh through analogy with His creation; not that it is highest in itself, nor that its known object is highest, nor highest for one who knows the realities of existents, nor highest for one who knows Allāh by innate disposition, let alone one who knows Him by divine law, let alone one who knows Him by sainthood, let alone one who knows Him by revelation and Prophethood, let alone one who knows Him by the Message, let alone one who knows Him by [hearing His] Speech, let alone one who knows Him by vision.

Since the ultimate point of the Sabian philosophers and their highest knowledge is Absolute Being, and since the origin of Jahmism and the denial of the Lord's attributes is derived from the Sabians, and since these Ittīhādiyyah are originally Jahmites, and since the Christian elements within them share [features] with the Sabians, resulting in a connection between them and the Sabians—their object of worship and god became Absolute Being. They claimed that this is Allāh, mimicking what a group of ancient philosophers held regarding the denial of the Maker and the affirmation of Absolute Being, thereby validating Pharaoh's statement: {And what is the Lord of the worlds?} [Ash-Shu'arā': 23]. Although Muslim philosophers do not agree with that, but rather affirm the Lord from Whom the world issued. However, by their veneration of Absolute Being, they became aligned and close. Whoever reflects on the words of Nuṣayr al-Ṭūsī, the Sabian philosopher, and the words of Al-Ṣadr al-Qūnawī, the Christian Ittīhādiyyah philosopher, and the words of the Ismā'īlyyah in Al-Balāgh al-Akbar [The Greatest Proclamation] and Al-Nāmūs al-A'ẓam [The Greatest Law]—in which it says: 'The closest people to us are the philosophers; there is no difference between us and them except regarding the Necessary Existent, for they affirm it and we deny it'—will know the connection between these groups. Likewise, the correspondence between Al-Ṣadr and Al-Nuṣayr, wherein Al-Nuṣayr affirms the Necessary Existent according to the method of the Sabian philosophers, and Al-Ṣadr makes that Absolute Being and claims it is Allāh—[reflecting on this] one knows the reality of what I have said and understands the manner of their agreement on misguidance and disbelief. And [one knows] that Al-Nuṣayr is closer [to truth] in terms of his acknowledgment of the Lord, the Maker, Who is distinct from creation, but he is more disbelieving in terms of his distance from Prophethood, divine laws, and acts of worship. And that Al-Ṣadr is closer in terms of his veneration of acts of worship, Prophethoods, and theosis according to the Christian method, but he is more disbelieving in that his object of worship has no reality; rather, he worships Absolute Being, which has no external reality. This is why Al-Ṣadr held greater disbelief in statement but less disbelief in his practice, while Al-Nuṣayr held greater disbelief in practice but less disbelief in his statement. Yet both are disbelievers in their statement and practice. This is why it appears to rational people among the general Muslims from Al-Ṣadr's words that they are lies, falsehood, and delusion, contradicting what the Messenger brought. Just as it appears to them from Al-Nuṣayr's actions that they constitute apostasy and aversion from what the Messenger brought. This is why Al-Nuṣayr was closer to the scholars, because his words contain some truth, just as Al-Ṣadr was closer to the worshippers, because his actions contain some worship.



## Regarding The Perfection Of The Soul, And The Differing Of People Concerning That

He also said:

People have differed regarding this station—which is the ultimate goal of servants.

A group of philosophers and their likes suppose that the perfection of the soul lies in mere knowledge. They make the knowledge by which [the soul] is perfected that which they know of—the science of metaphysics. They consider acts of worship as disciplines for the soul's character until it becomes prepared for knowledge. Thus, the soul becomes a secluded world parallel to the existing world. These people are misguided, indeed disbelievers, for several reasons:

1. Among them: They believed perfection comes from mere knowledge, just as Jahm [ibn Safwān], Al-Ṣālīhī, and Al-Ash'arī—in the well-known of his two opinions—and most of his followers believed that faith is mere knowledge. However, the philosophers are in a worse state than the Jahmiyyah. For the Jahmiyyah make faith the knowledge of Allāh, whereas those [philosophers] make the soul's perfection consist in knowing Absolute Being inasmuch as it is existence. And the absolute on condition of absoluteness exists only in minds, not in external realities. And the absolute without condition also does not exist externally except specifically. Even if they know the universal Being which is divided into necessary and contingent, the object of their knowledge has no external existence. The same applies to those who practice Sufism and theosis according to their path, like Ibn 'Arabī, Ibn Sab'in, and their likes.

Also: The Jahmiyyah acknowledge the Messengers and what they brought. So, generally, they acknowledge that Allāh created the heavens and the earth, and other things brought by the Messengers, unlike the philosophers.

In summary: The soul's perfection is not in mere knowledge. Rather, along with knowledge of Allāh, there must be love of Him, worship of Him, and turning to Him. This constitutes the soul's action, its volition, and the proof of its knowledge and recognition.

2. They thought that the knowledge by which the soul is perfected is their knowledge, yet much of it is ignorance, not knowledge.
3. They did not know the divine knowledge brought by the Messengers, which is the highest knowledge by which the soul is perfected, along with acting according to its requirements.
4. They believe that once they attain that knowledge, the obligations of the Shari'ah are dropped from them, and its prohibitions become permissible for them. This is the way of the Bāṭiniyyah, including the Ismā'iliyyah and others,

like Abū Ya'qūb al-Sijistānī, author of *Al-Aqālīd al-Malakūtiyyah* [The Celestial Keys], and his followers. It is also the way of those heretical Sufis who agree with them, who misinterpret His statement: {And worship your Lord until there comes to you the certainty.} [Al-Ḥijr: 99] to mean that you act until knowledge is attained by you, and once knowledge is attained, action is dropped from you. It was said to Al-Junayd that some people say they reach [Allāh] through the path of piety until the obligations are dropped from them and prohibitions become permissible for them—or words to this effect. He replied: 'Adultery, theft, and drinking wine are better than this.'

Among these are those whose seeking of unveiling and similar types of knowledge is greater than their seeking of what Allāh has obligated upon them. He says in his supplication: 'O Allāh, I ask You for infallibility in movements, stillness, steps, intentions, and words from doubts, conjectures, intentions, and delusions that veil the hearts from contemplating the unseen.' The basis of the issue is that the ability which constitutes perfection for them comes from [this perceived] ability.

Another group: For them, perfection lies in power, authority, and disposal in existence: the execution of command and prohibition, either outwardly through kingship and apparent authority, or inwardly. Their worship and spiritual struggle are directed towards that. Many of these enter into polytheism and magic, worshipping stars and idols so that devils may aid them in their objectives. These are more misguided and more ignorant than those before them. The utmost goal of one who worships Allāh [among them] is seeking extraordinary feats, having a share of this [power]. This is why some of them were seen flying, some seen walking [on water], and some...<sup>1</sup> Among them are ignorant, misguided people.

A group makes perfection consist in the combination of both matters [knowledge and power]. They enter into statements and actions involving polytheism and magic to seek help from devils for what they seek of information about hidden matters and for the execution of their disposal in the world.

The manifest truth is that human perfection lies in worshipping Allāh in knowledge and action, as his Lord commanded him. These are the servants of Allāh, they are the believers and the Muslims, they are the allies of Allāh, the pious, the party of Allāh, the successful, and the soldiers of Allāh, the victorious. They are the people of beneficial knowledge and righteous action. They are the ones who purified their souls and perfected them; they perfected the theoretical, knowing faculty and the volitional, practical faculty. As Allāh Almighty said: {And remember Our servants, Ibrāhīm (peace be upon him), Isḥāq (peace be upon him), and Ya'qūb (peace be upon him), possessors of strength and insight.} [Sād: 45]. And Allāh Almighty said: {By the star when it descends, Your companion [Muḥammad] has not strayed, nor has he erred, Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed.} [An-Najm: 1-4]. And Allāh Almighty said: {Guide us to the straight path—The path of those upon whom You have bestowed favor, not of those who have evoked [Your] anger nor of those who are astray.} [Al-Fātiḥah: 6-7]. And Allāh Almighty said: {Then whoever follows My guidance will neither go astray nor suffer misery.} [Ṭā-Hā: 123]. And Allāh Almighty said: {Those are upon guidance from

---

<sup>1</sup> Two words in the original text were unclear to the copyist.

their Lord, and it is those who are the successful.} [Al-Baqarah: 5]. And Allāh Almighty said: {To Him ascends good speech, and righteous action elevates it.} [Fāṭir: 10]. And Allāh Almighty said: {Except for those who believe and do righteous deeds and advise each other to truth and advise each other to patience.} [Al-'Asr: 3].



## Regarding The Reality Of The Doctrine Of The Ittihādiyyah

The reality of the doctrine of the Ittihādiyyah—like the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ [Ibn ‘Arabī] and his ilk—to which their words lead and which they state explicitly in places, is that realities follow beliefs. This is one of the positions of the Sophists. Thus, whatever anyone says or believes is true within the self of this speaker or believer. This is why they consider lies to be truth and say the recognizer does not belie anyone, for the lie is also an existing matter and is true in the self of the liar. If he believes it, it is true in his belief and his speech. And if he says what he does not believe, it is true only in his speech. This is why the verifier commands that one should believe everything the creatures believe, as he [Ibn ‘Arabī] said:

*The creatures have formed beliefs about God  
And I have believed all that they believed*

It is known that contradictory beliefs cannot have their objects [coexist] in external reality, but [they can coexist] within the self of the believer. This is why they command affirmation of contradictories and contraries and make this one of the principles of their path and verification. It is known that contradictories do not coexist externally, but it is possible to believe in their coexistence, so that becomes true in the self of the believer. They claim that this occurs through unveiling, thus their unveiling is contradictory. I discussed this with one of them, and he said: ‘Both are true. Like the one to whom it was unveiled that Venus is above Mercury, and the one to whom it was unveiled that it is below Mercury.’ He said, ‘In the unveiling of this one, it is above Mercury, and in the unveiling of that one, it is below Mercury,’ and similar examples. Thus, they made established realities follow unveiling, belief, and speech. This is why they say: ‘Go where you wish, for Allāh is there; and say what you wish about Him, for Allāh is the Vast.’<sup>1</sup>

The implication of this principle is that every person says what he wishes and believes what he wishes, without distinguishing between truth and falsehood, or truthfulness and falsehood, and that nothing in existence is to be denied. And this is what they say. This is regarding reports and knowledge.

As for command and action, their verifier says: ‘For us, there is nothing forbidden; but these veiled ones said ‘forbidden,’ so we said, ‘It is forbidden for you.’ Thus, for them, there is no command nor prohibition. As the judge, who was a student of the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ, said in verses recited to me by the

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a line of poetry in the Basī‘ meter. It was written this way in the Majmū‘ [al-Fatāwā], but the correct way to write it is:

This is why they say:

*Go where you wish, for Allah is there; and say  
What you wish about Him, for Allah is the Vast*

witness Ibn 'Amad, nicknamed 'Ur'ayyah:<sup>1</sup>

The affair is but one sequence / In it no praise and no blame /

Only custom has specified / And nature and the Lawgiver with judgment.

At that point, nothing remains for words and deeds except mere capability. This is why they always go along with whatever is. Whatever exists and occurs is, for them, true. So the permissible is what you find and comes into your hand; the forbidden is what you forbid yourself; the truth is whatever you say, whatever it may be; and falsehood is what no one has said.

These [Ittiḥādiyyah] are worse than the antinomian heretics who follow sheer predetermination. For those [antinomians] negate command, prohibition, reward, and punishment, whereas these [Ittiḥādiyyah] also negate the Maker, the Message, and all realities. They make realities dependent on what is unveiled to a person and do not grant realities inherent truths in themselves by which they are realized, such that [one reality] is affirmed and its contradictory negated. Rather, for them, this [lack of inherent reality] is conveyed by absoluteness: that you should not stop at any single belief, but rather believe everything that people have believed. If these are contradictory statements, then existence encompasses all of this, and the unity of being encompasses all of this.

It is known that existence only encompasses the existence of these beliefs; it does not encompass the realization of the objects of belief in themselves. This is something undisputed among rational people. For a false belief and a lying statement do exist and are included within existence. However, this does not necessitate that they be true and truthful. For when 'truth' and 'truthfulness' are applied to declarative statements, what is meant is not their mere existence—for that is known through sense perception. If that were the case, then all [statements] would be true and truthful. It is well-known that one asking about their truth and truthfulness considers them divisible into true and false, truthful and lying. What is meant by their being true and truthful is their correspondence or non-correspondence with the reality reported. Then, [a statement] might correspond in the belief of the speaker but not with external reality; this is error. It might be called lying, or this term might not be applied to it. An example of the first [being called lying] is the Prophet's statement: 'Abū al-Sanābil has lied.' And his statement: 'Whoever said it has lied; indeed, he has two rewards, indeed he is striving.' And the statement of 'Ubādah [ibn al-Ṣāmit]: 'Your father lied.' And the statement of Ibn 'Abbās: 'Nawf lied.' An example of the second [not being called lying] is his statement [after the shortened prayer]: 'I did not forget, nor was it shortened.' Then Dhū al-Yadayn said to him: 'Nay, indeed you forgot.'

It seems the difference—and Allāh knows best—is that whoever reports something while being negligent regarding the path by which he could know its correctness or error, and thus errs, is called a liar—unlike one who was not negligent. Because he spoke without proof or evidence, hazarding a guess, and thus erred; unlike one who reported without being negligent. {This distinction is suitable for differentiating regarding one who swears an oath about something he believes to be as he swore, but it turns out otherwise: if he swore

---

<sup>1</sup> The name is written this way in the original text.

hazarding a guess without any basis to rely on, like one who swore this is a crow or not a crow without any grounds at all, and it turns out he was wrong, [then this one breaks his oath, and that one breaks his oath like this, even if he did not know his error, and even if he was correct. This is the issue of swearing he is in Paradise.]]<sup>1</sup> This is like what you say: The Mufti who issues a fatwa without knowledge has sinned, even if he happens to be correct. Likewise, the one praying towards the Qiblah without striving [to determine it]. And likewise, the one interpreting the Qur'an by his opinion.

This is why you find these [Ittiḥādiyyah] among the people most prone to lying in their reports; indeed, lying is like truthfulness to them. They use it according to need and do not care if they report about the same thing with two contradictory reports. You find them in their actions acting according to their whims, performing two contradictory actions as well, if this suits their purpose at one time, and that suits their purpose at another time. They are always with the one in power, whether he is a believer or a disbeliever, righteous or wicked, a veracious one or a heretic. Although the Tatars before their Islām shared this [trait] with them, they [the Tatars] were better than them regarding reports, since the Tatars did not report about divine matters with two contradictory reports. Rather, one of them either believed something based on knowledge or imitation, or believed nothing. As for combining contradictories, they did not. So these [Ittiḥādiyyah] are in a worse state than the likes of the Tatars. This is why they have no [good] outcome, for they are not pious who distinguish between the commanded and the forbidden, or truthfulness and falsehood. The [good] outcome is only for the pious. The standing of one of them depends only on the extent to which he is capable. It is known that the capability of one of them does not last; rather, he performs actions with it that become the cause of ruin.

There is no doubt that these people are included in His Almighty's statement: {Those who disbelieve and avert [people] from the way of Allāh—He will waste their deeds.} [Muḥammad: 1]. And in His statement: {That is because those who disbelieve follow falsehood...} [Muḥammad: 3]. And His statement: {But those who disbelieved—their deeds are like a mirage in a lowland which a thirsty one thinks is water until, when he comes to it, he finds it is nothing but finds Allāh before Him, and He will pay him in full his due account.} [An-Nūr: 39]. And in His statement: {The example of those who disbelieve in their Lord is [that] their deeds are like ashes which the wind blows forcefully on a stormy day; they have no power over anything they have earned.} [Ibrāhīm: 18]. And in His statement: {Deaf, dumb, blind—so they do not understand.} [Al-Baqarah: 171]. And in His statement: {And We have certainly created for Hell many of the jinn and mankind. They have hearts with which they do not understand, they have eyes with which they do not see, and they have ears with which they do not hear. Those are like livestock; rather, they are more astray.} [Al-A'rāf: 179].

[There is no doubt that truth is of two types: existing truth, with which true reports are concerned; and intended truth, with which wise commands and righteous actions are concerned. The opposite of truth is falsehood. An example

<sup>1</sup> The phrases underlined [here enclosed in curly braces {}] are confused. There may be a scribal error (taṣḥīf). What is meant by this phrase—and Allah knows best—is that whoever swears hazarding a guess without any basis to rely on breaks his oath, even if he did not know his error, and even if he was correct.

of the second type of falsehood is the Prophet's (peace be upon him) statement: 'Every amusement with which a man entertains himself is falsehood, except his shooting with his bow, his training of his horse, and his playing with his wife, for these are from the truth.' When existing truth is reported contrary [to reality], it is a lie.<sup>1</sup>

These [Ittiḥādīyah] do not distinguish between truth and falsehood: neither between the existing truth that should be believed and the non-existent falsehood that should be negated in reports, nor between the intended truth that should be adopted and the falsehood that should be avoided. Rather, they pursue whatever they desire and are capable of from either category. The truest existing truth is what Allāh has informed exists. And the true intended report [i.e., command] is what Allāh has commanded. If you wish, you could say: The truest report about the existing truth is the report of Allāh, and the best command regarding the intended truth is the command of Allāh. Faith combines these two foundations: affirming Him in what He reported, and obeying Him in what He commanded. When they are mentioned together, it is said: {Indeed, those who have believed and done righteous deeds...} [Multiple verses]. Action is better than speech, as Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī said: 'Faith is not by wishful thinking nor by adornment, but it is what settles in the heart and is confirmed by action.'

---

<sup>1</sup> His statement here: '(An example of the second type of falsehood is the Prophet's (peace be upon him) statement...)' indicates an omission, as the (first type of falsehood) was not mentioned previously. This omission concerns the mention of the two types of falsehood. These two types are indicated by what he mentioned in 2/415 [of Majmū' al-Fatāwā], where he said:

(For falsehood is the opposite of truth; and Allah is the Manifest Truth. Truth has two meanings: First, established existence [Perhaps: existent]. Second, the beneficial objective, like the Prophet's statement: 'Witr [prayer] is truth.'

Falsehood is also of two types:

First: The non-existent. If it is non-existent, then believing in its existence and reporting its existence is falsehood, because the belief and report follow the object believed and reported about; they are valid by its validity and invalid by its invalidity. If the object believed and reported about is false, then the belief and report are likewise false; this is lying.

Second: That which is not beneficial nor useful. This is what he referred to here in 2/201 [of Majmū' al-Fatāwā] with his statement: '(An example of the second type of falsehood).'

Like His Almighty's statement: {And We did not create the heaven and the earth and what is between them in vain.} [Sād: 27]. And like the Prophet's statement: 'Every amusement with which a man entertains himself is falsehood, except his shooting with his bow, his training of his horse, and his playing with his wife, for these are from the truth.' And his statement about 'Umar: 'Indeed, this is a man who does not love falsehood.' That which has no benefit in it: commanding it is falsehood, intending it is falsehood, and acting upon it is falsehood; since acting upon it, intending it, and commanding it are falsehood.



## Question About Those Who Gathered Upon Various Matters Of Corruption

### Question

The Shaykh was asked:

About a group that gathered upon various matters of corruption, with each of them clinging to some reason. Among them was one who said: Indeed, Yūnus al-Qattāt saves his followers and disciples from the evil reckoning and painful punishment. Among them was one who claims that ‘Alī al-Ĥarīrī had been given a state such that when he was alone with women and beardless youths, his private part would become like a woman’s private part. Among them was one who claims prophethood and claims that he must inevitably appear at some time, and his religion and law will prevail; and that part of his ‘black law’ is the prohibition of women, the permission of the abominable act of sodomy, and the prohibition of certain foods and other things, like figs, almonds, and lemons. A group followed him: among them were those who used to pray but abandoned prayer. Specific individuals gather with him on many days, etc.

### Answer

He answered:

As for the statement of the one who says that Yūnus al-Qattātī saves his followers and disciples from the evil reckoning and painful punishment on the Day of Resurrection:

A general response is given: Whoever claims that a shaykh among the shaykhs saves his disciples from punishment on the Day of Resurrection has claimed that his shaykh is superior to Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdullāh (peace be upon him). Whoever says this is asked to repent; if he repents, [fine], otherwise he is killed. For it is established in the authentic Hadith that the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: ‘O Fātīmah, daughter of Muḥammad, I cannot avail you anything from Allāh! O Safīyyah, aunt of the Messenger of Allāh, I cannot avail you anything from Allāh! O ‘Abbās, uncle of the Messenger of Allāh, I cannot avail you anything from Allāh! Ask me whatever you wish of my wealth.’ And it is established from him in the Sahih collection that he said: ‘I shall certainly not find any of you coming on the Day of Resurrection with a grunting camel on his neck, saying: ‘O Messenger of Allāh, help me!’ And I will say: ‘I cannot avail you anything from Allāh; I have already conveyed [the message] to you.’ The Hadith in its entirety. Similar statements were mentioned regarding other matters.

So, if the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) says such things to his Ahl al-Bayt and his Companions who believed in him, honored him, and supported him—from the Muhājirūn and the Anṣār—saying that he cannot avail them

anything from Allāh, then how can this be said about a shaykh whose utmost status is to be among those who follow them in righteousness? Allāh Almighty has said: {And what can make you know what is the Day of Recompense? Then, what can make you know what is the Day of Recompense? It is the Day when a soul will not possess for another soul [power to do] a thing; and the command, that Day, is [entirely] with Allāh.} [Al-Infītār: 17-19]. And He said: {And fear a Day when no soul will suffice for another soul at all...} [Al-Baqarah: 48, 123], and similar explicit texts from the Qur'ān and Sunnah.

It is known that the Prophets and others possess nothing on the Day of Resurrection except intercession. It is established in the Sahih collection that people will come to Ādam to intercede, and he will say: 'Nafsī, nafsi!' (I am only worried about my fate, I am only worried about my fate!) Likewise, Nuḥ, Ibrāhīm, Mūsā, and 'Īsā will say [the same]—and these are the Possessors of Resolve among the Messengers, and they are the best of creation. 'Īsā will say to them: 'Go to Muḥammad, a servant whom Allāh has forgiven his past and future sins.' [The Prophet (peace be upon him) continued:] 'When I see my Lord, I will fall down prostrating to Him. He will say: 'O Muḥammad, raise your head! Speak, you will be heard; ask, you will be given; intercede, your intercession will be accepted.' Then He will set a limit for me, and I will admit them into Paradise.' He mentioned something similar happening a second time.

So this is the best of creation and the most honored by Allāh; when he sees his Lord, he does not intercede until he prostrates to Him and praises Him. Then He gives him permission to intercede, setting a limit for him of those He admits into Paradise. This confirms His Almighty's statement: {Who is it that can intercede with Him except by His permission?} [Al-Baqarah: 255], among other verses. It has come in the authentic Hadith that the angels, the prophets, and the believers will intercede, but only with His permission regarding limited matters; the matter is not left to the intercessor's choice. This applies to those known to intercede. If someone were to say: 'Muḥammad saves all his disciples from the Fire,' he would be lying. Rather, among his Ummah are people who will enter the Fire, then he will intercede for them. As for the shaykhs, they do not have intercession like his intercession. A righteous man may be allowed by Allāh to intercede for whomever He wills, but there is no intercession except for the people of faith.

As for those affiliated with Shaykh Yūnus, many of them are disbelievers in Allāh and His Messenger. They do not affirm the obligation of the five daily prayers, the fast of the month of Ramadān, or the pilgrimage to the Ancient House. Nor do they forbid what Allāh and His Messenger have forbidden. Rather, they possess words reviling Allāh, His Messenger, the Qur'ān, and Islām, which are known to those familiar with them.

As for the common folk among them—who do not know their secrets and realities—such a person possesses the Islām of the general Muslims, which he acquired from other Muslims, not from them. For their elite, like Shaykh Salūl, Jahlān, Al-Suhbānī, and others, did not consider prayer obligatory; indeed, they did not even testify to the Messengership of the Prophet (peace be upon him). In their poems—like the poetry of Al-Kūjalī and others—there is blasphemy against the Prophet (peace be upon him), the Qur'ān, and Islām, which neither the Jews nor the Christians would accept. Then, some of them attribute this

poetry to Yūnus, while others say it is falsely attributed to Yūnus. However, it is known and witnessed that they chant disbelief and find ecstasy in it. One of them urinates in the food and says, 'Yūnus's explanation for my liver,' or 'Yūnus's rosewater,' and they consider the food containing urine permissible and view it as a blessing.

As for their blasphemies, such as their saying: 'I protected the sanctuary, I dwelt in it, I left the creatures in paths of wandering. Mūsā on the Mount, when he fell, conversed with me. The companion of Aqrab, I kept him away until he came. On the Day of Resurrection, creatures will see crowds going to their prophet 'Īsā to fulfill their needs.' And they say: 'Come, let's destroy the mosque and make it a dung heap. Let's break the wood of the pulpit and make belts from it. Let's burn paper and make a lute from it. Let's pluck the judge's beard and make strings from it.' [And:] 'I carried the Throne until it screamed. I shouted at Muḥammad until he fled. The seven seas tremble from my awe.' And other matters even greater than this, too great to mention due to the disbelief they contain, which is worse than the statement of those who said Allāh has a son.

As for the statement that one of the shaykhs' private part used to transform into a woman's private part: it is a fabricated lie. Rather, his path contains reprehensible things that oppose the religion of Islām, known to those familiar with the religion of Islām. His followers transmit blasphemies from him which they recorded, such as his saying: 'If I killed seventy prophets, I would not be mistaken.' It is known that killing a single prophet is among the greatest forms of disbelief. In the Hadith from the Prophet (peace be upon him): 'The most severely punished people on the Day of Resurrection will be one who killed a prophet or was killed by a prophet.'

If it is said: 'He said this while witnessing the predetermined, cosmic reality, that Allāh is the Creator of the servants' actions,' then the excuse is uglier than the sin. For if predestination were a valid excuse, then Iblīs, Pharaoh, and all other disbelievers would bear no blame, neither in this world nor in the Hereafter. This person who argues using predestination, if someone were to transgress against him, he would fight him and become angry with him. If predestination is an excuse, then it is an excuse [for the aggressor] to do whatever he wants to him. If it is not an excuse, then one should not harm a human being. How then can it be an excuse for one who disbelieves in Allāh and His Messenger?

Ādam (peace be upon him) only won the argument against Mūsā because Mūsā blamed him for the calamity that befell him [and his descendants], he did not blame him concerning Allāh Almighty's right regarding the sin. For Ādam repented, and the one who repents from a sin is like one who has no sin. Rather, [Mūsā] said to him: 'Why did you expel us and yourself from Paradise?' [Ādam] replied: 'Do you blame me for a matter Allāh decreed for me forty years before He created me?' So Ādam won the argument against Mūsā.

Likewise, everyone afflicted by a calamity originating from his father or anyone else is commanded to submit to Allāh's decree. As Allāh Almighty said: {And whoever believes in Allāh—He guides his heart.} [At-Taghābun: 11]. 'Alqamah said: 'This refers to a man who is afflicted by a calamity; he knows it is from Allāh, so he accepts and submits.' As for sins, the servant must not commit them. If he does commit them, he must repent from them. Whoever repents and regrets resembles his father Ādam. Whoever persists and makes excuses resembles his

enemy Iblīs. Allāh Almighty said: {So be patient; indeed, the promise of Allāh is truth. And ask forgiveness for your sin...} [Ghāfir: 55]. Thus, the believer is commanded to be patient with calamities and seek forgiveness for sins and faults.



## **Whoever Claims Prophethood And Permits Forbidden Things Is A Disbeliever**

As for the one who claims prophethood, permits the abominable act of sodomy, forbids marriage, and [other things] mentioned thereof: this matter is too obvious to require comment. For he is among the disbelievers and the most wicked of apostates. Killing this person and whoever follows him is obligatory by the consensus of the Muslims.

One of these individuals should either be addressed with proof, perhaps Allāh will grant him repentance and guide him, or the legal punishment should be carried out upon him, so he is killed. Whoever is capable of either of these two actions, it is incumbent upon him. Whoever is incapable of both this and that, then Allāh does not burden a soul beyond its scope. However, it is upon him to know the good and love it, and deny the evil and hate it, and do what he is capable of regarding both—commanding [good] and forbidding [evil]. As the Prophet (peace be upon him) said in the authentic Hadith: ‘Whoever among you sees an evil, let him change it with his hand; if he is unable, then with his tongue; if he is unable, then with his heart, and beyond that there is not even a mustard seed’s weight of faith.’

And Allāh, Glorified and Exalted is He, knows best.



## One Who Denied The Creation Of The Servants' Actions, And The Saying Of Ahl Al-Sunnah Regarding It

### Question

The question is requested from the beneficence of Shaykh al-Islām, Muftī of Mankind, Taqī al-Dīn—may Allāh reward him with Paradise—that he give us a ruling regarding two men who disputed over these two mentioned verses of poetry, which are the saying of the poet:

The Lord is real, and the servant is real  
Would that I knew who is the obligated one?  
If you say servant, that one is dead  
Or if you say Lord, how can He be obligated?

One of the men said: 'This statement is disbelief, for the speaker has made the Lord and the servant a single reality, with no difference between them, and has nullified obligation.'

The second man said to him: 'You did not understand the meaning and accused the speaker of what he did not believe or intend. For the speaker said: 'The Lord is real, and the servant is real,' meaning the Lord is real in His Lordship and the servant is real in his servitude. So the Lord is not a servant, nor is the servant a Lord, as you claimed. Then he said: 'Would that I knew who is the obligated one?' despite knowing that obligation is real. He became perplexed as to whom he should attribute the performance of it. So he said: 'If you say servant, that one is dead.' The dead has no movement from himself; rather, another moves him as he wills. Likewise, the servant—even though he is alive—is with his Lord like the dead with the washer; he has no action from himself without Allāh. Because He, Glorified is He, if He did not empower the servant to fulfill the obligation, he would not be capable of it. So the action belongs to Allāh in reality, and to the servant metaphorically. The proof for this is the saying *Lā ĥawla wa lā quwwata illā billāh al-'Alī al-'Aẓīm* [There is no turning nor power except by Allāh, the Most High, the Magnificent]; meaning: no turning from disobedience and no power for obedience except by Allāh. It is known that the Lord is not subject to obligation, because there is no one to obligate Him. And the servant does not fulfill what he is obligated with except by Allāh, yet the obligation is real. So the speaker expressed wonder upon witnessing this state and became perplexed about it, while still affirming it and that it is a duty upon the servant. Therefore, it is not appropriate for a rational person to criticize someone whose words he does not understand; rather, the deficiency lies in the limited understanding.'

So, with which of them lies the truth?

## Answer

Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah—may Allāh sanctify his soul and illuminate his grave—answered, saying:

All praise is due to Allāh. The words of this second man are false words and a delving into that which his knowledge does not encompass and whose reality he does not know. He is neither knowledgeable of the reality of Ibn ‘Arabī’s saying and its foundation from which this poetry and other things branched, nor is he adhering to the requirement and indication of this wording.

As for the foundation of Ibn ‘Arabī, it is that existence is one, and that Necessary Existence is the very essence of contingent existence. [This is based on] the view that the non-existent is a ‘thing’, and the essences of non-existent things are established in non-existence, and the existence of the Truth flows onto them. Thus, the existence of everything is the very essence of the existence of the Truth, according to him. This is elaborated elsewhere.

This is why he [Ibn ‘Arabī] said [regarding Pharaoh]: ‘And since Pharaoh was in the position of authority, the master of the moment, and the caliph by the sword—even if he was unjust according to the customary law—for that reason he said: {I am your Lord, the Most High} [An-Nāzi‘āt: 24]. Meaning, even if all are lords in some respect, I am the highest among them due to what I have been given outwardly of rule over you. When the magicians knew the truth of what he said, they did not deny it but affirmed it for him. They said to him: {So decree whatever you are to decree. You only decree for this worldly life.} [Ī‘ā-Hā: 72]. The dominion is yours. Thus, Pharaoh’s statement {I am your Lord, the Most High} was correct, even though he was the essence of the Truth.’ He [Ibn ‘Arabī] also said: ‘And among His Beautiful Names is The Most High. High over whom? There is nothing there but Him. High above what? There is nothing but Him.’ ... Until he [Ibn ‘Arabī] said: ‘And whoever knows what we have established regarding numbers, and that their negation is the essence of their affirmation, knows that the Transcendent Real is the likened creation. So the Commanding Creator is the created, and the created command is the Creator. All of that is from one essence; nay, rather, it is the one essence.’ He also said: ‘Do you not see that the Truth appears with the attributes of creation? So all attributes of the Truth are His right, just as the attributes of originated things are the right of the Creator.’ And similar statements which abound in his words.

This man [Ibn ‘Arabī] has a sequence in his spiritual path similar to the sequence of the Qarmatian heretics. The first thing that appears is the belief of the Mu‘tazilite Kullābiyyah who negate the narrative attributes and affirm the seven or eight [rational] attributes. Then after that, the belief of the philosophers who negate the attributes and affirm an abstract Necessary Existence from which contingent beings emanated. Then after this, this [Necessary] Existence is made to be the existence of every existent. So for him, there are not two existences: one necessary and the other contingent; nor one Creator and the other created. Rather, the essence of Necessary Existence is the essence of contingent existence, despite the multiplicity of levels. The levels, for him, are the fixed essences in non-existence, according to the claim of those who say the non-existent is a ‘thing’. There is no doubt that whoever considers the non-existent a ‘thing’ established externally to the mind, his view is false. However, those [Mu‘tazilah] say the Creator gave these essences a created existence. But Ibn

'Arabī says: Rather, His own existence overflowed onto them. So they are dependent on Him for their existence, and He is dependent on their establishment [for His manifestation]. This is why he said: 'So he worships Me and I worship him; he praises Me and I praise him.' This is why obligation is impossible according to him. For obligation requires an obliger and an obligated one, one commanding and the other commanded. Thus, obligation became impossible. This is why, for example, regarding speech and hearing, [he uses] the Prophet's (peace be upon him) saying: 'Indeed, Allāh has overlooked for my Ummah what their souls tell them, as long as they do not speak of it or act upon it.' Since the one speaking [internally] here is the one spoken to, he made this an analogy for the existence of the Lord. For him, all speech in existence is His speech; He is the speaker, according to him, and He is the listener.

This is why he says: 'If you say servant, that one is dead.' In another place, I saw in his handwriting: 'If you say servant, that is negation.' Because the servant, for him, has no created existence; rather, his existence is the Necessary, Eternal Existence, according to him. This is elaborated elsewhere, for the man's words explain each other. This principle—namely, the doctrine of waḥdah al-wujūd—is his doctrine and the doctrine of Ibn Sab'īn, his companion Al-Shushtarī, Al-Tilimsānī, Al-Ṣadr al-Qūnawī, Sa'īd al-Farghānī, 'Abdullāh al-Balyānī, Ibn al-Fāriḍ, and others among the proponents of heresy who advocate waḥdah), Fūlūl, and Ittihād.

As for the meaning of this poetry: His saying, 'Would that I knew who is the obligated one?' is an interrogative of denial regarding the obligated one. Then he said: 'If you say servant, that one is dead,' and in another place he said, 'that is negation.' Both are false. For the servant exists and is established, not non-existent or negated. However, Allāh is the One Who made him existent and established. This is the religion of the Muslims: that everything besides Allāh is created by Allāh, existing because Allāh granted it existence. Nothing has existence except through Allāh's bringing it into existence. Considered in itself, it deserves nothing but non-existence...<sup>1</sup> ...existent, living, speaking, acting, willing, capable; rather, all of this...<sup>2</sup> ... does not prevent the affirmation of their essences, attributes, and actions.

He, Glorified is He, is the One Who made the living alive. Indeed, He is the One Who made the Muslim a Muslim, and the praying person one who prays. As the Friend [Ibrāhīm] said: {Our Lord, and make us Muslims [in submission] to You...} [Al-Baqarah: 128]. And he said: {My Lord, make me an establisher of prayer, and [many] from my descendants.} [Ibrāhīm: 40]. This is the issue of the creation of the servants' actions, which is the doctrine of Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah, along with their agreement that the servant is commanded, forbidden, rewarded, punished, promised, and threatened. He, Glorified is He, is the One Who made the white white, the black black, the tall tall, the short short, the moving moving, the still still, the moist moist, the dry dry, the male male, the female female, the sweet sweet, and the bitter bitter. Despite this, entities are described by these attributes. Allāh Almighty is the Creator of the essences and their attributes. So what wonder is there in a created essence being described by its attributes? And how could Allāh not be the Creator of all that in truth?

---

<sup>1</sup> Gap in the original text.

<sup>2</sup> Gap in the original text.

So if the speaker says: 'The Lord is real, and the servant is real': If he means by this that this reality is the essence of that reality, then this is *Ittiḥādīyah* and heresy, and this is what negates obligation. If he means that the servant is a real, created being whom the Creator created, then this is the doctrine of the Muslims. And that does not negate the Creator enabling the creature, just as He is his Creator.

His statement: 'If you say servant, that one is dead,' is a lie. For the servant is not dead; rather, he is alive, whom Allāh Almighty brought to life. As Allāh Almighty said: {How can you disbelieve in Allāh when you were dead and He brought you to life?} [Al-Baqarah: 28]. Allāh does not obligate the dead; He only obligates the living. If it is said that he meant by his statement 'dead' that considered in himself, he has no life, it is replied: Interpreting his intent this way is corrupt both linguistically and conceptually. Linguistically, because his words do not necessitate that. Conceptually, because if interpreted that way, it does not negate obligation. If he was dead—were it not for Allāh's giving life—and Allāh has given him life, then he has become alive through Allāh's giving him life. In that case, Allāh only obligated a living being; He did not obligate a dead one.

As for the statements of the brothers of the heretics and those who defend them, that he said: 'Would that I knew who is the obligated one?' despite knowing that obligation is real, so he became perplexed as to whom he should attribute its performance. Then he said: 'If you say servant, that one is dead. The dead has no movement from himself; rather, another moves him as he wills. Likewise, the servant—even though he is alive—is with his Lord like the dead with the washer; he has no action from himself without Allāh.'

It is said to them: This excuse is false for several reasons:

1. Because there is no perplexity here. Rather, the obligated one is the servant, without doubt or perplexity. For it is impossible that Allāh be the one obligated with fasting, circumambulation, and stoning the pillars. Rather, He is the Commander of that, and the servant is the one commanded with that. Whoever is perplexed whether the one commanded with that is Allāh or the servant is either of unsound mind, insane, or of corrupt religion, a heretic, an utter apostate. The fact that Allāh is the Creator of the servant and his action does not prevent the servant from being the one commanded and forbidden. For no one has ever said that Allāh is the one who bows, prostrates, circumambulates, stones the pillars, and fasts the month of Ramadān. Rather, the entire Ummah agrees that the servant is the one who bows, prostrates, fasts, the worshipper. There is no dispute in that between Ahl al-Sunnah and the Qadariyyah.

2. His statement that the servant—even though alive—is with his Lord like the dead with the washer is not correct. For the dead has no sensation or will regarding the movement performed upon him, nor power for it. He is not described as loving the action or hating it, or wanting it or disliking it. Nor [is he described] as bowing, prostrating, fasting, performing Hajj, or fighting the enemy. Based on this saying [of the defender], the dead is not praised for the washer's action, nor blamed, nor rewarded, nor punished. As for the servant, Allāh made him living, willing, capable, acting. He fasts, prays, performs Hajj, kills, and commits adultery by his choice and will. Allāh is the Creator of his essence, his attributes, and his actions. So he has a will, and Allāh is the Creator of his will. As Allāh Almighty said: {For whoever wills among you to

take a right course.} {And you do not will except that Allāh wills, Lord of the worlds.} [At-Takwīr: 28-29]. He has power, and Allāh is the Creator of his power. He is the one praying, fasting, performing Hajj and 'Umrah, and Allāh is his Creator and the Creator of his actions. So comparing him to the dead is a false analogy.

3. It may be said: If he is like the dead with the washer, then the washer would be the obligated one, meaning Allāh would be the obligated one. This necessitates that the Lord is the obligated one.

4. Rational human beings agree, based on the natural disposition Allāh created in them, that the living servant is commanded and forbidden, praised and blamed for his voluntary actions. They agree that whoever uses predestination as an excuse for his oppression and abominations—that is not accepted from him. If an oppressor wronged another, no one would accept from him that he deflect blame from himself by [citing] predestination. As for the dead, no rational person blames him, commands him, or forbids him. How can this be compared to that?

As for the speaker's statement: 'For indeed, Allāh, if He did not empower the servant for the obligation, he would not be capable of it,' this is correct speech. However, it contains nothing that negates his being obligated, commanded, forbidden, praying, fasting, killing, or committing adultery.

As for his statement: 'So the action belongs to Allāh in reality; and to the servant metaphorically,' this is false speech. Rather, the servant is the one praying, fasting, performing Hajj and 'Umrah, the believer, and he is the disbeliever, the wicked, the killer, the adulterer, the thief—in reality. Allāh Almighty is not described by any of these attributes; rather, He is transcendent above that. However, He is the One Who made the servant the doer of these actions. So these are His creations and His effects in reality, and they are the action of the servant also in reality.

However, a group of the theologians—those affirming predestination—thought that the action is the effect, and the creating is the created thing. When they believed that the servants' actions are created and effected by Allāh, they said: 'So they are His action.' It was then said to them: 'Are they also the action of the servant?' They became confused. Some said: 'They are his acquisition, not his action,' without distinguishing between acquisition and action with a verified distinction. Some said: 'Rather, it is an action between two agents.' Some said: 'Rather, the Lord performed the essence of the action, and the servant performed its qualities.'

The verification is what the Imāms of the Sunnah and the majority of the Ummah hold: the distinction between the action and the effect, the creating and the created thing. The servants' actions, like other originated things, are created and effected by Allāh, just as the servant's self and all his attributes are created and effected by Allāh. This [created thing] is not the essence of His creating and His action; rather, they are created and effected. These actions are the action of the servant, inhering in him; they do not inhere in Allāh, nor is He described by them. For He is not described by His creations and effects; He is only described by His creating and His action, just as He is described by all else that inheres in His Essence. The servant is the agent of these actions, and he is the one described by them. He has power over them, and he is their agent by his

choice and will. All of that is created by Allāh. So they are the action of the servant and the effect of the Lord. However, these [inherent] attributes [like color, length] Allāh did not create through the mediation of the servant's power and will, unlike his voluntary actions. For He created those [voluntary actions] through the mediation of His creating the servant's will and power, just as He created other effects through the mediation of other causes.

This is elaborated elsewhere, but this is the extent that this page allowed. And Allāh knows best.



## A Book That Appeared Among The People Containing Falsehoods Contradicting What Is In The Book Of Allāh

### Question

What do the esteemed scholars—the imāms of the religion and guides of the Muslims—say:

Regarding a book circulating among the people whose author claimed he composed and produced it for the people with the permission of the Prophet (peace be upon him) in a dream he claimed to have seen; while most of his book contradicts what Allāh revealed in His revealed Books and is the opposite and contrary to the sayings of His sent Prophets? Among what he said in it is: that Ādam (peace be upon him) was only named insān (human) because he is to the Truth, may He be exalted, like the pupil (insān) of the eye is to the eye, through which sight occurs. And he said in another place: that the Transcendent Truth is the likened creation. And he said regarding the people of Nuḥ (peace be upon him), that had they abandoned their worship of Wadd, Suwā', Yaghūth, Ya'ūq, and Nasr, they would have become ignorant of the Truth to the extent of what they abandoned of these [idols]. Then he said: For the Truth has, in every object of worship, an aspect known by whoever knows it and unknown by whoever is ignorant of it. So the knowledgeable one knows who he worshipped and in what form He appeared such that He was worshipped, and that differentiation and multiplicity are like limbs in a physical form. Then he said regarding the people of Hūd (peace be upon him), that they attained the essence of closeness, so distance vanished, and the designation of Hell ceased in their case. Thus, they succeeded in [attaining] the bliss of closeness by way of entitlement, stemming from what this delightful, experiential station granted them by way of favor. For they only attained it through what their realities deserved based on the deeds they were upon, and they were upon the straight path of the Lord.

Then, he denied therein the ruling of the threat concerning everyone upon whom the word of punishment was justified among all the servants. So, does one who believes him in that commit disbelief or not? Or [is it permissible] to be pleased with it from him or not? And does the listener commit sin, if he is rational and mature, and does not denounce it with his tongue or his heart, or not? Give us a fatwā with clarity and explanation, just as the covenant was taken for clarification, for negligence has harmed the weak and the ignorant. And Allāh is the One sought for help, and upon Him is reliance, that He hasten the exemplary punishment for the heretics, for the rectification of the situation and the cutting off of the source of misguidance.

## Answer

So he answered:

Praise be to Allāh. These mentioned, reprehensible statements: every single statement among them constitutes disbelief concerning which there is no dispute among the people of the religions—the Muslims, the Jews, and the Christians—let alone it being disbelief in the Sharī'ah of Islam.

For the statement of the one who says: 'Ādam is to the Truth, may He be exalted, like the pupil (insān) of the eye is to the eye, through which sight occurs,' implies that Ādam is a part of the Truth, may He be exalted and sanctified, and a portion of Him, and that he is the best of His parts and portions. This is the reality of the doctrine of these people, and it is well-known from their sayings.

The second statement aligns with that, which is his saying: 'the Transcendent Truth is the likened creation.' And thus he said in completing that: 'So the command is the Creator, the created; and the command is the created, the Creator. All of that is from one essence; nay, rather, it is the one essence, and it is the many essences. {So look what you think.} [Aṣ-Ṣaffāt: 102] {O my father, do as you are commanded!} [Aṣ-Ṣaffāt: 102] And the son is the essence of his father, so he did not see himself slaughtering anyone but himself. {Then We ransomed him with a great sacrifice} [Aṣ-Ṣaffāt: 107]. So He appeared in the form of a ram—He who appeared in the form of a human and appeared in the form [of a ram]; not by the ruling of a son, [the son] who is the essence of the father. {And created from it its mate} [An-Nisā': 1]. So he [Ādam] married none but himself.'

And he said in another place: 'And He is the Hidden from every understanding, except from the understanding of one who says: The universe is His form and His identity.' And he said: 'And among His beautiful names is The High—high over whom? There is nothing there but Him. And high above what? It is none other than Him. So His highness is for Himself. And He, in terms of existence, is the essence of existent beings. So the named 'created things' are the highness itself, and they are none other than Him.' Until he said: 'So He is the essence of what appeared, and He is the essence of what was hidden while it appeared. And there is none who sees Him other than Him, and there is none who speaks of Him besides Him. So He is apparent to Himself, hidden from Himself—and He is the one named Abū Sa'īd Al-Kharrāz'—and other names of created things. Until he said: 'So The High for Himself is the one who possesses the perfection by which He encompasses all existential matters and non-existential relations, whether they are praiseworthy according to custom, intellect, and law, or blameworthy according to custom, intellect, and law. And that belongs to none but the One named Allāh, specifically.' And he said: 'Do you not see the Truth appearing with the attributes of created things? And He informed of that about Himself. And [appearing] with attributes of deficiency and blame? Do you not see the creation appearing with the attributes of the Truth? So they [attributes], from beginning to end, are attributes for Him, just as the attributes of created things are a right for the Truth.' And similar statements.

Indeed, the author of this mentioned book, which is Fuṣūṣ Al-Ĥikam, and his likes, such as his companion Al-Qūnawī, At-Tilimsānī, Ibn Sab'īn, Ash-Shushtarī, Ibn Al-Fārid, and their followers—their doctrine which they adhere to is that existence is one. They are called the people of waḥdat al-wujūd, and they claim

realization and recognition. They make the existence of the Creator the very essence of the existence of the creatures. So, whatever attributes the creatures possess—good or bad, praise or blame—the one characterized by them, according to them, is the essence of the Creator. And the Creator, according to them, has no existence distinct from the existence of the creatures, separate from them at all. Rather, according to them, there is absolutely no ‘other’ than the Creator, nor anything ‘besides’ Him. Among their sayings is: ‘There is nothing except Allāh.’ Therefore, the idol worshippers, according to them, did not worship other than Him, because, according to them, there is no ‘other’ than Him. This is why they interpreted the statement of the Exalted: {And your Lord has decreed that you worship none but Him} [Al-Isrā’: 23] to mean: ‘Your Lord has predestined that you worship none but Him,’ since, according to them, there is no ‘other’ than Him whose worship could be conceived. So every worshipper of an idol only worshipped Allāh.

This is why the author of this book made the worshippers of the calf correct and mentioned that Mūsā rebuked Hārūn for his denunciation of their worship of the calf. He said: ‘Mūsā was more knowledgeable of the matter than Hārūn because he knew what the companions of the calf worshipped, due to his knowledge that Allāh had decreed that none should be worshipped except Him, and whatever Allāh decrees must occur. So Mūsā’s rebuke of his brother Hārūn was due to the matter occurring [as decreed] while he [Hārūn] denounced it and lacked compliance [with the divine decree]. For the recognizer is one who sees the Truth in everything; nay, rather, sees Him as the essence of everything.’

This is why they make Fir’awn (Pharaoh) one of the major recognizers and realizers and [claim] that he was correct in his claim of lordship. As he said in this book: ‘And since Fir’awn was in the position of authority, the master of the moment, and that he was unjust according to the established custom, for that reason he said: {I am your Lord, the Most High} [An-Nāzi’āt: 24]—meaning, ‘Even if all are lords in some respect, I am the highest among them due to what I have been given outwardly of authority over them.’ When the magicians knew the truthfulness of Fir’awn in what he said, they did not deny it; rather, they affirmed it for him and said to him: {So decree whatever you are to decree} [Tāhā: 72]. The dominion is yours. Thus, Fir’awn’s statement {I am your Lord, the Most High} was correct, and he was the essence of the Truth.’

And it is sufficient for you to know their disbelief that one of their mildest statements is that Fir’awn died a believer, free from sins. As he said: ‘And Mūsā was a coolness of the eye for Fir’awn through the faith that Allāh gave him at the time of drowning. So He took his soul pure, purified, with no trace of wickedness in him, because He took him at the time of his faith before he had committed any sins, and Islam wipes away what came before it.’

Yet it is known by necessity from the religion of the people of the revealed religions—Muslims, Jews, and Christians—that Fir’awn is among the greatest disbelievers in Allāh. Indeed, Allāh did not narrate in the Qur’ān the story of any disbeliever by his specific name more extensively than the story of Fir’awn, nor did He mention about any disbeliever such disbelief, tyranny, and haughtiness greater than what He mentioned about Fir’awn. And He informed about him and his people that they will enter the severest punishment. For the term ‘Āl Fir’awn’ (People of Fir’awn), like the terms ‘Āl Ibrāhīm’, ‘Āl Lūt’, ‘Āl Dāwūd’, and

'Āl Abi Awfā', includes the one to whom it is attributed, by the consensus of the people. So when they come to the greatest enemy of Allāh among mankind, or one who is among His greatest enemies, and declare him correct and truthful in that for which Allāh declared him a disbeliever, it becomes known that what they say is greater than the disbelief of the Jews and Christians. So how much more so their other statements?

The Salaf of the Ummah and its Imāms have agreed that the Creator, may He be exalted, is distinct from His creatures; there is nothing of His creatures in His Essence, nor anything of His Essence in His creatures. The Salaf and the Imāms declared the Jahmiyyah disbelievers when they said He is in every place. Among what they condemned them for was: How can He be in wombs, latrines, and empty spaces? Exalted is Allāh above that! How then [can one tolerate] those who make Him the very existence of wombs, latrines, empty spaces, impurities, and filth?

The Salaf of the Ummah and its Imāms agreed that {There is nothing whatsoever like unto Him} [Ash-Shūrā: 11], neither in His Essence, nor in His Attributes, nor in His Actions. And whoever among the Imāms said, 'Whoever likens Allāh to His creation has disbelieved, and whoever denies what Allāh described Himself with has disbelieved, and what Allāh described Himself or His Messenger described Him with is not anthropomorphism.' And where do the anthropomorphists and corporealists stand compared to these [proponents of waḥdat al-wujūd]? For the utmost extent of their disbelief is to make Him like the creatures. However, they say: He is eternal, and they [creatures] are originated. But these [proponents of waḥdat al-wujūd] have made Him the essence of the creatures and made Him the very substance of created bodies, describing Him with all the deficiencies and defects with which every disbeliever, every sinner, every devil, every beast of prey, and every snake among snakes is described. So exalted is Allāh above their fabrication and misguidance! And Glory be to Him, and highly exalted is He above what they say! And Allāh, may He be exalted, will avenge Himself, His religion, His Book, His Messenger, and His believing servants from them.

These people say that the Christians only disbelieved because of their specification, when they said: {Indeed, Allāh is the Messiah} [Al-Mā'idah: 72]. So everything the Christians said about the Messiah, they say about Allāh. The disbelief of the Christians is but a part of the disbelief of these people. When this mentioned book was read to the best of their later figures, someone said to him: 'This book contradicts the Qur'ān.' He replied: 'The Qur'ān is entirely polytheism. True monotheism is only in this speech of ours'—meaning that the Qur'ān differentiates between the Lord and the servant, whereas the reality of Tawḥīd, according to them, is that the Lord is the servant. The questioner then said to him: 'Then what is the difference between my wife and my daughter?' He said: 'There is no difference, but these veiled ones said 'forbidden,' so we say it is forbidden for you.'

When it is said about their doctrine that it is disbelief, this term does not [fully] capture its state, for disbelief is a genus under which there are varying types. Rather, the disbelief of every disbeliever is a part of their disbelief. This is why it was said to their leader, 'You are a Nuṣayrī.' He replied, 'Nuṣayr is a part of me.' 'Abdullāh ibn Al-Mubārak used to say: 'We can relate the words of the Jews and

Christians, but we cannot relate the words of the Jahmiyyah.' And these are worse than those Jahmiyyah, for the utmost of their [Jahmiyyah's] position was the statement that Allāh is in every place, whereas the statement of these [proponents of wahdat al-wujūd] is that He is the existence of every place; according to them, there are not two existing things, one indwelling and the other its locus. This is why they said that Ādam is from Allāh like the pupil of the eye is to the eye. It is known by Muslims, Jews, and Christians, by necessity from the religion of the Messengers, that whoever says about any human being that he is a part of Allāh is a disbeliever in all religions, since the Christians did not say this—even though their statement is among the greatest forms of disbelief. No one has said that the essence of the creatures is part of the Creator, nor that the Creator is the creature, nor that the Transcendent Truth is the likened creation.

Likewise, his statement: 'that had the polytheists abandoned the worship of idols, they would have become ignorant of the Truth to the extent of what they abandoned of them'—is disbelief known by necessity from all religions. For the people of the religions agree that all the Messengers forbade the worship of idols and declared those who do so disbelievers, and that the believer is not a believer until he disassociates himself from the worship of idols and every object of worship besides Allāh. As Allāh the Exalted said: {There has already been for you an excellent pattern in Ibrāhīm and those with him, when they said to their people, 'Indeed, we are disassociated from you and from whatever you worship other than Allāh. We have rejected you, and there has appeared between us and you animosity and hatred forever until you believe in Allāh alone'} [Al-Mumtaḥanah: 4]. And the Friend [Ibrāhīm] said: {Then do you see what you have been worshipping,} {You and your ancient forefathers?} {Indeed, they are enemies to me, except the Lord of the worlds} [Ash-Shu'arā': 75-77]. And the Friend said: {to his father and his people, 'Indeed, I am disassociated from that which you worship,} {Except for He who created me; and indeed, He will guide me'} [Az-Zukhruf: 26-27]. And Allāh's Friend—who is the imām of the monotheists, in whose progeny Allāh placed prophethood and the Book, and upon whose veneration the people of the religions agree—said: {O my people, indeed I am free from what you associate with Allāh.} {Indeed, I have turned my face toward He who created the heavens and the earth, inclining toward truth, and I am not of those who associate others with Allāh} [Al-An'ām: 78-79]. This is more widespread and evident among the people of the religions—the Jews and Christians, let alone the Muslims—than needing to cite specific texts as evidence. So whoever says: 'had the idol worshippers abandoned them [idols], they would have become ignorant of the Truth to the extent of what they abandoned of these,' is more disbelieving than the Jews and Christians. And whoever does not declare them disbelievers is more disbelieving than the Jews and Christians, for the Jews and Christians declare idol worshippers disbelievers. How then [can one accept] someone who considers the one who abandons idol worship to be ignorant of the Truth to the extent of what he abandoned thereof? Along with his statement: 'So the knowledgeable one knows who he worshipped and in what form He appeared such that He was worshipped, and that differentiation and multiplicity are like limbs in a physical form and like spiritual faculties in a spiritual form, so none other than Allāh was worshipped in every object of worship.' Nay, this is greater than the disbelief of the idol worshippers themselves! For those [idol worshippers] took them as intercessors

and intermediaries, as they said: {We only worship them that they may bring us nearer to Allāh in position} [Az-Zumar: 3]. And Allāh the Exalted said: {Or have they taken other than Allāh as intercessors? Say, 'Even though they do not possess [power over] anything, nor do they reason?'} [Az-Zumar: 43]. And they used to affirm that Allāh is the Creator of the heavens and the earth and the creator of the idols, as the Exalted said: {And if you asked them, 'Who created the heavens and the earth?' they would surely say, 'Allāh'} [Az-Zumar: 38]. And the Exalted said: {And most of them believe not in Allāh except while they associate others with Him} [Yūsuf: 106]. Ibn 'Abbās said: You ask them who created the heavens and the earth, and they say 'Allāh,' then they worship other than Him. And they used to say in their talbiyah: 'Labbayka lā sharīka lak, illā sharīkan huwa lak, tamlīkuhu wa mā malak' [Here I am at Your service, You have no partner, except a partner that belongs to You; You own him and whatever he owns]. This is why the Exalted said: {He presents to you an example from yourselves. Do you have among those whom your right hands possess any partners in what We have provided for you so that you are equal therein [and] would fear them as you fear yourselves [each other]?} [Ar-Rūm: 28].

These [proponents of waḥdat al-wujūd] are greater in disbelief from the aspect that they made the idol worshipper a worshipper of Allāh, not a worshipper of other than Him, and [claimed] that the idols are from Allāh like the limbs of a human are to the human and like the faculties of the soul are to the soul; whereas the idol worshippers acknowledged that they [idols] are other than Him and are created. And from the aspect that the idol worshippers among the Arabs used to affirm that the heavens and the earth have a Lord other than them Who created them, whereas these people, according to them, the heavens, the earth, and all other creatures do not have a Lord distinct from the heavens, the earth, and all other creatures; rather, the created is the Creator.

This is why he made the people of 'Ād and others among the disbelievers to be on a straight path, made them in the essence of closeness, and made the inhabitants of the Fire enjoy themselves in the Fire just as the inhabitants of Paradise enjoy themselves in Paradise. Yet it is known by necessity from the religion of Islam that the people of 'Ād, Thamūd, Fir'awn and his people, and all other disbelievers whose stories Allāh narrated are enemies of Allāh and that they will be punished in the Hereafter, and that Allāh cursed them and was angry with them. So whoever praises them and makes them among those brought near [to Allāh] and among the people of bliss is more disbelieving than the Jews and Christians in this respect.

This fatwā does not allow for elaborating on the speech of these people and explaining their disbelief and heresy, for they are of the same kind as the Qarmatians, the Bāṭiniyyah, and the Ismā'īliyyah, who were more disbelieving than the Jews and Christians, and their doctrine entails disbelief in all the Books and Messengers. As Shaykh Ibrāhīm Al-Ja'barī said when he met Ibn 'Arabī—the author of this book—he said: 'I saw him as an impure old man who denies every Book Allāh revealed and every Prophet Allāh sent.'

And the jurist Abū Muḥammad ibn 'Abd As-Salām—when he arrived in Cairo and they asked him about him—said: 'He is an evil, lying, reprehensible old man who believes in the eternity of the world and does not forbid any private part.' His statement, 'believes in the eternity of the world,' is because this is his [Ibn

‘Arabi’s] view, and this is well-known disbelief. So the jurist Abū Muḥammad declared him a disbeliever for that, and at that time his statement that the world is Allāh, and that the world is the form of Allāh and the identity of Allāh, had not yet become apparent—for this is greater than the disbelief of those who believe in the eternity of the world but affirm a Necessary Existent and say that possible existence emanated from Him. And those shaykhs who personally observed him said about him that he was a liar and a fabricator. And in his books—like *Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyyah* and similar works—there are lies that are not hidden from any intelligent person. This is despite him being closer to Islam than Ibn Sabʿīn, Al-Qūnawī, At-Tilimsānī, and their likes among his followers. So if the one who is closer [to Islam] holds this disbelief—which is greater than the disbelief of the Jews and Christians—then how about those who are further from Islam? And I have not described even a tenth of the disbelief they mention.

However, the affair of these people has become confused for those who do not know their condition, just as the affair of the Qarmatians/Bāṭiniyyah became confused when they claimed to be Fāṭimids and affiliated themselves with Shīʿism, so their followers became inclined towards them, unaware of their hidden disbelief. This is why those who inclined towards them were one of two types: either a heretical hypocrite or an ignorant, misguided person.

Likewise are these proponents of Ittīḥādiyyah: their leaders are imāms of disbelief whose execution is obligatory, and the repentance of none of them is accepted if caught before repenting, for they are among the worst *zanādiqah* (heretical hypocrites) who outwardly display Islam while inwardly concealing the greatest disbelief. These are the ones who understand their own doctrine and its opposition to the religion of the Muslims. Punishment is obligatory for everyone who associates with them, or defends them, or praises them, or venerates their books, or is known to help and assist them, or dislikes speaking against them, or starts making excuses for them, saying that this speech, one does not know what it is, or [making excuses for] the one who said he authored this book [based on a dream], and similar excuses which are only made by an ignorant person or a hypocrite. Rather, punishment is obligatory for everyone who knows their condition and does not help in taking action against them. For taking action against these people is one of the greatest obligations, because they have corrupted the intellects and religions of a multitude of shaykhs, scholars, kings, and princes, and they strive throughout the land causing corruption and hindering [people] from the path of Allāh.

Their harm in the religion is greater than the harm of those who corrupt the worldly affairs of the Muslims while leaving their religion, like highway robbers and the Tatars who take wealth from them but leave them their religion. And one who does not know them should not underestimate them, for their misguidance and leading astray is too great to describe. They resemble the Qarmatians/Bāṭiniyyah most closely. This is why they desire the state of the Tatars and prefer their victory over the Muslims—except for the common folk among their adherents and followers, who may not be aware of the reality of their affair. This is why they endorse the Jews and Christians in what they are upon, considering them to be upon truth, just as they consider idol worshippers to be upon truth. Each one of these [positions] is among the greatest forms of disbelief.

Whoever thinks well of them—and claims he does not know their condition—should be informed of their condition. If he does not then separate from them and openly show them denunciation, he is to be joined with them and counted among them.

As for one who says their words have an interpretation compatible with the Shari'ah, he is one of their leaders and imāms. For if he is intelligent, he knows his own lie in what he says. And if he believes this inwardly and outwardly, he is more disbelieving than the Christians. So whoever does not declare these people disbelievers and provides an interpretation for their words is further away from declaring the Christians disbelievers for the Trinity and Ittiḥād.

And Allāh knows best.



## The Reality Of The Doctrine Of Ittiḥādiyyah And Waḥdat Al-Wujūd

And Shaykh al-Islām Aḥmad ibn Taymiyyah—may Allāh sanctify his soul—said:  
In the name of Allāh, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful.

{All praise is for Allāh, Lord of the worlds,} {The Most Gracious, the Most Merciful,} {Master of the Day of Judgment.} [Al-Fātiḥah: 2-4] And I bear witness that there is no god but Allāh, the One, the Truth, the Manifest. And I bear witness that Muḥammad is His servant and His Messenger, the Seal of the Prophets (peace be upon him) with abundant peace, and upon all his brethren, the Messengers.

To proceed: Your letter has arrived, in which you seek clarification of the doctrine of these Ittiḥādiyyah and an explanation of its invalidity. And [you mentioned] that you had previously heard from me some explanation of the corruption of their doctrine, but time constrained you from completing the remainder of the explanation, and travel hastened you; until you saw among you some who support their doctrine, from those who affiliate themselves with the Path and Reality. Your letter found a receptive place with me and encountered a ready acceptance.

And I have written that which I hope Allāh will benefit the believers with and repel through it the harm of these heretics, the hypocrites, who deviate concerning the names of Allāh and His signs—the created ones and the revealed ones in His Clear Book, and [which] clarifies the difference between what the people of realization and certainty are upon—from the guided people of knowledge and recognition—and what these heretical hypocrites are upon, who imitate the recognizers, just as those who imitated the Prophets from among the false prophets imitated [them], just as they likened contrived poetry and the narrations of fabricators to the Word of Allāh, so that it becomes clear that these people are of the same kind as the disbelieving hypocrites, the apostates, the followers of Fir’awn and the Qarmatians / Bāṭīniyyah, and the companions of Musaylimah and Al-’Ansi and their likes among the fabricators. And [it becomes clear] that the people of knowledge and faith—the truthful, the martyrs, and the righteous, whether they are from the foremost, brought near [to Allāh], or from the moderate, companions of the right—are followers of Ibrāhīm Al-Khalīl, Mūsā Al-Kalīm, and Muḥammad, the one sent to all mankind.

Allāh has indeed differentiated in His Clear Book—which He made a judge between people concerning that wherein they differed of the truth—between truth and falsehood, guidance and misguidance, and believers and disbelievers. And the Exalted said: {Or do those who commit evils think We will make them like those who have believed and done righteous deeds—[make them] equal in

their life and their death? Evil is that which they judge!} [Al-Jāthiyah: 21]. And He said: {Or should We treat those who believe and do righteous deeds like corrupters in the land? Or should We treat the righteous like the wicked?} [Śād: 28]. And He said: {Then should We treat the Muslims like the criminals?} {What is [the matter] with you? How do you judge?} [Al-Qalam: 35-36].

And He has clarified the state of those who imitate the Prophets and the people of knowledge and faith from among the people of lies and wickedness, those upon whom things are confused and who confuse others. And He informed that they [too] have revelation and inspiration, but from the devils. So He said: {And indeed, the devils inspire their allies [among men] to dispute with you. And if you were to obey them, indeed, you would be polytheists.} [Al-An'ām: 121]. And the Exalted said: {Shall I inform you upon whom the devils descend?} {They descend upon every sinful liar.} [Ash-Shu'arā': 221-222]. And He informed that whoever apostatizes from the religion of Allāh, Allāh will inevitably bring forth in their place those who will establish His clear religion. So He said: {O you who have believed, whoever of you should revert from his religion—Allāh will bring forth [in place of them] a people He will love and who will love Him, [who are] humble toward the believers, powerful against the disbelievers; they strive in the cause of Allāh and do not fear the blame of a critic. That is the favor of Allāh; He bestows it upon whom He wills. And Allāh is all-Encompassing and Knowing.} [Al-Mā'idah: 54].

And that is because the doctrine of these heretics, in the speech they utter and the poetry they compose, lies between fabricated narration and contrived poetry. And it was to these two [types] that Abū Bakr Aṣ-Ṣiddiq alluded when 'Umar ibn Al-Khaṭṭāb, in some of what he addressed him with, said to him: 'O Khalīfah of the Messenger of Allāh, conciliate the people.' So he took hold of his beard and said: 'O Ibn Al-Khaṭṭāb! Are you a tyrant in Jāhiliyyah and weak-hearted in Islam?' 'Upon what basis should I conciliate them? Upon a fabricated narration? Or contrived poetry?' He means: I am not calling them to a fabricated narration like the 'Qur'ān' of Musaylimah, nor to contrived poetry like the poetry of Ṭulayḥah Al-Asadi.

And these two types are those with which the people of wickedness and clear fabrication oppose the Qur'ān. The Exalted said: {So I swear by what you see,} {And what you do not see,} {Indeed, it is the word of a noble Messenger.} {And it is not the word of a poet; little do you believe.} {Nor the word of a soothsayer; little do you remember.} {[It is] a revelation from the Lord of the worlds.} [Al-Ḥāqqah: 38-43]. And the Exalted said: {And indeed, it [the Qur'ān] is the revelation of the Lord of the worlds.} {The Trustworthy Spirit has brought it down} [Ash-Shu'arā': 192-193]... until His statement ... {And the devils have not brought it down} [Ash-Shu'arā': 210] until the end of the sūrah. So He mentioned in this sūrah the characteristic of the lying soothsayers and the misguided poets and declared it [the Qur'ān] free from these two types, just as in Sūrah Al-Ḥāqqah. And the Exalted said: {Indeed, it is the word of a noble messenger,} {[Who is] possessed of power and with the Owner of the Throne, secure [in position]} [At-Takwīr: 19-20] until the end of the sūrah. So the messenger here is Jibril, and in the first verse [Al-Ḥāqqah], it is Muḥammad (peace be upon him). Therefore, He exonerated Muḥammad there [in Al-Ḥāqqah] from being a poet or a soothsayer, and He exonerated here [in At-Takwīr] the messenger [Jibril] sent to him from being one of the devils.



## Understanding The Doctrine Of The Ittiḥādiyyah Is Sufficient To Show Its Corruption

Know—may Allāh guide you and direct you—that understanding the doctrine of these people is sufficient to show its corruption; with a proper understanding, it requires no other proof. Rather, the doubt arises because most people do not understand the reality of their statements and their intent, due to the vague and ambiguous terms within them. Moreover, they themselves also do not understand the reality of what they intend and say, and for this reason, they frequently contradict themselves in their statements. They merely profess something and say it, or they follow it.

And for this reason, they have indeed divided among themselves into sects, and they are not guided to distinguish between their sects, despite their awareness that they are divided. This is why when I explained to groups of their followers and their leaders the reality of their statements and the secret of their doctrine, they began to venerate that [explanation]. And were it not for the condemnation and refutation I coupled with it, they would have made me one of their imāms. And they would have offered me, out of the obedience of their souls and their wealth, what defies description, just as the Christians offer to their leaders, and the Ismā'īliyyah to their chiefs, and just as the people of Fir'awn offered to Fir'awn.

And everyone who accepts the statement of these people is one of two men: either ignorant of the reality of their affair, or unjust, desiring exaltation in the land and corruption, or combining both descriptions. And this is the state of the followers of Fir'awn, about whom Allāh said: {Thus he made light of [the intellects of] his people, and they obeyed him} [Az-Zukhruf: 54]. And the state of the Qarmatians with their leaders. And the state of the disbelievers and the hypocrites regarding their imāms who call to the Fire, and on the Day of Resurrection, they will not be helped. {Indeed, Allāh has cursed the disbelievers and prepared for them a Blaze}... until His statement ... {and curse them with a great curse} [Al-Aḥzāb: 64-68]. And the Exalted said: {And of the people are some who take other than Allāh as equals}... until His statement: {...nor will they emerge from the Fire} [Al-Baqarah: 165-167].



## The Reality Of The Doctrine Of Ittiḥādiyyah

The reality of the doctrine of these people is: that the existence of created beings is the very essence of the existence of Allāh the Exalted; their existence is not other than His, nor is there anything besides Him whatsoever. For this reason, whoever called them Ḥulūliyyah or said they are proponents of Ḥulūl, they considered him veiled from knowing their doctrine, outside of entering into the inner reality of their affair. This is because whoever says that Allāh indwells in the creatures has affirmed that the locus is other than the indweller. And this, according to them, is duality and an affirmation of two existences: one, the existence of the Truth, the Indweller; and the second, the existence of the creature, the locus. And they do not acknowledge the affirmation of two existences whatsoever.

And there is no doubt that this doctrine [of Ḥulūl] is lesser disbelief than their doctrine [of waḥdat al-wujūd]. It is the doctrine of many of the Jahmiyyah, whose views the Salaf used to refute, and they are the ones who claim that Allāh, in His very Essence, is in every place. Groups of the Imāms and the Salaf mentioned this [view] concerning the Jahmiyyah and declared them disbelievers for it. Indeed, a number of the Imāms—such as Ibn Al-Mubārak, Yūsuf ibn Asbāṭ, and a group of the people of knowledge and ḥadīth from the companions of [Imām] Aḥmad and others—considered them, due to this [belief], to be outside the seventy-two sects [of Islam]. And it is the doctrine of some of the theologians of the Jahmiyyah and many of their devout adherents.

And there is no doubt that the heresy of these later ones [the Ittiḥādiyyah], their adherence to Jahmī views, and their heretical hypocrisy is a derivation and completion of the heresy of these early Jahmiyyah, their adherence to Jahmī views, and their heretical hypocrisy.

As for the reason for naming them Ittiḥādiyyah, there are two explanations for it:

1. One explanation, they do not approve of, because Ittiḥād follows the pattern of iqtirān (joining), and iqtirān necessitates two things, one of which unites with the other, whereas they never acknowledge two existences.
2. The second explanation affirms the validity of this name, based on [the idea] that multiplicity became unity, as I will explain regarding their inconsistency. This approach [justifying the name] is either according to the doctrine of Ibn ‘Arabī, for he considers existence to be different from subsistence/affirmation and says that the existence (wujūd) of the Truth prevails over the subsistence (thubūt) of contingent beings, thus Ittiḥād (union) between existence and subsistence becomes valid. Or, according to the view of those who do not differentiate [between wujūd and thubūt], they say that the imaginary multiplicity becomes unity after the unveiling, or the real/essential multiplicity becomes absolute unity.



**Regarding What Is Built Upon The  
Foundation Of Their Doctrine: That The  
Existence Of Created Beings Is The Very  
Essence Of The Existence Of The Lord**

And since their fundamental principle, upon which they built, is: that the existence of created beings and manufactured things—even the existence of jinn, devils, disbelievers, sinners, dogs, pigs, impurities, disbelief, sinfulness, and disobedience—is the very essence of the existence of the Lord, not that it is distinct from Him or separate from His Essence, even though it is created by Him, under His lordship, made by Him, and sustained by Him.

And [since] they witness that in created beings there is apparent differentiation and multiplicity [perceived] by sense and intellect, they needed a unification that removes the multiplicity and a unity that lifts the differentiation, while [still] affirming its [apparent] existence. Thus, they fell into inconsistency regarding three positions.

I will explain them to you, even though they themselves—some of them—do not explain their own position or the position of others, due to their lack of complete witnessing and conceptualization of the truth.



## The First Position: The Position Of Ibn ‘Arabī, Author Of Fuṣūṣ Al-Ĥikam

And while it constitutes disbelief, he is the closest of them to Islam, due to the abundance of good statements found in his writings, and because he does not adhere firmly to al-Ittiḥād as consistently as others; rather, he is very inconsistent regarding it. Rather, he relies on his vast imagination, in which he imagines truth at times and falsehood at others. And Allāh knows best what [state] he died upon.

For his position is built upon two principles:

One of them: that the non-existent is a thing subsistent in non-existence, in agreement with those among the [Mu‘tazilah] and the [Rāfidāh] who said that. The first to innovate this position in Islam was Abū ‘Uthmān Ash-Shaḥḥām, the shaykh of Abū ‘Alī Al-Jubbā‘ī, and groups of the innovating [Qadariyyah] from the [Mu‘tazilah] and [Rāfidāh] followed him in it. These say that every non-existent whose existence is possible, indeed its reality, essence, and entity are subsistent in non-existence; because were it not for their subsistence, the known thing informed about would not be distinguished from the unknown thing informed about, and it would not be valid to intend that which one desires to bring into existence, because intention requires distinction, and distinction only occurs regarding something subsistent.

However, these [Mu‘tazilah], although they innovated this position—which is intrinsically false, and groups of Sunni theologians declared them disbelievers for it—they acknowledge that Allāh created their existence, and they do not say that the essence of their existence is the essence of the existence of the Truth. As for the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ and his followers, they say: The essence of their existence is the essence of the existence of the Truth. So they [contingent beings] are distinct through their essences which are subsistent in non-existence, [yet] united with the existence of the Truth which subsists in them. Most of his speech is based on this for whoever reflects upon it and understands it. And Ibn ‘Arabī, by positing the essences as subsistent [in eternity], necessitates the [eternal] existence of every contingent being, and this is not the position of the [Mu‘tazilah]. So this is a third difference.

And these proponents of [the view] that the non-existent is a thing subsistent in non-existence—whether they say its existence is a creation of Allāh or it is Allāh—say that the essences and entities are not made nor created, and that the existence of everything is an additional measure beyond its essence. And they may say existence is an attribute of the existent.

And this statement, although it bears resemblance to the statement of the proponents of the eternity of the world, or the proponents of the eternity of the world’s matter and its prime matter which is distinct from its form, it is not

identical to it, even if there is a shared element between them. For these originated forms of animals, plants, and minerals are not eternal by the consensus of all rational people; rather, they come into being after not having been. Likewise, the attributes and accidents subsisting in the bodies of the heavens, and the transformations occurring in the elements—such as the movements of the planets, the sun, the moon, the clouds, rain, thunder, lightning, and so forth—all of this is originated, not eternal, according to everyone with sound senses; for one sees that with one’s own eyes. And those who say that the essence of the non-existent is subsistent in eternity, or that its matter is eternal, say that the essences of all these things are subsistent in eternity, and they say that the matter of the entire universe is eternal, but not its forms.

Know that when a doctrine is intrinsically false, its critic cannot convey it in a way that allows for a true conception; for this [true conception] is only possible for the truth. As for the false statement, when it is explained, its very explanation reveals its corruption, such that it is said, ‘How did this become dubious to anyone?’ and one marvels at their belief in it. And a person should not marvel, for there is nothing imaginable of the types of falsehood but that a group of people has adopted it. This is why Allāh described the people of falsehood as dead, and as {deaf, dumb, blind} [Al-Baqarah: 18], and that they {do not understand}, and that they {do not reason} [Al-Anfāl: 22], and that they {certainly in differing speech} [Adh-Dhāriyāt: 8], {Turned away therefrom is he who is turned away} [Adh-Dhāriyāt: 9], and that they {in their doubt are wavering} [At-Tawbah: 45], and that they {wander blindly} [Al-Baqarah: 15].

Rather, the confusion arose—and Allāh knows best—for these people because they saw that Allāh—Glorified is He—knows what has not yet occurred before its occurrence, or [as He says] {His command is only when He intends a thing that He says to it, ‘Be,’ and it is} [Yā-Sīn: 82]. So they perceived that the non-existent which He creates is distinguished in His knowledge, will, and power, so they assumed this was due to the distinction of a subsistent essence belonging to it. But the matter is not so. Rather, it is distinguished in Allāh’s knowledge and His Book. And one of us knows the existent, the non-existent possible, and the non-existent impossible; and knows what has been, like Ādam and the Prophets; and knows what will be, like the Resurrection and the Reckoning; and knows what did not happen, [but] if it had happened, how it would have occurred, just as one knows what Allāh informed about the people of the Fire: {But if they were returned, they would return to that which they were forbidden} [Al-An’ām: 28], and that {And if Allāh had known any good in them, He would have made them hear} [Al-Anfāl: 23], and that {Had there been within them [i.e., the heavens and earth] gods besides Allāh, they both would have been ruined} [Al-Anbiyā’: 22], and that {If there had been with Him [other] gods, as they say, then they [each] would have sought to the Owner of the Throne a way} [Al-Isrā’: 42], and that {Had they gone forth among you, they would not have increased you except in confusion} [At-Tawbah: 47], and that {And if not for the favor of Allāh upon you and His mercy, not one of you would have been pure, ever} [An-Nūr: 21], and similar conditional sentences where the negation or affirmation of the condition is known.

So these matters which we know and conceive—whether we negate them, affirm their external existence, or remain undecided—our mere conception of

them does not grant their essences subsistence externally, outside our knowledge and minds, just as we conceive a mountain of ruby, a sea of mercury, a human of gold, and a horse of stone. So the subsistence of a thing in knowledge and decree is not the subsistence of its essence externally. Rather, the knower knows the thing, speaks of it, and writes it, while its essence has no subsistence nor existence externally at all.

And this is the prior decree of Allāh for His creation, as in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim from ‘Abdullāh ibn ‘Amr from the Prophet (peace be upon him) who said: {Indeed, Allāh wrote the decrees of the creatures fifty thousand years before He created the heavens and the earth.}

And in Sunan Abī Dāwūd from ‘Ubādah ibn Aṣ-Ṣāmit from the Prophet (peace be upon him) who said: {The first thing Allāh created was the Pen. He said to it, ‘Write.’ It said, ‘My Lord, what shall I write?’ He said, ‘Write what is to be until the Day of Resurrection.’}

And Ibn ‘Abbās said: ‘Indeed, Allāh created the creation and knew what they would do. Then He said to His knowledge, ‘Be a book,’ and it became a book. Then He revealed the confirmation of that in His Book, saying: {Do you not know that Allāh knows what is in the heaven and earth? Indeed, that is in a Record} [Al-Ḥajj: 70].’

And this is the meaning of the ḥadīth narrated by Aḥmad in his Musnad {from Maysarah Al-Fajr, who said: I said, ‘O Messenger of Allāh, when were you [made] a prophet?’} And in a narration {When were you written as a prophet?—He said: While Ādam was between the spirit and the body.} This is the wording of the authentic ḥadīth. As for what these ignorant ones narrate—like Ibn ‘Arabī in Al-Fuṣūṣ and others among the ignorant common folk: {I was a prophet while Ādam was between water and clay; I was a prophet while Ādam was neither water nor clay}—this has no basis and was not narrated by any of the truthful scholars, nor is it found in any of the reliable books of knowledge with this wording. Rather, it is false, for Ādam was never ‘between water and clay.’ For Allāh created him from dust, mixed the dust with water until it became clay, and dried the clay until it became sounding clay like pottery. So he had no state ‘between water and clay,’ composed of water and clay. And if it were said ‘between water and dust,’ it would be further from impossibility, although this state has no particular significance. Rather, he said {between the spirit and the body} and he said {And indeed Ādam was cast down in his clay} because Ādam’s body remained for forty years before the spirit was breathed into him, as the Exalted said: {Has there [not] come upon man a period of time...} [Al-Insān: 1] the verse. And the Exalted said: {And [mention, O Muḥammad], when your Lord said to the angels, ‘Indeed, I am creating a human being from sounding clay...’} [Al-Ḥijr: 28-29] the two verses. And the Exalted said: {Who perfected everything which He created and began the creation of man from clay} [As-Sajdah: 7] the two verses. And the Exalted said: {When your Lord said to the angels, ‘Indeed, I am creating a human being from clay’} [Ṣād: 71] the verse. And the narrations about the creation of Ādam and the breathing of the spirit into him are well-known in the books of ḥadīth, tafsīr, and others.

So he (peace be upon him) informed {that he was a prophet—meaning, written as a prophet—while Ādam was between the spirit and the body}. And this—and Allāh knows best—is because in this state, the decree that is [executed] by

the hands of the angels of creation is determined. So it is decreed for them, becomes apparent to them, and what will come from the creature is written before the spirit is breathed into it, as the two Shaykhs [Al-Bukhārī and Muslim] reported in the two Ṣaḥīḥs, and in the rest of the major books: the ḥadīth of the truthful, the believed one, which is among the widely transmitted narrations that the people of knowledge have received with acceptance and upon whose authenticity they have agreed; which is the ḥadīth of Al-A'mash from Zayd ibn Wahb from 'Abdullāh ibn Mas'ūd who said: The Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him)—and he is the truthful, the believed one—narrated to us: 'Indeed, the creation of one of you is gathered in his mother's womb for forty days as a *nutfah* (drop of sperm), then he becomes an *'alaqah* (clot) for a similar period, then he becomes a *mudghah* (lump of flesh) for a similar period. Then Allāh sends the angel, and he is commanded with four words. It is said: 'Write his provision, his lifespan, his deeds, and whether he is wretched or happy.' Then the spirit is breathed into him.—And he said—{By the One in Whose Hand my soul is, indeed one of you performs the deeds of the people of Paradise until there is but an arm's length between him and it, then the decree overtakes him, and he performs the deeds of the people of the Fire, and thus enters the Fire. And indeed one of you performs the deeds of the people of the Fire until there is but an arm's length between him and it, then the decree overtakes him, and he performs the deeds of the people of Paradise, and thus enters Paradise.' [Al-Bukhārī: 3208, Muslim: 2643]

So when the truthful, the believed one, informed that the angel writes his provision, deeds, lifespan, and whether he is wretched or happy after the creation of the body and before the breathing of the spirit, and Ādam is the father of mankind, it was also appropriate for this that what would come from him be written after the creation of his body and before the breathing of the spirit into it. And Muḥammad (peace be upon him) is the master of the children of Ādam; so he is the greatest of the progeny in rank and the highest of them in mention. So he (peace be upon him) informed that he was written as a prophet at that time. And the writing of his prophethood is the meaning of the 'being' of his prophethood; for it is a 'being' in the written decree, not a 'being' in actual existence, since his prophethood did not come into existence until Allāh made him a prophet at the age of forty years (peace be upon him), as the Exalted said to him: {And thus We have revealed to you an inspiration of Our command...} [Ash-Shūrā: 52] the verse. And He said: {Did He not find you an orphan and give [you] refuge?} [Ad-Ḍuḥā: 6] the verse. And He said: {We relate to you the best of stories...} [Yūsuf: 3] the verse.

Therefore, this meaning came explained in the ḥadīth of Al-'Irbād' ibn Sāriyah from the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) that he said: {Indeed, I am the servant of Allāh, written as the Seal of the Prophets, while Ādam was certainly cast down in his clay. And I will inform you about the beginning of my affair: the supplication of Ibrāhīm, the glad tidings of 'Īsā, and the vision of my mother which she saw when she gave birth to me, and a light came forth for her from which the palaces of Syria illuminated for her.} This is the wording of the ḥadīth from the narration of Ibn Wahb. Mu'āwiyah ibn Ṣālīḥ narrated to us from Sa'd ibn Suwayd from 'Abd al-A'lā ibn Hilāl As-Sulamī from Al-'Irbād'. Al-Baghawī narrated it in Sharḥ As-Sunnah like this. And Al-Layth ibn Sa'd narrated from him similarly. And Imām Aḥmad narrated it in the Musnad from Ibn Maḥdī:

Mu'āwiyah ibn Ṣāliḥ narrated to us with the chain from Al-'Irbād' who said: The Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) said: {Indeed, I am the servant of Allāh, the Seal of the Prophets, while Ādam was certainly cast down in his clay. And I shall inform you about the beginning of that: the supplication of my father Ibrāhīm, the glad tidings of 'Isā, and the vision of my mother which she saw—and likewise the mothers of the Prophets see.} And his statement {cast down in his clay} means wrapped up and thrown upon the face of the earth, a form of clay into which the spirit had not yet flowed.

And it has been narrated {that Allāh wrote his name upon the Throne and upon what is in Paradise of doors, domes, and leaves.} And several reports have been narrated concerning that which agree with these established narrations that show the honoring of his name and the exaltation of his mention at that time.

And the wording of the ḥadīth in the Musnad from Maysarah Al-Fajr has preceded, when {it was said to him, 'When were you [made] a prophet?' He said, 'While Ādam was between the spirit and the body.} And Abū Al-Ḥusayn ibn Bishrān narrated it through the chain of Shaykh Abū Al-Faraj ibn Al-Jawzī in Al-Wafā bi Fadā'il Al-Muṣṭafā: Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Amr narrated to us, Aḥmad ibn Ishāq ibn Ṣāliḥ narrated to us, Muḥammad ibn Ṣāliḥ narrated to us, Muḥammad ibn Sinān Al-'Awfī narrated to us, Ibrāhīm ibn Ṭahmān narrated to us from Yazīd ibn Maysarah from 'Abdullāh ibn Sufyān from {Maysarah who said: I said, 'O Messenger of Allāh, when were you [made] a prophet?' He said: 'When Allāh created the earth and turned Himself towards the heaven and proportioned them as seven heavens, and created the Throne: He wrote upon the leg of the Throne: Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh, Seal of the Prophets. And Allāh created the Paradise which He made Ādam and Ḥawwā' inhabit, so He wrote my name upon the doors, the leaves, the domes, and the tents, while Ādam was between the spirit and the body. Then when Allāh the Exalted gave him life, he looked towards the Throne and saw my name, so Allāh informed him that he [Muḥammad] is the master of your children. Then when the devil deceived them both, they repented and sought intercession through my name to Him.}

And Abū Nu'aym Al-Ḥāfiẓ narrated in the book Dalā'il An-Nubuwwah: And through the chain of Shaykh Abū Al-Faraj: Sulaymān ibn Aḥmad narrated to us, Aḥmad ibn Rushdīn narrated to us, Aḥmad ibn Sa'īd Al-Fihri narrated to us, 'Abdullāh ibn Ismā'il Al-Madanī narrated to us from 'Abd Ar-Rahmān ibn Zayd ibn Aslam from his father from 'Umar ibn Al-Khaṭṭāb who said: The Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) said: {When Ādam committed the error, he raised his head and said, 'O Lord, by the right of Muḥammad, forgive me.' So He revealed to him, 'And what is Muḥammad? And who is Muḥammad?' He said, 'O Lord, indeed when You completed my creation, I raised my head towards Your Throne, and thereupon was written: Lā ilāha illā Allāh, Muḥammad Rasūl Allāh. So I knew that he is the most honored of Your creation to You, since You joined his name with Your name.' He [Allāh] said, 'Yes, I have forgiven you. And he is the last of the Prophets from your progeny, and were it not for him, I would not have created you.} So this ḥadīth supports the one before it, and they are like an explanation for the authentic narrations.

And in the two Ṣaḥīḥs from 'Ā'ishah, she said: {The first [form] with which the revelation to the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) began was the true

vision. He would not see any vision except that it came like the breaking of dawn. Then seclusion was made beloved to him; so he used to go to the cave of Ĥirā' and engage in taĥannuth therein—which is worship—for a number of nights before returning to his family, taking provisions for that. Then he would return to Khadījah and take provisions for a similar period, until the Truth came upon him suddenly while he was in Ĥirā'. The angel came to him and said to him, 'Read!' He said, 'I am not a reader.' He [the Prophet] said: 'So he took me and pressed me until I reached my limit of exhaustion, then he released me and said, 'Read!' I said, 'I am not a reader.' He said: 'So he took me and pressed me until I reached my limit of exhaustion, then he released me and said, 'Read!' I said, 'I am not a reader.' Then he took me and pressed me until I reached my limit of exhaustion, then he released me; and said: {Read in the name of your Lord who created,} {Created man from a clinging clot} [Al-'Alaq: 1-2]. So the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) returned with it, his shoulder muscles trembling...'} the ḥadīth in its entirety. [Al-Bukhārī: 3, Muslim: 160]

He has informed in this authentic ḥadīth that he was not a reader. And this sūrah was the first thing Allāh revealed to him, and through it he became a prophet. Then He revealed Sūrah Al-Muddaththir to him, and through it he became a messenger because of His statement: {Arise and warn} [Al-Muddaththir: 2]. Therefore, the Glorified mentioned in this sūrah [Al-'Alaq] the real existence and the knowledge-based existence. And this is a clear matter that a person comprehends with his heart, not needing revelation for it, for a thing does not exist before its existence.

As for things being known to Allāh before their existence: this is true, without doubt. Likewise, their being written with Him or with His angels, as the Book and the Sunnah have indicated, and the reports have conveyed. And this knowledge and writing is the Decree which the extremists among the [Qadariyyah] deny, claiming that Allāh does not know the actions of the servants except after their occurrence. They are disbelievers, declared as such by the Imāms like Ash-Shāfi'ī, Ahmad, and others. The Book and the Sunnah have explained this Decree, and the Prophet (peace be upon him) answered the question posed about it, which is abandoning action because of it. The Prophet (peace be upon him) answered regarding that.

So in the two Ṣaḥīḥs from {'Alī ibn Abī Tālib, he said: We were at a funeral in Baqī' Al-Gharqad when the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) came to us. He sat down, and we sat around him. He had a small stick with him. He lowered his head and began to poke [the ground] with his stick. Then he said: 'There is none among you'—or he said—'There is no soul brought into existence except that Allāh has written its place in Paradise or the Fire, and except that it has been written as wretched or happy.' He [Alī] said: So a man said: 'O Messenger of Allāh, should we not then rely on our book and abandon action? For whoever is among the people of happiness will proceed to the action of the people of happiness, and whoever is among the people of wretchedness will proceed to the action of the people of wretchedness?' He said: 'Act, for everyone is facilitated: As for the people of happiness, they are facilitated towards the action of the people of happiness. And as for the people of wretchedness, they are facilitated towards the action of the people of wretchedness.'—Then he recited: {As for he who gives and fears Allāh...} until the end of the verses [Al-Layl: 5-10].} [Al-Bukhārī: 4949, Muslim: 2647] And in another narration: {The Messenger of

Allāh (peace be upon him) was sitting one day, and in his hand was a stick with which he was poking the ground. He raised his head and said: 'There is not one soul among you except that its station in Paradise and the Fire has been known.' They said: 'O Messenger of Allāh, then what is the point of action? Should we not rely [on the decree]?' He said: 'No. Act, for everyone is facilitated towards that for which he was created.'—Then he recited: {As for he who gives...} [Al-Layl: 5] the verse.} [Al-Bukhāri: 4945]

And in the two Ṣāḥīḥs also from 'Imrān ibn Ḥuṣayn, he said: {It was said, 'O Messenger of Allāh, are the people of Paradise known from the people of the Fire?' He said, 'Yes.' It was said: 'Then what is the point of the actions of the actors?' He said: 'Everyone is facilitated towards that for which he was created.} [Al-Bukhāri: 6596, Muslim: 2649] And in a narration: {That two men from Muzaynah came to the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) and said: 'O Messenger of Allāh, consider what people do today and strive in—is it something decreed upon them and passed concerning them from a decree that has preceded, or is it concerning what they will face from that which their Prophet brought them and upon which the proof has been established against them?' He said: 'No. Rather, it is something decreed upon them and passed concerning them. And the confirmation of that is in the Book of Allāh: {And [by] the soul and He who proportioned it,} {And inspired it [with discernment of] its wickedness and its righteousness} [Ash-Shams: 7-8].}'

And in Ṣāḥīḥ Muslim from Jābir ibn 'Abdullāh, he said: {Surāqah ibn Mālik ibn Ju'shum came and said: 'O Messenger of Allāh, explain our religion to us as if we were created now. Concerning what is the action today? Is it concerning that with which the pens have dried and the decrees have run? Or concerning what is yet to come?' He said: 'No, rather concerning that with which the pens have dried and the decrees have run.' He [Surāqah] said: 'Then what is the point of action?' He said: 'Act, for everyone is facilitated.}'

And in Ṣāḥīḥ Muslim {from 'Abdullāh ibn 'Amr, he said: I heard the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) say: 'Allāh wrote the decrees of creation fifty thousand years before He created the heavens and the earth.'—He said: 'And His Throne was upon the water.}'

And in Sunan Abī Dāwūd from 'Ubādah ibn Aṣ-Ṣāmit that he said to his son: 'O my son, you will never find the taste of the reality of faith until you know that what afflicted you was not meant to miss you, and what missed you was not meant to afflict you. I heard the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) say: {Indeed, the first thing Allāh created was the Pen. He said to it: 'Write.' It said: 'My Lord, what shall I write?' He said: 'Write the decrees of everything until the Hour is established.}' O my son, I heard the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) say: {Whoever dies upon other than this is not from me.} And At-Tirmidhī narrated it through another route from Al-Walīd ibn 'Ubādah that he said: He—meaning his father—called me at the time of death and said: 'O my son, fear Allāh and know that if you fear Allāh, you believe in Allāh and you believe in the Decree, all of it, its good and its bad. And if you die upon other than this, you will enter the Fire. Indeed, I heard the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) say: {Indeed, the first thing Allāh created was the Pen. He said: 'Write.' It said: 'What shall I write?' He said: 'Write the Decree, what has been and what will be until eternity.}'

And in At-Tirmidhī also from Abū Khuzāmah from his father that a man came to the Prophet (peace be upon him) and said: ‘Consider ruqyah we seek, medicine we use for treatment, and precautions we take—do they repel anything from the Decree of Allāh the Exalted?’ He said: ‘They are part of the Decree of Allāh.’}

However, [this writing] is only established in the decree for the non-existent possible which will come into being. As for the non-existent possible which will not come into being—such as admitting the believers into the Fire, establishing the Resurrection before its time, turning mountains into rubies, and the like—this non-existent is possible, and it is a ‘thing subsistent in non-existence’ according to those who say ‘the non-existent is a thing.’ Despite this, its occurrence is not decreed, and Allāh knows it as it is: He knows that it is possible and that it will not occur. Likewise, the impossibilities, such as a partner for the Creator or His son—for Allāh knows that {He neither begets nor is born,} {Nor is there to Him any equivalent} [Al-Ikhlâs: 3-4], and He knows He has no partner in dominion nor any protector out of weakness, and He knows He is the Living, the Sustainer {Neither drowsiness overtakes Him nor sleep} [Al-Baqarah: 255], and He knows that {Not absent from Him is an atom’s weight within the heavens or within the earth} [Saba’: 3]. And these non-existent impossibilities are not ‘things’ by the consensus of rational people, despite their subsistence in knowledge. So it becomes clear that what does not exist and what is impossible to exist can [still] subsist in knowledge, as knowledge is vast. So if someone expands [the meaning] and says, ‘The non-existent is a thing in knowledge,’ or ‘existent in knowledge,’ or ‘subsistent in knowledge,’ then this is correct. But [to say] that it is a thing in itself—this is false. And through this, the doubt arising in this matter is removed.

And what Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamā’ah and the generality of rational human beings from all groups are upon is: that the non-existent is not a thing in itself, and that its subsistence, existence, and occurrence are one and the same thing. The Book, the Sunnah, and the early consensus have indicated this. Allāh the Exalted said to Zakariyyā: {and I created you before, when you were not a thing} [Maryam: 9]. So He informed that he was not a thing. And the Exalted said: {Does man not remember that We created him before, while he was not a thing?} [Maryam: 67]. And the Exalted said: {Or were they created by nothing, or were they the creators [of themselves]?} [At-Ťūr: 35].

So He condemned their belief that they could have been created from ‘non-thing’ that created them, or that they created themselves. This is why Jubayr ibn Mu’im said: When I heard the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) recite this sūrah, I felt my heart was about to split. And if the non-existent were a ‘thing,’ the condemnation would not be complete, as it would be permissible to say: They were only created from a ‘thing,’ but it is non-existent. Thus, their creator would be a non-existent ‘thing.’

And the Exalted said: {Those will enter Paradise, and they will not be wronged at all} [Maryam: 60]. If the non-existent were a ‘thing,’ the meaning would be: they will not be wronged [by diminishing] an existent thing or a non-existent thing. And it is inconceivable that they could be wronged [regarding] the non-existent, for it does not belong to them. As for His statement {Indeed, the earthquake of the Hour is a tremendous thing} [Al-Ĥajj: 1], it is informing about

the earthquake when it occurs that it is a tremendous thing, not informing about the earthquake in its current [non-existent] state. This is why He said: {On the Day you see it, every nursing mother will be distracted from that [child] she was nursing} [Al-Fajj: 2]. And if 'the Hour' itself were intended [by 'thing'], the meaning would be that it is a tremendous thing in knowledge and decree.

His statement, the Exalted: {Our word to a thing when We intend it is only that We say to it, 'Be,' and it is} [An-Nah: 40]—those who say 'the non-existent is a thing' have used it as evidence, but it is proof against them. Because He informed that He intends the 'thing' and that He brings it into being. According to them, it is [already] subsistent in non-existence, and only its existence is intended, not its essence and self. But the Qur'an informed that its self is intended and comes into being. And this is one of the ramifications of this issue.

For what Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah and the generality of rational people are upon is that essences are made, and that the essence of everything is the very same as its existence, and that the existence of a thing is not an additional measure beyond its essence. Rather, there is nothing externally except the thing which is the thing, and it is its essence, its self, its essence, and its reality. And its existence and subsistence externally are not additional to that.

Those [opponents] say existence is an additional measure beyond the essence, and they say essences are not made, and they say the existence of everything is additional to its essence. And among the philosophers are those who differentiate between existence regarding the Necessary and the contingent, saying: The Necessary Existence is identical to the essence, but contingent existence is additional to the essence.

The doubt of these people is what was mentioned previously: that a person may know the essence of a thing but not know its existence, and that existence is common among existents, while the essence of each thing is specific to it. Whoever reflects will discern the reality of the matter. For we have explained the difference between knowledge-based existence and real/external existence. And this difference holds true for existence, essence, subsistence, essence, and so forth. So the subsistence of these matters in knowledge, writing, and speech is not their subsistence externally, outside of that—which is the subsistence of their reality and essence which is what it is. So when a person conceives an essence, he has known its mental existence, but this does not necessitate the real, external existence. So the statement of the one who says: 'I have conceived the reality, essence, self, and quiddity of the thing, but I did not know its existence'—[means] its knowledge-based existence occurred, but its real, external existence did not occur, and its real essence, its real entity, its real, external self was not known. So there is no difference between the word 'existence' and the word 'essence' except that one word may be used to refer to the mental and the other to the external. So the difference comes from the aspect of the locus, not from the aspect of essence and existence.

As for their statement: 'Existence is common, but reality has no commonality in it'—the response concerning it is likewise. For the specific existence found externally has no commonality in it, just as the specific reality found externally has no commonality in it. Rather, knowledge perceives the common existent just as it perceives the common essence. So the common [element] has its subsistence in the mind, not externally. And what is external has absolutely no

commonality in it. If the mind perceives the specific essence existing externally, there is no commonality in it. Commonality only exists in the absolute, general matters it perceives. And there is nothing external that is absolute and general with the description of absoluteness and generality. Rather, what is [found] therein is the absolute without the condition of absoluteness, and that is only found externally as something specific.

So the rational person should differentiate between the subsistence and existence of a thing in itself and its subsistence and existence in knowledge. For the former is the real, external existence. As for the latter, it is called mental existence and knowledge-based existence. And there is nothing except that it has these two subsistences. Knowledge is expressed through utterance, and the utterance is written with script. So everything comes to have four levels: existence in external reality, existence in minds, existence on the tongue, and existence in writing/fingertips—real/external existence, knowledge-based existence, verbal existence, and written existence.

This is why the first thing Allāh revealed to His Prophet was the sūrah: {Read in the name of your Lord who created} [Al-'Alaq: 1]. He mentioned both types therein. So He said: {Read in the name of your Lord who created,} {Created man from a clinging clot} [Al-'Alaq: 1-2]. So He mentioned all created beings with their real/external existence generally, then specifically—He specified man with creation after having generalized others. Then He said: {Read, and your Lord is the most Generous,} {Who taught by the pen,} {Taught man that which he knew not} [Al-'Alaq: 3-5]. So He specified the teaching for man after generalizing the teaching by the Pen. And He mentioned the Pen because teaching by the Pen is writing, and it necessitates the teaching of utterance, for the script corresponds to it. And the teaching of utterance is clarification, and it necessitates the teaching of knowledge, because the expression corresponds to the meaning.

So His teaching by the Pen came to necessitate the three levels: verbal, knowledge-based, and written. This is contrary to if He had mentioned teaching absolutely, or mentioned the teaching of knowledge only, as that would not encompass the levels. So He mentioned in this sūrah the real/external existence and the knowledge-based existence, and that Allāh, Glorified is He, is the Giver of both. So He is the Creator of the creation and the Creator of man, and He is the Teacher by the Pen and the Teacher of man.

As for affirming the existence of a thing externally before its existence, this is a matter whose corruption is known through reason and revelation, and it contradicts the Book, the Sunnah, and the consensus.



## **Regarding Ibn 'Arabī's Statement That The Existence Of The Essences Is The Very Self And Essence Of The Existence Of The Truth, And The Invalidity Of That**

So this is one of the two principles of Ibn 'Arabī. As for the other principle, it is their statement that the existence of the essences is the very self and essence of the existence of the Truth. And in this, they stand alone from all affirmers of the Maker among the Muslims, Jews, Christians, Magians, and polytheists. Rather, it is the reality of the statement of Fir'awn and the Qarmatians, the deniers of the Maker's existence, as we shall explain, if Allāh wills.

So whoever understands this understands all of Ibn 'Arabī's speech, his poetry and prose, and what he claims, such as that the Truth is nourished by the creation, because the existence of the essences is nourished by the essences subsistent in non-existence. And for this reason, he speaks of unification from the aspect of existence and differentiation from the aspect of essence and entities. And he claims that this is the secret of the Decree, because the essences only accept what is subsistent for them in non-existence within themselves. So it is they [the essences] that did good and did evil, were praised and were blamed, and the Truth did not give them anything except what they were upon in the state of non-existence.

So reflect upon his speech, how it comprises two things: denial of the existence of the Truth, and denial of His creation of His creatures. So he is a denier of the Lord who created, thus acknowledging neither a Lord nor a creation, and a denier of the Lord of the worlds, so [there is] neither a Lord nor worlds under lordship, since there are only subsistent essences and an existence subsisting in them. So neither are the essences under lordship, nor is the existence under lordship; neither are the essences created, nor is the existence created.

And this [view] differentiates between the manifestations and the Manifest, and the locus of manifestation and that which is manifested, because the manifestations, according to him, are the essences subsistent in non-existence, whereas the Manifest is the existence of the creation.



## **Regarding The View Of Aš-Šadr Al-Fakhr Ar-Rūmī, Who Did'nt Hold Existence To Be Additional To Essence, And His Statement In Which He Explicitly Stated Disbelief**

As for his companion Aš-Šadr Al-Fakhr Ar-Rūmī, he does not say that existence is additional to essence, for he was more deeply involved in speculation and kalām than his shaykh [Ibn 'Arabī], but he was more disbelieving and possessed less knowledge and faith, and less knowledge of Islam and the speech of the Shaykhs. And since their doctrine was disbelief, everyone who became proficient in it became more disbelieving.

So when he saw that differentiating between the existence of things and their essences was untenable, and [since] according to him Allāh is existence, and there must be some distinction between this and that, he distinguished between the absolute and the specific/determined. So according to him, Allāh is Absolute Existence which is not determined nor distinguished, and that when it becomes determined and distinguished, it is the creation, whether it becomes determined at the level of divinity or otherwise.

And this statement explicitly declares disbelief more than the first [Ibn 'Arabī's view], and it is the reality of the doctrine of Fir'awn and the Qarmatians, even though the first [view] is more corrupt from the aspect of its differentiation between the existence of things and their subsistence. That is because, according to the first view, it is possible to posit an existence for the Truth external to the essences of contingent beings, and that it emanated upon them, so it contains an acknowledgment of the existence of the Lord, the Self-Subsistent, the Independent of His creation—even though it contains disbelief from the aspect that it made the created the Creator and the one under lordship the Lord; indeed, it did not affirm creation at all. Despite this, I have not seen him [Ibn 'Arabī] explicitly state the existence of the Lord as distinct from the existence subsisting in the essences of contingent beings.

As for this one [Ar-Rūmī], he explicitly stated that there is nothing besides Absolute Existence pervading the specific/determined existents. And the absolute does not have an absolute existence [externally]; for there is no absolute body externally conditional upon being absolute, nor an absolute human, nor an absolute animal conditional upon being absolute. Rather, [it] is only found in something specific/determined.

Realities have three considerations: generality, particularity, and absoluteness.

So if we say: general animal, or general human, or general body, or general existence, this only exists in knowledge and language. As for what is external to that, there is no existing thing externally that encompasses two [distinct] things.

This is why generality is among the contingent attributes of the attributes of the living. So it is said: general knowledge, general will, general anger, general report, general command. And the possessor of the attribute is also described with generality, as in the ḥadīth in Sunan Abi Dāwūd {that the Prophet (peace be upon him) passed by 'Alī while he was supplicating, and he said: 'O 'Alī, make it general, for the virtue of generality over particularity is like the virtue of the heaven over the earth.' And in the ḥadīth that {when His statement was revealed: {And warn your nearest kindred} [Ash-Shu'arā': 214], he generalized and particularized.} Narrated by Muslim from the ḥadīth of Mūsā ibn Ṭālib from Abū Hurayrah. And the attribute is described with generality, as in the ḥadīth of the Tashahhud: {Peace be upon us and upon the righteous servants of Allāh. For if you say that, it will indeed reach every righteous servant of Allāh in the heaven and the earth.} [Al-Bukhārī: 831, Muslim: 402] As for the absolute statement of those who say that generality is only among the contingent attributes of words, it is not so, as the meanings of the words subsisting in the heart are more entitled to generality than the words; and the rest of the attributes like will, love, hatred, anger, and pleasure are subject to generality and particularity just as speech is. Rather, the meanings external to the mind are those existing externally, like their saying: general rain, general fertility; these are what people disputed about: is describing them with generality literal or metaphorical? There are two views: (One) It is metaphorical because every part of the rain and fertility does not fall except where the other falls [i.e., specific locations], so there is no generality there. (And it was said) Rather, it is literal because the absolute rain has become general.

As for particularity, it applies to them [realities] when they exist externally, for everything has an essence and entity specific to it, by which it is distinguished from others—I mean the real, individual reality in which there is no commonality, like: this man, this grain, this dirham. And what applies to it externally also applies to it in the mind. For the conception of the mental is wider than the external realities, as it includes the existent, the non-existent, the impossible, and the decreed matters.

As for absoluteness, it undoubtedly applies to them [realities] when they are in the mind, for the intellect conceives an absolute human and absolute existence. But externally, can anything absolute be conceived? There are two views on this. It is said: The absolute has existence externally, for it is part of the specific/determined. And it is said: It has no existence externally, since there is nothing external except the specific/determined, restricted, and the absolute in which number [i.e., multiple instances] shares cannot be part of the specific/determined in which nothing shares with it.

The verification is: that the absolute without any condition includes the restricted, specific/determined. As for the absolute conditional upon being absolute, the specific/determined, restricted does not enter into it. This is like when the jurists say: absolute water, for it is conditional upon being absolute, so mixed water does not enter into it. As for the absolute without condition, mixed water enters into it. So if we say: Water is divided into three categories: purifying, pure, and impure, the three are categories of water. The purifying is the absolute water, into which that which is not purifying, like juices and impure waters, does not enter. So the water being divided is the absolute without condition, and the water which is a counterpart to the [other] two waters is the absolute

conditional upon being absolute.

However, this absoluteness and restriction which the jurists mentioned regarding the name 'water' pertains only to linguistic absoluteness and restriction—meaning what enters into the absolute term, like the word 'water,' or into the restricted term, like the words 'impure water' or 'rose water.' As for what our discussion was initially about, it is absoluteness and restriction in the meanings of the words. So there is a difference between the two types, for people make very many mistakes due to not differentiating between these two.

That is because every name either has a specific referent that accepts no sharing, like 'I,' 'this,' and 'Zayd'—and it is called the specific/determined and the particular—or it accepts sharing. This [latter type] which accepts sharing is the universal, absolute meaning, and it has three considerations, as mentioned before. As for the absolute term and the restricted term, examples are 'freeing a slave' [absolute term] and {and you find no water} [restricted term, implies purifying water]. That is because a meaning may enter into the absolute sense of the term but not enter into the absolute term itself—meaning, it enters into the term without the condition of absoluteness, but does not enter into the term with the condition of absoluteness, as we said regarding the word 'water.' For 'water' is applied to semen and other things, as He said: {from an ejected fluid} [At-Īrīq: 6], and one says 'rose water.' But this [semen, rose water] does not enter into [the meaning of] 'water' when used absolutely, but [only] when restricted. So if the common element between the absolute term 'water' and the restricted term 'water' is taken, it is the absolute without the condition of absoluteness. So it is said: Water is divided into absolute and mixed. The subject of the division does not have an absolute name [encompassing both], but context implies comprehensiveness and generality, which is our statement: Water has three categories. So here too there are three things: the subject of the division, which is general water, and it is the absolute without condition, but it has no single word for it except a compound phrase; the absolute category, which is the term conditional upon its absoluteness; and the second [category], the restricted term, which is the term conditional upon its restriction.

This is so because the speaker using a term either uses it absolutely or restricts it; there is no third state. If he uses it absolutely, it has a meaning, and if he restricts it, it has a meaning. Then, if he restricts it, he either restricts it with a restriction of generality or a restriction of particularity. The restriction of generality is like his saying: Water has three categories. The restriction of particularity is like his saying: rose water.

When the difference between restricting and making absolute the term and restricting and making absolute the meaning is known, it is known that the meaning also has three states: either it is absolute, or restricted by a restriction of generality, or restricted by a restriction of particularity. And the absolute among meanings is of two types: absolute conditional upon being absolute and absolute without condition. Likewise with terms: the absolute among them may be absolute conditional upon being absolute, like our saying 'absolute water' and 'absolute slave,' or it may be absolute without the condition of absoluteness, like our saying 'human.'

So the absolute restricted by [the condition of] absoluteness does not include the restricted by what negates absoluteness; thus, rose water does not enter into

[the category of] absolute water. As for the absolute without restriction, the restricted enters into it, just as the deficient human enters into the name 'human.'

Thus, it has become clear that the absolute conditional upon being absolute among concepts has no existence externally. So there is no absolute human externally; rather, it must be determined as this or that. And there is no absolute animal in it [externally], and no absolute rain conditional upon being absolute. As for the absolute conditional upon being absolute among terms, like 'absolute water,' its referent exists externally, because the condition of absoluteness here is in the term, so it does not prevent its meaning from being specific/determined. But the condition of absoluteness there [in the previous case] was in the meaning, and an absolute referent conditional upon being absolute is inconceivable, since every existent has a reality by which it is distinguished, and whatever has no reality by which it is distinguished is not a thing. And if it has a reality by which it is distinguished, its distinction prevents it from being absolute in every respect, for the absolute in every respect has no distinction. So we have no existent that is absolute conditional upon being absolute. However, pure non-existence might be said to be absolute conditional upon being absolute, since there is no reality there that is distinguished, nor an essence that is realized, such that it could be said that reality prevents, by its definition, anything else from being it.

As for the absolute among concepts without condition: if its existence externally is affirmed, it is only found as something specific, distinguished, particularized. And the specific, particularized enters into the absolute without condition, but does not enter into the absolute conditional upon being absolute, since the absolute without condition is more general. And it does not follow, if the absolute without condition exists externally, that the absolute conditional upon being absolute must exist externally, because the latter is more specific than it.

So if we say: absolute animal, or human, or body, or existence—if we mean by it the absolute conditional upon being absolute, then it has no existence externally. And if we mean the absolute without condition, then it is only found as something specific and particularized. Therefore, there is nothing external except that which is specific, distinguished, separate from everything else by its definition and reality.

Therefore, whoever says: 'The existence of the Truth is Absolute Existence, not the specific/determined,' the reality of his statement is that the Truth has no existence at all, nor subsistence, except the very self of the specific, distinguished things. And the specific things are not Him, so He is nothing at all.

To summarize the point: If he meant the absolute conditional upon being absolute, it has no external existence, so the Truth would have no existence at all. And if he meant the absolute without condition, then if its external existence is denied, there is nothing to discuss. But if its existence is affirmed, it is only found as something specific. Thus, the Truth would have no existence except the existence of the essences [i.e., specific things].

So two problematic consequences follow:

1. The Truth has no existence besides the existence of the creatures.

2. The contradiction, which is his statement that He is Absolute Existence, not the specific/determined.

So reflect upon the statement of this one [Ar-Rūmī]; for he makes the Truth within created beings like the universal within its particulars, and like the genus, species, property, and differentia within all its existing, specific instances. And the proponent of this view places the manifestations and levels within the determined/specific things, just as the first one [Ibn 'Arabi] placed them within the essences subsistent in non-existence.



## Those Who Did Not Differentiate Between Essence and Existence, Nor Between Absolute and Specific/Determined

As for At-Tilimsānī and his like: he does not differentiate between essence and existence, nor between absolute and specific/determined. Rather, according to him, there is nothing 'besides' nor 'other' in any way whatsoever. Created beings are merely parts of Him and portions of Him, like the waves of the sea within the sea, and the parts of a house within the house. From their poetry:

*The sea, no doubt, in my view, is one in its unity  
Even if it multiplies with waves and foam  
So let not the forms you witness deceive you  
For the One Lord is the essence pervading the number*

And from it [also]:

*The sea is nothing but the wave, nothing else  
Even if the multiplicity of the numerous differentiates it*

And there is no doubt that this statement is more proficient in disbelief and heretical hypocrisy. For distinguishing between existence and essence and making the non-existent a 'thing,' or distinguishing externally between the absolute and the specific/determined and making the absolute a 'thing' beyond the specific instances in the mind—these are two weak, false positions. And whoever has sharpened his critical insight knows that whoever posits two things within these externally existing entities—(one) their existence, and (the second) their essences—or posits for them an existing absolute reality additional to their existing essence, has indeed erred gravely. And he has confused what the intellect grasps of abstract meanings, absolute from determination, and of essences abstracted from external existence, with what actually exists externally thereof. And he did not realize that the conceptions and estimations of the intellect are wider than what exists and obtains by its essence, just as one conceives non-existents, impossibilities, and conditionals, and estimates what has no existence whatsoever, whether possible or impossible, and extracts from specific instances absolute attributes within it [the mind], and from existents, essences conceived within it.

However, this [third] position [of At-Tilimsānī] is more severe in ignorance and disbelief concerning Allāh the Exalted. For its proponent does not differentiate between the manifestations and the Manifest, and considers multiplicity and differentiation to exist only in the mind of the person when he is veiled from witnessing the reality. Then, when his veil is lifted, he perceives that there was never any 'other', and that the seer is the essence of the seen, and the witness is the essence of the witnessed.



## The Positions Of Those Who Oppose Ahlus-Sunnah, Part Of Which Is Derived From The Statements Of The Philosophers

Know that these positions: I do not know of them belonging to anyone from any nation before these people in this manner. However, I saw in some philosophical books translated from Aristotle that he related from some philosophers their statement: 'Existence is one,' and he refuted that. And sufficient [condemnation] for you is a doctrine that even the theologians (mutakallimah) of the Sabians (Ġābi'īn) do not approve of.

These positions only emerged with the emergence of the Tatar state. Before that, the [prevalent forms of] disbelief were general incarnation (Ĥulūl 'āmm), or pantheism (Ittiḥād), or specific incarnation (Ĥulūl khāṣṣ). That is because the division is fourfold, for whoever makes the Lord the servant in reality: either says He does Ĥulūl in him, or does Ittiḥād with him. And under both assumptions, he either makes that specific to some of the creation, like the Messiah, or makes it general for all creation. So these are four categories:

1. Specific Incarnation (Al-Ĥulūl al-Khāṣṣ). This is the position of the Nestorians among the Christians and their like, who say that the divine nature indwelt the human nature and clothed itself with it, like the indwelling of water in a vessel. These [Nestorians] refined the disbelief of the Christians due to their mixing with the Muslims, and the first of them appeared in the time of Al-Ma'mūn. This is [also] the position of those extremists of this Ummah who agree with these Christians, like the extremists among the [Rāfiḍah] who say He indwelt 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and the Imāms of his household, and the extremists among the ascetics who believe in indwelling in the Awliyā' (saints) and those in whom they believe wilayah (sainthood) resides, or in some of them, like Al-Ḥallāj, Yūnus, Al-Ḥākīm, and their likes.
2. Specific Pantheism (Al-Ittiḥād al-Khāṣṣ). This is the position of the Jacobite Christians, and their position is more wicked. They are the Sudanese [Nubians] and the Copts. They say: The divine nature and the human nature mixed and blended like the mixing of milk with water. This is [also] the position of those extremists affiliated with Islam who agree with these [Jacobites].
3. General Incarnation (Al-Ĥulūl al-'Āmm). This is the position mentioned by the Imāms of Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Ḥadīth concerning a faction of the early Jahmiyyah, and it is the position of most of the devout adherents of the Jahmiyyah, who say: Allāh, in His very Essence, is in every place. They cling to ambiguous verses of the Qur'ān, like His statement: {And He is Allāh in the heavens and in the earth} [Al-An'ām: 3] and His statement: {And He is with

you} [Al-Ĥadīd: 4]. The refutation of these is abundant and well-known in the words of the Imāms of the Sunnah, the people of knowledge, and the scholars of ḥadīth.

4. General Pantheism (Al-Ittiḥād al-'Āmm). This is the position of these heretics who claim that He is the very essence of the existence of created beings. These are more disbelieving than the Jews and Christians in two respects:

- a) From the aspect that those [Jews and Christians] said the Lord unites with His servant whom He brought near and chose, after they had not been united. Whereas these [Ittiḥādiyyah] say: The Lord has always been the servant and other creatures; He is not other than them.
- b) From the aspect that those [Jews and Christians] specified that [union] for those whom they venerated, like the Messiah. Whereas these [Ittiḥādiyyah] made that pervasive in dogs, pigs, filth, and dirt.

And if Allāh the Exalted has said: {They have certainly disbelieved who say, 'Indeed, Allāh is the Messiah, the son of Maryam'} [Al-Mā'idah: 72] the verse, then how about one who says: Allāh is the disbelievers, the hypocrites, children, the insane, impurities, foul things, and everything? And if Allāh refuted the statement of the Jews and Christians when they said: {We are the children of Allāh and His beloved ones} [Al-Mā'idah: 18], and said to them: {Say, 'Then why does He punish you for your sins?' Rather, you are human beings from among those He has created} [Al-Mā'idah: 18] the verse, then how about one who claims that the Jews and Christians are the very essences of the existence of the Lord, the Creator, not other than Him nor besides Him? And that it is inconceivable that Allāh would punish anyone but Himself? And that every speaker in the universe is the essence of the hearer? As in his [the Prophet's (peace be upon him)] statement: {Indeed, Allāh has overlooked for my Ummah what their souls whisper to them}. And that the one engaging in intercourse is the essence of the one with whom intercourse is engaged? Until their poet said:

*And my hand takes pleasure if it passes over my body,  
Because I, in reality, am none other than You.*

Know that since the disbelief of these people—in their statement that Allāh is all His creatures—is greater than the disbelief of the Christians in their statement: {Indeed, Allāh is the Messiah, the son of Maryam}, and since the Christians are misguided, most of them not comprehending their own doctrine regarding Tawḥīd—as it is something imagined, neither known nor comprehended, where they make the Lord one substance, then make Him three substances, and interpret that through the multiplicity of properties and persons which are the hypostases, while the properties, according to them, are not substances, thus contradicting themselves alongside their disbelief.

Likewise, these heretical Ittiḥādiyyah are misguided, most of them not comprehending the statements of their leaders nor understanding them. They are in that like the Christians: the more foolish and ignorant the Shaykh is, the more knowledgeable he is of Allāh and the greater he is in their estimation. And they have a share of worship of the Lord whom they disbelieve in, like the Christians. This is as long as one of them is in the veil. But when the veil is lifted from his heart and he realizes that he is Him, then he has the choice: either to

drop the command and prohibition from himself and remain neglected, doing whatever he loves; or to uphold the station of command and prohibition to preserve the levels, and so that the veiled people—who are the majority of creation—may follow his example. And they claim that the Prophets were like that, since they considered them perfect.



## The Doctrine Of The Ittīhādiyyah Is Composed Of Three Materials

The doctrine of these Ittīhādiyyah, like Ibn ‘Arabī, Ibn Sab‘īn, Al-Qūnawī, and At-Tilimsānī, is composed of three materials:

1. The negation and denial of the Jahmiyyah.
2. The vague generalities of the Sufis: which is what is found in the speech of some of them of vague, ambiguous statements, just as the Christians were misguided by similar things in what they narrate from the Messiah, so they follow the ambiguous and leave the clear. Also, the words of those overcome in their intellect who spoke in a state of intoxication.
3. And from philosophical heresy, which is the origin of Jahmī thought, and their speech regarding Absolute Existence, the Intellects, the Souls, revelation, prophethood, necessity, possibility, and whatever truth and falsehood is therein.

This [third] material is more dominant in Ibn Sab‘īn and Al-Qūnawī. The second is more dominant in Ibn ‘Arabī, and for this reason, he is the closest of them to Islam. All of them share in Jahmī thought. And At-Tilimsānī is the greatest of them in realizing this heresy and Ittīhād in which they stand alone, and the most disbelieving concerning Allāh, His Books, His Messengers, His laws, and the Last Day.

The explanation of that is that he [Al-Qūnawī] said: He was, within me, manifest in His essential unity, knowing Himself and what emanates from Him, and that the known things, in their entirety, were unveiled within the reality of knowledge, witnessing them.

So it is said to him: You have affirmed His knowledge of what emanates from Him and of known things He witnesses, other than Himself. Then you mentioned that He presented Himself to these witnessed, non-existent cosmic realities. At that point, He expressed [Himself] with ‘Anā’ [I], and the reality of prophethood appeared, in which the Truth appeared clearly, and Absolute Existence was reflected therein, and that it is the one named by the name Ar-Raḥmān, just as the first is the one named by the name Allāh. And you continued the discourse until you said: And He is now as He ever was.

So this [entity] which He knew would emanate from Him and was witnessed by Him [while being] non-existent in itself—is it the Truth or other than Him?

If it is the Truth, then it necessitates that the Lord was non-existent and that He emanated from Himself. Then, that is a contradiction.

And if it is other than Him, then you have made that ‘other’ the mirror for the reflection of Absolute Existence, which is Ar-Raḥmān. Thus, the creation would be Ar-Raḥmān.

So you are perplexed between making Him have known a non-existent that emanated from Him—thus He would have an ‘other,’ and it [the other] would not be Ar-Raḥmān—and between making this manifest describer identical to Him, and He is Ar-Raḥmān, so it would not be non-existent nor emanated from Him. Or [the third option is] that you describe the [same] thing with the characteristics of the Truth, the Creator, at times, and with the characteristics of the servant, the created, at other times. This, besides being a contradiction, is disbelief of the grossest kind, and it is analogous to the statement of the Christians: the divine nature [is] the human nature. But this is greater disbelief in multiple respects.



## Refutation Of The Doctrine Of Ittiḥādiyyah

### The First Aspect

These cosmic realities—which you mentioned were non-existent in themselves, their essences witnessed in His knowledge in His absolute manifestation in which He was united with Himself in His essential unity—did He create them, bring them into being, and make them existent after their non-existence? Or did they remain eternally non-existent?

If they remained eternally non-existent, then it necessitates that none of the cosmic entities exist, and this is defying sense, intellect, and revelation, and no rational person says it, nor has any rational person said it.

And if they became existent after their non-existence, it is impossible that they be identical to Him, because Allāh was not non-existent such that He would [later] exist. This invalidates al-Ittiḥād. And it necessitates, then, that there be an existent which is not Allāh, but rather His creation, His possessions, and His servants. And this invalidates your statement: ‘And He is now, with nothing alongside Him, as He ever was.’

### The Second Aspect

Your statement ‘The divine creation was composed from what was towards the secret of His affair,’ or your statement: ‘The Truth appeared in it,’ or similar expressions used by these Ittiḥādiyyah in this context, such as their saying: ‘The Truth appeared and manifested,’ and ‘These are the manifestations of the Truth and His loci of manifestation,’ and ‘This is a divine manifestation and a divine locus of manifestation,’ and the like: Do you mean by it that the essence of His Being occurred there?

Or do you mean by it that He became apparent, manifest to them such that they know Him?

Or do you mean by it that He appeared to His creation through them and manifested through them? And that there is no fourth category?

If you mean the first—which is the statement of the Ittiḥādiyyah—then you have explicitly stated that the essence of the creatures—even dogs, pigs, impurities, devils, and disbelievers—is the Being of Allāh, or it and the Being of Allāh are united, or the Being of Allāh indwells in them. And this disbelief is greater than the disbelief of those who said: {Indeed, Allāh is the Messiah, the son of Maryam} [Al-Mā'idah: 72], and ‘Allāh is the third of three,’ and ‘Allāh begets and is born,’ and ‘He has sons and daughters.’ And if you state this explicitly, the Muslims will recognize your statement and assign you to your kind. So there is no need for vague terms that the thirsty mistakes for water—and would that when he came to it, he found it to be nothing! Nay, rather, he

finds it to be deadly poison.

And if you mean that He became apparent, manifest to them, then this means He became known to them. And there is no doubt that Allāh becomes known to His servant. However, your statement in this regard is false in two ways: ‘

1. One way is that you made Him known to non-existents that have no existence, [merely] because He knew them, and you believed that since they were known, it is permissible that they become knowing. This is the essence of falsehood.
2. Another way is that when He knows a thing will come into being, it is not permissible that this [thing], before its existence, be knowing, powerful, or acting.

And [another way is] that this is not the case for all known created beings; rather, only some of them are capable of knowledge.

And if you say that Allāh is known through them—because they are signs indicating Him—then this is true; it is the religion of the Muslims and the witnessing of the recognizers. But you did not say this, for two reasons:

1. They do not become signs except after He creates them and makes them existent, not while they are non-existent [but] known. And you did not affirm that He created them, nor made them existent, nor that He gave anything to His creation. Rather, you made His own Self the one manifesting to them.
2. You explicitly stated that He manifested to them and appeared to them, not that He indicated through them to His creation and made them signs to be an insight and a reminder for every repentant servant. And Allāh has informed in His Book that He places signs (āyāt) in these created things, and the āyah is like the sign (‘alāmah) and indication (dalālah), as He said: {And your god is one God. There is no deity [worthy of worship] except Him, the Entirely Merciful, the Especially Merciful.}... until His statement: {...are signs for a people who use reason} [Al-Baqarah: 163-164]. And sometimes He calls the thing itself an āyah, as the Exalted said: {And a sign (āyah) for them is the dead earth. We have brought it to life...} [Yā-Sīn: 33]. And this which Allāh mentioned in His Book is the truth. So if it is said regarding something similar: ‘He manifested through it and appeared through it,’ just as it is said ‘He knew and recognized through it,’ the meaning would be correct. However, the terms ‘manifestation’ and ‘appearance’ in such a context are not transmitted [from the Salaf] and contain ambiguity and vagueness. For ‘appearance’ and ‘manifestation’ are understood [primarily] as appearance and manifestation to the eye, especially the term ‘manifestation’, for its usage for manifestation to the eye is predominant. And this is the doctrine of the Ittihādiyyah; Ibn ‘Arabī stated it explicitly and said: ‘So the eye does not fall except upon Him.’ And if, according to them, what is seen with the eye is Allāh, then this is explicit disbelief by the consensus of the Muslims. Indeed, it is established in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim that the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: {And know that none of you will see his Lord until he dies.} Especially if it is said: ‘He appeared in it and manifested in it,’ for the term becomes ambiguous between [meaning] His Essence is in it, or it has become like a mirror in which an image of the seen is reflected. Both are false; for the Essence of Allāh is not in the creatures, nor are the creatures seen within His very Essence like the seen is

seen in a mirror. Rather, their appearance is their indication of Him and their testimony for Him, and that they are signs for Him regarding Himself and His Attributes, Glorified is He and Praised. As the Book of Allāh has stated.

### **The Third Aspect**

Does the conjunction of the Alif and Nūn expressed by 'Anā' [I], and the term which is 'the reality of prophethood,' and 'the relative spirit'—do these things enter into the designation of the names of Allāh, such that they are among what enters into the designation of His apparent and implicit names? Or are they not included in the designation of His names?

If the first [is true]: then all creatures would be included in the designation of the names of Allāh, and the creatures would be a part of Allāh and an attribute for Him.

If the second [is true]: then these things are non-existent, having no existence in themselves. So how can it be conceived that they are existent yet non-existent, subsistent yet non-subsistent, negated yet non-negated? This is a clear dichotomy, and it is one of the things that exposes the reality of this deception. For these matters which were known to Him [but] non-existent, [then] upon the descent of the 'divine cell', these things which he mentioned appeared. So these apparent, known matters after this descent have become 'Anā,' 'reality of prophethood,' 'relative spirit,' 'action of the essence,' 'object of the essence,' and 'meaning of intermediaries.' If all of that is in Allāh, then there are two great forms of disbelief therein: (1) all creatures being part of Allāh, and (2) His being subject to change with these changes which are from deficiency to perfection and from perfection to deficiency. And if they are external to His Essence, then these things were non-existent, and He did not create them externally from Himself according to them [the Ittiḥādiyyah]. So how can the situation be?

### **The Fourth Aspect**

Is the 'knot of the reality of prophethood' and what is with it: either something subsisting in itself, or an attribute of Him or of another?

If it is subsisting in itself, then is it Allāh or other than Him? If it is Allāh, then Allāh would be the apparent point, and He would be the reality of prophethood, and He would be the relative spirit. And he said after this: that He placed the relative spirit in the form of the action of His essence, and that He gave Muḥammad the knot of his prophethood. So He would have made Himself the form of His action and given Muḥammad His own Essence. This, besides being among the clearest and ugliest forms of disbelief, is contradictory. Who is the giver and who is the given? If He gave His Essence to another?

And if these things are entities subsisting in themselves and are other than Allāh—whether they are angels or otherwise, from everything besides Allāh among the essences—then it is a creation among the creations of Allāh, made, under lordship. And Allāh is the Creator of everything. So he [Al-Qūnawī] has made the appearance of the Truth descriptive and [made] it the one named by the name Ar-Raḥmān. Thus, the one named by the name Ar-Raḥmān, the describer of Himself, would be created. This is explicit disbelief, and it is greater than the heresy of those concerning whom it was said: {when it was said to them,

'Prostrate to the Most Gracious,' they said, 'And what is the Most Gracious?}' [Al-Furqān: 60], and greater than the heresy of those concerning whom it was said: {while they disbelieve in the Most Gracious} [Ar-Ra'd: 30]. For those disbelieved in His name and attribute while affirming the Lord of the worlds, whereas these affirmed the name but made the Named One a creature from among His creatures.

And if the intended meaning by this 'reality' and what is with it is an attribute: then is it an attribute of Allāh or of another? If it is an attribute of Allāh, it is not permissible for it to be the one named by the name Ar-Raḥmān, for that is a name for Allāh Himself, not for His attributes. And prostration is to Allāh, not to His attributes, and supplication is to Allāh, not to His attributes. And if it is an attribute of another, then this implication is even greater and greater.

This is a division from which there is no escape. For this heretic concerning the names of Allāh made this 'knot'—which he called 'the knot of the reality of prophethood,' and made it the form of the Truth's knowledge of Himself, and made it a mirror for the reflection of Absolute Existence, a locus for the distinction of His eternal attributes, and [claimed] that the Truth appeared in it in His form and attribute, as a describer describing Himself and encompassing it, and He is the one named by the name Ar-Raḥmān—then he mentioned that He gave Muḥammad this knot. And it is known that the one named by the name Ar-Raḥmān is the one named by the name Allāh, as the Exalted said: {Say, 'Call upon Allāh or call upon the Most Gracious (Ar-Raḥmān). Whichever [name] you call—to Him belong the best names'} [Al-Isrā': 110]. So He, Glorified is He, would be this knot which He gave to Muḥammad. And if it were an attribute of Him or of another, then it would be Ar-Raḥmān. So this heretic revolves between [saying] Ar-Raḥmān is a creation from the creation of Allāh or an attribute from His attributes, and between [saying] Ar-Raḥmān was gifted by Allāh to Muḥammad. And each of the two possibilities is among the foulest and most hideous forms of disbelief.

## The Fifth Aspect

His statement: 'This reality has two ends: an end towards the Truth facing it, in which the Higher Existence appeared as a describer, and an end towards the appearance of the universe from it, which is named the relative spirit.'

He mentioned in this statement the appearance of Existence and the appearance of the universe. And it was previously stated that the Truth was, and nothing was with Him, and He was manifest to Himself in His essential unity, and that when the 'divine cell' descended, the 'knot of the reality of prophethood' appeared and became a mirror for the reflection of Existence, so the Truth appeared in it in form and attribute, as a describer. And he mentioned in this statement the Truth facing it and the Higher Existence which appeared in this Truth, and the end which it [the reality] has towards the Truth. So he mentioned three things here: the Truth, Existence, and the end. And he had previously made the Truth identical to Absolute Existence which was reflected, and it is the Truth which appeared in it as a describer. So sometimes he makes the Truth identical to Absolute Existence, and sometimes he makes Absolute Existence have appeared in this Truth. This is a contradiction.

Then it is said to him: These two, according to you, are expressions for the Lord,

may He be exalted. So you have made Him manifest and made Him a locus of manifestation. If you mean by 'appearance' existence, then the Lord would have existed time after time. This is heinous disbelief. How can the repetition of His existence be conceived? And how can it be conceived that He existed in Himself after not having existed in Himself? And if you mean by it clarity and manifestation, then there is no creature there for Him to appear and manifest to, since the universe has not yet been created. And you said the Truth appeared in it as a describer and named Him Ar-Rahmān, and you did not make His appearance known or witnessed. So how can it be conceived that He manifested to Himself after not having been manifest [before]? For this describes Him as not having known Himself until He knew Himself [later]. Also, you had said He was manifest to Himself in His unity. So this is disbelief and contradiction.

## The Sixth Aspect

Then it is said to him: These two, according to you, are expressions for the Lord, may He be exalted. So you have made Him manifest and made Him a locus of manifestation. If you mean by 'appearance' existence, then the Lord would have existed time after time. This is heinous disbelief. How can the repetition of His existence be conceived? And how can it be conceived that He existed in Himself after not having existed in Himself? And if you mean by it clarity and manifestation, then there is no creature there for Him to appear and manifest to, since the universe has not yet been created. And you said the Truth appeared in it as a describer and named Him Ar-Rahmān, and you did not make His appearance known or witnessed. So how can it be conceived that He manifested to Himself after not having been manifest [before]? For this describes Him as not having known Himself until He knew Himself [later]. Also, you had said He was manifest to Himself in His unity. So this is disbelief and contradiction

This perplexity and contradiction is like the perplexity and contradiction of the Christians regarding the hypostases. For they say: The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are three gods, yet they are one God. And the one who clothed himself with the human nature of the Messiah is the Son. And they say: They [the hypostases] are Existence, Knowledge, Life, and Power. So it is said to them: If these are attributes, then they are not gods, and it is inconceivable that the one who clothed himself with the Messiah be a god unless he is the Father. And if they are substances, it necessitates that they not be one God, because three substances cannot be one substance. And they sometimes illustrate that with our saying: Zayd the knowing, the powerful, the living. So his being knowing is not [identical to] his being powerful. If it is said to them: All of this does not prevent [him] from being one essence having multiple attributes, but you do not say that. Also, if the one united with the Messiah is a god, it is impossible for him to be an attribute; rather, he must be the one described. And you do not say that. So what is true, you do not say; and what you say is not true. And the Exalted has said: {O People of the Scripture, do not commit excess in your religion or say about Allāh except the truth} [An-Nisā': 171]. So the Christians are perplexed, contradictory: if they make the hypostasis an attribute, it becomes impossible for the Messiah to be God; and if they make it a substance, it becomes impossible for God to be one. And they want to make the Messiah Allāh, and make him the son of Allāh, and make the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit one God. This is why Allāh described them in the Qur'an sometimes

with shirk and sometimes made them a category distinct from the polytheists, because they say both things, even though they are contradictory.

And such is the state of these people. For they want to affirm Ittiḥād and that there is no 'other,' and they [also] want to affirm the existence of the universe. So they made the subsistence of the universe [reside] in His knowledge, while He witnesses it, and made Him manifest to that which is witnessed by Him. Then when He manifests in it, He is the one manifesting, not another, and those witnessed essences are the universe.

This man [Al-Qūnawī] and Ibn 'Arabī share in this, but they differ in another aspect. For Ibn 'Arabī says: The existence of the Truth appeared in the essences subsistent in themselves. So if you wish, say it is the Truth; and if you wish, say it is the creation; and if you wish, say it is the Truth and the creation; and if you wish, say neither Truth in every respect nor creation in every respect; and if you wish, affirm perplexity regarding that.

As for this one [Al-Qūnawī], he says: [He] manifested to the essences witnessed by Him.

So they both said regarding all of creation what resembles the statement of the Melkite Christians regarding the Messiah, where they said that the divine nature and the human nature became one substance with two hypostases. As for At-Tilimsānī, he does not affirm multiplicity in any way; so he is like the Jacobite Christians, and they are the most disbelieving among them. And the Christians said that regarding one person, and they said the divine nature clothes itself with the human nature after not having been clothed with it.

These [Ittiḥādiyyah] said it is in the entire universe and that it has always been so. So they affirmed the generality and necessity of that, whereas the Christians affirmed its specificity and origination. Until one of them said: 'The Christians only disbelieved because they specified.' And this meaning has been mentioned by Ibn 'Arabī in more than one place in Al-Fuṣūṣ, and he mentioned that the Prophets' denunciation of the idol worshippers was only due to specification; otherwise, the perfected recognizer is one who worships Him in every manifestation; and He is the worshipper and the worshipped. And that had the idol worshippers abandoned their worship, they would have abandoned [a portion] of the Truth commensurate with what they abandoned of them [the idols]. And that Mūsā only denounced Hārūn because Hārūn forbade them from worshipping the calf, due to Hārūn's narrowness [of understanding] and Mūsā's knowledge that they worshipped none but Allāh. And that Hārūn was not given power over the calf so that they might worship Allāh in every form. And that the greatest manifestation in which He was worshipped is caprice, so nothing greater than caprice has been worshipped. However, Ibn 'Arabī affirms essences subsistent in non-existence. And this Ibn Ḥamawayh [Al-Qūnawī] only affirmed them as witnessed in knowledge. And this [latter] view is the correct one [regarding essences not existing eternally]; however, the Ittiḥād he sought cannot be achieved with it. This is why he [Ibn 'Arabī] was the furthest of them from realizing Ittiḥād and the closest to Islam, even though he was the most contradictory and nonsensical among them. And much nonsense is better than much disbelief.

The implication of his [Al-Qūnawī's] statement here is that he made His [Allāh's] existence conditional upon the existence of the universe, even if He has

some existence other than the universe, just as the light of the eye is conditional upon the existence of the eyelids, even though it subsists in the pupil. Based on this, Allāh would be dependent on the universe, needing it like the need of the eye's light for the eyelids. And Allāh the Exalted has said: {Allāh has certainly heard the statement of those [Jews] who said, 'Indeed, Allāh is poor, while we are rich'}... until the end of the verse [Āl 'Imrān: 181]. So if this is His statement regarding those who described Him as poor [in need] of their wealth so He could give it to the poor, then how [much worse] is His statement regarding one who makes His very Essence dependent on His creatures, such that were it not for His creatures, His Essence would dissipate, disperse, and cease to exist, just as the light of the eye dissipates, disperses, and ceases to exist if the eyelid ceases to exist?

And He said in His Book: {Indeed, Allāh holds the heavens and the earth, lest they cease. And if they should cease...} the verse [Fāṭir: 41]. So who holds the heavens and the earth? And He said in His Book: {And of His signs is that the heaven and the earth remain by His command} the verse [Ar-Rūm: 25]. And He said: {He raised the heavens without pillars that you [can] see} [Ar-Ra'd: 2]. And He said: {His Kursī extends over the heavens and the earth, and their preservation tires Him not. And He is the Most High, the Most Great} [Al-Baqarah: 255]. {And tires Him not}: does not burden Him nor trouble Him. And it has come in the ḥadīth; the ḥadīth of Abū Dāwūd: {The heavens and the earth and what is between them are not in the Kursī except like a ring thrown in a desert land, and the Kursī in the Throne is like that ring in the desert land.} And He said in His Book: {They have not appraised Allāh with true appraisal, while the earth entirely is [within] His grasp on the Day of Resurrection...} the verse [Az-Zumar: 67]. And it is established in the authentic collections from the ḥadīth of Abū Hurayrah, Ibn 'Umar, and Ibn Mas'ūd: 'Indeed, Allāh holds the heavens and the earth in His Hand.' [Al-Bukhārī: 7412, Muslim: 2788] So He in Whose grasp are the heavens and the earth, Whose Kursī extends over the heavens and the earth, and their preservation tires Him not, and by Whose command the heaven and the earth remain, and He is the One Who holds them lest they cease—could He be in need of them, dependent upon them, such that if they ceased, He would disperse, dissipate, and cease to exist?

And if the Muslims declare as a disbeliever one who says the heavens carry Him or shade Him, because that implies His need for His creatures; and one who says that in His Istiwā' upon the Throne He is in need of the Throne like the need of the carried for its carrier, indeed he is a disbeliever? Because Allāh is Independent of the worlds, Living, Self-Sustaining. He is the Absolute Independent, and everything besides Him is poor towards Him. This is despite the fact that the principle of Istiwā' upon the Throne is established by the Book, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Salaf of the Ummah and the Imāms of the Sunnah; indeed, it is established in every Book revealed to every Prophet sent. How then [can one accept] someone who says He is dependent upon the heavens and the earth, and that if the heavens and the earth were removed, He would disperse, dissipate, and cease to exist? So where does His need for the Throne for carrying compare to the need of His Essence for what is beneath the Throne?

Then it is said to these people: If you believe in the eternity of the heavens and the earth and their perpetuity, then this is disbelief. It is a belief in the eternity of the world and a denial of the cleaving asunder of the heavens and the earth and

their splitting. And if you believe in their origination, then how was He before their creation? Was He dissipated, dispersed, non-existent, then when He created them, He became existent, gathered? Does any rational person say this?

So you revolve between two types of disbelief, along with extreme ignorance and misguidance. Choose whichever you wish! Indeed, the forms of the world constantly perish, and replacements for them originate in the world, like animals, plants, and minerals, and like what Allāh originates in the atmosphere of clouds, thunder, lightning, rain, and so forth. So whenever something of that ceases to exist, does [part] of the light of the Truth diminish, disperse, and cease to exist commensurate with what ceased thereof? And whenever something of that increases, does His light increase, gather, and exist?

And if he means that the light of Allāh remains after the cessation of the heavens and the earth, but nothing appears in it, then what is the thing that appears after the non-existence of these things? And what effect do the heavens and the earth have in preserving the light of Allāh?

It is established in the Ṣaḥīḥ from Abū Mūsā Al-Ash'arī from the Prophet (peace be upon him) that he said: {Indeed, Allāh does not sleep, nor is it befitting for Him to sleep. He lowers the scale and raises it. The deeds of the night are raised to Him before the deeds of the day, and the deeds of the day before the deeds of the night. His veil is Light—or Fire—were He to remove it, the splendors of His Face would burn whatever of His creation His sight perceives.} And 'Abdullāh ibn Mas'ūd said: 'Indeed, your Lord has no night or day with Him; the light of the heavens is from the light of His Face.' So the truthful, the believed one, informed that if Allāh were to remove His veil, the splendors of His Face would burn whatever His sight perceives of the heavens, the earth, and other things. So He Whose Face's splendors burn the heavens and the earth, and Whose veil is what prevents this burning—could His light be preserved only by the heavens and the earth?

## The Seventh Aspect

His statement: 'So the celestial entities are its upper eyelid, and the terrestrial entities are its lower eyelid. And the human differentiation in the terrestrial entities are the eyelashes of the upper eyelid. And the Universal Soul is its pupil, and the Greatest Spirit is its white.'

It is said to him: If the universe is this eye, then what thing is the other eye? And where are the rest of the limbs? This is necessitated by your statement if you mean by 'eye' the specific/determined [organ]. And if you mean the essence and self—which is what is determined within it—then you have made the very heavens, earth, animals, and angels portions of Allāh and parts of Him. And this is the statement of these Pharaonic, Ittīhādī zanādiqah (heretical hypocrites) whom Allāh followed in the world with a curse, and on the Day of Resurrection, they will be among the disgraced.

So it is said to him: Based on this, Allāh did not create anything, nor is He the Lord of the worlds. Because He either creates Himself or another. His creating Himself is impossible, and this is known intuitively that a thing does not create itself. This is why the Exalted said: {Or were they created by nothing, or were they the creators [of themselves]?} [At-Ṭūr: 35]. Meaning: Were they created without

a creator, or did they create themselves? This is why Jubayr ibn Mut'im said: When I heard the Prophet (peace be upon him) recite this verse, I felt my heart was about to split. So they knew intuitively that the Creator cannot be the created. And His creating another is impossible according to their principle, because these things are parts of Him, not other than Him.

### **The Eighth Aspect**

He made humans the eyelashes of the eyelid of the reality of Allāh. And they are constantly increasing and decreasing, dying and living, and among them are the disbeliever and the believer, the sinner and the righteous. So the eyelashes of the eyelid of the reality of Allāh would constantly be dispersed, grinning, corrupted. And the polytheists, Jews, and Christians would be the eyelids of His reality. Yet He cursed those who made them His sons by way of selection, so how about one who makes them part of Himself?

### **The Ninth Aspect**

He is contradictory in that he made the Spirit its white and the Universal Soul its pupil, and the heavens the upper eyelid and the earths the lower eyelid. And it is known that the eyelids of the human eye surround the pupil and the white. And the Spirit and the Soul, according to him, are above the heavens and the earth, not between the heaven and the earth like the pupil and white of the eye are between the eyelids. So this analogy, besides being among the ugliest forms of disbelief, contains the ignorance and contradiction that you see.

### **The Tenth Aspect**

The Universal Soul is a name he received from the Sabian philosophers. As for the Spirit, his intended meaning by it is what they call the Intellect, which is the first of the emanations, and he called it Spirit. This he built upon the doctrine of the Sabians, and this is not from the religion of the monotheists. We have explained the corruption of that elsewhere. However, the Sabian philosophers are better than these [Ittiḥādiyyah], for they affirm a Necessary Existent from Whom the Intellects, Souls, celestial spheres, and the earth emanated; they do not make them identical to Him. Whereas these make them identical to Him. So their statement only corresponds to the deniers like Fir'awn—and his party—who said: {And what is the Lord of the worlds?} [Ash-Shu'arā': 23], and said: {I have not known you to have a god other than me} [Al-Qaṣāṣ: 38], and said: {O Hāmān, construct for me a tower that I might reach the ways,} {The ways into the heavens...} the verse [Ghāfir: 36-37]. For Fir'awn affirms the existence of this universe and says: There is no Lord above it, nor does it have a creator other than itself [or himself].

So these, when they say He is the essence of the heavens and the earth, have denied what Fir'awn denied and affirmed what Fir'awn affirmed. Except that Fir'awn did not name it [the universe] a god and did not say it is Allāh. Whereas these said: This is Allāh. So they affirm the Maker, but make Him the artifact. So they are, in reality, deniers, while in their [own] belief, they are affirmers. And Fir'awn is the opposite: he denied the Maker outwardly, while inwardly he affirmed Him. So he is more disbelieving than them, while they are more misguided than him and more ignorant. This is why they venerate him greatly.

## The Eleventh Aspect

His statement: 'Nay, this is the clear, followed truth; not what the one deviated from the paths of Islam and its religion sees, bewildered in the desert of his misguidance and ignorance.'

It is said: Who among the first and the last said this 'truth'? Here is the Book of Allāh from beginning to end, which is the Word of Allāh, His revelation, and His sending down—there is nothing of this in it, nor in a single ḥadīth from the Prophet (peace be upon him), nor from any of the Imāms of Islam and its Shaykhs, except from these fabricators against Allāh, who are, among the Shaykhs of the religion, analogous to Genghis Khan in matters of war. Their religion resembles his state, and perhaps his affirmation of the Maker is better than their affirmation. However, some of them may obligate [following] Islam, so they would be better than the Tatars in this respect. But as for their realizers and the majority of them, they permit becoming Jewish, Christian, or Muslim, and polytheism; they forbid none of that. Rather, the realizer, according to them, has nothing forbidden for him, nor anything obligatory upon him. And it is known that the disbelieving Tatars are better than these, for these are apostates from Islam, among the ugliest of the people of apostasy. And the apostate is worse than the original disbeliever in many respects. And if Abū Bakr Aṣ-Ṣiddīq fought the apostates for their withholding of Zakāh, then fighting these is more fitting.

As for what he related from the one he called 'the Realized Shaykh, the Knower, the Lordly One, the Seventh Succor' (in Ash-Sham'ah—The Candle) that he said: 'Know that the universe, in its entirety, is the pupil of the eye of Allāh which does not sleep,' etc.—the response to it is from several aspects:

1. Calling the speaker of such a statement a 'realizer,' 'knower,' and 'lordly one' is the essence of misguidance and error. Nay, this is speech that neither the Jews, nor the Christians, nor the idol worshippers would utter. If the one who said it was deprived of intellect, his ruling is the ruling of others [in that state], that Allāh has lifted the Pen from him. But if he was rational, then [it is] audacity against Allāh Who says: {And they say, 'The Most Gracious has taken a son.'} {You have done an atrocious thing.} {The heavens almost rupture therefrom...} until the end of the verses [Maryam: 88-91]. And He said: {And they say, 'The Most Gracious has taken a son.' Exalted is He! Rather, they are [but] honored servants.} {They cannot precede Him in speech...} until His statement: {...the wrongdoers} [Al-Anbiyā': 26-29]. And He said: {They have certainly disbelieved who say that Allāh is the Messiah, the son of Maryam. Say, 'Then who could prevent Allāh at all if He intended to destroy the Messiah, the son of Maryam...'} until His statement: {...and to Him is the [final] destination} [Al-Mā'idah: 17-18]. So if this is His statement regarding those who say, 'They are His sons and His beloved ones,' then how [much worse] is His statement regarding those who say, 'They are the eyelashes of His eyelid'? Exalted is Allāh far above what the wrongdoers say!

2. This misguided Shaykh—who uttered this disbelief and misguidance—contradicted the end of his statement with its beginning. For the word 'eye' is ambiguous between the self/essence of a thing the seeing organ, and other meanings. When one says 'the eye of the thing', it refers to the 'eye' meaning 'self', i.e., it is distinguished by itself from others. So when he says: 'The

universe, in its entirety, is the pupil of the eye of Allāh—which does not sleep—the ‘eye’ here means the sight/organ. Then he said at the end of his statement: ‘And we mean by the eye of Allāh that wherein Allāh becomes determined.’ This is from ‘eye’ meaning ‘self’. And this ‘eye’ [self] has no pupil nor eyelids. This is like someone saying: The spring gushed forth and overflowed, and we drank from it and bathed, and I weighed it on the scale and found it to be ten mithqāls, and its gold is pure. The reason for this is that he often manipulated letters without meanings.

3. It is a contradiction from another angle. For if the universe is the pupil of the eye, then the rest of the limbs besides the eye should remain from Allāh. Then when he says at the end of his statement: ‘And Allāh is the light of the eye,’ Allāh becomes part of the eye or an attribute of it. So he made—at the beginning of his statement—the universe part of Allāh, and at the end of his statement, made Allāh part of the universe. Both statements are disbelief. Nay, this is greater than the disbelief of those whom Allāh mentioned by His statement: {And they attributed to Him from His servants a portion. Indeed, man is clearly ungrateful.} {Or has He taken daughters out of what He creates... and favored you with sons?} [Az-Zukhruf: 15-16]. So if Allāh declared as a disbeliever one who attributed to Him a portion from His servants, how about one who sometimes makes His servants a portion of Him, and sometimes makes Him a portion of them? So may Allāh curse the masters of these statements and avenge Himself, His Book, His Messenger, and His believing servants from them.

4. It is a contradiction from another perspective. For when he says: ‘The eye is that wherein Allāh becomes determined,’ and ‘The entire universe is the pupil of His eye which does not sleep,’ he has made Him determined in the entire universe. Then when he says after that, ‘And He is the light of the eye,’ the remaining parts of the eye—the eyelids, eyelashes, pupil, and white—remain [areas where] He has not become determined therein. So he has made Him determined therein [yet] not determined therein.

5. The light of the eye is dependent upon the eye, needing it for its subsistence therein. So if Allāh is in the universe like the light in the eye, it necessitates that He be in need of the universe. Know that this statement resembles the statement of the Ḥulūliyyah, who say: He is in the universe like water in a sponge, or like life in the body, and the like. And they say: He, in His Essence, is in every place. This is the statement of the early Jahmiyyah whom the Imāms of Islam declared disbelievers. And it was related from Jahm that he used to say: He is like this air, or he said: He is this air. And his statement first, ‘It [the universe] is the pupil of the eye of Allāh,’ resembles the statement of the Ittiḥādiyyah. For the Ittiḥādiyyah say: He is like the candle which takes on different forms [shapes of light] while it is one. So He, according to them, is Existence, and the difference in its states is like the difference in the states of the candle. This is why the proponent of these statements was confused, not settling among the monotheistic, sincere Muslims, nor is he, according to these heretical Ittiḥādiyyah, among their realized recognizers. For all of these are of the same kind as the Nuṣayriyyah and the Ismā’iliyyah. The statements of these [Ittiḥādiyyah] regarding the Lord are of the same kind as the statements of those [Nuṣayriyyah/Ismā’iliyyah]. And among those are adherents to the Sharī’ah and those who abandon it, and these are likewise.

But those are more proficient in heresy, and they know they are deniers like Fir'awn, whereas these are ignorant ones who think they are doing good.

6. His statement: 'that if the celestial and terrestrial entities were removed, the light of Allāh the Exalted would expand such that nothing at all would appear in it.' This is a vague statement. And there is no doubt that the speaker of this statement is among those wavering between the disbelievers and the believers; he is neither among the believers nor among the pure Ittiḥādiyyah. But he has indeed mixed truth with falsehood. That is because the Ittiḥādiyyah say that if the essence of the heavens and the earth ceased, Allāh would cease to exist. Some of them state this explicitly, while most of them allude to it, and their common folk do not understand this from the doctrine of the rest [of their leaders]. For these are of the same kind as the Qarmatians and the Bāṭiniyyah, and those only reach the 'Greatest Proclamation', which is the final level of their elite. This is why one of the major figures of these Ittiḥādiyyah related to me concerning the author of this statement that he used to say: 'There is only a subtle difference between Tawḥīd and heresy.' I said to him: This is among the falsest of falsehoods! Nay, there is no greater difference between two doctrines than that between Tawḥīd and heresy. And he said this based on this mixing and confusion which he mixed, like his statement that if the celestial and terrestrial entities were removed, the light of Allāh would expand such that nothing would appear in it. So it is said to him: If the celestial and terrestrial entities are removed, what do you mean by its 'expansion'? Do you mean its dispersal and non-existence, like the dispersal of the eye's light upon the absence of the eyelids? Or do you mean that an existing thing expands? And what is it that expands then? Is it the Self of Allāh or an attribute from His attributes? And upon what does it expand? And what is it that appears in it or does not appear? If you mean the first—which is the implication of the beginning of your statement, because you said: 'And we only said the celestial and terrestrial entities are the eyelids of the eye of Allāh because they preserve the appearance of the light. For if the eyelids of a person's eye were cut off, the light of his eye would disperse and dissipate such that he sees nothing at all. Likewise, if the celestial and terrestrial entities were removed, the light of Allāh would expand such that nothing at all would appear in it.' And you had said: 'Allāh is the light of the eye, the Greatest Spirit its white, and the Universal Soul its pupil.' And it is known that the light of the eye, according to what you mentioned, has the existence of the eyelids as its condition. So if the condition is removed, the conditioned is removed. Thus, the universe, according to you, would be a condition for the existence of Allāh. So if the universe were removed, the reality of Allāh would be removed due to the absence of its condition. And if you affirm an essence for Him other than the universe, then this is one of the two positions of the Ittiḥādiyyah. For they sometimes make the existence of the Truth the very essence of the existence of the creatures, nothing else. According to this, His existence is inconceivable with the non-existence of the creatures. This is pure denial of the Maker, and it is the position of Al-Qūnawī and At-Tilimsānī, and it is the position of the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ in much of his speech. And sometimes they posit an existence for Him subsisting in itself, then they make the very same existence also the existence of the creatures, meaning that it emanated upon them. This is lesser disbelief

than the first, although both are among the grossest and ugliest forms of disbelief. And in the speech of the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ and others—in some places—there is that which agrees with this position. Likewise the speech of this one [the author of Ash-Sham’ah], for he sometimes alludes to this meaning. Then, despite that, do they make His existence conditional upon the existence of the universe, so He would be in need of the universe, or do they not? They may say this, and they may say that.

7. They praise misguidance, perplexity, injustice, error, and the punishment with which Allāh punished the nations. And they twist the Word of Allāh and the word of His Messenger with a twisting whose corruption is known by the necessities of reason. Like the statement of the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ: ‘If Nūḥ had not combined the two invitations for his people, they would have answered him. He invited them openly, then he invited them secretly..’ until he said: ‘And he mentioned about his people that they feigned deafness to his invitation due to their knowledge of what was obligatory upon them of answering his invitation. So the scholars of Allāh knew what Nūḥ alluded to regarding his people by way of praising them in the language of blame, and knew that they only failed to answer his invitation because of the differentiation within it, while the matter is Qur’ān [unification], not Furqān [differentiation]. And whoever is established in the Qur’ān does not listen to the Furqān, even if it is within it.’ So they praise and commend what Allāh has blamed, cursed, and forbidden, and they commit fabrication and lies against Allāh and heresy concerning the names of Allāh and His signs with that from which: {The heavens almost rupture therefrom and the earth splits open and the mountains collapse in devastation} [Maryam: 90]. Like the statement of the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ in the chapter on Nūḥ: {Because of their sins they were drowned} [Nūḥ: 25]—‘So it is they [sins/steps] that stepped with them, so they drowned in the seas of knowledge of Allāh, which is perplexity.’ {and were put into a Fire} [Nūḥ: 25]—‘in the essence of water, in the two praiseworthy states.’ {And when the seas are filled with flame} [At-Takwīr: 6]—‘You ‘sajara’ the oven when you kindle it.’ {and they found not for themselves besides Allāh any helpers} [Nūḥ: 25]—‘So Allāh was the essence of their helpers. Thus they perished in Him eternally. Had you brought them out to the sword—the sword of nature—they would have descended from this lofty rank, even though all is for Allāh and by Allāh; nay, rather, it is Allāh.’ {And Nūḥ said, ‘My Lord, do not leave upon the earth from among the disbelievers’—‘those who covered themselves with their garments and put their fingers in their ears seeking covering, because he invited them that He might forgive them, and ghafr means covering’—{‘an inhabitant’} [Nūḥ: 26]—‘anyone, so that the benefit may be general, just as the invitation was general.’ {Indeed, if You leave them’—‘i.e., let them be and leave them’—{‘they will mislead Your servants’} [Nūḥ: 27]—‘i.e., perplex them and take them out from servitude to what is within them of the secrets of lordship, so they see themselves as lords after they were, in their own eyes, servants. So they are the servant-lords.’ {and they will not beget’—‘i.e., produce or manifest’—{‘except the wicked’} [Nūḥ: 27]—‘i.e., one who manifests what was hidden’—{‘disbeliever’} [Nūḥ: 27]—‘i.e., one who conceals what appeared after its appearance. So they manifest what was hidden, then they conceal it after its appearance. Thus the observer is perplexed, and the intent

of the wicked one in his wickedness is not known, nor the disbeliever in his disbelief, while the person is one.' {My Lord, forgive me}'—'i.e., cover me and cover my stages, so my station and rank may be unknown, just as Your rank was unknown in Your statement: {And they have not appraised Allāh with true appraisal} [Al-An'ām: 91]. ' {and my parents}'—'i.e., those from whom I was a result, namely the intellect and nature.' {and whoever enters my house}'—'i.e., my heart'—{as a believer}'—'believing in the divine reports within it, which is what their souls whisper to them.' {and the believing men}'—'from the intellects'—{and the believing women}'—'from the souls.' {And do not increase the wrongdoers}'—'from the darkneses, the people of the unseen enveloped within the dark veils'—{except in destruction'} [Nūh: 28]—'i.e., perdition, so they do not know themselves due to their witnessing the Face of the Truth without them [knowing themselves].'

And all of this is among the ugliest distortions and alterations of the Word of Allāh. Indeed, Allāh condemned the People of the Scripture in the Qur'ān for less than this. For He condemned them for distorting the words from their places and for {writing the Scripture with their own hands, then saying, 'This is from Allāh,' to exchange it for a small price} [Al-Baqarah: 79], and {they say, 'It is from Allāh,' but it is not from Allāh. And they speak untruth about Allāh while they know} [Āl 'Imrān: 78].

These [Ittīhādiyyah] have distorted the Word of Allāh from its places with the ugliest distortion, written books of hypocrisy and heresy with their own hands, and claimed they are from Allāh. Sometimes they claim they take [knowledge] from where the angel who reveals to the Prophet takes it, thus being above the Prophet by a degree. Sometimes they claim they take from where Allāh takes, so one of them becomes, in his knowledge of himself, like Allāh's knowledge of him, because the taking is from one source. And sometimes one of them claims that the Prophet (peace be upon him) gave him in a dream this great hypocrisy and profound heresy and commanded him to bring it out to his Ummah, and that he presented it just as the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) defined it for him, without addition or subtraction. And a group of virtuous people—even some who addressed me about him and defended him—used to think he considered lying permissible, and they preferred to say: he used to intentionally lie, and that this was easier [to accept] than disbelief. Then they explicitly stated that his position is disbelief. And more than one rational and virtuous person, from the Shaykhs and scholars, used to testify against him for intentional lying. And it is known that this is among the most extreme lies against Allāh and His Messenger, and that he is among the most deserving of His statement: {And who is more unjust than one who invents a lie about Allāh or says, 'It has been revealed to me,' while nothing has been revealed to him} [Al-An'ām: 93]. And many of the lying false prophets—like Al-Mukhtār ibn Abī 'Ubayd and his likes—their lies and fabrications did not reach this extent. Nay, Musaylimah the Liar, his lies and fabrications did not reach this extent. And all of these used to venerate the Prophet (peace be upon him) and acknowledge his Messengership, but claimed he was another messenger, and did not deny the existence of the Lord, nor deny the Qur'ān outwardly. Whereas these denied the Lord, associated everything with Him, fabricated these books which they sometimes claim are greater than the Qur'ān, and prefer themselves over the Prophet (peace be upon him) in some respects, as the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ explicitly stated

concerning the Seal of the Awliyā'. And the trustworthy related to me concerning the sinner At-Tilimsānī that he used to say: 'The Qur'ān is entirely shirk; there is no Tawhīd in it. Tawhīd is only in our speech.'

As for misguidance and perplexity: Allāh never praised that, nor did the Prophet (peace be upon him) say: {Increase me in perplexity concerning You}. No scholar of ḥadīth narrated this ḥadīth, nor is it in any of the books of ḥadīth, nor in any of the books of those who know ḥadīth; nay, nor [in the books] of those who know Allāh and His Messenger. Likewise his citing as evidence His statement: {Whenever it flashes for them, they walk therein; but when darkness covers them, they stand [still]} [Al-Baqarah: 20]. This is only the state of the hypocrites, the apostates. For misguidance and perplexity are among what Allāh condemned in the Qur'ān. Allāh the Exalted said in the Qur'ān: {Say, 'Shall we invoke instead of Allāh that which neither benefits us nor harms us and be turned back on our heels after Allāh has guided us? [We would then be] like one whom the devils enticed [to wander] upon the earth perplexed...'} the verse [Al-An'ām: 71]. And thus these misguided, perplexed ones want to do to the believers; they want them to invoke besides Allāh that which neither harms them nor benefits them—namely creatures, idols, images, and everything worshipped besides Allāh. And they want to turn the believers back on their heels, turning them away from faith in Allāh, His angels, His Books, His Messengers, and the resurrection after death, so they become perplexed, misguided, {like one whom the devils enticed [to wander] upon the earth perplexed, while he has companions inviting him to guidance, [saying], 'Come to us.'} [Al-An'ām: 71]. And the Exalted said: {And We will turn away their hearts and their eyes...} until His statement: {...wander blindly} [Al-An'ām: 110]—i.e., become perplexed. And the Exalted said: {and their hearts have doubted, and they, in their doubt, are hesitating} [At-Tawbah: 45]. And the Exalted said: {Guide us to the straight path,} {The path of those upon whom You have bestowed favor, not of those who have evoked [Your] anger or of those who are astray} [Al-Fātiḥah: 6-7]. So He commanded that we ask Him for guidance to the straight path, the path of those upon whom He bestowed favor, who are different from those who evoked His anger and from the misguided. And these [Ittīḥādiyyah] condemn the straight path and praise the way of the people of misguidance and perplexity, opposing the Books of Allāh and His Messengers, and what Allāh created His servants upon of intellects and minds.



## Clarifying Some Terms Of Ibn 'Arabī's Beliefs That Explain His Doctrine

Regarding the mention of some of Ibn 'Arabī's terms that clarify what we have mentioned of his school [of thought], for indeed, most people may not understand it.

He said in the Faṣṣ (Bezel) of Yūsuf—after having made the universe, in relation to Allāh, like the shadow of a person, and contradicting himself in the analogy—: 'So, everything you perceive is the existence of the Truth in the essences of possibilities. From the perspective of the identity of the Truth, it is His existence; and from the perspective of the difference of forms within it, it is the essences of possibilities. Just as the name 'shadow' does not cease [to apply] to it despite the difference of forms, similarly, the name 'universe' or the name 'other-than-the-Real' does not cease [to apply] to it despite the difference of forms. From the perspective of the oneness of its being a shadow, it is the Truth, because He is the One, the Unique. And from the perspective of the multiplicity of forms, it is the universe. So, pay close attention and realize what we have clarified for you. If the matter is as I have mentioned to you, then the universe is imagined; it has no real existence. This is the meaning of illusion, meaning, it is made to appear to you that it is an additional thing, existing by itself, external to the existence of the Truth, but it is not so in reality. Do you not see it, in the sensory realm, connected to the person from whom it extends? It is impossible for it to detach from that connection, because it is impossible for a thing to detach from its own essence. So, know your essence, who you are, what your identity is, what your relation is to the Truth, and by what [aspect] you are Real, and by what [aspect] you are universe, other, and non-other, and similar terms.'

And he said at the beginning of the Fuṣūṣ—after 'A Bezel of Divine Wisdom in an Adamic Word'—and he had divided bestowal by Allāh's command, stating it occurs either upon request or without request, and mentioned the category not requested because something is Allāh's gift, until he said: 'Among these are those who know that Allāh's knowledge of him in all his states is what he was upon in the state of the subsistence of his essence before its existence. He knows that the Truth only gives him what his essence gave Him of knowledge about him, which is what he was upon in the state of his subsistence. Thus, he knows from where Allāh's knowledge of him was obtained. There is no group among the people of Allāh higher or more unveiled than this group. They are the ones standing upon the secret of the divine decree. They are of two types: those who know this generally and those who know it in detail. The one who knows it in detail is higher and more complete than the one who knows it generally. For he knows what was determined in Allāh's knowledge concerning him, either by Allāh informing him of what his essence gave Him of knowledge about him, or by unveiling for him his subsistent essence and the transitions of states upon it

ad infinitum. This [latter] is higher, for he becomes, in his knowledge of himself, at the level of Allāh's knowledge of him, because the source from which [knowledge is] taken is one. However, from the servant's perspective, it is a providence from Allāh that preceded for him, being among the states of his essence. The possessor of this unveiling knows this when Allāh informs him of that—i.e., of the states of his essence. For it is not within the capacity of the creature, when Allāh informs him of the states of his subsistent essence—upon which the form of existence occurs—to be aware, in this state, of the Truth's awareness of these subsistent essences in their state of non-existence, because they are essential relations that have no form.

By this measure, we say: Divine providence preceded for this servant with this equality in its imparting of knowledge. It is from here that Allāh says: {until We know} [Muhammad: 31]. This is a phrase whose meaning is verified, not as imagined by one who does not have this disposition. The utmost extent for the one who affirms transcendence is to make that occurrence [of knowing] relate to the connection of knowledge, which is the highest aspect a theologian can conceive in this matter, were it not that he affirmed knowledge as additional to the Essence, thus making the connection belong to it [knowledge], not to the Essence. By this, he separated himself from the verifier among the people of Allāh, the possessor of unveiling and witnessing. Then we return to the bestowals and say: Bestowals are either essential or nominal. As for the essential grants, gifts, and bestowals, they never occur except through a divine manifestation. The manifestation from the Essence never occurs except according to the form of the preparedness of the servant to whom the manifestation occurs; nothing else occurs. Therefore, the one to whom the manifestation occurs saw nothing but his own form in the mirror of the Truth. He did not see the Truth, nor is it possible for him to see Him, despite his knowledge that he only saw his form in Him. It is like a mirror in the visible world: when you see the forms in it, you do not see it [the mirror itself], despite your knowledge that you only saw the forms, or your form, in it. So Allāh brought forth that example, setting it up for His essential manifestation, so that the one to whom the manifestation occurs may know that he did not see Him. There is no example closer or more similar to vision and manifestation than this. Strive within yourself, when you see the form in the mirror, to see the substance of the mirror; you will never, ever see it. So much so that some who perceived something like this regarding the form seen [in the mirror] concluded that the form seen is [located] between the sight of the seer and the mirror. This is the greatest extent of knowledge he could reach. But the matter is as we have stated and maintained. We have explained this in *Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyyah*. When you taste this, you have tasted the ultimate goal beyond which there is no goal in the right of the creature. So do not aspire, nor tire yourself, in seeking to ascend higher than this level, for there is absolutely nothing beyond it; what is after it is sheer non-existence. Thus, He is your mirror for your seeing yourself, and you are His mirror for His seeing His names and the manifestation of their rulings. And they [the rulings/names] are nothing other than His essence. So the matter became mixed and obscure. Among us is one who was ignorant in his knowledge and said: 'Inability to attain comprehension is comprehension.' And among us is one who knew and did not say such a thing—and it is the highest saying—rather, knowledge granted him silence, not inability. This is the highest

knower of Allāh. This knowledge belongs only to the Seal of the Messengers (peace be upon him) and the Seal of the Saints. None of the prophets or messengers sees it except from the niche of the Seal of the Messengers (peace be upon him), and none of the saints sees it except from the niche of the Seal of the Saints. So much so that the messengers, whenever they see it, see it only from the niche of the Seal of the Saints. For messengership and prophethood—I mean legislative prophethood and its messengership—cease, but sainthood never ceases. So the messengers, from the perspective of their being saints, do not see what we have mentioned except from the niche of the Seal of the Saints. How then [can it be seen by] those saints below them? Even if the Seal of the Saints is a follower, in ruling, of the legislation brought by the Seal of the Messengers, that does not detract from his station nor contradict what we maintain, for from one aspect he is lower, just as from another aspect he is higher. There has appeared in our outward law what supports what we maintain regarding the merit of 'Umar concerning the captives of Badr in the ruling about them, and regarding the pollination of date palms. It is not necessary for the perfect one to have precedence in everything and in every rank. Rather, the gaze of the 'men' is towards precedence in the rank of knowledge of Allāh; that is their objective. As for the occurrences of the created realms, their thoughts have no attachment to them. So realize what we have mentioned. When the Prophet (peace be upon him) represented prophethood as a wall of bricks, which was complete except for the place of one brick, the Prophet (peace be upon him) was that brick. However, he (peace be upon him) did not see it except—as he said—as one brick. As for the Seal of the Saints, he must have this vision, so he sees what the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) represented for him. He sees in the wall the place of two bricks, and the bricks are of gold and silver. He sees the two bricks that the wall is missing and by which it is completed: a brick of gold and a brick of silver. He must see himself imprinted in the place of those two bricks. So the Seal of the Saints is those two bricks, and thus the wall is completed. The reason necessitating his seeing it as two bricks is that he is a follower of the law of the Seal of the Messengers (peace be upon him) in the outward, which is the place of the silver brick. This is his outward aspect and the rulings he follows therein. Just as he takes from Allāh in secret that in which, in the outward form, he is a follower, because he sees the matter as it is, so he must see it thus. This is the place of the golden brick in the inward, for he takes from the source from which the angel who brings revelation to the Messenger takes. If you understand what I have alluded to, you have obtained beneficial knowledge. Every prophet from Ādam until the last prophet, none of them takes except from the niche of the Seal of the Prophets, even if the existence of his clay was delayed. For he, by his reality, exists. This is his (peace be upon him) statement: {I was a prophet while Ādam was between water and clay}. Other prophets were not prophets until they were sent. Likewise, the Seal of the Saints was a saint while Ādam was between water and clay. Other saints were not saints until after fulfilling the conditions of sainthood related to divine character traits and being characterized by them, because Allāh is named Al-Walī Al-Ĥamīd (The Protecting Friend, The Praiseworthy). So the Seal of the Messengers, from the perspective of his sainthood, his relation with the Seal of Sainthood is like the relation of the [other] saints and messengers with him [the Seal of Messengers], for he is the Saint, the Messenger, the Prophet. And the Seal of the Saints is the Saint, the Inheritor, taking from the Origin, witnessing the ranks. He is a good

deed among the good deeds of the Seal of the Messengers, Muḥammad (peace be upon him), the foremost of the community and the master of the children of Ādam in opening the gate of intercession. By his intercession, he designated a specific state that was not generalized. In this specific state, he preceded the divine names, for Ar-Raḥmān (The Most Compassionate) did not intercede with Al-Muntaqim (The Avenger) for the people of affliction until after the intercession of the intercessors. Thus, Muḥammad attained mastery in this specific station. Whoever understands the ranks and stations will not find it difficult to accept such speech.' End quote.

This section has mentioned the reality of his doctrine upon which he builds all his other statements. So reflect upon the disbelief it contains, regarding which: {The heavens are almost torn apart, and the earth splits open, and the mountains fall down in utter ruin} [Maryam: 90]. [Reflect upon] what it contains of denial of Allāh's creation and command, denial of His Lordship and Divinity, reviling and insulting Him. [Reflect upon] what it contains of disparaging His messengers and His truthful ones and claiming precedence over them with false claims for which there is no proof; rather, their corruption is known with the slightest intellect and faith, and the easiest [understanding] derived from any Book or Qur'ān. He made the disbelievers, hypocrites, and Pharaohs the people of Allāh and His elite, the people of unveilings. This is false from several perspectives:

### **The First Perspective**

He affirmed for him [the servant] a subsistent essence before his existence, and for all other existing things, and that this subsists for him and for all his states. Everything that exists, whether essences, attributes, substances, or accidents, its essence subsists before its existence. This is a deviation in which he was preceded, as mentioned earlier.

### **The Second Perspective**

He made Allāh's knowledge of the servant obtained only from His knowledge of that subsistent essence in non-existence, which is the reality of the servant, not from His own Sacred Self. And [he claimed] that His knowledge of the subsistent essences in non-existence and their states prevents Him from doing anything other than that, and that this is the secret of the divine decree. This implies describing Allāh as being in need of the essences and their independence from Him, negating the perfection of His knowledge and power that He deserves by Himself, and necessitates attributing ignorance and incapacity [to Him]. Some of what is in this statement resembles what Allāh mentioned about those who said: {Allāh has certainly heard the statement of those who said, 'Indeed, Allāh is poor, while we are rich.'} [Āl 'Imrān: 181]. For he made the realities of the subsistent essences in non-existence independent of Allāh in their realities and essences, and made the Lord dependent on them for His knowledge of them. He did not gain knowledge of them except from them, [just as] the servant gains knowledge of perceptible things from his perception of them, while those perceived things are independent of the perceiver.

Muslims know that Allāh knows things before they exist through His eternal, pre-existent knowledge, which is one of the necessary implications of His Sacred

Self. He did not acquire His knowledge of them from them: {Does He who created not know, while He is the Subtle, the Aware?} [Al-Mulk: 14]. This verse proves the necessity of His knowledge of things from several angles, encompassing the proofs mentioned by the people of reflection and inference—rational analogy—from theologians, philosophers, and others:

1. He is their Creator, and creation is origination with determination. This implies determining them in knowledge before their formation in the external world.
2. This necessitates will and volition, and will necessitates conceptualization of the intended object and awareness of it. This is the well-known method among most theologians.
3. They emanate from Him, and He is their complete cause. Knowledge of the origin and cause of a matter necessitates knowledge of the branch or effect. Thus, His knowledge of Himself necessitates knowledge of everything that emanates from Him.
4. He is in Himself Subtle, perceiving the minute; Aware, perceiving the hidden. This is the requirement of knowledge of things. Therefore, the existence of the requirement is necessary due to the existence of the complete cause. Thus, in His knowledge of things, He is self-sufficient and independent of them, just as He is self-sufficient in all His attributes. Then, when He sees things after their existence and hears the speech of His servants and the like, He only perceives what He originated and created, what is dependent on Him and in need [of Him] in every respect. He does not need anything other than Himself at all for His knowledge and perception. Therefore, it is impermissible to say that His knowledge of things was acquired from the things themselves, which are subsistent and independent of Him in their subsistence.

As for the denial of His power: It is because he made the Lord capable only of manifesting Himself in those subsistent essences in non-existence, which are independent of Him. So His power is limited by them, confined to them, despite their independence from Him and the subsistence of their realities without Him. This, according to him, is the secret that rendered Allāh incapable of decreeing anything other than what He created. So, according to him, He is not able to add an atom to the universe or subtract an atom from it, nor add a drop to the rain or subtract a drop from it, nor increase the height of a person or decrease it, nor change anything of his attributes, movements, or stillness, nor move a stone from its place, nor divert water from its course, nor guide one astray, nor lead astray one guided, nor move something stationary, nor make stationary something moving. In sum, He is capable only of what exists, because whatever exists, its essence subsists in non-existence, and He is not capable of more than manifesting Himself in those essences. This attribution of ignorance and incapacity which he mentioned and claimed is the secret of the divine decree—although it includes some of what other deviants have said—contains disbelief that other deviants would not accept. For those who say that the non-existent is a ‘thing’ say that about every possibility, whether it existed or not. They do not make His knowledge of things acquired from the things before their existence, nor [do they claim] that His creation and power are confined to what He knew of them. For He knows types of possibilities that He did not create; His

knowledge of possibilities is wider than what He created. They do not make the impediment preventing Him from creating other than what He created the fact that the subsistent essences in non-existence do not accept other than this existence. Rather, according to them, their existence in another form is possible, which is also among the possibilities subsistent in non-existence. So their view does not lead either to attributing ignorance or incapacity from this perspective. Rather, they might say the impediment to that is that this [existing creation] is the most perfect and most fitting of forms. So His knowledge that there is nothing more perfect than this prevents Him, by His wisdom, from willing what is not most perfect. Thus, they make the impediment something related back to His own Sacred Self, so that they do not make Him prevented by something else. So where is the one who posits no impediment for Him from another, nor any repeller of His decree, compared to the one who makes Him prevented and barred? And where is the one who makes Him knowledgeable by Himself compared to the one who makes Him acquire knowledge from another, and from that which is independent of Him? This is despite the fact that most people have condemned those who said: 'There is nothing more wondrous in possibility than this universe.'

### **The Third Perspective**

He claimed that among the group he considered the highest of the people of Allāh are those whose knowledge is at the level of Allāh's knowledge, because the source [of knowledge] is one, when [Allāh] unveils for him the states of the subsistent essences in non-existence, so he knows them from the perspective that Allāh knew them. Except that, from the servant's side, it is a providence from Allāh that preceded for him, being among the states of his essence. The possessor of this unveiling knows this when Allāh informs him of that. Thus, he made his knowledge and Allāh's knowledge from a single source.

### **The Fourth Perspective**

He made Allāh knowledgeable [of events] after He had not been knowledgeable [of them in that specific way], following the ambiguous which is His statement: {until We know}. He claimed it is a phrase whose meaning is verified, based on his corrupt foundation that the existence of the servant is the very essence of the existence of the Lord. So every creature that came to know what it did not know, it is Allāh who came to know what He did not know. This disbelief has not been preceded by any disbeliever. For the utmost extent of one who denies Allāh's decree is to say: Allāh knew what He had not known [in terms of its occurrence]. But to make everything newly known to a creature actually newly known to Allāh, and that Allāh was not knowledgeable of what every creature knew until that creature knew it—this fabrication has not been made by anyone else.

### **The Fifth Perspective**

He claimed that the essential manifestation occurs according to the form of the preparedness of the one receiving the manifestation, and that the one receiving the manifestation saw nothing but his own form in the mirror of the Truth, and that it is impossible for him to see the Truth, despite his knowledge that he only

saw his form in Him. He used the analogy of the mirror, making the Truth the mirror and the form in the mirror his own form. This confirms what I mentioned of his doctrine: that the existence of the essences, according to him, is the existence of the Truth, and the essences were subsistent in non-existence, and the existence of the Truth appeared in them. So the one receiving the manifestation, who is the servant, does not see existence abstracted from the essences; he sees only the essences in which existence appeared. Thus, there is no way for him ever to see existence [itself]. This, according to him, is the ultimate goal beyond which there is no goal in the right of the creature, and what is after it is sheer non-existence. 'Thus, He is your mirror for your seeing yourself, and you are His mirror for His seeing His names and the manifestation of their rulings.' This is because the servant does not see himself—which is his essence—except in the existence of the Truth, which is His existence. And the servant is His mirror for His seeing His names and the manifestation of their rulings, because the names of the Truth, according to him, are the relations and connections between the essences and the existence of the Truth. The rulings of the names are the subsistent essences in non-existence, and the manifestation of these rulings occurs through the manifestation of the Truth in the essences. The essences, which are the reality of observation, are the mirror of the Truth by which He sees His names and the manifestation of their rulings. For when He manifests Himself in the essences, the relation between existence and the essences—which are the names—occurs, and their rulings—which are the essences—manifest. The existence of these essences is the Truth. This is why he said, 'And they are nothing other than His essence.' 'So the matter became mixed and obscure.' Reflect on this from his words and what corresponds to it, so you may know what he believes regarding the Essence of the Truth and His names: that the Essence of the Truth, according to him, is the very existence of creatures, and His names are the relations between existence and the essences, and their rulings are the essences. [Reflect] so you may know how his words encompass denial of Allāh, His names, His attributes, His creation, and His command, and encompass deviation regarding Allāh's names and signs—the created signs and the recited signs. For what he mentioned is the utmost deviation regarding Allāh's names and signs—the created signs and the recited signs. For he did not affirm any name or sign for Him, since there is only one existence, and that [existence] is neither a name nor a sign. And the subsistent essences are not His names nor His signs. When he affirmed two things, he differentiated between them by existence and subsistence—while there is no [real] difference between them [in his system]—the matter became mixed and obscure for him. This is the reality of his statement and the secret of his doctrine, by which he claims to be the most knowledgeable person in the world about Allāh, and that he thereby surpassed the Šiddīq [Abū Bakr] who was ignorant and said: 'Inability to attain comprehension is comprehension'; and he surpassed the messengers, who only knew that from his niche. It contains types of disbelief and deviation too numerous to count:

1. Among them: Disbelief regarding the Essence of Allāh, since according to him, there is only the existence of the creature.
2. Among them: Disbelief regarding the names of Allāh, since according to him, they are merely non-existent matters. So when we say: {All praise is for Allāh, Lord of the worlds} {The Most Compassionate, the Most Merciful} {Al-

Fatīḥah: 2-3], the Lord, according to him, is merely a relation to subsistence.

## The Sixth Perspective

He said: 'So the matter became mixed and obscure.' Or rather, based on his corrupt foundation, it is mixed and obscure. But based on the foundation of guidance and faith, it is distinct and clear. Allāh has clarified through His Book the truth from falsehood and guidance from deviation. He said: 'Among us is one who was ignorant in his knowledge and said: 'Inability to attain comprehension is comprehension.' This statement is well-known among them, attributed to Abū Bakr Aṣ-Ṣiddīq. So he [Ibn 'Arabī] made him ignorant. Although this wording has not been preserved from Abū Bakr, nor is it authentically transmitted from him in any reliable reports. Ibn Abī Ad-Dunyā only mentioned something similar in the book Kitāb Ash-Shukr from one of the Tābī'in, unnamed, and it is only transmitted mursal (with a missing link) from someone whose mursal reports often contain errors. Just as they narrate about 'Umar that he said: 'When the Prophet (peace be upon him) and Abū Bakr conversed, I was like a Zanjī (black African) between them.' This too is a lie by the consensus of knowledgeable scholars. Rather, what is in the Ṣaḥīḥ from Abū Sa'īd Al-Khudrī is: {The Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) addressed us on the minbar (pulpit) and said: 'Indeed, Allāh gave a servant the choice between the world and the Hereafter, and that servant chose what is with Allāh.' Abū Bakr wept and said: 'Rather, we would ransom you with our lives and wealth,} or words to that effect. People started saying: 'How strange is this old man, weeping because the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) mentioned a servant whom Allāh gave a choice between the world and the Hereafter!' But the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) was the one given the choice, and Abū Bakr was the most knowledgeable of us about him. So Abū Bakr was the most knowledgeable among them of the intent of the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) and his purposes in his speech, even though they all shared in understanding it. This is like what is in the Ṣaḥīḥ, that {'Alī (may Allāh be pleased with him) was asked: Did the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) leave anything with you? And in another wording: Did the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) entrust anything specific to you that he did not entrust to the people? He said: No, by the One who split the seed and created the soul, except for an understanding that Allāh grants a servant in His Book, and what is in this scroll. And in it was [rulings concerning] blood money, the freeing of captives, and that a Muslim should not be killed for a disbeliever}. Based on this hadith and similar authentic hadiths, the scholars deduced that everything mentioned about 'Alī and the Ahl al-Bayt—that they were singled out with knowledge that the Prophet (peace be upon him) specified for them exclusively—is a lie against them. Examples include what is mentioned about al-Ja'far, al-bitāqah, al-jadwal, and other things, and what the Qarmaṭīan Bāṭiniyyah transmit from them. For indeed, more lies have been fabricated against Ja'far Aṣ-Ṣādiq (may Allāh be pleased with him) than against anyone else. Similarly, lies were fabricated against 'Alī (may Allāh be pleased with him) and other Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt (may Allāh be pleased with them), as has been clarified and elaborated elsewhere. Many of these heretics and ignorant ones may use as evidence for that the hadith of {Abū Hurayrah: I memorized two containers [of knowledge] from the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him). As for one of

them, I have disseminated it among you; as for the other, if I were to disseminate it, you would cut this throat.} This hadith is authentic. However, the other container did not contain anything of the knowledge of religion, knowledge of Allāh, or His oneness which is exclusive to His saints. Nor was Abū Hurayrah among the major Companions who would be singled out for such things—if this were something to be singled out for. Rather, that container contained hadiths about the tribulations that would occur among Muslims. For the Prophet (peace be upon him) informed them of the tribulations that would occur among Muslims and the battles that would occur between them and the disbelievers. This is why when the killing of ‘Uthmān and the tribulation of Ibn Az-Zubayr and the like occurred, Ibn ‘Umar said: ‘If Abū Hurayrah were to tell you that you would kill your caliph and demolish the House [Ka’bah] and other things, you would say: Abū Hurayrah lied.’ So Abū Hurayrah used to refrain from narrating hadiths about tribulations before they occurred, because this was something that the leaders and common folk could not bear. Similarly, they may use as evidence the hadith of Ĥudhayfah ibn Al-Yamān, that he was the possessor of the secret which no one else knew. Ĥudhayfah’s hadith is known, but the secret which no one else knew was his knowledge of the identities of the hypocrites who were present during the expedition of Tabūk. It is said that they had intended to attack the Prophet (peace be upon him), so Allāh revealed their plan to the Prophet (peace be upon him), and he informed Ĥudhayfah of their specific identities. This is why ‘Umar would only pray [the funeral prayer] over someone whom Ĥudhayfah prayed over, because praying over hypocrites is forbidden. It is established in the Ṣaḥīḥ from Ĥudhayfah that when he mentioned the tribulations and that he was the most knowledgeable of people about them, he clarified that the Prophet (peace be upon him) did not single him out with the narration of them, but rather narrated [them] to all the people. He said: ‘And the most knowledgeable among us was the one with the best memory.’ What clarifies this further is that it is in the Sunan that {during the year of the Conquest [of Makkah], the Prophet (peace be upon him) had declared the blood of a group of people permissible [to be shed]: among them was ‘Abdullāh ibn Abī Sarḥ. ‘Uthmān brought him to the Prophet (peace be upon him) so he could pledge allegiance. The Prophet (peace be upon him) paused for a moment, then accepted his pledge and said: ‘Was there not among you a right-minded man who would look at me while I held back from this man, and strike his neck?’ A man from the Anṣār said: ‘O Messenger of Allāh, why didn’t you signal to me?’ He replied: ‘It is not befitting for a prophet to have deceitful eyes.} This and similar accounts clarify that the Prophet’s (peace be upon him) outward and inward were congruent; he did not show people the opposite of what he concealed, as claimed by the heretics among the philosophers, Qarmatians, deviant ascetics, and their like.

## The Seventh Perspective

He said: ‘And among us is one who knew and did not say such a thing—and it is the highest saying—rather, knowledge granted him silence, not inability. This is the highest knower of Allāh. This knowledge belongs only to the Seal of the Messengers and the Seal of the Saints. None of the saints or messengers sees it except from the niche of the Seal of the Messengers, and none of the saints sees it except from the niche of the Seal of the Saints; so much so that the

messengers, whenever they see it, see it only from the niche of the Seal of the Saints. For messengership and prophethood—I mean legislative prophethood and its messengership—cease, but sainthood never ceases. So the messengers, from the perspective of their being saints, do not see what we have mentioned except from the niche of the Seal of the Saints. How then [can it be seen by] the saints below them? Even if the Seal of the Saints is a follower in ruling of the legislation brought by the Seal of the Messengers, that does not detract from his station nor contradict what we maintain, for from one aspect he is lower, just as from another aspect he is higher...’ until his statement, ‘...When the Prophet (peace be upon him) represented prophethood as a wall of bricks...’ In this speech, there are types of deviation, disbelief, and disparagement of the prophets and messengers that neither the Jews nor the Christians would utter. What he resembled in this speech is like what was mentioned regarding the saying of the one who said: ‘So the roof collapsed upon them from beneath them’—that this is neither rational nor Qur’ānic. Likewise, what he mentioned here—that the prophets and messengers benefit from the Seal of the Saints who comes after them—contradicts reason, for the predecessor does not benefit from the successor. It also contradicts the Sharia, for it is known by necessity from the religion of Islam that the prophets and messengers are superior to the saints who are not prophets or messengers. He claims that the knowledge—which according to him is the highest knowledge—is the doctrine of waḥdat al-wujūd, that the existence of the Creator is the existence of the creature, which is the reality of negating the Maker and denying Him. This is the doctrine that Pharaoh proclaimed. It was not enough for him to claim that this is truth, but he claimed it is the highest knowledge. That was not enough for him, so he claimed that the messengers only see it from the niche of the Seal of the Saints. Thus, he made the Seal of the Saints more knowledgeable of Allāh than all the prophets and messengers, and made them see the knowledge of Allāh from his niche. Then he proceeded to explain that, saying: ‘For messengership and prophethood—I mean legislative prophethood and its messengership—cease, but sainthood never ceases. So the messengers, from the perspective of their being saints, do not see what we have mentioned except from the niche of the Seal of the Saints. How then [can it be seen by] the saints who are not prophets or messengers?’ This is because they could not possibly posit a prophet or messenger after the Prophet (peace be upon him), for that is manifest disbelief. So they claimed that only legislative prophethood and its messengership cease, meaning—but as for the prophethood of verification and the messengership of verification, which is sainthood according to them—it has not ceased. This sainthood, according to them, is superior to prophethood and messengership. This is why Ibn ‘Arabi said in some of his writings: ‘The station of Prophethood is in a barzakh (intermediate realm), slightly above the Messenger and below the Saint.’ And he said in the Fuṣūṣ, in the ‘(Bezel of) an ‘Uzayriyan Word’: ‘So if you hear one of the people of Allāh say, or it is transmitted to you from him that he said: ‘Sainthood is higher than Prophethood,’ that speaker only means what we have mentioned. Or he says: ‘The Saint is above the Prophet and the Messenger,’ he means by that within a single person, which is that the Messenger (peace be upon him), from the perspective of his being a saint, is more complete than him from the perspective of his being a prophet and messenger; not that the saint who follows him is higher than him. For the follower never reaches the followed in that wherein he follows him, for if he reached him, he would not be his

follower.’ When they elaborate on this, they say: The sainthood of the Prophet is above his prophethood, and his prophethood is above his messengership, because by his sainthood he takes from Allāh. Then they posit a sainthood similar to his as established for themselves, and they make the sainthood of the Seal of the Saints greater than his [the Prophet’s] sainthood, and that the sainthood of the Messenger is subordinate to the sainthood of the Seal of the Saints whom they claim.

In this speech are various points we have clarified elsewhere:

1. (Among them) is that the claim of the claimant regarding the existence of a Seal of Saints as they claim is false and baseless. No well-known figure before these [individuals] mentioned this except Abū ‘Abdillāh Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī At-Tirmidhī Al-Ḥakīm in the book *Khatm Al-Wilāyah* (The Seal of Sainthood). He mentioned in this book things that are erroneous and mistaken, contradicting the Book, the Sunnah, and consensus. Although he (may Allāh have mercy on him) possessed merit and knowledge, and had commendable good and acceptable speech and beneficial realities, there are errors in his speech that must be rejected. Among the most egregious is what he mentioned in the book *Khatm Al-Wilāyah*, such as his claim therein that there will be among the later generations those whose rank with Allāh is greater than the rank of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and others. Then he contradicted himself elsewhere; when he related from some people that the saint may be isolated from people, he refuted that and argued using Abū Bakr and ‘Umar, saying: ‘This would necessitate that he be superior to Abū Bakr and ‘Umar,’ and he refuted that.

2. (Among them) is that he mentioned in his book what implies that abandoning outward deeds—even if they are prescribed supererogatory acts—is superior for the perfect one possessing inward deeds. This is also an error according to the Imāms of the Path. For the most perfect of creation is the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him), and the best guidance is the guidance of Muḥammad (peace be upon him). He never ceased maintaining whatever he could of regular devotions and supererogatory physical acts until his death.

(Among them) is what he claimed regarding the Seal of Saints who would be at the end of time, preferring him and giving him precedence over preceding saints, and that he would be to them like the Seal of the Prophets is to the [other] prophets. This is clear deviation. For the best saints of Allāh from this Ummah are Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, ‘Alī, and their likes among the Foremost Preceders from the Muhājirūn and the Anṣār, as established by well-known texts. The best of generations is his (peace be upon him) generation, as in the authentic hadith: {The best of generations is my generation in which I was sent, then those who follow them, then those who follow them.} And in At-Tirmidhī and others, that {he said regarding Abū Bakr and ‘Umar: ‘These two are the masters of the mature inhabitants of Paradise from the first and the last, except for the prophets and messengers.’} At-Tirmidhī said: A ḥasan hadith. And in Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī from ‘Alī (may Allāh be pleased with him), that his son asked him: ‘O father, who is the best of people after the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him)?’ He said: ‘O my son, Abū Bakr.’ He asked: ‘Then who?’ He said: ‘Then ‘Umar.’ Eighty-odd

individuals narrated from him that he said: ‘The best of this Ummah after its Prophet is Abū Bakr, then ‘Umar.’ This is a vast topic. Allāh has said: {Those are with the ones upon whom Allāh has bestowed favor—of the prophets, the truthful, the martyrs, and the righteous} [An-Nisā’: 69]. These four are the ranks of the servants: the best of them are the prophets, then the truthful, then the martyrs, then the righteous. The Prophet (peace be upon him) {forbade any of us from preferring himself over Yūnus ibn Mattā}—despite His saying {And do not be like the companion of the fish} [Al-Qalam: 48] and His saying {while he was blameworthy} [Aṣ-Ṣāffāt: 142]—alerting [us] that it is even more fitting that no one should prefer himself over others [prophets]. In Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī from Ibn Mas‘ūd from the Prophet (peace be upon him), he said: {Let none of you say, ‘I am better than Yūnus ibn Mattā.’} And in Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī also from him, he said: The Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) said: {It is not befitting for a servant to be better than Yūnus ibn Mattā.} And in another wording: {to say: ‘I am better than Yūnus ibn Mattā.’} And in Al-Bukhārī also from Abū Hurayrah from the Prophet (peace be upon him), he said: {Whoever says, ‘I am better than Yūnus ibn Mattā,’ has lied.} And in the two Ṣaḥīḥs from Abū Hurayrah from the Prophet (peace be upon him), that he said—meaning the Messenger of Allāh—{It is not befitting for a servant to say: ‘I am better than Yūnus ibn Mattā.’} And in the two Ṣaḥīḥs from Ibn ‘Abbās from the Prophet (peace be upon him), and in one wording: {In what he narrates from his Lord: It is not befitting for a servant to say, ‘I am better than Yūnus ibn Mattā.’} This contains a general prohibition. As for what some people narrate that he said: ‘Do not prefer me over Yūnus ibn Mattā’ and interpret it as the equality of the state of the companion of the Mi‘rāj (Ascension) and the state of the companion of the fish: this is a false transmission and a false interpretation. The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: ‘Stand firm, Uḥūd, for upon you is only a Prophet, or a Ṣiddīq (truthful one), or a Shahīd (martyr).’ And Abū Bakr is the best of the Ṣiddīqūn. The term ‘Seal of the Saints’ (khātam al-awliyā’) is not found in the speech of any of the Salaf of the Ummah nor its Imāms, nor is it mentioned in the Book of Allāh or the Sunnah of His Messenger. The implication of this term is that he is the last pious believer, for Allāh says: {Unquestionably, [for] the allies of Allāh there will be no fear concerning them, nor will they grieve} [Yūnus: 62]. So everyone who is a pious believer is an ally of Allāh. They are of two levels: the Foremost, Brought Near and the Companions of the Right, the Moderate, as Allāh divided them in Sūrah Fāṭir, Sūrah Al-Wāqī‘ah, Al-Insān, and Al-Muṭaffifin.

In Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī from Abū Hurayrah from the Prophet (peace be upon him), he said: {Allāh says: Whoever shows enmity to a walī (ally) of Mine, I have declared war against him. My servant does not draw near to Me with anything more beloved to Me than the religious duties I have enjoined upon him, and My servant continues to draw near to Me with supererogatory works (nawāfil) until I love him. When I love him, I am his hearing with which he hears, his seeing with which he sees, his hand with which he strikes, and his foot with which he walks. Were he to ask [something] of Me, I would surely give it to him; and were he to seek refuge in Me, I would surely grant him refuge. I do not hesitate about anything I am going to do as I hesitate about taking the soul of My faithful servant: he dislikes death and I dislike hurting

him, but it is inevitable for him.} So those who draw near to Allāh with obligatory duties are the righteous, the moderate, the Companions of the Right. Those who draw near to Him with supererogatory acts which He loves, after the obligatory duties, are the Foremost, Brought Near. Supererogatory acts only come after obligatory duties. Abū Bakr Aṣ-Ṣiddīq said in his counsel to ‘Umar ibn Al-Khaṭṭāb: ‘Know that Allāh has a right upon you during the night that He does not accept during the day, and a right upon you during the day that He does not accept during the night. And He does not accept a supererogatory act until you perform the obligatory duty.’ The proponents of Ittiḥādiyyah claim that the nearness of supererogatory acts necessitates that the essence of the Truth becomes the essence of his [the servant’s] limbs, and that the nearness of obligatory duties necessitates that the Truth becomes the essence of his entire existence. This is corrupt from many perspectives; rather, it is explicit disbelief, as we have explained elsewhere. If the Seal of the Saints is the last pious believer in the world, then that man is not the best of the saints nor the most perfect of them. Rather, the best and most perfect of them are their predecessors who were more closely connected to the best of the Messengers than others. For the closer a saint is specifically connected to the Messenger, taking from him, and conforming to him, the more superior he is. Since a saint is only a saint of Allāh by following the Messenger inwardly and outwardly, the measure of sainthood for Allāh corresponds to the measure of following the Messenger.

Although there are among the saints inspired individuals (muḥaddathūn), as established in the two Ṣaḥīḥs from the Prophet (peace be upon him) that he said: {Indeed, there were among the nations before you inspired individuals (muḥaddathūn). If there is anyone in my Ummah [like that], it is ‘Umar.} This hadith indicates that the first of the inspired individuals in this Ummah was ‘Umar. And Abū Bakr is superior to him, as he is the Ṣiddīq. The inspired one—even if he is inspired and spoken to from Allāh—must measure that against the Book and the Sunnah, for he is not infallible. As Abū Al-Ḥasan Ash-Shādhilī said: ‘Infallibility has been guaranteed for us in what the Book and the Sunnah brought, but infallibility has not been guaranteed for us in unveilings and inspirations.’ This is why ‘Umar ibn Al-Khaṭṭāb was one who stopped at the Book of Allāh. Abū Bakr Aṣ-Ṣiddīq used to clarify things for him that contradicted what occurred to him [‘Umar], as he clarified for him on the day of Al-Ḥudaybiyah, the day of the Prophet’s (peace be upon him) death, the day of fighting those who withheld Zakāh, and other instances. ‘Umar ibn Al-Khaṭṭāb used to consult the Companions; sometimes he would defer to them, and sometimes they would defer to him. Perhaps he would state an opinion, and a woman from among the Muslims would refute his statement and clarify the truth for him, and he would defer to her and abandon his opinion, like [the issue of] limiting the dowry. Perhaps he would hold an opinion, then a hadith from the Prophet (peace be upon him) would be mentioned to him, and he would act upon it and abandon his opinion. He used to accept parts of the Sunnah from those below him [in rank] in numerous cases. He used to state an opinion, and it would be said to him: ‘You are correct.’ He would reply: ‘By Allāh, ‘Umar does not know if he has hit upon the truth or erred.’ If this was the case for the Imām of the inspired ones, then every person whose heart speaks to him from his Lord until the Day of Resurrection is below ‘Umar. None of them is infallible;

rather, error is possible for all of them. Although a group claims that the saint is protected, which is analogous to the infallibility established for the prophets—and Al-Ĥakīm At-Tirmidhī alluded to this—this is false, contradicting the Sunnah and consensus. This is why Muslims unanimously agree that from every person’s statement, some is taken and some is left, except for the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him), even though they [people] differ in levels of guidance, light, and correctness. This is why the Ṣiddīq was superior to the Muḥaddath, because the Ṣiddīq takes from the niche of prophethood, so he only takes something infallible and protected. As for the Muḥaddath, correctness and error occur for him, and the Book and the Sunnah distinguish his correctness from his error. By this, all the saints became dependent on the Book and the Sunnah; they must weigh all their affairs by the traditions of the Messenger. Whatever conforms to the traditions of the Messenger is truth, and whatever contradicts that is falsehood, even if they exercised ijtihād (independent reasoning) in it. Allāh rewards them for their ijtihād and forgives their errors. It is known that the Foremost Preceders were greater in guidance and adherence to the prophetic traditions, so they possess greater faith and piety. As for the last of the saints, he will not attain the like of what they attained. The hadith that is narrated: {The parable of my Ummah is like that of rain; it is not known whether its beginning is better or its end}—its chain of narration has been criticized. Assuming its authenticity, its meaning is only that there will be at the end of the Ummah those who approximate its beginning, such that it becomes unclear to some people which is better, just as the two ends of a garment might seem similar to some people, despite the certainty that the first is better than the last. This is why he said: ‘it is not known.’ It is known that this negation is not general for [all people], for it must be known which is superior.

Then, this ‘Seal of the Saints’ became an imagined rank with no reality. Groups began claiming it for themselves or for their shaykh. More than one person claimed it, and none claimed it except those whose speech contained falsehood such as neither the Jews nor the Christians uttered. For example, the author of the Fuṣūṣ claimed it, and he was followed by the author of the discourse on letters, a shaykh from their followers who was in Damascus, and another who used to claim he was the Mahdī who would marry his daughter to ‘Isā ibn Maryam, and that he was the Seal of the Saints. These and their likes claim matters that are only befitting for Allāh alone, just as a claimant among them might claim for himself or his shaykh what the Christians claimed for the Messiah. Then, the author of the Fuṣūṣ and his likes built the matter upon [the premise] that the saint takes from Allāh without an intermediary, while the prophet takes via the intermediary of the angel. For this reason, the Seal of the Saints became superior, according to them, from this perspective. This is false and a lie. For the saint does not take from Allāh except through the intermediary of the Messenger sent to him. If he is inspired (muḥaddath) and something is cast into him, he is obligated to weigh it against what the Messenger brought of the Book and the Sunnah. Allāh’s speaking to His servants is in three ways:—from behind a veil, as He spoke to Mūsā;—by sending a messenger, as He sent the angels to the prophets;—and by revelation/inspiration. This [last one] has a share for the saint. As for the first two ranks, they are exclusive to the prophets. So the saints upon whom the proof has been established through the messengers do not take knowledge of the religion except through the

mediation of Allāh’s messengers to them, even if it is only by measuring it against what the Messenger brought. They will never reach, in their taking from Allāh, the rank of a prophet or messenger. How then can they be taking from Allāh without an intermediary, and how can this taking be higher, when they do not reach the station of Mūsā’s being spoken to, nor the station of angels descending upon them as they descended upon the prophets? This is the religion of the Muslims, Jews, and Christians.

As for these Jahmī Ittīhādiyyah (Pantheistic Jahmites): they built upon their corrupt foundation that Allāh is Absolute Existence subsisting for every existent thing. Thus, the thoughts that occur in their hearts—even if they are from the whispers of Shayṭān—they claim they took them from Allāh without an intermediary, and that they are spoken to just as Mūsā ibn ‘Imrān was spoken to. Among them are those who claim their state is superior to the state of Mūsā ibn ‘Imrān, because Mūsā heard the address from the tree, while they—according to their claim—hear the address from a living, speaking being. As is narrated about the author of the Fuṣūṣ that he said:

*Every speech in existence is His speech  
Be it prose or poetry, it’s the same to us*

They were aided in this by what they believed from the doctrines of the Jahmiyyah and their followers, who claim that Allāh’s speaking to Mūsā was merely a type of inspiration, and that the servant may see Allāh in this world if the impediment is removed from his eye, since, according to them, there is no veil to vision separate from the servant; rather, the veil is connected to him. So when it is lifted, he witnesses the Truth. But they witness nothing except what they imagine of Absolute Existence, which has no reality except in their minds, or [they witness] created existence. So the witnessed Lord according to them—who addresses them, in their claim—either has no existence except in their minds, or has no existence except the existence of creatures. This is the negation of the Lord, His Books, and His Messengers. Innovations are the corridor to disbelief and hypocrisy, just as Tashayyu’ (Shiism) is the corridor to Rafd’ (Rejectionism), and Rafd’ is the corridor to Qarmatīsm and negation (ta’ṭīl). So speech containing Jahmism (tajahhum) is the corridor to [full] Jahmism, and Jahmism is the corridor to heresy (zandaqah) and negation (ta’ṭīl). It is established in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim from the Prophet (peace be upon him) that he said: {And know that none of you will see his Lord until he dies.} This is why the Salaf of the Ummah and its Imāms agreed that Allāh will be seen in the Hereafter and that no one sees Him in this world with his eyes. Regarding the Prophet’s (peace be upon him) seeing his Lord, there is well-known discourse involving ‘Ā’ishah and Ibn ‘Abbās. ‘Ā’ishah denied the vision, while it is established from Ibn ‘Abbās in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim that he said: {Muḥammad saw his Lord with his heart twice.} Likewise, Aḥmad mentioned from Abū Dharr and others that he affirmed seeing Him with his heart. This, which is explicitly reported from Ibn ‘Abbās, Abū Dharr, and others, is what is explicitly reported from Aḥmad and other Imāms of the Sunnah. It is not established from any of them that they affirmed vision with the eye in this world, just as it is not established from any of them that they denied vision in the Hereafter. However, both positions are held by factions of the Jahmiyyah. The negation is held by the theologians of the Jahmiyyah, and the affirmation is held by some Sufi Jahmites like the Ittīhādiyyah and a faction from others. These Ittīhādiyyah combine negation and affirmation, as Ibn Sab’īn says:

'An eye that sees is an essence that is not seen, and an essence that is not seen is an eye that sees,' and the like, because their doctrine necessitates combining contradictories. They say about all beings what the Christians said about the Messiah. This is why they diversified in that just as the Christians diversified regarding the Messiah.

Among the types [of error] in their claim is that the Seal of the Saints is superior to the Seal of the Prophets from some aspects. For Abū 'Abdillāh Al-Ḥakīm At-Tirmidhī did not say this, nor did any other well-known shaykhs. Rather, the man [At-Tirmidhī] was of greater stature and greater faith than to fabricate this explicit disbelief. But he erred by a handspan, and they built upon his error what became disbelief.

Greater than that is their claim that the saints and messengers, from the perspective of their sainthood, are followers of the Seal of the Saints and take from his niche. This is false according to reason and religion, for the predecessor does not take from the successor, and the messengers do not take from others [non-messengers].

Greater than that is that he made them followers of him in the knowledge of Allāh, which is the noblest of their sciences.

More evident than that is that he made the knowledge of Allāh to be the doctrine of the proponents of the unity of existence, those who say that the existence of the creature is the very essence of the existence of the Creator.

Let the believer reflect on this hideous disbelief, degree after degree: His citing, as evidence for preferring a non-prophet over him [the Prophet], the story of 'Umar and the pollination of date palms. Would any Muslim say that 'Umar was superior to the Prophet (peace be upon him) because of his opinion regarding the captives? Or that the farmers who master the craft of pollination are superior to the prophets in that regard? Then he was not content with that, until he said: 'It is not necessary for the perfect one to have precedence in every science and every rank. Rather, the gaze of the 'men' is towards precedence in the rank of knowledge of Allāh; that is their objective.'

So he claimed that he is more knowledgeable of Allāh than the Seal of the Prophets, and that his precedence over him is in knowledge of Allāh, while the Seal of the Prophets' precedence over him is only in legislation. This is among the greatest forms of disbelief into which the extremists among the philosophers, Sufis, and theologians fall—those who claim that they are more perfect than the messengers in matters of knowledge, like knowledge of Allāh and the like, and that the messengers only preceded them in general legislation which was made for the well-being of people in their worldly affairs. They might say: The laws are just regulations established for worldly benefit. As for recognition, realities, and high ranks in this world and the Hereafter, they prefer themselves and their paths over the prophets and the paths of the prophets. It is known by necessity from the religion of Muslims that this is among the greatest forms of disbelief and deviation. This was a cause for denying the realities of what the messengers informed about concerning faith in Allāh and the Last Day, claiming that what these [deviants] say in this regard is the truth. They ended up, regarding the reports of the messengers, sometimes denying them, sometimes distorting them, sometimes consigning their meaning [to Allāh], and sometimes claiming that the messengers lied for the benefit of the

masses. Then, most of those who hold these views still prefer the prophets and messengers over themselves, except for the extremists among them, as mentioned before. These are the worst of people in statement and belief. There was among us a shaykh, one of the most ignorant of people, whom a group of non-Arabs venerated, and it was said he was the Seal of the Saints. He claimed that he interpreted knowledge in two ways, while the Prophet (peace be upon him) only interpreted it in one way, and that he was more perfect than the Prophet (peace be upon him). He received this from the author of the Fuṣūṣ. People like this are numerous in these times. The cause of the deviation of the philosophers, Sufis, and theologians is agreement with their deviation. This is not the place for lengthy elaboration on the deviation of this, but the purpose is to point out that the author of the Fuṣūṣ and his likes held the view of these [extremists]. As for the disbelief of one who prefers himself over the Prophet (peace be upon him)—as the author of the Fuṣūṣ mentioned—it is manifest. However, among these are those who do not hold that view, but they believe they have a path to Allāh other than following the Messenger, and they permit themselves to follow that path even if it contradicts the law of the Messenger. They use the story of Mūsā and Al-Khadīr as evidence. But there is no proof in it for two reasons:

1. Mūsā was not sent to Al-Khadīr, nor was Al-Khadīr obligated to follow Mūsā. For Mūsā was sent to the Children of Israel. This is why it is stated in the authentic hadith: {When Mūsā greeted Al-Khadīr with salām, he [Al-Khadīr] said: 'And how is salām [known] in your land?' He said: 'I am Mūsā.' He asked: 'Mūsā of the Children of Israel?' He said: 'Yes.' He [Al-Khadīr] said: 'Indeed, you possess knowledge from Allāh's knowledge that He taught you, which I do not know, and I possess knowledge from Allāh that He taught me, which you do not know.'} This is why our Prophet (peace be upon him) said: {We have been favored over people with five things: our rows [in prayer] have been made like the rows of the angels; the earth has been made a place of prostration and a means of purification for me, so wherever prayer time finds any man, he has his place of prostration and his means of purification; spoils of war have been made lawful for me, while they were not lawful for anyone before me; I have been given the intercession; and the prophet [before me] used to be sent specifically to his people, while I have been sent to all people.} And he said: {I have been given five things which were not given to anyone before me: I have been granted victory through awe [instilled in the enemy] for a month's distance; the earth has been made a place of prostration and a means of purification for me; spoils of war have been made lawful for me, while they were not lawful for anyone before me; I have been given the intercession; and the prophet [before me] used to be sent specifically to his people, while I have been sent to all people.} Allāh has said: {And We have not sent you except comprehensively to mankind as a bringer of good tidings and a warner} [Saba': 28]. And Allāh said: {Say, [O Muḥammad], 'O mankind, indeed I am the Messenger of Allāh to you all...'} [Al-A'rāf: 158]. So Muḥammad (peace be upon him) is the Messenger of Allāh to all the two weighty creations: their humans and their jinn, their Arabs and their non-Arabs, their kings and their ascetics, the saints among them and the non-saints. No one has [the right] to deviate from following him, inwardly and outwardly, nor from following what he brought of the Book and the Sunnah,

in subtle matters or significant ones, neither in knowledge nor in actions. No one has [the right] to say to him what Al-Khadīr said to Mūsā. As for Mūsā, he was not sent to Al-Khadīr.

2. The story of Al-Khadīr does not contain any contradiction to the Sharia. Rather, the actions he performed are permissible in the Sharia if the servant knows their reasons, as Al-Khadīr knew them. This is why when he explained their reasons to Mūsā, he [Mūsā] agreed with him on that. Had it contradicted his [Mūsā's] Sharia, he would not have agreed under any circumstance. We have elaborated on this elsewhere. For damaging the ship, its implication is that it is permissible for a person to preserve inviolable property for its owner by destroying part of it, for that is better than its complete loss. Just as it was permissible for the shepherd—during the time of the Prophet (peace be upon him)—to slaughter the sheep he feared would die. The story of the boy, its implication is the permissibility of killing an attacking child. This is why Ibn 'Abbās said to Najdah: 'As for the boys, if you know about them what Al-Khadīr knew about that boy, then kill them; otherwise, do not kill them.' As for repairing the wall, it involves doing a good deed without payment, despite need, if it is for the offspring of righteous people.

## The Eighth Perspective

His statement: 'When the Prophet (peace be upon him) represented prophethood as a wall...' until the end of his words. It implies that knowledge is of two types:

1. Knowledge of the Sharia [in this] he takes from Allāh just as the Prophet takes. For he said: 'The reason necessitating his seeing it as two bricks is that he is a follower of the law of the Seal of the Messengers in the outward, which is the place of the silver brick. This is his outward aspect and the rulings he follows therein. Just as he takes from Allāh in secret that in which, in the outward form, he is a follower, because he sees the matter as it is, so he must see it thus.' This which he claimed—that the saint takes from Allāh in secret that in which he follows the messengers, like the leading scholars with their followers—contains deviation that is not hidden from one who believes in Allāh and His messengers. For this person claims he was given the like of what the messengers of Allāh were given, and says, 'Revelation came to me,' while nothing was revealed to him. He places the messengers at the level of teachers of medicine, arithmetic, grammar, etc.; when the student knows the proof used by his teacher, he should agree with him due to sharing the knowledge with him, not because he is a messenger and an intermediary from Allāh to him in conveying the command and prohibition. This disbelief resembles the disbelief of Musaylimah the Liar and his like, who claimed partnership with the Messenger in messengership. His muezzin used to say: 'I bear witness that Muḥammad and Musaylimah are the messengers of Allāh.'

2. Knowledge of Reality, and in this, he is above the Messenger. As he said: 'This is the place of the golden brick in the inward, for he takes from the source from which the angel who brings revelation to the Messenger takes.' He has claimed that this knowledge—which is the place of the golden brick, the knowledge of the inward and reality—he is superior to the Messenger in

it, because he takes it from where the angel takes the knowledge revealed to the Messenger, while the Messenger takes it from the angel, but he takes it from above the angel, from where the angel takes it. This is beyond the claim of Musaylimah the Liar, for Musaylimah did not claim he was higher than the Messenger in any of the divine sciences, whereas this one claimed he was above him in the knowledge of Allāh. Then he said: 'If you understand what I have alluded to, you have obtained beneficial knowledge.' It is known that this disbelief is worse than the disbelief of the Jews and Christians. For the Jews and Christians would not accept making any believer superior to Mūsā and 'Īsā. This one claims that he and his likes—those who claim to be the Seal of the Saints—are above all the messengers and more knowledgeable of Allāh than all the messengers. Rational philosophers do not accept this; only their extremists and the foolish among them say such things, those who are furthest from reason and religion.

### The Ninth Perspective

His statement: 'Every prophet from Ādam...' until the end of the section. It implies that all prophets and messengers take only from the niche of the Seal of the Prophets, in order to pave the way for his [claim] that all prophets take only from the niche of the Seal of the Saints. Both are deviation. For among the messengers, none takes from another except one who was commanded to follow his law, like the prophets of the Children of Israel and the messengers sent among them who were commanded to follow the Torah, as Allāh said: {Indeed, We sent down the Torah, in which was guidance and light...} [Al-Mā'idah: 44]. As for Ibrāhīm, he did not take from Mūsā and 'Īsā. Nūḥ did not take from Ibrāhīm. Nūḥ, Ibrāhīm, Mūsā, and 'Īsā did not take from Muḥammad, although they gave glad tidings of him and believed in him, as Allāh said: {And [mention] when Allāh took the covenant of the prophets, [saying], 'Whatever I give you of the Scripture and wisdom...'} [Āl 'Imrān: 81]. Ibn 'Abbās said: 'Allāh never sent a prophet except that He took the covenant from him regarding Muḥammad, and took the covenant from his people, that they must believe in him, and if he were sent while they were alive, they must support him.'

### The Tenth Perspective

His statement: 'For he, by his reality, exists. This is his statement: {I was a prophet while Ādam was between water and clay},' unlike other prophets. 'Likewise, the Seal of the Saints was a saint while Ādam was between water and clay.' This is a clear lie, contradicting the consensus of the Imāms of the religion, even if this is said by a faction of the people of deviation and heresy. For Allāh knew things and decreed them before He brought them into being. They do not exist by their realities except when they are brought into existence. There is no difference in that between the prophets and others. His (peace be upon him) reality was not existing before he was created, except just as the reality of others was [existing], in the sense that Allāh knew it and decreed it. However, the appearance of his report and name was more renowned and greater than others. For he was written in the Torah and the Gospel, and before that, as Imām Aḥmad narrated in his Musnad from Al-'Irbād' ibn Sāriyah from the Prophet (peace be upon him), he said: {I was indeed the servant of Allāh, written as the Seal of the Prophets, while Ādam was still kneaded in his clay. I shall inform you

about the beginning of that: the supplication of my father Ibrāhīm, the glad tidings of 'Īsā, and the vision of my mother; she saw, when she gave birth to me, as if a light came out of her that illuminated the palaces of Syria.} And the hadith of Maysarah Al-Fajr: {I asked: O Messenger of Allāh, when were you a prophet? And in another wording: When were you written as a prophet? He said: While Ādam was between the spirit and the body.} This is the wording of the hadith. As for his statement: {I was a prophet while Ādam was between water and clay}, it has no basis; none of the scholars of hadith narrated it with this wording, and it is false, for he [Ādam] was not between water and clay, since clay is water and earth. But when Allāh created Ādam's body before breathing the spirit into him, He wrote the prophethood of Muḥammad (peace be upon him) and decreed it, as established in the two Ṣaḥīḥs from Ibn Mas'ūd, who said: The Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him), the truthful and believed, told us: {The creation of one of you is gathered in his mother's womb for forty days as a sperm-drop, then he becomes a clot for a similar period, then he becomes a lump of flesh for a similar period. Then the angel is sent to him and commanded with four words. It is said: Write down his provision, his deeds, his lifespan, and whether he is wretched or happy. Then the spirit is breathed into him.} It is narrated that his name was written on the leg of the Throne and the doorposts of Paradise. So where is the writing and decree compared to the existence of the reality? The hadiths narrated in this regard are of this type, such as his being a light circumambulating around the Throne, or a star rising in the sky, and the like, as mentioned by Ibn Ḥamawayh—the companion of Ibn 'Arabī—and some of which was mentioned by 'Umar Al-Mullā in Wasīlat Al-Muta'abbidīn, and Ibn Sab'īn and their likes, who narrate fabrications and lies by the consensus of those knowledgeable in hadith. For regarding this meaning, they narrated hadiths, all of which are lies. So much so that I once met an esteemed shaykh from the companions of Ibn Ḥamawayh, whom his companions called Sulṭān Al-Aqṭāb (Sultan of the Poles). We discussed the book Al-Fuṣūṣ, and he venerated it and its author. When I pointed out some of what was in it, he was shocked and began mentioning such hadiths. I explained to him that all of this was lies.

## The Eleventh Perspective

Write down his provision, his deeds, his lifespan, and whether he is wretched or happy. Then the spirit is breathed into him.} It is narrated that his name was written on the leg of the Throne and the doorposts of Paradise. So where is the writing and decree compared to the existence of the reality? The hadiths narrated in this regard are of this type, such as his being a light circumambulating around the Throne, or a star rising in the sky, and the like, as mentioned by Ibn Ḥamawayh—the companion of Ibn 'Arabī—and some of which was mentioned by 'Umar Al-Mullā in Wasīlat Al-Muta'abbidīn, and Ibn Sab'īn and their likes, who narrate fabrications and lies by the consensus of those knowledgeable in hadith. For regarding this meaning, they narrated hadiths, all of which are lies. So much so that I once met an esteemed shaykh from the companions of Ibn Ḥamawayh, whom his companions called Sulṭān Al-Aqṭāb (Sultan of the Poles). We discussed the book Al-Fuṣūṣ, and he venerated it and its author. When I pointed out some of what was in it, he was shocked and began mentioning such hadiths. I explained to him that all of this was lies.

His statement: 'And the Seal of the Saints was a saint while Ādam was between

water and clay...' until his statement, '...So the Seal of the Messengers, from the perspective of his sainthood, his relation with the Seal of Sainthood is like the relation of the [other] saints and messengers with him...' until the end of the speech. He mentioned therein what was previously stated about the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) being, in relation to this claimed Seal, like all other prophets and messengers are to him [the Seal of Messengers], taking from his [the Seal of Saints'] niche the knowledge of Allāh, which is the highest knowledge—namely, waḥdat al-wujūd. [He mentioned] that he [Muḥammad] is the foremost of the community and the master of the children of Ādam in opening the gate of intercession. 'By his intercession, he designated a specific state that was not generalized...' until his statement, '...Thus, Muḥammad attained mastery in this specific station.' So he lied against the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) in his statement that he said: 'I am the master of the children of Ādam specifically in intercession,' and he deviated and fabricated by claiming he is master only in intercession, not in the remaining ranks, unlike the fabricated Seal [of Saints], who is master in the knowledge of Allāh and other stations.

I used to say: If the one addressing us were someone who preferred Ibrāhīm, Mūsā, or 'Isā over Muḥammad (peace be upon him), it would be a great calamity that Muslims could not bear. How then [can we bear] someone who prefers a man from the Ummah of Muḥammad over Muḥammad and over all the prophets and messengers in the best of sciences, claiming they take that from his niche? And this science is the height of deviation and heresy. This preferer is among the most deviant of the children of Ādam and the furthest from the straight path, even if he has extensive writings and numerous works, possesses knowledge of many things, and holds sway over the hearts of factions from various types of philosophers, Sufis, theologians, jurists, and common people. For this speech is among the greatest speech in deviation according to the people of knowledge and faith. And Allāh knows best. It has become clear that this speech contains disbelief, disparagement of the messengers, contempt for them, belittling them; rather, even disbelief in them and in what they brought, which is not hidden from any believer. One of the notable virtuous men told me that he heard Shaykh Ibrāhīm Al-Ja'barī—may Allāh have mercy on him—say: 'I saw Ibn 'Arabī—and he is an impure shaykh—disbelieving in every Book Allāh revealed and in every Prophet Allāh sent.' He spoke the truth in what he said; but this is only some of the types of disbelief he mentioned. Likewise, the statement of Abū Muḥammad ibn 'Abd As-Salām: 'He is an evil, abominable, lying shaykh who believes in the eternity of the world and does not forbid any private part'—this is correctly reported from him, but it is only some of the types of disbelief he mentioned. For his [Ibn 'Abd As-Salām's] statement [was made when] his [Ibn 'Arabī's] condition had not become clear and verified to him. Otherwise, according to him [Ibn 'Arabī], there is no Lord and universe as stated by the theistic philosophers who affirm a Necessary Existent and a possible universe. Rather, according to him, the existence of the universe is the existence of Allāh. This corresponds to the view of the materialist fatalists who deny the existence of the Maker absolutely and do not affirm any necessary existent other than the universe, as Allāh mentioned about Pharaoh and his ilk. His view corresponds to the view of Pharaoh, but Pharaoh did not acknowledge Allāh, whereas these [Ittīhādīs] acknowledge Allāh but interpret Him as the existence

which Pharaoh acknowledged. So they are more ignorant than Pharaoh and more deviant. Pharaoh was more disbelieving than them, as his disbelief contained defiance and arrogance not present in their disbelief, as Allāh said: {And they rejected them, while their [inner] selves were certain of them, out of injustice and haughtiness} [An-Naml: 14]. And Mūsā said to him: {He said, 'You have already known that none sent down these [signs] except the Lord of the heavens and the earth as clear proofs'} [Al-Isrā': 102].

The summary of the matter of the author of the Fuṣūṣ and his ilk is the demolition of the three foundations of faith. For the foundations of faith are: belief in Allāh, belief in His messengers, and belief in the Last Day.

1. As for belief in Allāh: they claimed His existence is the existence of the universe; the universe has no maker other than the universe.
2. As for the Messenger: they claimed they are more knowledgeable of Allāh than him and all the messengers, and that they [the messengers] take the knowledge of Allāh—which is negation and the unity of existence—from his [the Seal of Saints'] niche, and that they [the saints] are equal to him [the Prophet] in taking knowledge of the Sharia from Allāh.
3. As for belief in the Last Day: he said:

*So nothing remained but the True Promise alone  
And by the True Threat, an eye witnesses.  
Even if they enter the Abode of Misery (Hell), they are  
Upon a pleasure therein, a distinct bliss*

This is narrated from some people of deviation before him, that he said: 'Indeed, the Fire will become for its inhabitants a fiery nature which they enjoy. At that point, there will be no fear, no danger, and no punishment, because it is something found pleasant.'

4. Then, regarding command and prohibition: according to him, the Commander, the Prohibiter, the commanded, and the prohibited are one. This is why the first thing he said in Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyyah, which is his largest book, was:

*The Lord is real, and the servant is real  
Oh, would that I knew, who is the one obligated?  
If you say 'servant,' that one is Lord  
Or if you say 'Lord,' how can He be obligated?*

In another place [it reads] 'that one is dead'—I saw it in his handwriting. This is built upon his foundation, for according to him, there is no servant, nor any existence except the existence of the Lord. So who is the one obligated? According to his foundation, He is the one obligated and the one who obligates, as they say: He sent from Himself to Himself a messenger.

As Ibn Al-Fārid said in his poem, which he composed according to their doctrine and named Naẓm As-Sulūk:

*To me, a messenger, I was sent from myself  
And my essence, by my signs, deduced about me*

Its content is the doctrine of the unity of existence, which is the doctrine of Ibn 'Arabī, Ibn Sab'īn, and their likes. As he said:

*For her are my prayers, at the station I perform them  
 And I witness therein that she prayed to me  
 Both of us are praying, worshipping, prostrating to me  
 In reality, with union, in every prostration  
 None prayed to me but myself, so it was not  
 My prayer for other than me in performing every rak'ah*

Until his statement:

*I have never ceased being her, and she never ceased being me  
 And no difference; rather, my essence loved my essence*

Such examples are numerous. And Allāh knows best. My companion, the jurist and Sufi Abū Al-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Qurbāsh told me: that he entered upon Shaykh Qutb Ad-Dīn ibn Al-Qasfāllānī and found him composing a book. He asked: 'What is this?' He replied: 'This is in refutation of Ibn Sab'īn, Ibn Al-Fārid, Abū Al-Ḥasan Al-Jazulī, and Al-'Afif At-Tilimsānī.' He told me about Jamāl Ad-Dīn ibn Wāṣil and Shams Ad-Dīn Al-Aṣbahānī: that they used to reject the words of Ibn 'Arabī, invalidate them, and refute him. And that Al-Aṣbahānī saw a book from his books with him and said to him: 'If you acquire any of his books, do not come to me,' or words to this effect. And that Ibn Wāṣil, when he mentioned his [Ibn 'Arabī's] story about the apple that transformed from a ḥūriyyah (maiden of Paradise), and he spoke with it or had intercourse with it, said: 'By Allāh, besides Whom there is no god, he lies.' And indeed, he was truthful in his oath. My companion, the knowledgeable and virtuous Abū Bakr ibn Sālār told me: from Shaykh Taqīyy Ad-Dīn ibn Daqīq Al-Īd—the shaykh of his time—from Imām Abū Muḥammad ibn 'Abd As-Salām, that they asked him about Ibn 'Arabī when he entered Egypt, and he said: 'An evil, lying, abominable shaykh who believes in the eternity of the world and does not forbid any private part.' Taqīyy Ad-Dīn used to say: 'He is a possessor of vast imagination.' More than one Egyptian jurist who heard the words of Ibn Daqīq Al-Īd told me this. Ibn Buhayr told me from Rashīd Ad-Dīn Sa'īd and others that he said: 'He used to deem lying permissible.' This is his best condition. The Shaykh, the knowledgeable, the recognizer Kamāl Ad-Dīn Al-Marāghī, the shaykh of his era, told me that when he arrived [somewhere] and heard the speech of these people regarding Tawḥīd (Oneness), he said: 'I read some of their writings to Al-'Afif At-Tilimsānī and saw it contradicting the Book and the Sunnah. When I mentioned that to him, he said: 'The Qur'ān does not contain Tawḥīd; rather, the Qur'ān is entirely shirk. Whoever follows the Qur'ān will not reach Tawḥīd.' He [Al-Marāghī] said: So I asked him: 'What is the difference, according to you, between the wife, the unrelated woman, and the sister? All are one?' He said: 'There is no difference between them according to us. It is only these veiled ones who believe it is forbidden, so we say it is forbidden for them, according to them. But according to us, there is nothing forbidden.' Kamāl Ad-Dīn Al-Marāghī also told me that when he discussed this doctrine with At-Tilimsānī, he said—and I was reading to him about it—'For they had esteemed him greatly in our view, and we were eager to know [Fuṣūṣ Al-Ḥikam]. When he began explaining it to me, I would say, 'This contradicts the Qur'ān and the Hadiths.' He said: 'Throw all of this behind the door and be present with a pure heart until you receive this Tawḥīd'—or words to that effect. Then he feared I would spread this about him, so he came to me weeping and said: 'Conceal for me what you heard from me.' Kamāl Ad-Dīn also told me that he met Shaykh Abū Al-'Abbās Ash-Shādhilī, the

student of Shaykh Abū Al-Ḥasan, who said about At-Tilimsānī: ‘These are disbelievers. These believe that the creation is the Creator.’ He [Al-Marāghī] said: ‘I had resolved to enter seclusion under his [At-Tilimsānī’s] guidance, but I said [to Ash-Shādhilī]: ‘I will not take this [doctrine] from him; I will only learn the etiquette of seclusion from him.’ He said to me: ‘Your example is like someone who wants to get close to the Sultan through the master of the furnace and the garbage collector. If the garbage collector is the one who brings him close to the Sultan, what will his state be with the Sultan?’ He also told us: The Chief Justice Taqiyy Ad-Dīn ibn Daqīq Al-Īd said to me: ‘The Tatars only conquered the eastern lands due to the prevalence of philosophy among them and the weakness of the Sharia.’ I said to him: ‘But in your lands, there is the doctrine of these who believe in Ittiḥād, which is worse than the doctrine of the philosophers?’ He replied: ‘The statement of these people is not uttered by any rational person. Rather, every rational person knows the corruption of the statement of these people’—meaning its corruption is obvious—‘so this is not mentioned among things that might confuse rational people, unlike the discourse of the philosophers, which contains something rational, even if it is corrupt.’ Tāj Ad-Dīn Al-Anbārī, the virtuous Egyptian jurist, told me that he heard Shaykh Ibrāhīm Al-Ja’barī say: ‘I saw Ibn ‘Arabī, an old man with a dyed beard, and he is an impure shaykh who disbelieves in every Book Allāh revealed and every Prophet Allāh sent.’ Shaykh Rashīd Ad-Dīn ibn Al-Mu’allim told me that he said: ‘When I was young in Damascus, I used to hear people say about Ibn ‘Arabī and Al-Khusrawshāhī that both were heretics’—or words to this effect. He told me from Shaykh Ibrāhīm Al-Ja’barī: that he was present with Ibn Al-Fārid’ at his death, and he was reciting:

*If my station in love, in your view  
Is what I have encountered, then I have wasted my days  
A wish my soul attained for a time  
And today I consider it confused dreams*

The virtuous jurist Tāj Ad-Dīn Al-Anbārī told me that he heard Shaykh Ibrāhīm Al-Ja’barī say: ‘I saw Ibn ‘Arabī and Ibn Al-Fārid’ in my dream. They were two blind old men, walking and stumbling, saying: ‘How is the path? Where is the path?’

Shihāb Ad-Dīn Al-Mizzī told me from Sharaf Ad-Dīn ibn Ash-Shaykh Najm Ad-Dīn ibn Al-Ḥakīm from his father that he said: ‘I arrived in Damascus and coincided with the death of Ibn ‘Arabī. I saw his funeral procession as if ashes had been sprinkled on it. I saw it did not resemble the funerals of the saints’—or he said—‘so I knew that this...’ or something similar. And from his father from Shaykh Ismā’īl Al-Kūrānī that he used to say: ‘Ibn ‘Arabī is a devil.’ And from him that he used to say about Al-Ḥarīrī that he was a devil. Shihāb Ad-Dīn told me from Qādī Sharaf Ad-Dīn Al-Bāzili that his father used to forbid him from the writings of Ibn ‘Arabī, Ibn Al-Fārid’, and Ibn Sab’īn.



## Some Matters That Reveal Their Disbelief And The Corruption Of Their Reasoning

Regarding some matters by which their disbelief and the corruption of their statements become apparent. This is from several perspectives:

### The First Perspective

The reality of their statement is that Allāh did not create anything, nor originate it, nor bring it into being, nor form it. This is because if there is no existence except His existence, then it is impossible that He be the Creator of His own existence or the Bringer into Being of His own Essence. For the knowledge of that is among the clearest and most self-evident of knowledge to the intellects: that a thing does not create itself. This is why He, Glorified is He, said: {Or were they created by nothing, or were they the creators?} [Aṭ-Ṭūr: 35]. For they know they were not created without a creator, and they know that a thing does not create itself, so it is determined that they have a Creator. But according to these disbelieving, atheistic, Pharaonic [proponents], there is nothing that the Lord could have created, brought into being, or originated except His own Sacred Self. And His Sacred Self cannot be but created, sustained, fashioned, brought into being, due to the impossibility of that according to self-evident reason. This is among the most manifest disbelief according to all people of religions and opinions. As for the view of the author of the Fuṣūṣ: there is nothing except His existence and the essences subsistent in non-existence, which are independent of Him. His existence cannot be created, and the essences are independent of Him, so Allāh created nothing.

### The Second Perspective

According to them, Allāh is not the Lord of the worlds nor the Owner of the Kingdom, since there is only His existence, and He cannot be the Lord of Himself, nor can the owned king be the owning King. They have explicitly stated this disbelief, despite its contradiction, and said: He is the Owner of the Kingdom, based on [the idea] that His existence is dependent on the essences of things, and the essences of things are dependent on His existence. So things are owners of His existence, thus He is the Owner of the Kingdom.

### The Third Perspective

According to them, Allāh has not provided sustenance for anyone, nor given anything to anyone, nor shown mercy to anyone, nor done good to anyone, nor guided anyone, nor bestowed any blessing upon anyone, nor taught anyone any knowledge, nor taught anyone clear expression. According to them, in sum: nothing has reached anyone from Him, neither good nor evil, nor benefit nor

harm, nor bestowal nor withholding, nor guidance nor misguidance, absolutely. And [according to them] all these things are the very essence of Himself and sheer existence. So there is no other for anything to reach, nor anyone besides Him to benefit from them, nor any servant who could be sustained, aided, or guided. Then, according to the view of the author of the Fuṣūṣ: these essences are subsistent in non-existence, and the essences are the ones that did good and evil, benefited and harmed. This, according to him, is the secret of the divine decree. According to the view of the others: there is absolutely no subsistent essence other than Him. Rather, He is the one blaming Himself by Himself, defending Himself by Himself, killing Himself by Himself. He is the one sustained, struck, reviled. He is the penetrator and the penetrated, the eater and the eaten. They have stated this explicitly.

### **The Fourth Perspective**

According to them, Allāh is the one who bows, prostrates, submits, and worships, fasts, feels hunger, stands [in prayer], sleeps, is afflicted by illnesses and diseases, is tested by enemies, suffers affliction, and is overcome by hardship. They have stated this explicitly. They have stated that every distress that afflicts souls, He is the one whom the distress afflicts. And when He relieves the distress, He is only relieving it from Himself. This is why some of these—who are among the most disbelieving of Allāh’s creation and the greatest of them in hypocrisy, deviation, insolence towards Allāh, and stubbornness—disliked that a person should be patient with affliction, because according to them, He is the one afflicted and tested. They have explicitly stated that He is described with every deficiency and fault, for there is no one else characterized by deficiencies and faults other than Him. So every fault, deficiency, disbelief, and transgression in the universe, He is the one characterized by it; no one else is characterized by it. All of them agree on this regarding existence. Then, the author of the Fuṣūṣ says that this is subsistent in non-existence, while others say: there is nothing besides the existence of the Truth, which is characterized by these faults and defects.

### **The Fifth Perspective**

According to them, those who worshipped Al-Lāt, Al-’Uzzā, and Manāt, the third, the other one; and those who worshipped Wadd, Suwā’, Yaghūth, Ya’ūq, and Nasr; and those who worshipped Sirius, the star, the sun, and the moon; and those who worshipped the Messiah, ’Uzayr, and the angels; and all others who worshipped idols and images—from the people of Nūḥ, ’Ād, Thamūd, the people of Pharaoh, the Children of Israel, and all other polytheists among the Arabs—worshipped none but Allāh. It is inconceivable that they could worship other than Allāh. They have stated this explicitly in many places, such as the statement of the author of the Fuṣūṣ in the Bezel of the Nūḥian Word:

{And they schemed a great scheme} [Nūḥ: 22]. Because the call to Allāh is a scheme against the one called, for he was not non-existent from the beginning that he should be called to the end. {I call to Allāh} [Yūsuf: 108]—this is the essence of the scheme—{upon insight}. It implies that the entire matter belongs to Him. So they responded to him with a scheme, just as he called them...’ until he said, ‘...So they said in their scheme: {Never leave your gods and never leave Wadd or Suwā’ or Yaghūth and Ya’ūq and Nasr} [Nūḥ: 23]. For if they were to

leave them, they would be ignorant of the Truth to the extent of what they left of these [idols]. For the Truth has, in every object of worship, a particular aspect known by whoever knows it and unknown by whoever is ignorant of it. Among the Muhammadans: {And your Lord has decreed that you not worship except Him} [Al-Isrā': 23]—meaning He ruled. The knower knows who worshipped, and in what form He appeared such that He was worshipped, and that differentiation and multiplicity are like limbs in the sensory form and like spiritual faculties in the spiritual form. So none but Allāh was worshipped in every object of worship. The lowest is the one who imagined divinity in it; were it not for this imagining, the stone or anything else would not have been worshipped. This is why He said: {Say, 'Name them!'} [Ar-Ra'd: 33]. If they named them, they would name them stone, tree, star. If it were said to them: 'Whom did you worship?' they would say: 'One God.' They would not say 'Allāh' or 'the God' except based on what was imagined. Rather, [one might say]: 'This is a divine locus of manifestation that should be venerated,' so he does not restrict himself. The lowest is the possessor of imagination, who says: {We only worship them that they may bring us nearer to Allāh in position} [Az-Zumar: 3]. The highest, the knower, says: {So your god is one God, therefore submit to Him} [Al-Ĥajj: 34] wherever He appears. {And give good tidings to the humble} [Al-Ĥajj: 34], those whose fire of nature has subsided, so they said 'a god' and did not say 'nature'.

He also said in the Hārūnian Bezel: Then Hārūn said to Mūsā: {Indeed, I feared that you would say, 'You have caused division among the Children of Israel'} [Ĥā Hā: 94]. Meaning, you would make me a cause for their division. For the worship of the calf divided them. Among them were those who worshipped it, following As-Sāmīrī and imitating him, and among them were those who refrained from worshipping it until Mūsā returned to them, so they could ask him about it. Hārūn feared that this division among them would be attributed to him. Mūsā was more knowledgeable of the matter than Hārūn, because he knew what the worshippers of the calf worshipped, due to his knowledge that Allāh had decreed that none should be worshipped except Him, and whatever Allāh rules must occur. Mūsā's rebuke of his brother Hārūn was because the matter occurred [i.e., idol worship] due to his [Hārūn's] disapproval of it and his lack of breadth [in understanding]. For the recognizer is the one who sees the Truth in everything; rather, he sees Him as the essence of everything. So Mūsā was educating Hārūn with the education of knowledge, even though he was younger than him in age. That is why when Hārūn said to him what he said, he turned to As-Sāmīrī and said to him: {So what is your affair, O Sāmīrī?} [Ĥā Hā: 95], meaning, regarding what you did by turning specifically to the form of the calf... He continued the discourse until he said: '...So the lack of strength in Hārūn's active deterrence was [the reason] that [Mūsā's command] regarding the worshippers of the calf was executed by overpowering the calf, just as Mūsā overpowered it—a manifest wisdom from Allāh in existence, so that He might be worshipped in every form. Even if that form disappears afterwards, it only disappears after having been invested with divinity in the view of its worshipper. This is why no type [of being] remained except that it was worshipped, either as worship of deification or worship of subjugation. This is inevitable for one who understands. Nothing in the universe was worshipped except after being invested with elevation in the view of the worshipper and appearing with rank

in his heart. That is why the Truth named Himself for us as Rafi' Ad-Darajāt (Exalted in Ranks) [Ghāfir: 15], and did not say Rafi' Ad-Darajah (Exalted in Rank). He multiplied the ranks within a single essence. For He decreed that none should be worshipped except Him, in many different ranks, each rank providing a divine locus of manifestation wherein He was worshipped. The greatest and highest locus of manifestation wherein He was worshipped is desire, as He said: {Have you seen the one who takes as his god his own desire?} [Al-Jāthiyah: 23]. It is the greatest object of worship, for nothing is worshipped except through it, and it [desire itself] is not worshipped except through its own essence. Regarding it, I say: 'And the truth of desire is that desire is the cause of desire; Were it not for desire in the heart, desire would not be worshipped.' Do you not see Allāh's knowledge of things, how perfect it is? How He completed [the description] regarding the one who worshipped his desire and took it as his god, saying: {And Allāh misguided him despite knowledge} [Al-Jāthiyah: 23]. Misguidance is bewilderment. That is because when this worshipper saw that he worshipped nothing but his desire, by his obedience to its command in worshipping whomever [or whatever] it commanded him to worship from among persons, to the extent that even the worship of Allāh was also out of desire. For if desire—which is will accompanied by love—had not occurred for him in that sacred precinct, he would not have worshipped Allāh nor preferred Him over others. Likewise, everyone who worshipped any form from the forms of the universe and took it as a god, only took it through desire. So the worshipper remains always under the dominion of his desire. Then he saw the objects of worship diversifying among the worshippers. Every worshipper of a certain thing declares as a disbeliever whoever worships other than it. The one who has the slightest awareness becomes bewildered at the unity of desire—rather, the oneness of desire, as mentioned, for it is a single essence in every worshipper. {And Allāh misguided him}—meaning, Allāh bewildered him—{despite knowledge}; [knowledge] that every worshipper worshipped only his desire, and nothing enslaved him except his desire, whether it coincided with the prescribed matter or did not coincide. The perfected recognizer is the one who saw every object of worship as a locus of manifestation for the Truth, worshipped therein. That is why they all called it 'god', along with its specific name: tree, stone, animal, human, star, or angel. This is the name of its individuality, while divinity is a rank imagined by the worshipper to be the rank of his object of worship. But in reality, it is a locus of manifestation of the Truth to the sight of this worshipper, who is devoted to this object of worship in this specific locus of manifestation of a stone. This is why some who did not know what he was saying, out of ignorance, said: {We only worship them that they may bring us nearer to Allāh in position} [Az-Zumar: 3], despite calling them gods, as they said: {Has he made the gods [all] one God? Indeed, this is a curious thing!} [Śād: 5]. They did not deny it, but rather expressed amazement at it, for they stopped at the multiplicity of forms and the attribution of divinity to them. Then the Messenger came and called them to one God who is known but not witnessed according to their witnessing [of idols]. They affirmed Him in their view and believed in Him in their statement: {We only worship them that they may bring us nearer to Allāh in position}, due to their knowledge that those forms were stones. That is why the proof was established against them by His saying: {Say, 'Name them!'} [Ar-Ra'd: 33]. They would only name them by what they knew to be their true names, like stone, wood, star, and the like. As for the

recognizers of the matter as it is, they appear in the form of disapproval of the forms that were worshipped, because their rank in knowledge requires them to be subject to the ruling of the time, [following] the ruling of the Messenger in whom they believed, imposed upon them, by which they were named believers. So they are worshippers of the time, despite their knowledge that they did not worship the essences of those forms, but rather worshipped Allāh in them, by the ruling of the dominion of the manifestation which they knew from them [the forms], while the denier—who has no knowledge of what manifests—was ignorant of it. The perfected recognizer—whether a prophet, messenger, or inheritor from them—concealed it. So he commanded them to withdraw from those forms when the messenger of the time withdrew from them, in following the Messenger, hoping for Allāh’s love for them, due to His saying: {Say, [O Muḥammad], ‘If you should love Allāh, then follow me, [so] Allāh will love you’} [Āl ‘Imrān: 31]. So he called to a God who is sought, known in general terms, but not witnessed nor perceived by vision. Rather, He perceives vision due to His subtlety and pervasion in the essences of things. So vision does not perceive Him, just as it does not perceive the spirits that govern their bodies and outward forms. He is the Subtle, the Aware. Awareness is tasting, tasting is manifestation, and manifestation is in forms. So they [forms] are necessary, and He is necessary. Thus, whoever sees Him must worship Him according to his desire. If you understand this...’ End quote [from Ibn ‘Arabī].

So reflect on the reality of what these people are upon. For they have unanimously agreed upon every shirk in the universe, equated every creature with Allāh, and permitted that everything be worshipped. Despite their worshipping everything, they say: ‘We worshipped none but Allāh.’ So two things have combined in their statement: every shirk and every denial and negation, along with their assumption that they worshipped none but Allāh. It is known that this contradicts the religion of all the messengers, contradicts the religion of all the People of the Book and all religions; rather, it even contradicts the religion of the polytheists as well, and contradicts the innate disposition upon which Allāh created His servants, which they comprehend with their hearts and find in their souls. It is the height of corruption, contradiction, sophistry, and denial of the Lord of the worlds. This is because it is known by necessity that the messengers used to consider what the polytheists worshipped as other than Allāh, and consider its worshipper as a worshipper of other than Allāh, a polytheist associating partners with Allāh, equating [others] with Him, setting up rivals for Him. For they called creation to the worship of Allāh alone, with no partner. This is the religion of Allāh, which He revealed in His Books and sent His messengers with. It is the general Islam, other than which Allāh does not accept from the first and the last, and He does not forgive the one who abandons it after the message has reached him, as He said: {Indeed, Allāh does not forgive association with Him, but He forgives what is less than that for whom He wills} [An-Nisā’: 48]. It is the differentiator between the people of Paradise and the people of the Fire, the felicitous and the wretched, as the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: {Whoever’s last words are ‘Lā ilāha illā Allāh’ (There is no god but Allāh), Paradise becomes obligatory for him.} And he said: {Whoever dies knowing that there is no god but Allāh, Paradise becomes obligatory for him.} And he said: {I know a word which no servant says at death except that his soul finds repose in it, and it is the head of the religion.} And as

he said: {I have been commanded to fight the people until they testify that there is no god but Allāh and that I am the Messenger of Allāh. If they say it, they have protected their blood and property from me, except by its right, and their reckoning is with Allāh.} The virtues of this statement, its realities, and its position in the religion are beyond what describers can describe or recognizers can know. It is the reality of the entire matter, as He said: {And We did not send any messenger before you except that We revealed to him that, 'There is no deity except Me, so worship Me.'} [Al-Anbiyā': 25]. So He, Glorified is He, informed that He reveals to every messenger the negation of divinity from everything other than Him and its affirmation for Him alone. These atheistic polytheists claimed that everything deserves divinity just as Allāh deserves it. Allāh said: {And ask those We sent before you of Our messengers: Did We make besides the Most Compassionate deities to be worshipped?} [Az-Zukhruf: 45]. These atheists claimed that everything is a worshipped god. So He, Glorified is He, informed that He did not make deities besides the Most Compassionate. Allāh said: {And We certainly sent into every nation a messenger, [saying], 'Worship Allāh and avoid Ṭāghūt (false deities).'} [An-Naḥl: 36]. So Allāh, Glorified is He, commanded His worship and the avoidance of Ṭāghūt. According to these [Ittiḥādīs], all Ṭāghūts have Allāh within them, or they are Allāh, and whoever worships them has worshipped none but Allāh. Allāh said: {O mankind, worship your Lord, who created you and those before you...} [Al-Baqarah: 21-22] the two verses. So He, Glorified is He, commanded the worship of the Lord, the Creator of these signs. According to these accursed atheists, He is the essence of these signs. He, Glorified is He, forbade people from setting up rivals for Him. According to them, this is inconceivable, for the rivals are His very essence, so how can He be a rival to Himself? And those who worshipped the rivals worshipped none other than Him.

Then, these atheists used as evidence the polytheists' naming what they worshipped 'gods', as they said: {Has he made the gods [all] one God?} [Ṣād: 5]. They believed that since they named them gods, the polytheists' naming was proof that divinity was established for them. Allāh refuted this argument against the polytheists in more than one place, like His statement, Glorified is He, about Hūd in his address to the polytheists among his people: {Do you dispute with me concerning names you have named, you and your fathers...?} [Al-A'rāf: 71] the verse. This is a refutation of their statement: {Have you come to us that we should worship Allāh alone and leave what our fathers used to worship?} [Al-A'rāf: 70]. The Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) informed that their naming them gods and objects of worship was a naming they and their fathers innovated; Allāh did not send down any proof or authority for it. The judgment belongs only to Allāh alone. He, Glorified is He, commanded that none be worshipped except Him. How then can one argue using the statement of polytheists who have no proof, when Allāh has invalidated their statement and commanded creation to worship none but Him, excluding these idols which the polytheists named gods? According to the atheists, the worshippers of idols worshipped none but Allāh. Furthermore, the polytheists disapproved of the Messenger when he came to them so they would worship Allāh alone and abandon what their fathers used to worship. If they had always been worshipping Allāh alone, as the atheists claim, then they would not have been called to abandon what their fathers worshipped. Rather, he—and the other

prophets—came to them so that everything their fathers worshipped would be worshipped!

Likewise, He, Glorified is He, said in Sūrah Yūsuf about him: {O my two companions of prison, are separate lords better or Allāh, the One, the Prevailing?} {You worship not besides Him except names you have named, you and your fathers, for which Allāh has sent down no authority...} [Yūsuf: 39-40] until His statement: {...But most of the people do not know.} [Yūsuf: 40]. He, Glorified is He, said: {So have you considered Al-Lāt and Al-'Uzzā?} {And Manāt, the third, the other one?} [An-Najm: 19-20] until His statement: {...And there has already come to them from their Lord guidance.} [An-Najm: 23]. These three mentioned in this sūrah are the great, major idols which the polytheists used to frequent from their cities. Al-Lāt was near Qudayd on the coast for the people of Madinah. Al-'Uzzā was near 'Arafāt for the people of Makkah. Manāt was in At-Ṭā'if for Thaḳīf. These three are the [main] cities of the land of Ḥijāz. He, Glorified is He, informed that the names the polytheists named were names they innovated, having no reality. They only worshipped names with no referents, because the named object possesses nothing of divinity, might, or estimation. Allāh did not send down any authority for these names. The polytheists follow nothing but assumption, which does not avail against the truth at all, [assuming] that they are gods that benefit and harm, and they follow the desires of their own souls. According to the atheists, when they worship their desires, they have worshipped Allāh.

He, Glorified is He, said about the Imām of Imāms, the Friend of the Most Compassionate, and the best of creation—after Muḥammad (peace be upon him)—that he said to his father: {O my father, why do you worship that which does not hear and does not see and will not benefit you at all?} {O my father, indeed there has come to me of knowledge that which has not come to you...} [Maryam: 42-43]—until his statement—{...and become to Shayṭān an ally.} [Maryam: 45]. So he forbade him and disapproved of his worshipping idols that do not hear, see, or benefit him at all. According to the claim of these heretics—'they worshipped none but Allāh in every object of worship'—then Allāh would be the one who does not hear, see, or benefit him at all. He is the one whom he [Ibrāhīm] forbade him from worshipping, and He is the one who commanded him to worship Him! Likewise, the most adept of their tyrants, the wicked At-Tilimsānī, said in a poem of his:

'O my reproacher, you forbid me and command me... While ecstasy is a truer prohibiter and commander!

If I obey you and disobey ecstasy, I return blind... From direct vision to the illusions of reports.

The very thing you call me to, if you... Verify it, you will see it is the forbidden, O my neighbor!

Ibrāhīm also said to his father: {O my father, do not worship Shayṭān. Indeed Shayṭān has ever been, to the Most Compassionate, disobedient.} [Maryam: 44]. According to them, Shayṭān is a divine locus of manifestation that should be venerated, and whoever worships him has worshipped none but Allāh. Shayṭān is not other than the Most Compassionate that we should disobey him. He, Glorified is He, said: {Did I not enjoin upon you, O children of Ādam, that you not worship Shayṭān—indeed, he is to you a clear enemy?} {And that you

worship [only] Me? This is a straight path.] [Yā Sīn: 60-61] until His statement: {...then will you not reason?} [Yā Sīn: 62]. So He forbade them from worshipping Shayṭān and commanded them to worship Allāh, Glorified is He, alone. According to them, worshipping Shayṭān is also worshipping Him, so Shayṭān and all existing things should be worshipped, for they are His essence.

Allāh also said about the Imām of creatures, the Friend of the Most Compassionate, that when: {He saw a star, he said, 'This is my lord.' But when it set, he said, 'I like not those that disappear.'} {And when he saw the moon rising, he said, 'This is my lord.' But when it set, he said, 'Unless my Lord guides me, I will surely be among the people gone astray.'} {And when he saw the sun rising, he said, 'This is my lord; this is greater.' But when it set, he said, 'O my people, indeed I am free from what you associate with Allāh.} {Indeed, I have turned my face...} [Al-An'ām: 76-79]—until His statement—{...and they are the [rightly] guided.} [Al-An'ām: 82]. He also said: {There has already been for you an excellent example in Ibrāhīm and those with him, when they said to their people, 'Indeed, we are disassociated from you...' } [Al-Mumtaḥanah: 4] until His statement: {...until you believe in Allāh alone.} [Al-Mumtaḥanah: 4]. Allāh said: {And [mention, O Muḥammad], when Ibrāhīm said to his father and his people, 'Indeed, I am disassociated from that which you worship,} {Except for Him who created me...'} [Az-Zukhruf: 26-27]. The verse. Allāh said: {Have you considered that which you have been worshipping,} {You and your ancient forefathers?} [Ash-Shu'arā': 75-76]—until His statement—{When we equated you with the Lord of the worlds.} [Ash-Shu'arā': 98]. Allāh said: {When he said to his father and his people, 'What are these statues to which you are devoted?'} [Al-Anbiyā': 52] until His statement: {...They said, 'Burn him and support your gods, if you are to act.'} [Al-Anbiyā': 68].

So this Friend, whom Allāh made an Imām for the Imāms who are guided by his command—from the prophets and messengers after him and all other believers—said: {Indeed, I am free from what you associate with Allāh.} {Indeed, I have turned my face toward Him who created the heavens and the earth, inclining toward truth.} [Al-An'ām: 78-79]. According to the atheists, that which they associated [with Him] is the essence of the Truth; it is not other than Him. How then can he disassociate himself from Allāh, towards Whom he turned his face? One of two things is necessary according to their foundation: either he worships Him in everything, in all manifestations, without restriction or specification—which is the state of the perfected one according to them—so he does not disassociate himself from anything; or he worships Him in some manifestations, like the action of the deficient ones according to them. As for disassociating from some existing things, he [Ibn 'Arabi] said that if the people of Nūḥ had left them [their idols], they would have left [a portion] of the Truth proportionate to what they left of those idols. The messengers disassociated themselves from idols, so the messengers left much of the Truth and disassociated themselves from Allāh, to Whom they called creation! The polytheists—according to their claim—are in a better state than the messengers, because the polytheists worshipped Him in some manifestations and did not disassociate themselves from the rest, while the messengers disassociated themselves from Him in most manifestations!

Then, Ibrāhīm's statement: {I have turned my face toward Him who created the heavens and the earth} [Al-An'ām: 79] is false according to their foundation, for

He did not create them, since they are not other than Him. How fitting for them is His statement: {Have you not seen those who were given a portion of the Scripture? They believe in Jibt and Ṭāghūt...} [An-Nisā': 51] the verse. Then the statement of the Friend: {And how should I fear what you associate while you do not fear that you have associated with Allāh...?} [Al-An'ām: 81] the verse. This is the argument of Allāh which He gave Ibrāhīm against his people, by his saying: How should I fear what you worship besides Allāh? These are the created things worshipped besides Him. According to them, they are not worshipped besides Him, and whoever does not fear them has not feared Allāh. So the messengers did not fear Allāh! The statement of the Friend: {...that you have associated with Allāh that for which He has not sent down to you authority?} [Al-An'ām: 81] is not correct according to them, for they did not associate anything with Allāh, since there is nothing else besides Him that they could associate with Him. Rather, the object of worship they worshipped is Allāh. The most they did was worship Him in some manifestations. This does not mean they made another a partner with Him in worship.

His statement: {Those who believe and do not mix their faith with wrongdoing—those will have security, and they are the [rightly] guided.} [Al-An'ām: 82]. It is reported in the two Ṣaḥīḥs from 'Abdullāh ibn Mas'ūd, who said: {When this verse was revealed, it distressed the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him), and they said: 'Which of us has not wronged himself?' The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: 'Have you not heard the statement of the righteous servant: {Do not associate anything with Allāh. Indeed, association [with Him] is great wrongdoing?} [Luqmān: 13]}. Allāh and His Messenger have informed that shirk is great wrongdoing, and that security belongs to those who believe in Allāh and do not mix their faith with shirk. According to the claim of these atheists, the faith of those who mixed their faith with shirk is the perfect, complete faith. It is the faith of the verifier, the recognizer, according to them. Because whoever believes in Allāh in all His manifestations and worships Him in every existing thing is more perfect than one who did not believe in Him where He did not manifest [in a specific form] and worshipped Him only where He is not witnessed and not known. According to them, it is inconceivable that He exists except in the creature. So whoever does not worship Him in any creature at all has not worshipped Him in reality at all. If they state absolutely that he worshipped Him, it is a word without meaning, i.e., if they interpret it as specification, then it would be specification in the sense that he specified some manifestations for worship. This, according to them, is a deficiency, not because of what he associated and worshipped, but rather because of what he left out. So, according to them, there is no wrongdoing or deficiency in shirk except in its being limited. Otherwise, if the shirk is general, it is more perfect and superior.

Likewise, the statement of the Friend to his people: {Indeed, we are disassociated from you and from whatever you worship besides Allāh} [Al-Mumtaḥanah: 4]. He disassociated himself, according to them, from the Truth who appeared in them and in their gods. Likewise, his disbelieving in Him [as manifested in idols] and his enmity towards them is disbelief in the Truth, according to them, and enmity towards Him. Then his statement: {...until you believe in Allāh alone} [Al-Mumtaḥanah: 4] is meaningless speech according to them, for they were believers in Allāh alone, since nothing else is conceivable according to them. The most they did was worship Him in some manifestations and leave others,

without disbelieving in Him in those [other manifestations]. Likewise, all else that He narrated about Ibrāhīm regarding his enmity towards what those [people] worshipped is, according to them, enmity towards Allāh, because none but Allāh was worshipped, as the heretics claimed, arguing with His statement: {And your Lord has decreed that you not worship except Him} [Al-Isrā': 23]. They said: Whatever Allāh decrees must occur. This is deviation regarding Allāh's verses, distortion of the words from their proper places, and lying against Allāh. For 'qaḍā' here does not mean decree and creation by the consensus of Muslims, rather, by the consensus of rational people, such that one could say: Whatever Allāh decreed must occur. Rather, it means commanded. What Allāh commands may occur or may not occur. So reflect on this distortion.

Likewise, his statement 'whatever Allāh rules must occur' is a general statement. [For judgment can mean religious command, which are the legal rulings, like His statement: {O you who have believed, fulfill [all] contracts. Lawful for you are the animals of grazing livestock...} [Al-Mā'idah:1].<sup>1</sup> And His statement: {And who is better than Allāh in judgment?} [Al-Mā'idah: 50]. And His statement: {That is the judgment of Allāh; He judges between you.} [Al-Mumtaḥanah: 10]. And judgment can be judgment with truth, creation, and action, like his statement: {So I will never leave [this] land until my father permits me or Allāh judges for me.} [Yūsuf: 80]. And His statement: {He said, 'My Lord, judge in truth.}' [Al-Anbiyā': 112]. This is why some of the Salaf used to recite: 'And your Lord enjoined that you not worship except Him.' Tha'lab mentioned this from Ibn 'Abbās, and they mentioned that it is like this in some codices. This is why He said in the continuation of the discourse: {and to parents, good treatment...} [Al-Isrā': 23] the verse, and He continued His commands and injunctions until He said: {That is from what your Lord has revealed to you of wisdom. And do not make [as equal] with Allāh another deity, lest you be thrown into Hell, blamed and banished.} [Al-Isrā': 39]. So He concluded the discourse similarly to how He opened it, with His command for Tawḥīd and His prohibition of shirk. It is not a report that no one worshipped except Allāh and that Allāh decreed and created that. How could it be, when He said: {And do not make [as equal] with Allāh another deity}? According to them, there is nothing in existence that could be made another deity; whatever is worshipped is the Deity Himself, not another besides Him.

Similar to the enmity of Ibrāhīm and the believers towards Allāh—according to their claim—when he showed enmity to the worshippers and the worshipped, while none but Allāh was worshipped, and Allāh worshipped none but Allāh, for He is the essence of every worshipper and the essence of every worshipped object. Likewise is His statement: {Do not take My enemies and your enemies as allies...}

{...You offer them affection...} [Al-Mumtaḥanah: 1]. According to their claim, Allāh has no enemy at all, and there is no other nor anything besides such that it could be conceived that He be an enemy to Himself or an enemy to the essences through which alone He manifests.

---

<sup>1</sup> Shaykh Nāṣir ibn Ḥamad Al-Fahd (p. 23) said: The point proving that judgment can mean religious command is at the end of the verse, namely His statement {Indeed, Allah judges what He wills}. It appears the omission is from the copyist.

## The Sixth Perspective

According to them, calling servants to Allāh is a scheme against them, as he [Ibn 'Arabi] explicitly stated when he said: 'Indeed, the call to Allāh is a scheme against the one called, for he was not non-existent from the beginning that he should be called to the end.' The author of the Fuṣūṣ also said: {...And give good tidings to the humble} [Al-Ḥajj: 34], those whose fire of nature has subsided, so they said 'a god' and did not say 'nature.' {And they had already led many astray} [Nūh: 24]—meaning, bewildered them in the enumeration of the One through aspects and relations. {And do not increase the wrongdoers} [Nūh: 24]—[meaning] those who wrong themselves, the chosen ones who inherited the Book, for they are the first of the three [categories], so he placed him before the moderate and the foremost—[except in misguidance] [Nūh: 24]—meaning, except in bewilderment. And among the Muḥammadans [is the prayer]: 'Increase me in bewilderment in You.' {Whenever it lights [the way] for them, they walk therein; but when darkness comes over them, they stand [still].} [Al-Baqarah: 20]. For the bewildering one, his is the cycle and the circular motion around the pole, so he does not depart from it. The traveler on the straight path is deviating, exiting the intended goal, seeking what he is [already] in, a possessor of imagination, his goal is towards it. So he has 'from' and 'to' and what is between them. The possessor of circular motion has no beginning necessitating 'from,' nor end for 'to' to govern him. So he has the most complete existence, and he is the one given comprehensive words.' End quote.

One of their poets said:

*What is wrong with your camel, its stopping place does not settle?  
And why does your straying not cease moving about?  
You will soon know that your journey was not  
Except to yourself, when you reach the destination*

So according to them, man is his own goal and his own object of worship. There is nothing beyond him for him to worship, intend, call upon, or respond to. This is why their statement is the reality of Pharaoh's statement. I used to say to those I debated that their statement is the reality of Pharaoh's statement, until one of the reliable recognizers whom I debated about this told me: that when one of their leaders called this muḥaddith to their doctrine and revealed to him the reality of their secret, he said: I said to him, 'This is the statement of Pharaoh?' He said: 'Yes, and we are upon the statement of Pharaoh.' I said to him: 'Praise be to Allāh that they have admitted this, for with the opponent's admission, there is no need for evidence.'

He [Ibn 'Arabi] considered the traveler on the straight path a possessor of imagination and praised the bewildered circular motion. The Qur'an commands the Straight Path, praises it, and commends its people, not the circular one. In the Mother of the Book: {Guide us to the Straight Path} [Al-Fātihah: 6]. He said: {And, [moreover], this is My path, which is straight, so follow it; and do not follow [other] ways...} [Al-An'ām: 153]. He said: {And if they had done what they were instructed, it would have been better for them and stronger in strengthening.} [An-Nisā': 66-67] the two verses. Allāh said regarding Mūsā and Hārūn: {And We gave them the explicit Book.} {And We guided them [both] to the Straight Path.} [Aṣ-Ṣaffāt: 117-118]. Allāh said: {And this is the path of your Lord, [leading] straight. We have detailed the verses for a people who

remember.} [Al-An'ām: 126]. He said about Iblīs: {‘Because You have put me in error, I will surely sit in wait for them on Your straight path.} {Then I will come to them...} [Al-A'rāf: 16-17] the verse. Allāh said: {And Iblīs had already confirmed his assumption about them, so they followed him, except for a party of believers.} [Saba': 20]. These heretics are among his greatest followers, for he sat in wait for them on Allāh's Straight Path and diverted them from it until they disbelieved in their Lord and believed that their own souls were their object of worship and their god. Allāh said regarding the Seal of the Messengers: {And indeed, [O Muḥammad], you guide to a straight path -} {The path of Allāh...} [Ash-Shūrā: 52-53] the verse.

Also, Allāh says: {And they will be returned to Allāh, their true Master...} [Yūnus: 30]. Allāh said: {Indeed, to Us is their return.} {Then indeed, upon Us is their reckoning.} [Al-Ghāshiyah: 25-26]. Allāh said: {To Allāh is your return all together...} [Al-Mā'idah: 105] the verse. Allāh said: {O mankind, indeed you are striving toward your Lord with [great] exertion and will meet Him.} [Al-Inshiqāq: 6]. According to these [Ittiḥādīs], there is nothing but you, and you are already returned to Allāh right now, and you have never ceased being returned to Him. He is not something other than you that you should be returned to Him, or go back to Him, or strive towards Him, or meet Him. This is why they told us that when Ibn Al-Fārid' was dying, he recited two verses:

*If my station in love, in your view  
Is what I have encountered, then I have wasted my days  
A wish my soul attained for a time  
And today I consider it confused dreams*

That is because he used to imagine that he was Allāh and that there was no return to Him nor going back to Him other than what he himself was upon. When the angels of Allāh came to him to remove his soul from his body, and there appeared to him from Allāh what he had not expected, it became clear to him that what he was upon was confused dreams from Shayṭān. Likewise, one of our companions told me from someone I know who has connections with these people, about the wicked At-Tilimsāni: that at the time of death, he changed and became agitated. He [the narrator] said: I entered upon him at the time of death and found him groaning. I asked him: ‘Why are you groaning?’ He said: ‘From fear of missing out.’ I said: ‘Subḥān Allāh! Someone like you fears missing out, when you admit the poor seeker into seclusion and connect him to Allāh in three days?’ He said words to the effect of: ‘All of that has vanished, and I found no reality to it.’

## **The Seventh Perspective**

According to them, whoever among humans claims divinity, like Pharaoh and the awaited Dajjāl, or [divinity] was claimed for him—whether he is from the saints of Allāh, a prophet like the Messiah, or not a prophet like 'Alī, or not from the saints of Allāh like Al-Ḥākīm in Egypt and others—indeed, according to these atheistic hypocrites, this claim is validated. The author of the Fuṣūṣ explicitly stated the validation of this claim, like the claim of Pharaoh. They often venerate Pharaoh, for no leader in disbelief preceded him like him, nor will any successor come for them like the one-eyed liar Dajjāl. When they act hypocritically towards the believers and manifest faith, they say: ‘He died a

believer and will not enter the Fire.’ They say: ‘There is nothing in the Qur’ān indicating his entry into the Fire.’ As for the reality of their affair, according to them, he never ceased being a recognizer of Allāh; rather, he is Allāh. And according to them, there is no Fire containing pain at all, as we will mention from them, if Allāh wills. However, one should be aware through this that innovations are breeding grounds for hypocrisy, just as the Sunnahs are symbols of faith.

The author of the *Fuṣūṣ* said in the *Bezel of Wisdom* in the ‘Musawian Word’, when discussing His statement: {And what is the Lord of the worlds?} [Ash-Shu’arā’: 23], he said: ‘And here lies a great secret. For he [Mūsā] answered with the action to one who asked about the essential definition. He made the essential definition the very essence of its relation to that by which He manifested Himself from the forms of the universe, or that in which the forms of the universe manifested. It is as if he said to him in response to his question: {And what is the Lord of the worlds?}, ‘He who manifests the forms of the worlds within Himself, from above—which is the heaven—and below—which is the earth—if you should be certain’ [Ash-Shu’arā’: 24],’ or He manifests Himself through them. When Pharaoh said to his companions that he [Mūsā] was surely mad—as we said regarding the meaning of his being mad, i.e., veiled from him—[meaning] knowledge of what he asked about, since it is inconceivable that he could know it at all, Mūsā increased the clarification to inform Pharaoh of his [Mūsā’s] rank in divine knowledge, due to his [Mūsā’s] knowledge that Pharaoh knew that. So he said: {Lord of the east and the west} [Ash-Shu’arā’: 28]. He brought [mention of] what appears and is hidden, which is the Manifest and the Hidden, {and what is between them} [Ash-Shu’arā’: 28], which is His statement: {And He is, of all things, Knowing} [Al-Baqarah: 29]. {If you should reason} [Ash-Shu’arā’: 28]—meaning, if you are people of restriction, for reason is for restriction. The first answer was the answer for the certain, who are the people of unveiling and existence. So he said to him: {if you should be certain}—meaning, people of unveiling and existence—’then I have informed you of what you have ascertained in your unveiling and existence.’ ‘If you are not of this category, then I have answered you with the second answer, if you are people of reason and restriction, and you confine the Truth to what the proofs of your intellects yield.’ So Mūsā appeared with both aspects to inform Pharaoh of his [Mūsā’s] merit and truthfulness. Mūsā knew that Pharaoh knew that, or knows that, because he asked about the quiddity. So he knew his question was not according to the convention of the ancients in questioning. That is why he answered [as he did]. Had he known otherwise from him, he would have faulted him in the question. When Mūsā made the one asked about the essence of the universe, Pharaoh addressed him in this language, while the people did not perceive. He said to him: {If you take a god other than me, I will surely place you among those imprisoned} [Ash-Shu’arā’: 29]. The ‘sin’ in ‘sijn’ is one of the added letters, meaning, ‘I will surely veil you.’ For you answered in a way that supported me in saying such a thing. If you speak to me in the language of allusion, [saying]: ‘You have acted ignorantly, O Pharaoh, by threatening me, when the essence is one. How then did you differentiate?’ Pharaoh would say: ‘The ranks differentiated the essence; the essence did not differentiate nor divide in its self. My rank now is control over you, O Mūsā, through action. I am you by essence, and I am other than you by rank.’ He continued the discourse until he said: ‘Since Pharaoh held the position of rule, the master of the time, and was the caliph by

the sword, and was acting according to the prevailing custom, for that reason he said: {I am your Lord, the Most High} [An-Nāzi'āt: 24]. Meaning, even if all are lords in some respect, I am the highest among them due to what I have been given outwardly of control over you.' When the sorcerers knew his truthfulness in what he said to them, they did not deny him but acknowledged that for him and said to him: {So decree whatever you are to decree. You only decree for this worldly life.} [Tā Hā: 72]. So the dominion is yours. Thus, his statement {I am your Lord, the Most High} was correct. Even if he was the essence of the Truth, the form belonged to Pharaoh. So he cut off hands and feet and crucified with the eye of truth in the form of falsehood, to attain ranks not attainable except by that action. For there is no way to negate causes, because the subsistent essences necessitated them. They only appear in existence in the form they have in subsistence, {since there is no change in the words of Allāh} [Yūnus: 64]. And the word of Allāh is nothing other than the essences of existing things.



## **One Of The Greatest Principles Of The Ittiḥādiyyah: ‘Allāh Was, And There Was Nothing With Him, And He Is Now As He Was’—The Latter Part Is A Lie Against Allāh**

And among the greatest principles relied upon by these Ittiḥādiyyah, the heretics who claim [to possess] verification and recognition, is what they transmit from the Prophet (peace be upon him), that he said: {Allāh was, and there was nothing with Him, and He is now as He was}—according to the pantheistic heretics. This addition, which is his saying: {and He is now as He was}, is a fabricated lie against the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him). The scholars of ḥadīth are in agreement that it is fabricated and concocted. It is not found in any of the compilations of ḥadīth, neither the major nor the minor ones, nor did any scholar narrate it with any chain of transmission—neither authentic, nor weak, nor with an unknown chain.

Rather, this statement was uttered by some of the later theologians of the Jahmiyyah, and it was received from them by these [Ittiḥādiyyah] who reached the final stage of Jahmism—which is denial [of attributes] and heresy. However, those [Jahmiyyah] might say: ‘Allāh was, and there was no place and no time, and He is now as He was.’ So these [Ittiḥādiyyah] said: ‘Allāh was, and there was nothing with Him, and He is now as He was.’

The most knowledgeable among these [Ittiḥādiyyah] regarding Islam, Ibn ‘Arabi, acknowledged that this is not from the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him). He said in the book *Mā Lā Budda lil-Murīd Minhu* (What is Indispensable for the Seeker): ‘Likewise, it has come in the Sunnah: {Allāh was, and there was nothing with Him}.’ He said: ‘And the scholars added: ‘and He is now as He was.’ Thus, no attribute returned to Him from His creation of the world that was not upon Him [before], nor [when] there was an existing world. So, believe regarding Him, concerning transcendence while the world exists, what you believed regarding Him when there was no world and nothing besides Him.’

And this which he said is the view of many theologians among the people of the Qiblah. If he had remained firm upon this, his statement would have been of the same kind as the statements of others; but he is contradictory. This is why the leader of the debauched Ittiḥādiyyah, Al-Tilimsānī, used to refute him in places where he [Ibn ‘Arabi] drew close to the Muslims, just as the Muslims refute him [Ibn ‘Arabi] in the places where he deviated into pantheism.

Rather, the ḥadīth transmitted from the Prophet (peace be upon him) is what Al-Bukhārī narrated from ‘Imrān ibn Ḥuṣayn, from the Prophet (peace be upon him), that he said: {Allāh was, and nothing was before Him, and His Throne was upon the water, and He wrote everything in the Remembrance, then He created

the heavens and the earth}.

As for this heretical addition, which is their saying: 'and He is now as He was,' the Jahmī theologians intended by it to negate the attributes with which He described Himself, such as His rising over the Throne and His descent to the lowest heaven, and other than that. So they said: He was in eternity not having risen over the Throne, 'and He is now as He was,' thus He cannot be upon the Throne, because that would necessitate change and alteration.

The People of the Sunnah and Affirmation answer them with two well-known responses:

1. That what is newly occurring is a relation and connection between Him and the Throne, similar in status to 'witness'. Ibn 'Aqil calls these 'states'. The emergence of new relations and connections is agreed upon among all the people of the earth, Muslims and non-Muslims, as this does not necessitate change or transformation [in the essence].

2. That even if that [action, like Istiwā'] necessitates a transition from one state to another and from one affair to another, it is like His coming, His arrival, His descent, His speaking to Mūsā, His coming on the Day of Resurrection in a form, and similar matters indicated by the texts, and affirmed by most of Ahl as-Sunnah wal-Ĥadīth and many theologians, and it is binding upon all other sects. We have mentioned the dispute of people regarding this in the principle concerning the distinction between attributes and created things, and the Attributes of Action.

But as for these Jahmī Ittiḥādiyyah, they said: 'and He is now as He was' meaning nothing else is with Him, just as He was in eternity with nothing with Him. They said: Because contingent beings are not other than Him nor besides Him, so there is nothing except Him. Therefore, there is nothing else with Him, neither eternally nor perpetually; rather, He is the very essence of existent things and the reality of contingent beings. They made the created, manufactured things to be the very essence of the Creator, the Originator, the Fashioner.

And they are constantly raving with this statement: {and He is now as He was}, and it is more revered to them than: {Say, 'He is Allāh, [who is] One'} [Al-Iklāṣ: 1] and than the Verse of the Throne, because of the indication it contains towards Ittiḥād, which constitutes their heresy. And they believe that it is established from the Prophet (peace be upon him), that it is from his words and among the secrets of his recognition. Yet we have explained that it is a fabricated lie against the Prophet (peace be upon him); he did not say it, nor did any scholar narrate it, nor is it in any of the compilations of ḥadīth. Rather, those knowledgeable in ḥadīth agree that it is fabricated. Nor is this addition transmitted from any renowned Imām in the Ummah known for leadership; rather, its origin is from those known for a type of Jahmism and denial of some attributes.

The wording of the known ḥadīth according to the scholars of ḥadīth, which the compilers of the Saḥīḥ collections narrated, is: {Allāh was, and there was nothing with Him, and His Throne was upon the water, and He wrote everything in the Remembrance}. This only negates the existence of created things like the heavens, the earth, and what is in them of angels, humans, and jinn; it does not negate the existence of the Throne. This is why many of the Salaf and Khalaf held

the view that the Throne preceded the Pen and the Tablet, using this ḥadīth as evidence. And they interpreted his saying: {The first thing Allāh created was the Pen, and He said to it: 'Write.' It said: 'What shall I write?' He said: 'Write what will be until the Day of Resurrection'} as referring to this creation mentioned in His saying: {And He it is Who created the heavens and the earth in six days—and His Throne was upon the water} [Hūd: 7].

This is similar to the famous ḥadīth of Abū Razīn Al-'Uqaylī found in the books of Masānīd and Sunan, that he asked the Prophet (peace be upon him), saying: {O Messenger of Allāh, where was our Lord before He created His creation?} He replied: {He was in 'amā' (often interpreted as a thin cloud or mist), with no air above it and no air below it, then He created His Throne upon the water}. So the 'creation' mentioned in this ḥadīth did not include the 'amā'. Some mentioned that this ['amā'] is the cloud mentioned in His saying: {Do they await but that Allāh should come to them in covers of clouds?} [Al-Baqarah: 210]. And there are well-known narrations concerning this.

The proof that this statement—which is their saying 'and He now as He was'—is a false statement, contradicting the Book, the Sunnah, the consensus, and reason, is based on several points:

1. That Allāh has informed that He is with His servants in more than one place in the Book, both generally and specifically. Such as His saying: {He is the One Who created the heavens and the earth in six days, then He rose over the Throne...} until His saying: {...And He is with you wherever you are} [Al-Ḥadīd: 4]. And His saying: {There is in no private conversation of three but that He is the fourth of them...} until His saying: {...wherever they may be} [Al-Mujādilah: 7]. And His saying: {Indeed, Allāh is with those who fear Him and those who are doers of good} [An-Nahl: 128]. And He said: {And Allāh is with the patient} [Al-Baqarah: 153, Al-Anfāl: 66] in two places. And His saying [to Mūsā and Hārūn]: {Indeed, I am with you both; I hear and I see} [Ṭā-Hā: 46]. [To Abū Bakr]: {Do not grieve; indeed, Allāh is with us} [At-Tawbah: 40]. {And Allāh said, 'I am with you'} [Al-Mā'idah: 12]. [Mūsā said]: {Indeed, with me is my Lord; He will guide me} [Ash-Shu'arā': 62]. And the Prophet (peace be upon him), when traveling, used to say: 'O Allāh, You are the Companion in the journey and the Successor over the family. O Allāh, accompany us in our journey and be our Successor over our family.' So, if the creation, generally and specifically, were not other than Him, nor were they with Him, but rather nothing else was with Him, it would be impossible for Him to be with Himself and His own essence. For 'witness' necessitates two things: one of them being with the other. Therefore, when Allāh informed that He is with these [creatures], the falsehood of their statement—{He is now as He was}, nothing with Him; rather, He is the very essence of created beings—becomes known. Also, 'witness' can only be from two parties, for its meaning is concomitance and companionship. So if one of two things is with the other, it is impossible that the other is not with it. Thus, it is impossible that Allāh is with His creation, yet they have no existence with Him and no reality at all, but are rather Him Himself.

2. Allāh said in His Book: {And do not set up with Allāh another god, lest you be thrown into Hell, blamed and rejected} [Al-Isrā': 39]. And He, the Exalted, said: {So do not invoke with Allāh another god, lest you be among the

punished} [Ash-Shu'arā': 213]. And He said: {And do not invoke with Allāh another god. There is no deity except Him. Everything will be destroyed except His Face} [Al-Qaṣa': 88]. So He forbade him [mankind] to set up or invoke with Him another god. He did not forbid him to affirm with Him a created being, or to say that with Him is an owned servant, or a dependent entity in need, or that with Him is an existing thing He created. Just as He said: 'There is no deity except Him', He did not say 'There is no existent except Him', or 'There is no he except Him', or 'There is nothing with Him except Him' in the sense that He is the very essence and reality of existent things. This is like His saying: {And your god is one God} [Al-Baqarah: 163]. He affirmed His Oneness in Divinity, He did not say that existent things are one. This Tawhīd which is in the Book of Allāh is the Tawhīd of Divinity, which is that you do not set up with Him nor invoke with Him any god other than Him. So where is this compared to making existence itself Him? Also, His prohibition against setting up or invoking another god with Him is proof that this is possible, as was done by the polytheists who invoked other deities with Allāh. If those deities were Him Himself—and nothing was with Him at all—it would be impossible to invoke other deities with Him. So these texts indicate that there are things with Him that are not deities, and it is not permissible for them to be made deities nor invoked as deities. Furthermore, according to the heretics, it is permissible to worship everything and invoke everything, since it is inconceivable to worship other than Him, for He is all things. Therefore, it becomes permissible for a person, according to them, to invoke every single thing from among the deities worshipped besides Allāh; and according to the heretics, he has not invoked another god with Him! Thus, they have made the very thing that Allāh forbade and designated as polytheism into tawhīd, and shirk, according to them, is inconceivable under any circumstance.

3. When Allāh was, and there was nothing with Him, there was no heaven with Him, nor earth, nor sun, nor moon, nor jinn, nor humans, nor animals, nor trees, nor Paradise, nor Hellfire, nor mountains, nor seas. So if He is now as He was, then it necessitates that none of these entities should be with Him. And this is a blatant denial of observable reality and disbelief in the Qur'an and faith.

4. Allāh was, and there was nothing with Him, then He wrote everything in the Remembrance, as mentioned in the authentic ḥadīth. So if there is nothing with Him afterwards, then what is the difference between the state of writing and before it, when He Himself is the writing and the Tablet, according to these Pharaonic heretics?



## Claim Of The Ittiḥādiyyah About The Faith Of Pharaoh And The Refutation Against Them

A faction among these Ittiḥādiyyah (pantheists)—who have deviated regarding the names and signs of Allāh—has claimed that Pharaoh was a believer and that he will not enter the Fire. They alleged that there is nothing in the Qurʾān indicating his punishment; rather, [they claim] it contains what negates it, like His saying: {‘Make the followers (Āl) of Pharaoh enter the severest punishment’} [Ghāfir: 46]. They said: Only his followers (Āl) are made to enter, not him. And His saying: {He will precede his people on the Day of Resurrection and lead them into the Fire} [Hūd: 98]. They said: He only leads them to it but does not enter it himself. They said [also]: Because he believed that {there is no deity except that in whom the Children of Israel have believed} [Yūnus: 90], and Jibril’s stuffing mud into his mouth does not negate the faith in his heart.

This statement is disbelief, its corruption known by necessity from the religion of Islam. As far as I know, no one among the people of the Qiblah preceded Ibn ‘Arabī in [making] it; indeed, not even among the Jews or the Christians. Rather, all people of [revealed] religions are unanimous on the disbelief of Pharaoh. Thus, this matter, among both the elite and the common folk, is clearer than needing proof. For no one disbelieved in Allāh and claimed lordship and divinity for himself like Pharaoh did. This is why Allāh repeated his story in the Qurʾān in multiple places, for the stories are but parables set forth to indicate faith, and among the disbelievers, none had greater disbelief than his.

The Qurʾān has indicated his disbelief and his punishment in the Hereafter in several places:

### The First Place

It is His, the Exalted’s, saying in Sūrah Al-Qaṣāʾ: {So these are two proofs from your Lord to Pharaoh and his establishment. Indeed, they were a defiantly disobedient people.} [Al-Qaṣāʾ: 32]... until His saying: {And We caused to follow them in this world a curse, and on the Day of Resurrection they will be among the despised.} [Al-Qaṣāʾ: 42]. So He, Glorified is He, informed that He sent him [Mūsā] to Pharaoh and his people, and informed that they were a defiantly disobedient people, and informed that they said: {‘This is not but invented magic’} [Al-Qaṣāʾ: 36], and informed that Pharaoh said: {‘I have not known you to have a god other than me’} [Al-Qaṣāʾ: 38], and that he ordered the construction of the tower so he might look upon the God of Mūsā, and that he thought him [Mūsā] to be a liar. And He informed that Pharaoh and his soldiers were arrogant and thought they would not return to Allāh, and that He seized Pharaoh and his soldiers and cast them into the sea; so observe how was the end

of the wrongdoers. And that He made them leaders inviting to the Fire, and on the Day of Resurrection they will not be helped. And that He caused a curse to follow them in this world, and on the Day of Resurrection they will be among the despised.

This is an explicit text that Pharaoh is among the defiantly disobedient, the deniers of Mūsā, the wrongdoers, those inviting to the Fire, cursed in this world after their drowning, despised in the Abode of the Hereafter. This is an explicit text that Pharaoh, after his drowning, is cursed, and he is despised and unhelped in the Hereafter. This is information about the utmost punishment, and it corresponds to the second passage in Sūrah Al-Mu'min [Ghāfir], which is His saying: {and the worst of punishment enveloped the people (Āl) of Pharaoh. The Fire, they are exposed to it morning and evening. And the Day the Hour appears [it will be said], 'Make the people (Āl) of Pharaoh enter the severest punishment.'} [Ghāfir: 45-46]. This is information about Pharaoh and his people; that the worst of punishment enveloped them in the Barzakh (intermediate realm after death), and that on the Day of Resurrection they will enter the severest punishment. This verse is one of those used by the scholars as evidence for the punishment of the Barzakh.

The doubt only entered [the minds of] these ignorant ones when they heard 'Āl Fir'awn' (the people/followers/family of Pharaoh) and assumed that Pharaoh himself was excluded from them. This is distorting the words from their contexts. Rather, Pharaoh is included in 'Āl Fir'awn' without dispute among the people of knowledge of the Qur'ān and the language. This is clarified by several points:

1. The term 'Āl Fulān' (the people/family/followers of so-and-so) in the Book and the Sunnah includes that person himself. Like His saying regarding the angels who were guests of Ibrāhīm: {Indeed, we have been sent to a people of criminals, Except the followers (Āl) of Lūt. Indeed, we will save them all, Except his wife.} [Al-Ĥijr: 58-60]. Then He said: {And when the messengers came to the family (Āl) of Lūt, He said} meaning Lūt: {Indeed, you are a people unknown.} [Al-Ĥijr: 61-62]. Likewise His saying: {Indeed, We sent upon them a storm of stones, except the family (Āl) of Lūt; We saved them before dawn} [Al-Qamar: 34]. Then He said after that: {And there certainly came to the people (Āl) of Pharaoh warnings. They denied Our signs, all of them, so We seized them with a seizure of one Exalted in Might and Perfect in Ability.} [Al-Qamar: 41-42]. It is known that Lūt is included in 'Āl Lūt' in these passages. Likewise, Pharaoh is included in the 'Āl Fir'awn' who denied and were seized. Related to this is the saying of the Prophet (peace be upon him): {Say: O Allāh, send prayers upon Muḥammad and upon the family (Āl) of Muḥammad, as You sent prayers upon the family (Āl) of Ibrāhīm.} And likewise his saying: {as You sent blessings upon the family (Āl) of Ibrāhīm.} So Ibrāhīm is included in that. Likewise his saying to Al-Ḥasan: {Indeed, charity is not permissible for the family (Āl) of Muḥammad.} And in the Saḥīḥ from 'Abdullāh ibn Abī Awfā, he said: 'When people brought their charity (ṣadaqah) to the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him), he would pray for them. My father brought his charity, and he said: 'O Allāh, send prayers upon the family (Āl) of Abū Awfā.' And Abū Awfā is the one who gave the charity. Similar to this term is 'Ahl al-Bayt' (People of the House), for the man is included in his Ahl al-Bayt, like the saying of the angels: {May the

mercy of Allāh and His blessings be upon you, People of the House} [Hūd: 73]. And the saying of the Prophet (peace be upon him): ‘Salmān is from us, the Ahl al-Bayt.’ And His, the Exalted’s, saying: {Allāh intends only to remove from you the impurity [of sin], O People of the House (Ahl al-Bayt)} [Al-Ahẓāb: 33]. This is because the ‘Āl’ of a man are those who pertain to him, and his own self is among those who pertain to him. And his ‘Ahl Bayt’ are those whom he takes as family, and he is among those who take his Ahl al-Bayt as family. Thus, it has become clear that the verse they thought was proof for them is actually proof against them regarding the punishment of Pharaoh along with the rest of the Āl Fir’awn in the Barzakh and on the Day of Resurrection. This is further clarified by the fact that the address in the entire story is information about Pharaoh and his people. Allāh, the Exalted, said: {And We had certainly sent Mūsā with Our signs and a clear authority To Pharaoh, Hāmān and Qārūn. But they said, ‘[He is] a magician and a liar.’} [Ghāfir: 23-24]... until His saying: {Pharaoh said, ‘I do not show you except what I see, and I do not guide you except to the way of right conduct.’} [Ghāfir: 29]... until His saying: {And Pharaoh said, ‘O Hāmān, construct for me a tower that I might reach the ways—The ways into the heavens—so that I may look at the deity of Mūsā’} [Ghāfir: 36-37]... until His saying: {and the worst of punishment enveloped the people (Āl) of Pharaoh. The Fire, they are exposed to it morning and evening...} [Ghāfir: 45-46]... until His saying: {...those who were arrogant will say, ‘Indeed, we are all within it. Indeed, Allāh has judged between the servants.’} [Ghāfir: 48]. So He informed, immediately after His saying: {‘Make the people (Āl) of Pharaoh enter the severest punishment’}, about their arguments in the Fire, the saying of the weak to those who were arrogant, and the saying of the arrogant to the weak: {‘Indeed, we are all within it’}. It is known that Pharaoh is the head of the arrogant ones, and he is the one who {instigated his people, and they obeyed him} [Az-Zukhruf: 54]. No one was as arrogant as Pharaoh, so he is more deserving of this description and ruling than all of his people.

2. The second passage—which is proof against them, not for them—is His, the Exalted’s, saying: {So they followed the command of Pharaoh, and the command of Pharaoh was not guided. He will precede his people on the Day of Resurrection and lead them into the Fire; and wretched is the place to which they are led.} [Hūd: 97-98]... until His saying: {...wretched is the gift which is given.} [Hūd: 99]. So He informed that he will precede his people, He did not say he will drive them, and that he led them into the Fire. It is known that when the one preceding leads those following into the Fire, he must be the first one to enter it, otherwise he would not be preceding; rather, he would be driving. Clarifying this is His saying: {And they were followed in this [world] by a curse and on the Day of Resurrection} [Hūd: 99]. So it is known that he and they will enter the Fire, and that they are all cursed in this world and the Hereafter. How fitting it is for the one arguing on behalf of Pharaoh to be in this position, for {‘A man is with whom he loves’} [Ḥadīth], and {those who disbelieved are allies of one another} [Al-Anfāl: 73].

Also, Allāh, the Exalted, has said: {Then has there not been a [single] city that believed so its faith benefited it except the people of Yūnus? When they believed...} [Yūnus: 98]. He is saying: Why did no people believe such that their faith benefited them, except the people of Yūnus? And He, the Exalted, said:

{Have they not traveled through the land and observed how was the end of those before them? They were more numerous than themselves and greater in strength and in impression on the land...} until His saying: {...the established way of Allāh which has preceded among His servants. And the disbelievers thereupon lost.} [Ghāfir: 82-85]. So He informed about the nations that denied the messengers, that they believed upon seeing the punishment, and that their faith did not benefit them at that point, and that this is the established way of Allāh that has passed among His servants. This corresponds exactly to what Allāh mentioned in His address to Pharaoh: {'Now? When you had disobeyed before and were of the corrupters?'} [Yūnus: 91]. This address is a rhetorical question of disapproval, meaning: Now you believe, when you had disobeyed before? So He denied that this faith would be beneficial or accepted. Whoever says it is beneficial and accepted has opposed the explicit text of the Qur'ān and opposed the established way of Allāh which has passed among His servants. Clarifying this is that if his faith at that point had been accepted, it would have averted the punishment from him, just as it was averted from the people of Yūnus, for when their faith was accepted, they were granted enjoyment for a time. For the drowning was a punishment for his disbelief; if he had not been a disbeliever, he would not have deserved punishment. And His saying after this: {So today We will save you in body that you may be to those who succeed you a sign} [Yūnus: 92] necessitates that those after him should take heed. If he had only died as a believer, a believer would not be someone whose destruction and drowning serves as a lesson.

Also, when Ibn Mas'ūd informed the Prophet (peace be upon him) about the killing of Abū Jahl, he said: 'This is the Pharaoh of this Ummah.' So the Prophet (peace be upon him) drew a parallel between the head of the disbelievers who denied him and the head of the disbelievers who denied Mūsā. This shows that he [Pharaoh] is the epitome of disbelief, so how could he have died a believer? It is known that whoever dies a believer, it is not permissible to brand him with disbelief nor describe him with it, because Islam demolishes what came before it. And in the Musnad of Aḥmad and Ishāq, and the Saḥīḥ of Abū Ḥātim, from 'Awf ibn Mālik from 'Abdullāh ibn 'Amr, from the Prophet (peace be upon him) regarding the one who abandons prayer: 'He will come [on the Day of Judgment] with Qārūn, Pharaoh, Hāmān, and Ubayy ibn Khalaf.'



## Those Who Claimed, Based On Texts, The Doctrine Of Ĥulūl And Ittiĥād, And Used Predestination As A Justification For Sins

### Question

The Shaykh, the Imām, the Lordly Scholar, Shaykh al-Islām, the Ocean of Knowledge, the Imām of Imāms, the Helper of the Sunnah, the Most Learned of Mankind, the Inheritor of the Prophets, Abū al-'Abbās Aĥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ĥalīm ibn Taymiyyah (may Allāh be pleased with him) was asked:

About statements found in the handwriting of someone trustworthy, mentioned by him from a group of people, among whom were some affiliated with religion. Among them: Some of the Salaf said: 'Allāh made His essence subtle and named it Reality, and made it dense and named it creation.' Shaykh Najm ad-Dīn Ibn Isrā'īl said: 'Allāh appeared in things in reality and veiled Himself by them metaphorically. Whoever is among the people of Reality and Ittiĥād witnesses them as manifestations and loci of theophany. Whoever is among the people of Metaphor and Separation witnesses them as veils and barriers.' He said: And he said in a poem of his:

*It was right for me to reject existence and its people  
When my hands clung in union to my Originator*

Then after a period, he changed the verse to:

*It was right for me to passionately love existence and its people...*

So I asked him about that, and he said: 'The station of the beginning is to see contingent beings as veils, so one rejects them. Then one sees them as manifestations and loci of theophany, so it becomes right for him to love them passionately, as one of them said:

*I kiss the ground where her beauty walked  
So how [much more] the abode where her beauty resided?*

He said: And Ibn 'Arabī said, following the recitation of the two verses of Abū Nuwās:

*The glass became fine, and the wine became clear  
They resembled each other, so the matter became similar  
As if it were wine and no cup  
And as if it were a cup and no wine*

[Ibn 'Arabī commented:] 'He donned the form of the world; so its outward is His creation, and its inward is His Reality.' Some of the Salaf said: 'The essence of what you see is an Essence you do not see, and an Essence you do not see is the essence of what you see. Allāh only, and multiplicity is illusion.' Shaykh Quṭb ad-

Dīn Ibn Sab'īn said: 'A Lord owning and a servant perishing, and you are that. Allāh only, and multiplicity is illusion.' Shaykh Muḥyī ad-Dīn Ibn 'Arabī said:

*O form of intimacy, whose secret is my meaning  
Your creation for the Command sees [is] for my allegiance  
We willed you, so We originated you as human creation  
That you might witness Us in the most perfect of things*

And in it [the collection of sayings]: One of the children of the Shaykhs requested Hajj from his father. The Shaykh said to him: 'O my son, circumambulate a house which Allāh has not left for the blink of an eye.' He said: And it was related about Rābī'ah al-'Adawiyyah that she performed Hajj and said [about the Ka'bah]: 'This is the idol worshipped on earth. By Allāh, Allāh never entered it, nor was He absent from it.' And in it, by Al-Ḥallāj:

*Glory to Him who manifested His humanity  
The secret of the radiance of His piercing Divinity  
Then He appeared, hidden yet manifest  
In the form of the eater and the drinker*

He said, and [also] by him:

*Creations have formed beliefs about God  
And I have believed all that they believed*

And by him also:

*Between me and You is an 'I-ness' crowding me  
So remove, by Your Reality, my 'I-ness' from the in-between*

He said: And Shaykh Shihāb ad-Dīn as-Suhrawardī al-Ḥalabī al-Maqtūl said: 'And by this 'I-ness' which Al-Ḥallāj sought to remove, the 'others' disposed of his blood. That is why the Salaf said: Al-Ḥallāj is half a man. That is because the 'I-ness' was not removed for him in meaning, so it was removed for him in form.' And in it, by Muḥyī ad-Dīn Ibn 'Arabī:

*By Allāh, it is nothing but bewilderment that appeared  
And by Me she swore, and indeed the Swearer is Allāh*

And he said therein: What is transmitted from 'Īsā (peace be upon him) is that he said: 'Indeed Allāh, Blessed and Exalted is He, longed to see His sacred Essence, so He created Adam (peace be upon him) from His light and made him like a mirror in which He looks at His sacred Essence. And indeed, I am that light, and Adam is the mirror.' Ibn al-Fārid' said in his poem As-Sulūk:

*And witness, when you polish your self  
Whom do you see, without doubt, in the polished mirror?  
Did other-than-you appear in it, or are you looking  
At yourself through it, upon the reflection of rays?*

He said: And Ibn Isrā'īl said: 'The command is twofold: a command through intermediary and a command without intermediary. The command through intermediaries, Allāh willed some to reject it and Allāh willed some to accept it. The command without intermediary cannot be rejected, and it is His, the Exalted's, saying: {Our word to a thing when We intend it is but that We say to it, 'Be,' and it is.} [An-Nāḥl: 40]. A poor man said to him: 'Indeed, Allāh said to Adam without intermediary: 'Do not approach the tree'—yet he approached

and ate.' He [Ibn Isrā'īl] said: 'You speak the truth. That is because Adam was a perfect human; that is why our Shaykh 'Alī al-Ḥarīrī said: 'Adam, the chosen one of Allāh, Exalted is He, his Tawḥīd was outward and inward. So His saying to Adam 'Do not approach the tree' was outward, and His command 'Eat' was inward, so he ate.' Likewise is His, the Exalted's, saying. And Iblīs, his Tawḥīd was outward, so he was commanded to prostrate to Adam, but he saw him as 'other', so he did not prostrate. So Allāh changed [His disposition] towards him and said: {Get out of it} [Al-A'rāf: 13].'

And a person said to Sayyidī Ḥasan: 'O Sayyidī Ḥasan, if Allāh says to His Prophet: {Not for you is any decision} [Āl 'Imrān: 128], what then are we?' Sayyidī said to him: 'The matter is not as you say or think. His saying to him: {Not for you is any decision} is the very affirmation for the Prophet (peace be upon him), like His, the Exalted's, saying: {And you threw not, [O Muḥammad], when you threw, but it was Allāh who threw} [Al-Anfāl: 17], [and] {Indeed, those who pledged allegiance to you, [O Muḥammad]—they are actually pledging allegiance to Allāh. The hand of Allāh is over their hands.} [Al-Fatḥ: 10].'

And in it, by Awḥad ad-Dīn al-Kirmānī:

*You were not absent from the heart, nor from my eye  
Between you and us, there is no 'in-between'*

And another said:

*Do not think that by prayer and fasting you attain  
Proximity and closeness to Beauty and Majesty  
Depart from the darkness of nature and be united  
With Allāh, otherwise all your claims are futile*

And another [attributed] to Al-Ḥallāj:

*When the lover reaches perfection in passion  
And is absent from the Remembered in the overpowering force of the  
Remembrance  
He witnesses truly, when passion witnesses Him  
That the prayer of the recognizers is from disbelief*

And by Shaykh Najm ad-Dīn Ibn Isrā'īl:

*The cosmos calls you, 'Do you not hear me?  
Who composed my scattered parts, and who dispersed me?  
Look, that you may see me, a sight for consideration  
There is nothing in me besides the existence of the One Who originated me*

And by him also:

*The atoms of the existence of the cosmos are witnesses to the Truth  
That no existent has existence besides the Truth  
And the cosmos, though its count is many  
From Him and to His Loftiness it begins and returns*

And by him also:

*I am absolved towards You from my saying and my doing  
And from my self, the absolution of one resigning  
And I am nothing in the fabric of the cosmos*

*Because I am like a vanishing shadow*

And by Al-'Afif at-Tilimsānī:

*I yearn for Him, and He is my heart. Does any  
Brother of ecstasy see other than me yearning for his heart?  
My gaze veils me from Him, as He is my Seer  
And His distance is only due to His extreme closeness*

And some of the Salaf said: 'Tawhīd has no tongue, and all tongues are its tongue.' And from that also: 'Tawhīd is known only by the One, and expression about the One is not possible, because He can only be expressed through other-than-Him, and whoever affirms an 'other' has no Tawhīd.' He said: And I heard Shaykh Muḥammad ibn Bishr an-Nawāwī say: 'Our master Shaykh 'Alī al-Ḥarīrī came to the mosque of Nawā'. Shaykh Muḥammad said: 'So I came to him, kissed the ground before him, and sat down. He said: 'O my son, I stood with love for a period and found it not the intended goal, because love can only be from an 'other' for an 'other', and there is no 'other' there. Then I stood with Tawhīd for a period and found it likewise, because Tawhīd can only be from a servant for a Lord. If people were just, they would see neither servant nor worshipped.'

And in it: I heard from Shaykh Najm ad-Dīn Ibn Isrā'īl, among what he confided to me, that he heard from our Shaykh, Shaykh 'Alī al-Ḥarīrī, in the year he passed away, say: 'O Najm, I saw my upper palate above the heavens and my jaw beneath the earths, and my tongue uttered a word that, if it were heard from me, not a drop of my blood would reach the earth.' Then, after a period, a person said in the presence of Sayyidī Shaykh Ḥasan ibn 'Alī al-Ḥarīrī: 'O Sayyidī Ḥasan, Allāh did not create anyone less intelligent than one who claimed he was a god, like Pharaoh, Nimrod, and their likes.' He [Ḥasan] said: 'This statement is only said by the most ignorant of Allāh's creation or the most knowledgeable of Allāh's creation.' I said to him: 'You speak the truth; that is because I heard your grandfather say: 'I saw such-and-such...'—then he mentioned what Shaykh Najm ad-Dīn had mentioned from the Shaykh.

And in it, some of the Salaf said: 'Whoever is the essence of the veil upon himself, then there is no veil and no veiled.'

So, what is requested from the learned masters is:

To clarify these statements: Are they true or false? How is their meaning known? What clarifies whether they are true or false? Is it obligatory to reject them, affirm them, or submit to those who said them? Do they have any permissible interpretation? What is the ruling concerning one who believes their meaning, either with knowledge of their reality or with general submission to those who said them?

Did those who uttered them intend a correct meaning that conforms to reason and transmission? Is it possible to interpret what is problematic among them and apply it to that [correct] meaning? Is it obligatory to explain their meaning and uncover their purport if there are people who believe in them but do not know their reality? Or should one remain silent about that and leave people to venerate them and believe in them despite lacking knowledge of their meaning? Clarify this, may you be rewarded.

**Answer**

He (may Allāh be pleased with him) answered:

All praise is due to Allāh, Lord of the worlds. These mentioned statements contain two false principles that contradict the religion of the Muslims, Jews, and Christians, in addition to contradicting transmitted knowledge and rational proof.

## The First Principle

Al-Ĥulūl and Al-Ittiḥād and what resembles them, like the doctrine of Waḥdat al-Wujūd, such as those who say: Existence is one, so the Necessary Existence of the Creator is the contingent existence of the creature. This is said by the proponents of Waḥdat al-Wujūd like Ibn 'Arabī and his companion Al-Qūnawī, Ibn Sab'īn, Ibn al-Fārid' (author of the Tā'iyyah poem, Naẓm as-Sulūk—The Arrangement of the Wayfaring), 'Āmir al-Bašrī as-Siwāsī (who has a poem rivaling Ibn al-Fārid's poem), At-Tilimsānī (who commented on Mawāqif an-Niffarī and has a commentary on the Beautiful Names [of Allāh] according to the way of these people), Sa'īd al-Farghānī (who commented on Ibn al-Fārid's poem), Ash-Shushtarī (author of zajal poems, who was a student of Ibn Sab'īn), 'Abdullāh al-Balyānī, Ibn Abī al-Manšūr the Egyptian Sufi (author of Fakk al-Azrār 'an A'nāq al-Azrār—Unbuttoning the Necks of Secrets), and their likes.

Then, among these are those who differentiate between existence and fixedness—as Ibn 'Arabī says—claiming that the essences are fixed in non-existence, independent of Allāh in themselves, and the existence of the Truth is their existence. The Creator is dependent on the essences for the manifestation of His existence through them, while they are dependent on Him for obtaining their existence, which is the same as His existence. His view is a composite of the view of those who said 'the non-existent is a thing' and the view of those who say 'the existence of the Creator is the existence of the creature.' He says: So the created existence is the Creator existence, and the Creator existence is the created existence, as is elaborated elsewhere.

Among them are those who differentiate between the absolute and the determined, as Al-Qūnawī and his likes say. They say: The Necessary [Being] is Absolute Existence without condition. This [Absolute Existence] is only found as absolute in minds, not in external realities. For what is universal in minds cannot exist in external realities except as determined. If it is said that the absolute is part of the determined, it follows that the existence of the Creator is part of the existence of the creature. And a part cannot originate and create the whole, so the Creator would not be existent.

Among them are those who said: The Originator is Absolute Existence on condition of absoluteness, as Ibn Sīnā and his followers say. His view is even more corrupt, for the absolute on condition of absoluteness exists only in minds, not in external realities. So the view of these [pantheists], agreeing with those [philosophers]—whose position necessitates denial [of attributes]—is worse than the view of those who resemble the proponents of Ĥulūl and Ittiḥād.

Al-Ĥākīm, or Al-Ĥallāj, or Yūnus al-Qunaynī, or others among those for whom divinity was claimed. For these latter groups may speak of restricted, specific Ĥulūl, while the former group speaks of absoluteness and generalization.

This is why they say that the Christians erred only in specification. Likewise, they

say regarding the polytheists, the worshippers of idols, that their error was only because they restricted themselves to some manifestations to the exclusion of others. They [the pantheists] permit polytheism and the worship of idols absolutely, in an absolute and general manner. There is no doubt that the statement of these people contains disbelief and misguidance greater than the disbelief of the Jews and Christians.

This doctrine is widespread among many later figures. Groups of the Jahmiyyah used to hold it. The words of Ibn 'Arabī in *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* and elsewhere, the words of Ibn Sab'īn and his companion Ash-Shushtarī, the poem of Ibn al-Fārid' (*Naẓm as-Sulūk*), the poem of 'Āmir al-Baṣrī, the words of Al-'Aff at-Tilimsānī, 'Abdullāh al-Balyānī, Aṣ-Ṣadr al-Qūnawī, much of the poetry of Ibn Isrā'īl, and what is transmitted of that from his Shaykh al-Ḥarīrī; likewise, similar things found in the words of many people other than these, are built upon this doctrine—the doctrine of Ḥulūl, Ittīhād, and waḥdat al-wujūd. Many people of wayfaring who do not believe this doctrine hear the poetry of Ibn al-Fārid' and others but do not recognize that his intention is this doctrine. For in this domain, there has occurred such confusion and misguidance as has bewildered many men.

The root of the misguidance of these people is that they did not recognize Allāh's distinction from His creation and His transcendence over them. They knew He exists, so they assumed His existence does not extend beyond their existence, like someone who sees the sun's rays and thinks they are the sun itself. When the Jahmiyyah appeared—deniers of Allāh's distinction from and transcendence over His creation—people divided regarding this matter into four positions:

1. The Salaf and the Imāms say: Allāh is above His heavens, risen over His Throne, distinct from His creation, as indicated by the Book, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Salaf of the Ummah, and as distinction and transcendence are known through sound reason which conforms to authentic transmission, and as Allāh has ingrained His creation upon this: their affirmation of it and their directing themselves towards Him, Glorified and Exalted is He.
2. The position of the deniers (*mu'at'īlah*) and negators among the Jahmiyyah, who say: He is neither inside the world nor outside it, neither distinct from it nor contiguous with it. Thus, they negate the two opposing descriptions, one of which must apply to any existent being. This is said by most of the *Mu'tazilah* and those who agreed with them from other groups.
3. The position of the Ḥulūliyyah among the Jahmiyyah, who say: He, in His essence, is in every place. This is said by the *Najjāriyyah*—followers of Ḥusayn an-Najjār—and others among the Jahmiyyah. These proponents of Ḥulūl and Ittīhād are of this type. For indwelling is more prevalent among the worshippers Sufis, and common folk of the Jahmiyyah, while negation and denial are more prevalent among their speculative thinkers and theologians. As it was said: The theologians of the Jahmiyyah worship nothing, and the Sufis of the Jahmiyyah worship everything. This is because worship entails seeking, intention, will, and love, and these cannot relate to something non-existent. The heart seeks something existent; if it does not seek what is above the world, it seeks what is within it. As for speech, knowledge, and

speculation, they can relate to both the existent and the non-existent. So when the people of theology and speculation describe the Lord with attributes of negation and denial—with which only the non-existent can be described—mere knowledge and speech do not contradict the non-existence of the worshipped being mentioned, unlike intention, will, and worship, which do contradict the non-existence of the worshipped being. This is why you find one of these individuals—when engaged in speculation and research—inclining towards negation, and when engaged in worship and Sufism, inclining towards Ḥulūl. If told, ‘This contradicts that,’ he says, ‘This is the requirement of my reason and speculation, and that is the requirement of my tasting and recognition.’ It is known that tasting and ecstatic experience, if not in accordance with reason and speculation, necessitates the corruption of both or the corruption of one of them.

4. The position of those who say: Allāh, in His essence, is above the world, and He, in His essence, is in every place. This is the view of groups among the people of kalām and Sufism, like Abū Mu’ādh and his likes. Al-Ash’arī mentioned this in Al-Maqālāt from various groups. And found in the words of the Sālimiyyah—like Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī and his followers, such as Abū al-Ḥakam ibn Barrajan and his likes—is that which indicates something like this, just as there is found in their words that which contradicts this.

In summary, the doctrine of Ḥulūl or what resembles it occurred among many of the later Sufis. This is why the Imāms of the group used to warn against it, as in the saying of Al-Junayd—when asked about Tawḥīd—he said: ‘Tawḥīd is the singling out of originatedness from eternity.’ He clarified that Tawḥīd is to distinguish between the Eternal and the originated. Ibn ‘Arabī—the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ—rejected that from him and claimed that Al-Junayd and his likes died without knowing Tawḥīd, because they affirmed the distinction between the Lord and the servant, based on his [Ibn ‘Arabī’s] claim that Tawḥīd involves no distinction between the Lord and the servant. He claimed that only one who is neither eternal nor originated can distinguish between the Eternal and the originated. This is ignorance, for the knowledge that this is not that, and the distinction between this and that, does not require the knower who distinguishes between the two things to not be one of the two things. Rather, a human knows that he is not that other human, even though he is one of them. So how can he not know that he is other than his Lord, even if he is one of them [i.e., an existent being]?

## The Second Principle

Using Predestination (Qadar) as a Justification for Sins and for abandoning commanded duties and committing prohibited acts. Indeed, belief in predestination is obligatory, but it is not permissible to use it as a justification for opposing the command, prohibition, promise, and threat of Allāh.

The people who went astray regarding predestination (qadar) fall into three categories:

1. A group who believed in the command, prohibition, promise, and threat, but denied predestination, claiming that some occurrences are not created by Allāh, like the Mu’tazilah and their likes.

2. A group who believed in the divine decree and predestination, agreeing with Ahl as-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah that whatever Allāh wills happens, and whatever He does not will does not happen, and that He is the Creator of everything, its Lord, and its Sovereign. However, they opposed this [belief] to the command and prohibition, calling this [qadar] the 'reality' and considering that to be contradictory to the 'law'. Among them are those who say: Witnessing predestination negates blame and punishment, and that for the recognizer, this [good] and that [evil] are equal. In this, they are contradictory, opposing the Sharia, reason, tasting, and ecstatic experience. For they do not equate one who does good to them with one who wrongs them, nor do they equate the knowledgeable with the ignorant, the capable with the incapable, nor the pure with the impure, nor the just with the unjust. Rather, they differentiate between them. They also differentiate according to their whims and purposes, not according to the command and prohibition. They adhere neither to predestination nor to the command; rather, as one of the scholars said: 'You are a Qadarī during obedience and a Jabrī during disobedience. Whichever doctrine suits your whim, you adopt it.' You will not find anyone justifying abandoning an obligation or committing a prohibition by citing predestination except that he is contradictory, not making it a justification when his own whim is opposed. Rather, he antagonizes whoever harms him, even if [the harmer] is justified [by qadar], and loves whoever agrees with his purpose, even if he is an enemy of Allāh. So his love and hatred, his alliance and enmity, are according to his whim, his purpose, his soul's tasting, and his experience, not according to Allāh's command and prohibition, His love and hatred, His alliance and enmity. For it is impossible for him to make predestination a justification for everyone. Indeed, this would necessitate corruption with which there can be no rectitude and evil in which there is no good. For if it were permissible for everyone to justify [their actions] by predestination, no aggressor would be punished, no oppressive wrongdoer would face retribution, no oppressed person's right would be taken from his oppressor, and everyone would do whatever he desires without any opposition confronting him. This entails such corruption as only the Lord of the servants knows. It is known by necessity that actions are divided into those that benefit the servants and those that harm them. Allāh sent His Messenger (peace be upon him) commanding the believers with good and forbidding them from evil, making lawful for them the good things and prohibiting for them the impure things. Whoever does not follow the law of Allāh and His religion follows its opposite: whims and innovations. His justification using predestination is from arguing with falsehood to refute the truth thereby, not from relying upon it. It would necessitate him making everyone upon whom the decrees run among those who have excuses. If he says: 'I excuse by predestination whoever witnesses it and knows that Allāh is the creator of his action and its mover, not one who is absent from this witnessing or is among the people of denial.' It is said to him: Then it is said to you: And the witnessing of this one and the denial of that one are from predestination? Predestination encompasses the witnessing of this one and the denial of that one? If this [witnessing] necessitates a difference [in ruling] despite predestination encompassing both, then you have made some people praiseworthy and some blameworthy despite predestination encompassing both? This is a

return to differentiation and adherence to the command and prohibition. At that point, you have contradicted your principle and become inconsistent within it. This is binding upon everyone who enters into this with you. Then, besides the corruption and contradiction of this principle, it is a false statement and a misleading innovation. Who made belief in predestination and witnessing it an excuse for abandoning obligations and committing prohibitions? Rather, belief in predestination is a good deed among good deeds, and this [one good deed] cannot suffice to repel all evil deeds. If a polytheist committed shirk with Allāh and denied His Messenger, looking [only] at the fact that this was decreed for him, that would not forgive his denial nor prevent his punishment. For Allāh does not forgive that shirk be committed with Him, whether the polytheist affirms predestination and looks to it, or denies it, or is heedless of it. Indeed, Iblīs said: {‘Because You have put me in error, I will surely make [disobedience] attractive to them on earth, and I will mislead them all’} [Al-Ĥijr: 39]. He persisted and used predestination as justification, and that was an increase in his disbelief and a cause for his increased punishment. As for Adam (peace be upon him), he said: {‘Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves, and if You do not forgive us and have mercy upon us, we will surely be among the losers.’} [Al-A’rāf: 23]. Allāh, the Exalted, said: {Then Adam received from his Lord [some] words, and He accepted his repentance. Indeed, it is He who is the Accepting of repentance, the Merciful.} [Al-Baqarah: 37]. So whoever seeks forgiveness and repents is Adamic and felicitous, and whoever persists and uses predestination as justification is Iblīsic and wretched. Allāh, the Exalted, said to Iblīs: {‘I will surely fill Hell with you and those among them who follow you all together.’} [Ĥād: 85]. Many of those who delve into ‘realities’ have gone astray in this matter. They follow various types of ‘realities’ which they experience and taste, and use predestination as justification for what they oppose regarding the command. Thus, they resemble the polytheists who used to innovate a religion Allāh had not legislated and use predestination as justification for opposing Allāh’s command.

3. Those who contend with the Lord regarding His combining the divine decree and predestination with the command and prohibition—as they mention this upon the tongue of Iblīs. These are adversaries of Allāh and His enemies.

As for the people of faith, they believe in the divine decree and predestination and the command and prohibition. They do what is commanded, leave what is prohibited, and are patient with what is decreed. As Allāh, the Exalted, said: {Indeed, he who fears Allāh and is patient—then indeed, Allāh does not allow to be lost the reward of those who do good.} [Yūsuf: 90]. So taqwā entails doing what is commanded and leaving what is prohibited, and ṣabr entails patience with what is decreed. When a calamity afflicts these people on earth or in themselves, they know that it was [written] in a Book, and that what afflicted them was not meant to miss them, and what missed them was not meant to afflict them. So they submit the affair to Allāh and are patient with what He tested them with. But when the command of Allāh comes, they hasten towards good deeds, race towards acts of obedience, call upon their Lord in hope and fear, avoid His prohibitions, preserve His limits, seek Allāh’s forgiveness, and repent to Him for their shortcomings in what He commanded and their

transgression of His limits; knowing that repentance is perpetually obligatory upon the servants, and following the example of their Prophet, as he says in the authentic ḥadīth: 'O people, repent to your Lord, for by the One in Whose Hand is my soul, indeed I seek Allāh's forgiveness and repent to Him one hundred times a day.' And in another narration: 'more than seventy times.' And the last Sūrah revealed to him was: {When the victory of Allāh has come and the conquest, And you see the people entering into the religion of Allāh in multitudes, Then exalt [Him] with praise of your Lord and ask forgiveness of Him. Indeed, He is ever Accepting of repentance.} [An-Naṣr: 1-3].

When these two principles are understood, the answer to the statements in this question is built upon them, and the misguidance that has entered into these matters becomes known.

So, the saying of the one who said: 'Allāh made His essence subtle and named it Reality, and made it dense and named it creation'—is from the sayings of the proponents of waḥdah, Ḥulūl, and Ittīḥād, , and it is false. For if the subtle is the dense, then the Reality is the creation, and there is no making subtle nor making dense. And if the subtle is other than the dense, then the distinction between the Reality and the creation is established—and this is the truth. In that case, the Reality cannot be creation, so it is inconceivable that the essence of the Reality could be creation in any way whatsoever, just as the essence of the creature cannot be the essence of the Creator in any way whatsoever.

Likewise, the saying of the other: 'He appeared in them [things] in reality and veiled Himself from them metaphorically.' For if the Manifest is other than the locus of manifestation, then the distinction between the Lord and the servant is established. And if neither is other than the other, then neither manifestation nor veiling can be conceived.

Then his saying: 'Whoever is among the people of Reality witnesses them as manifestations and loci of theophany, and whoever is among the people of Separation witnesses them as veils and barriers' is speech where parts contradict others. For if existence is one, then neither of the two witnesses is other than the other, nor is the witness other than the witnessed. This is why one of the Shaykhs of these people said: 'Whoever says there is anything in the cosmos besides Allāh has lied.' Another said to him: 'Then who is it that lied?' And he silenced him. This is because if nothing exists besides the Necessary Being Himself, then He is the one who lies, oppresses, eats, and drinks. The Imāms of these people state this explicitly, as the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ and others say: that He is described with all blameworthy attributes, and that He is the one who falls ill, is struck, is afflicted by calamities, and is described with faults and deficiencies, just as He is the one described with attributes of praise and blame. He said: 'So the High in Himself is the one who possesses all attributes, affirmative and negative, whether they are praiseworthy according to reason, scripture, and custom, or blameworthy according to reason, scripture, and custom. And that belongs only to the One named Allāh, specifically.' And he said: 'Do you not see the Real appearing with the attributes of originated things—and He has informed of that about Himself—and with the attributes of the self, and with blameworthy attributes? Do you not see the creature appearing with the attributes of the Creator? All of them are His right, just as the attributes of the creature are the right of the Creator.'

And the saying of the one who said: 'It was right for me to passionately love existence and its people' necessitates that he loves Iblīs, Pharaoh, Hāmān, and every disbeliever passionately, and loves dogs, pigs, urine, excrement, and every impurity passionately. Besides this being false according to reason and scripture, he is lying in that and contradicting himself. For if someone harmed him and caused him severe pain, he would hate him and treat him with hostility, indeed, he might transgress in harming him [in return]. So a man's passionate love for every existent being is impossible rationally and forbidden scripturally.

And what was mentioned from one of them, his saying: 'The essence of what you see is an Essence you do not see, and an Essence you do not see is the essence of what you see'—this is from the words of Ibn Sab'īn, and he is among the greatest proponents of polytheism, heresy, magic, and Iṭīhād. He was among their most excellent, intelligent, and knowledgeable regarding philosophy and the Sufism of the philosophers.

And the saying of 'Ibn 'Arabī': 'Its outward is His creation, its inward is His Reality' is the saying of the proponents of Ḥulūl, and he contradicts himself in that. For he affirms unity (waḥdah), so there should not be two existent things, one inward and the other outward. And differentiating between existence and essence is a differentiation that has no reality; rather, it is from the sayings of the people of lies and falsehood.

And the saying of Ibn Sab'īn: 'A Lord owning and a servant perishing, and you are that; Allāh only, and multiplicity is illusion' conforms to his corrupt principle that the existence of the creature is the existence of the Creator. This is why he said: 'and you are that.' For he made the servant perishing, i.e., having no existence, so only the existence of the Lord remains. So he said: 'and you are that.' Likewise he said: 'Allāh only, and multiplicity is illusion.' For according to his view, nothing exists except Allāh. This is why he and his companions used to say in their dhikr: 'There is nothing except Allāh' instead of the Muslims' saying 'There is no deity except Allāh.' Shaykh Quṭb ad-Dīn ibn al-Qaṣṭallānī used to call them the 'Laysiyah' and say: 'Beware of these Laysiyah.' This is why he said: 'and multiplicity is illusion.' This is a contradiction, for his saying 'illusion' necessitates someone who imagines. If the imaginer is the illusion itself, then Allāh would be the illusion. If the imaginer is other than the illusion, then existence has become multiple. Likewise, if the imaginer is Allāh, then Allāh has been described with false illusion, and this, besides being disbelief, contradicts his statement: 'Existence is one.' And if the imaginer is other than Him, then he has affirmed something other than Allāh, and this contradicts his principle. Then, whenever he affirms an 'other', multiplicity is necessitated, so multiplicity would not be illusion but would be real.

The two verses mentioned from Ibn 'Arabī, despite their contradiction, are built upon this principle. His saying: 'O form of intimacy, whose secret is my meaning' is an address on behalf of the Truth, saying to the human form: 'O form of intimacy, whose secret is my meaning'; meaning, it is the form, and I am its meaning. This necessitates that the meaning is other than the form, which necessitates multiplicity and differentiation between the meaning and the form. If the existence of the meaning is the existence of the form—as he explicitly states—then there is no multiplicity. If the existence of this is other than the existence of that, then he contradicts his own statement. His saying: 'Your

creation for the Command sees [is] for my allegiance' is vague speech that could possibly intend a correct meaning, i.e., without the Creator, the obligated beings would not exist, nor would creation exist for Allāh's command. But it is known that he does not hold this view, and that his intent is *wahdah*, *Ḥulūl*, and *Ittihād*. This is why he said:

*We willed you, so We originated you as human creation  
That you might witness Us in the most perfect of things*

He explained that the servants witness Him in the most perfect of things, which is the human form. This points towards *Ḥulūl*—which is the indwelling of the Truth in the creation—but he contradicts himself in his words, for he is not content with indwelling and does not affirm two existent beings, one indwelling in the other. Rather, according to him, the existence of the indweller is the very essence of the existence of the locus. However, he speaks of indwelling between fixedness and existence: the existence of the Truth indwells in the fixedness of contingent beings, and their fixedness indwells in His existence. This speech has no reality in the matter itself, for there is no difference between this and that; but it is his doctrine, which is self-contradictory.

As for the man who requested Hajj from his father, and he ordered him to circumambulate the father himself, saying: 'Circumambulate a house which Allāh has not left for the blink of an eye ever': This is disbelief by the consensus of the Muslims. For circumambulation of the Ancient House is something Allāh and His Messenger commanded. As for circumambulating prophets and righteous people, it is forbidden by the consensus of the Muslims. Whoever believes that to be religion is a disbeliever, whether he circumambulates his body or his grave. His saying: 'which Allāh has not left for the blink of an eye ever': If he intended by it absolute, general indwelling, then besides being false, it is contradictory. For then there is no difference between the circumambulator and the one circumambulated, so circumambulating this one by that one is no more appropriate than the reverse. Indeed, this necessitates that one circumambulates dogs, pigs, disbelievers, impurities, filth, every foul thing, and every cursed thing, because general indwelling and union encompass all of this. Once, their Shaykh Ash-Shirāzī said to his Shaykh At-Tilimsānī, having passed by a dead, mangy dog: 'Is this also from the essence of Allāh?' He replied: 'Is there anything outside of Him?' At-Tilimsānī passed by a dog with someone, and the other person kicked it with his foot. He [At-Tilimsānī] said: 'Do not kick it, for it is from Him.' This, besides being among the greatest forms of disbelief and falsehood, invalid according to reason and religion, is contradictory. For the kicker and the kicked are one, and likewise the prohibitor and the prohibited. So nothing among them is more deserving of command or prohibition than anything else, and multiplicity is inconceivable with unity. If it is said 'manifestations and loci of theophany,' it is replied: If they have an existence other than the existence of the Manifest and the One revealing Himself, then multiplicity is established and unity is nullified. If the existence of this is the existence of that, then no distinction remains between the manifestor and the locus of manifestation, nor the one revealing Himself and the locus of revelation. If he intended by his saying 'which Allāh has not left for the blink of an eye' specific *Ḥulūl*—as the Christians say about the Messiah—it necessitates that this *Ḥulūl* was established for him from the moment he was created—as the Christians say about the Messiah. Thus, it would not be something attained by

him through his recognition, worship, verification, and spiritual knowledge. In that case, there would be no difference between him and other humans, so why would Ĥulūl be established for him and not others? This is worse than the saying of the Christians, for the Christians claimed that for the Messiah because he was created without a father, whereas these Shaykhs were not preferred in the creation itself; rather, they were preferred through worship, recognition, verification, and Tawhīd. This is something that occurred for them after it was not present for them. If this is the cause of Ĥulūl, it necessitates that the Ĥulūl in them is originated, not concomitant with their creation. In that case, their saying that the Lord never left their bodies or hearts for the blink of an eye ever is false speech, however it is construed.

As for what is mentioned about Rābi'ah al-'Adawiyyah, her saying about the House [Ka'bah]: 'It is the idol worshipped on earth,' this is a lie against Rābi'ah. If anyone said this, he would be a disbeliever who is asked to repent; if he repents, [fine], otherwise he is killed. It is a lie, for Muslims do not worship the House; rather, they worship the Lord of the House through circumambulating it and praying towards it. Likewise, what is transmitted of her saying: 'By Allāh, Allāh never entered it, nor was He absent from it' is false speech attributed to her. According to the doctrine of the Ĥulūliyyah, there is no difference between that House and others in this meaning, so for what merit is it circumambulated, prayed towards, and made pilgrimage to, excluding other houses? The saying of the speaker: 'Allāh never entered it' is correct speech. As for his saying: 'nor was He absent from it,' if he meant that His essence indwells in it or something resembling this meaning, then it is false, and it contradicts his saying 'never entered it.' If he meant by it that Ittiḥād is concomitant with it, that entering did not newly occur for Him, and He never ceased being non-indwelling in it [because He is it], then this, besides being disbelief and falsehood, necessitates that the House has no merit over other houses, since all existent things, according to them, are like that.

As for the two verses attributed to Al-Ĥallāj:

*Glory to Him who manifested His humanity  
The secret of the radiance of His piercing Divinity  
Until He appeared in His creation, manifest  
In the form of the eater and the drinker*

By these, he explained specific Ĥulūl, like what the Christians say about the Messiah. Abū 'Abdullāh ibn Khafif ash-Shirāzi—before he became aware of the reality of Al-Ĥallāj's affair—used to defend him. When these two verses were recited, he said: 'May Allāh curse whoever said this.'

And his saying, also by him:

*Creations have formed beliefs about God  
And I have believed all that they believed*

This verse is known to be by Ibn 'Arabī. If Al-Ĥallāj preceded him in it and he [Ibn 'Arabī] merely quoted it, then attributing it to Al-Ĥallāj is correct. It is contradictory and false speech. For combining two contradictories in belief is the height of corruption. Two propositions that are contradictory through negation and affirmation in such a way that the truth of one necessitates the falsehood of the other cannot possibly be combined. These people claim that

what contradicts clear reason is established for them through unveiling, and that they affirm the combination of contradictories and opposites, and that whoever follows their path affirms opposition to the rational and the transmitted. There is no doubt that this is among the most corrupt views held by the sophists. It is known that the Prophets (peace be upon them) are greater than the Awliyā'. The Prophets came with things that minds are incapable of knowing, but they did not come with things that minds know to be false. They inform of matters that baffle the mind, not matters that are absurd to the mind. These heretics claim that absurdities of the mind are correct, that combining contradictories is correct, and that what opposes clear reason and authentic transmission is correct. There is no doubt that they are people of imagination and illusions. They imagine things in their souls, fantasize about them, and deem them established in external reality, whereas they are only their imaginations. False imagination can conceive of things that have no reality. This is why they say: 'The land of reality is the land of imagination,' as Ibn 'Arabī and others say. This is why they relate a story mentioned by Sa'īd al-Farghānī, the commentator on Ibn al-Fārid's poem—and he was one of their Shaykhs.

As for his saying:

*Between me and You is an 'I-ness' crowding me  
So remove, by Your Reality, my 'I-ness' from the in-between*

This statement is interpreted in three ways: the heretic says it, the crypto-heretic says it, and the truthful saint says it.

The first (heretic): His intent by it is seeking the removal of the fixedness of his 'I-ness' so that it may be said that his existence is the existence of the Truth and his 'I-ness' is the 'I-ness' of the Truth, so it is not said that he is other than Allāh nor besides Him. This is why the predecessors of these heretics said: 'Al-Ḥallāj is half a man; that is because the 'I-ness' was not removed for him in meaning, so it was removed for him in form.' They mean that since his 'I-ness' was not removed in fixedness in the reality of his witnessing, it was removed in form, so he was killed. This statement, besides the disbelief and heresy it contains, is contradictory, refuting itself. For his saying: 'Between me and You is an 'I-ness' crowding me' is an address to another and an affirmation of an 'I-ness' between him and his Lord. This affirms three things. That is why he says: 'So remove, by Your Reality, my 'I-ness' from the in-between.' He requested from another to remove his 'I-ness', and this affirms three things. This false meaning is the corrupt annihilation, which is annihilation from the existence of otherness. For this involves seeking the removal of 'I-ness'—which is seeking annihilation. Annihilation is of three types: annihilation from the existence of otherness, annihilation from the witnessing of otherness, and annihilation from the worship of otherness.

1. The first is the annihilation of the proponents of waḥdah, the heretics, as they interpreted the words of Al-Ḥallāj by it—which is to make existence a single existence.

2. As for the second—which is annihilation from the witnessing of otherness—this is what occurs to many wayfarers, as is related about Abū Yazīd and his likes. It is the station of absorption. It is when one becomes absent, through his Existent [God], from his own existence; through his Worshipped, from his worship; through his Witnessed, from his witnessing;

and through his Remembered, from his remembrance. So that which never was is annihilated, and He Who never ceases remains. This is like what is related that a man loved another. The beloved threw himself into the water, and the lover threw himself in after him. He [the beloved] said: 'I fell in, why did you fall in?' He replied: 'I became absent, through you, from myself, so I thought that you were me.' This is the state of one who is unable to witness any created thing when his heart witnesses the existence of the Creator. It is something that occurs to a group of wayfarers. Some people consider this part of wayfaring, and some consider it the goal of wayfaring, even making the goal annihilation in the Tawhîd of Lordship, so they do not differentiate between the commanded and the prohibited, the beloved and the disliked. This is a great error they fell into by witnessing predestination and the decrees of Lordship [to the exclusion] of witnessing the Sharia, the command and prohibition, the worship of Allāh alone, and obedience to His Messenger. Whoever seeks the removal of his 'I-ness' with this consideration is not praised for this, but he might be excused.

3. As for the third type—which is annihilation from the worship of otherness—this is the state of the Prophets and their followers. It is to be annihilated, through the worship of Allāh, from the worship of what is besides Him; through love of Him, from love of what is besides Him; through fear of Him, from fear of what is besides Him; through obedience to Him, from obedience to what is besides Him; and through reliance upon Him, from reliance upon what is besides Him. This is the realization of the Tawhîd of Allāh alone, without partner, and it is the Ḥanifiyyah, the religion of Ibrāhîm. Included in this is to be annihilated from following one's whim through obedience to Allāh, so one loves only for Allāh, hates only for Allāh, gives only for Allāh, and withholds only for Allāh. This is the religious, scriptural annihilation which Allāh sent His Messengers with and revealed His Books with.

Whoever says: 'So remove, by Your Reality, my 'I-ness' from the in-between' meaning that He [Allāh] should remove his self so he does not follow his whim, nor rely on himself, his own ability, and strength, but rather his action is for Allāh, not for his whim, and his action is by Allāh and by His strength, not by his own ability and strength, as Allāh, the Exalted, said: {You alone we worship, and You alone we ask for help} [Al-Fātiḥah: 5]—then this is true and praiseworthy. This is like what is related about Abū Yazîd that he said: 'I saw the Lord of Might in a dream and said: 'My God, how is the path to You?' He said: 'Leave your self and come.'—meaning, leave following your whim and relying on yourself—so your action is for Allāh and your seeking help is from Allāh, as Allāh, the Exalted, said: {So worship Him and rely upon Him} [Hūd: 123].

And the statement related from Ibn 'Arabi: 'And by Me she swore, and that the Swearer is Allāh' is also from their heresy and falsehood. He made himself the one swearing by himself, and made the swearer Allāh. So He is the swearer and the One sworn by. Just as they say: He sent from Himself to Himself a messenger by Himself, so He is the Sender, the Recipient, and the Messenger. And as Ibn al-Fārid said in his poem Naẓm as-Sulūk:

*To her are my prayers, at the station I perform them  
And I witness therein that she prayed to me*

*Both of us are one worshipper, prostrating  
To his reality, in union, in every prostration  
None prayed through me but myself, nor was  
My prayer for other than me in performing every rak'ah*

Until he said:

*I never ceased being her, nor did she cease being me  
No difference, rather my essence loved my essence  
The 'tā' [second person pronoun suffix] of address has been removed between us  
And in its removal from the separation of sects is my elevation  
If she is called, I am the responder, and if I  
Am the caller, she answers the one who called me and responds*

[And:]

*To me a messenger I was, sent from Me  
And my essence, through my signs, deduced about Me*

As for what is transmitted from 'Īsā ibn Maryam (prayers of Allāh be upon him), it is a lie against him. It is the speech of a lying heretic who fabricated it against the Messiah. This was not transmitted from him by any Muslim or Christian, for it does not even agree with the saying of the Christians. His saying: 'Indeed Allāh longed to see His sacred Essence, so He created Adam from His light and made him like a mirror in which He looks at His sacred Essence. And indeed, I am that light, and Adam is the mirror': This speech—besides the disbelief and heresy it contains—is contradictory. That is because Allāh, Glorified is He, sees Himself just as He hears His own speech. And this is the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him)—and he is a servant created by Allāh—who said to his companions: {'Indeed, I see you from behind my back just as I see you from in front of me.'} If the creature can sometimes see what is behind him—which is more profound than seeing oneself—then how can the Creator, the Exalted, not see Himself? Also, His longing to see Himself until He created Adam necessitates that He did not see Himself in eternity until He created Adam. Then, that longing, if it was eternal, He should have done that [creation] in eternity. If it was originated, there must be a cause necessitating its origination. Besides that, it might be said: Longing is also an attribute of deficiency, which is why it is not affirmed regarding Allāh, the Exalted. It has been narrated: {'The longing of the righteous for meeting Me has grown long, and I am more longing for meeting them'}—and it is a weak ḥadīth.

His saying: 'So He created Adam from His light and made him like a mirror, and I am that light, and Adam is the mirror'—necessitates that Adam was created from the Messiah. This contradicts reality, for Adam was created before the Messiah, and the Messiah was created from Maryam, and Maryam is from the descendants of Adam. So how could Adam be created from his descendant? If it is said: The Messiah is the light of Allāh, then this statement—although it is of the same type as the saying of the Christians—is worse than the saying of the Christians. For the Christians say: The Messiah is the humanity and the divinity, which is the Word, is the essence of the Son. They say: The Ittiḥād of the divinity and humanity occurred newly when the body of the Messiah was created. They do not say: Adam was created from the Messiah, since the Messiah, according to them, is the name for the divinity and humanity together, and it is impossible

for Adam to be created from that. Also, they do not say: Adam was created from the divinity of the Messiah. Also, the saying of the speaker: 'Adam was created from the light of Allāh which is the Messiah'; if he means by His light that which is an attribute of Allāh, then that is not the Messiah, who subsists in himself, as it is impossible for that which subsists in itself to be an attribute of another. If he means by His light that which is a light separate from Him, then it is known that the Messiah was not something existent and separate before the creation of Adam. So it is impossible, under any interpretation, for Adam to have been created from the light of Allāh which is the Messiah.

Also, if Adam was like a mirror and He looks at His sacred Essence in it, it necessitates that what appears in Adam is a likeness of His essence, not that Adam is His essence, nor a likeness of His essence, nor like His essence. In that case, if the meaning intended by that is that Adam knows Allāh, the Exalted, so He sees the likeness of His scientific essence in Adam, then the Lord, the Exalted, knows Himself, so the scientific likeness, if it were possible to see it, seeing the knowledge corresponding to Him existing within His own essence would be more fitting than seeing the knowledge existing within Adam. If the meaning intended is that Adam himself is a likeness of Allāh, then Adam would not be the mirror, but rather he would be like the likeness in the mirror. Also, specifying the Messiah as being that light is the saying of the Christians who specify him as being Allāh or the son of Allāh. These Ittīhādiyyah added to the saying of the Christians their doctrine of general Ittīhād, whereby they attributed to others besides the Messiah the same type of thing the Christians say about the Messiah.

*As for the saying of Ibn al-Fārid:  
And witness, when you polish your self  
Whom do you see, without doubt, in the polished mirror?  
Did other-than-you appear in it, or are you looking  
At yourself through it, upon the reflection of rays?*

This is a corrupt analogy. That is because one looking in a mirror sees a likeness of himself, so he sees himself via the mirror; he does not see himself without an intermediary. Their doctrine of waḥdat al-wujūd is false, and even if assumed correct, this [analogy] does not correspond to it.

Also, these people affirm general waḥdat al-wujūd, Ittīhād, and indwelling in everything. So their specifying Adam or the like of the Messiah after this contradicts their affirmation of generality. Only those who affirm specific Ittīhād, like the Christians, the extremists among the Shī'ah, the ignorant among the ascetics, and their likes, specify the Messiah and his like. Also, if it were supposed that a person sees himself in the mirror, the mirror is external to himself, so he sees himself or a likeness of himself in something other than himself. The cosmos, according to them, contains no 'other' nor 'besides', so there is no locus of manifestation distinct from the Manifest, nor a mirror distinct from the seer. They say: 'The cosmos is the manifestations of the Truth.' If they say: The manifestations are other than the Manifest, then multiplicity is necessitated and unity is nullified. If they say: The manifestations are the Manifest, then nothing has appeared in anything, nor has anything revealed itself in anything, nor has anything appeared to anything, nor has anything revealed itself to anything. And his saying: 'And witness, when you polish your self, whom do you see' would be contradictory speech, because here there is an

addresser, an addressee, and a mirror in which the essence is polished—these are three entities. If existence is one in essence, this speech is nullified, and every word they utter refutes their principle.



## What Was Mentioned From The Saying Of Ibn Isrā'īl: Command Is Of Two Types: Command Through An Intermediary, And Command Without An Intermediary

As for what he mentioned from the saying of Ibn Isrā'īl: 'Command is of two types: command through an intermediary and command without an intermediary,' and so forth—its substance is that the command which is through an intermediary is the religious, legislative command, and that which is without an intermediary is the existential, creative command related to divine decree. His making one of the two commands through an intermediary and the other without an intermediary is baseless speech. For indeed, the religious command can be both through an intermediary and without an intermediary. Allāh spoke to Mūsā and commanded him without an intermediary, and likewise He spoke to Muḥammad (peace be upon him) and commanded him on the night of the Mi'rāj, and similarly He spoke to Ādam and commanded him without an intermediary—and these are religious, legislative commands.

As for the existential command: the statement of the one who says it is without an intermediary is erroneous. Rather, Allāh Almighty created things, some by means of others. And the command of formation is not an address that the formed, created being hears, for this is impossible. This is why it has been said: If this were an address to it after its existence, it would not have been brought into being by 'Kun' (Be); rather, it would have been formed before the address. And if it were an address to it before its existence, then addressing the non-existent is impossible. It has been said in response to this: It is an address to that which is known [to Allāh], due to its presence in [His] knowledge, even if it is non-existent in actuality. As for what the faqīr mentioned, it is undoubtedly a valid question.

As for what he mentioned from his shaykh, that Ādam's Tawḥīd was outward and inward, so His saying {Do not approach} [cf. Al-Baqarah: 35; Al-A'rāf: 19] was outward, and His command {Eat} [cf. Al-Baqarah: 35; Al-A'rāf: 19] was inward—it is said [in response]: If what is meant by His saying {Eat} inwardly is that He commanded him with that inwardly as a legislative and religious command, then this is a lie and disbelief (kufr). And if he meant that He created that, decreed it, and brought it into being, then this is a decree shared between Ādam and all other created beings, for {His command is only when He intends a thing that He says to it, 'Be,' and it is} [Yā Sīn: 82].

And if it is said: Ādam witnessed the existential, creative command related to divine decree and was obedient to Allāh by complying with it—just as these people say: The recognizer who witnesses the decree is absolved of blame—then this, besides being known necessarily to be false from the religion of Islam, is

disbelief by the consensus of the Muslims.

So it is said: The existential command exists before the existence of the thing being formed; the servant does not hear it, nor is compliance with it within his capacity. Rather, the Lord is the One Who creates what He has formed by His will and power, and Allāh Almighty has no partner in creation and formation. And although the servant is an actor by his will and ability, and Allāh is the Creator of all that, Allāh's formation of the servant is not a command to an existing servant externally whom compliance is possible for. Likewise, whatever He created of his states and actions, He created it by His will and power, and: {His command is only when He intends a thing that He says to it, 'Be,' and it is} [Yā Sīn: 82]. So, everything that is among the things formed falls under this command.

Ādam's eating from the tree, and other such events, fall under this, just as Ādam himself does. So, the very act of Ādam's eating falls under this command, just as Ādam [himself] did. Therefore, the statement of the one who says: He said to Ādam inwardly, 'Eat,' is like the statement that He said to the disbeliever, 'Disbelieve,' and to the sinner, 'Sin.' But {Allāh does not command indecency} [Al-A'rāf: 28], {nor does He love corruption} [Al-Baqarah: 205], {nor does He approve for His servants disbelief} [Az-Zumar: 7]. And there is no inward or outward address found from Him to the disbelievers, the sinners, and the disobedient, [commanding them] to commit disbelief, sinfulness, and disobedience—even though that occurs by His will, power, creation, and His existential command. For the existential command is not a command to the servant that he should do that act; rather, it is a command of formation for that act in the servant, or a command of formation for the servant to be in that state.

So He, Glorified is He, is the One Who {created man anxious,} {When evil touches him, impatient,} {And when good touches him, withholding} [Al-Ma'ārij: 19-21]. And He is the One Who made the Muslims Muslims, as Al-Khalil (Ibrāhīm) said: {Our Lord, and make us Muslims [in submission] to You and from our descendants a Muslim nation [in submission] to You} [Al-Baqarah: 128]. So He, Glorified is He, made the servants according to the states upon which He created them, and His command to them for that is a command of formation, meaning that He said to them, 'Be like that,' so they become like that, just as He said to the inanimate object, 'Be,' and it is. So, in the command of formation, there is no difference between the inanimate and the living creature, and it does not require the knowledge, will, or power of the one commanded. However, the servant may know what the decree has brought about in his states, just as he knows what the decree has brought about in the states of others. But there is no knowledge in that for him that Allāh commanded him inwardly contrary to what He commanded him outwardly. Rather, He commanded him with obedience inwardly and outwardly, and forbade him from disobedience inwardly and outwardly, and He decreed what would occur in him of obedience and disobedience, inwardly and outwardly, and He created the servant and all his actions, inwardly and outwardly, and the existence of that is by His saying 'Kun' (Be), inwardly and outwardly.

There is no argument or excuse for the son of Ādam in the decree. Rather, the decree is believed in, but not argued with. The one who argues using the decree is corrupt in intellect and religion, and contradictory. For if the decree were an

argument and an excuse, it would necessitate that no one be blamed, nor punished, nor retaliated against. In that case, this person arguing with the decree would be obliged—when wronged in his person, property, honor, or sanctity—not to seek redress from the wrongdoer, nor be angry with him, nor condemn him. And this is something impossible in human nature; no one can do it. So it is impossible by nature and forbidden by religious law.

And if the decree were an argument and an excuse, Iblīs would not have been blameworthy nor punished, nor Pharaoh, nor the people of Nūḥ, ‘Ād, Thamūd, and others among the disbelievers. Nor would Jihād against the disbelievers be permissible, nor the establishment of prescribed punishments, nor cutting off the hand of the thief, nor flogging the adulterer, nor stoning him, nor executing the murderer, nor punishing any transgressor in any way whatsoever. Since arguing with the decree is invalid according to the innate disposition and intellects of creation, no nation among the nations has adopted it, nor is it the doctrine of any rational person who consistently applies their saying. For no one’s well-being, neither in this world nor the Hereafter, can be maintained upon it, nor can two people associate with each other for even an hour if one of them does not adhere to some form of law with the other. For the divine law is the light of Allāh in His earth and His justice among His servants.

However, the divine laws vary: sometimes they are revealed from Allāh, as brought by the Messengers, and sometimes they are not like that. Then, the revealed ones: sometimes they are altered and changed—as the People of the Book changed their laws—and sometimes they are not changed or altered. And sometimes abrogation enters into parts of them, and sometimes it does not.

As for the decree: no one argues with it except when following his desires. So when he commits a forbidden act merely out of his desire, taste, or feeling, without having knowledge of the act’s goodness or benefit, he resorts to the decree, just as the polytheists said: {If Allāh had willed, we would not have associated partners [with Him], nor would our fathers, nor would we have forbidden anything} [Al-An’ām: 148]. Allāh Almighty said: {Thus did those before them deny until they tasted Our punishment. Say, ‘Do you have any knowledge that you can produce for us? You follow nothing but assumption, and you are not but guessing.’} {Say, ‘With Allāh is the conclusive argument. Had He willed, He would have guided you all.’} [Al-An’ām: 148-149]. So He clarified that they had no knowledge regarding the religion they were upon; they only followed assumption. And these people were not among those for whom it is permissible for anyone to argue with the decree. For if someone had destroyed the Ka’bah, or insulted Ibrāhīm Al-Khalīl, or attacked their religion, they would have opposed him and harmed him. How [could it be otherwise], when they opposed the Prophet (peace be upon him) for the religion he brought, while what he did was also from the decreed? So if arguing with the decree were a valid argument, it would have been [valid] for the Prophet (peace be upon him) and his companions. If everything that occurs in existence is decreed, then the one upon truth and the one upon falsehood would equally share in arguing with the decree, if arguing with it were correct. However, they relied upon what they believed from the category of their religion, and in that, they followed assumption; they had no knowledge of it, rather they were only guessing.

And Mūsā, when he said to Ādam: ‘Why did you expel us and yourself from

Paradise?' Ādam (peace be upon him) said, among what he said to Mūsā: 'Do you blame me for a matter that Allāh decreed for me forty years before He created me?' So Ādam prevailed over Mūsā [in argument]. Ādam (peace be upon him) was not arguing with the decree for committing what was forbidden, nor was Mūsā someone against whom such an argument would be made and he would accept it. Rather, even individual believers do not do such a thing, so how [could it be] Ādam and Mūsā? And Ādam had repented from what he did, and his Lord chose him and guided him. And Mūsā knows Allāh better than to blame someone less than a prophet for an act from which he has repented, so how [could he blame] a prophet among the prophets? And Ādam knew that if the decree were an argument, he would not have needed to repent, nor would what happened have happened, such as his expulsion from Paradise and other things. And if the decree were an argument, it would have been [an argument] for Iblis and others. Likewise, Mūsā knew that if the decree were an argument, Pharaoh would not have been punished by drowning, nor the Children of Israel by the thunderbolt and other things. How [could it be otherwise], when Mūsā said: {My Lord, indeed I have wronged myself, so forgive me} [Al-Qaṣāṣ: 16], and he said: {You are our Protector, so forgive us and have mercy upon us; and You are the best of forgivers} [Al-A'rāf: 155]? And this is a vast topic.

Rather, Mūsā's blame towards Ādam was on account of the calamity that befell them through Ādam from eating of the tree. This is why he said: {Why did you expel us and yourself from Paradise?} Blame on account of a calamity that befalls a person is one type, and blame on account of the sin which is Allāh's right is another type. For if a father committed an act by which he became impoverished, such that his sons were harmed, and they began to blame him on account of the poverty that befell them, this would not be like blaming him for the fact that he sinned.

The servant is commanded to be patient with what is decreed and to obey what is commanded. And if he sins, he seeks forgiveness. As Allāh Almighty said: {So be patient. Indeed, the promise of Allāh is truth. And ask forgiveness for your sin} [Ghāfir: 55]. And Allāh Almighty said: {No disaster strikes except by permission of Allāh. And whoever believes in Allāh—He will guide his heart} [At-Taghābun: 11]. A group of the Salaf said: He is the man whom a calamity strikes, and he knows it is from Allāh, so he accepts it and submits.

So whoever argues with the decree to justify abandoning what is commanded, and despairs over the occurrence of what he dislikes from the decreed, has reversed faith and religion and become from the party of the atheists and hypocrites. And this is the state of those who argue with the decree. For when a calamity strikes one of them, his despair is great and his patience little, so he does not look to the decree nor submit to it. And when he commits a sin, he starts arguing with the decree. So he does not do what is commanded, nor leave what is forbidden, nor is he patient with what is decreed. And despite this, he claims that he is among the major saints of Allāh, the pious, and the Imams of the verifiers and monotheists, whereas he is actually among the enemies of Allāh, the atheists, and the party of the accursed Shayṭān.

This path is only followed by the people furthest from goodness, religion, and faith. You find one of them the most tyrannical of people when he has power, and the greatest of them in oppression and transgression, and the most

humiliated of people when he is overpowered, and the greatest of them in despair and weakness. This has been experienced by people from the factions far removed from faith in the Book and from the fighters among various types of people.

The believer, if he has power, is just and does good, and if he is overpowered and defeated, he is patient and seeks reward [from Allāh]. As Ka'b ibn Zuhayr said in his poem which he recited to the Prophet (peace be upon him)—the one that begins 'Bānat Su'ād...' etc.—in describing the believers: 'They are not overly joyous if their spears achieve [victory] one day, nor are they despairing when they are struck.' And some Arabs were asked about something concerning the Prophet (peace be upon him), and he said: 'I saw him victorious but not arrogant, and defeated but not despairing.' And Allāh Almighty has said: {They said, 'Are you indeed Yūsuf?' He said, 'I am Yūsuf, and this is my brother. Allāh has certainly favored us. Indeed, he who fears Allāh and is patient—then indeed, Allāh does not allow to be lost the reward of the good-doers.'} [Yūsuf: 90]. And Allāh Almighty said: {But if you are patient and fear Allāh, their plot will not harm you at all} [Āl 'Imrān: 120]. And Allāh Almighty said: {Yes, if you remain patient and conscious of Allāh and they [the enemy] come upon you [attacking] in rage this instant, your Lord will reinforce you with five thousand angels having marks [of distinction]} [Āl 'Imrān: 125]. And Allāh Almighty said: {And if you are patient and fear Allāh, indeed, that is of the matters [requiring] determination} [Āl 'Imrān: 186]. So He mentioned patience and piety in these four places. Patience includes patience with what is decreed, and piety includes doing what is commanded and leaving what is forbidden. Whoever is granted both of these has had goodness gathered for him, unlike the one who reverses [this]: he does not fear Allāh, but rather abandons His obedience, following his desires, and argues with the decree. He is not patient when tested, nor does he look to the decree at that time. Indeed, this is the state of the wretched, as one of the scholars said: 'You, when performing obedience, are a Qadarī (attributing the act to yourself), and when committing disobedience, you are a Jabrī (attributing the act to compulsion). Whichever doctrine agrees with your desire, you adopt it.'

He means: You, when you obey, make yourself the creator of your obedience, forgetting Allāh's blessing upon you in making you obedient to Him. And when you disobey, you do not acknowledge that you committed the sin; rather, you place yourself in the position of one compelled against his will, or like something moved that has no will, power, or knowledge. And both [positions] are erroneous. Abū Tālib Al-Makkī mentioned from Sahl ibn 'Abdullāh At-Tustarī that he said: When the servant does a good deed and says, 'O my Lord, I did this good deed,' his Lord says to him, 'I facilitated it for you, and I aided you upon it.' If he says, 'O my Lord, You aided me upon it and facilitated it for me,' his Lord says to him, 'You did it, and its reward is for you.' And when he commits a bad deed and says, 'O my Lord, You decreed this bad deed upon me,' his Lord says to him, 'You earned it, and its burden is upon you.' If he says, 'O my Lord, indeed I committed this sin, and I repent from it,' his Lord says to him, 'I decreed it upon you, and I forgive it for you.' And this is a topic elaborated upon elsewhere.

Witnessing only the decree without witnessing the command and prohibition, and relying on it to abandon what is commanded and commit what is forbidden, has become widespread among many affiliated with the Sufi

leadership and Sufism. This is the greatest misguidance. And whoever consistently applies this saying and adheres to its implications would be more disbelieving than the Jews, Christians, and polytheists. However, most who enter into this contradict themselves and do not consistently apply their saying.

The saying of this speaker is from this category. His statement: 'Ādam's command to eat was inward, so he ate, and Iblīs's Tawhīd was outward, so he was commanded to prostrate to Ādam, but he saw him as 'other', so he did not prostrate, so Allāh changed [His favor] towards him and said: {Get out of it} [Al-A'rāf: 18; Šād: 77],' the verse—this, along with the heresy it contains, is a lie against Ādam and Iblīs. For Ādam acknowledged that he was the one who committed the error and that he was the one who wronged himself, and he repented from that. He did not say that Allāh wronged him, nor that Allāh commanded him inwardly to eat. Allāh Almighty said: {Then Ādam received from his Lord [some] words, and He accepted his repentance. Indeed, it is He who is the Accepting of repentance, the Merciful} [Al-Baqarah: 37]. And Allāh Almighty said: {They said, 'Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves, and if You do not forgive us and have mercy upon us, we will surely be among the losers.'} [Al-A'rāf: 23]. And Iblīs persisted and argued with the decree, saying: {My Lord, because You have put me in error, I will surely make [disobedience] attractive to them on earth, and I will mislead them all} [Al-Ĥijr: 39].

As for his saying: 'He saw him as 'other', so he did not prostrate'—this is worse than arguing with the decree. For this is the saying of the atheistic proponents of Waḥdah (Unity of Being). And it is a lie against Iblīs, for Iblīs did not refrain from prostrating because he [Ādam] was 'other'; rather, he said: {I am better than him. You created me from fire and created him from clay} [Al-A'rāf: 12; Šād: 76]. And the angels were not commanded to prostrate because Ādam was not 'other'. Rather, the otherness between the angels and Ādam is established and known. And Allāh Almighty: {And He taught Ādam the names—all of them. Then He showed them to the angels and said, 'Inform Me of the names of these, if you are truthful.'} {They said, 'Exalted are You; we have no knowledge except what You have taught us. Indeed, it is You who is the Knowing, the Wise.'} [Al-Baqarah: 31-32].

The angels and Ādam were acknowledging that Allāh is distinct from them and they are other than Him. This is why they called upon Him with the supplication of a servant to his Lord. So Ādam says: {Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves} [Al-A'rāf: 23], and the angels say: {we have no knowledge except what You have taught us} [Al-Baqarah: 32], and they say: {Our Lord, You have encompassed all things in mercy and knowledge, so forgive those who have repented and followed Your way and protect them from the punishment of Hellfire} [Ghāfir: 7], the verse. And Allāh Almighty has said: {Say, 'Is it other than Allāh that you order me to worship, O ignorant ones?'} [Az-Zumar: 64]. And Allāh Almighty said: {Say, 'Is it other than Allāh I should take as a protector,} {Creator of the heavens and the earth? And it is He who feeds and is not fed.'} [Al-An'ām: 14]. And He said: {Say, 'Then is it other than Allāh I should seek as judge while it is He who has revealed to you the Book explained in detail?'} [Al-An'ām: 114]. So if there were no 'other' besides Him, the polytheists would not have ordered him to worship other than Allāh, nor to take other than Allāh as a protector or judge, so they would not have deserved censure. Since He censured them for that, it indicates the existence of an 'other' whose worship and taking as a protector

and judge is possible, and that whoever does that is a polytheist associating partners with Allāh. As Allāh Almighty said: {So do not invoke with Allāh another deity and [thus] be among the punished} [Ash-Shu'arā': 213]. And He said: {And do not make [as equal] with Allāh another deity and [thereby] become blamed and forsaken} [Al-Isrā': 22], and similar examples.

As for the saying of the speaker: That His saying: {Not for you is the decision} [Āl 'Imrān: 128] is the essence of affirmation for the Prophet (peace be upon him), like His saying: {And you threw not, [O Muḥammad], when you threw, but it was Allāh who threw} [Al-Anfāl: 17], [and] {Indeed, those who pledge allegiance to you—they are actually pledging allegiance to Allāh. The hand of Allāh is over their hands} [Al-Fatḥ: 10]—this is based on the saying of the proponents of Wahdah and Itiḥād. And the meaning of His saying: {Not for you is the decision} is made [to be] that your action is the action of Allāh due to the lack of otherness. This is a great misguidance for several reasons:

1. His saying: {Not for you is the decision} was revealed in the context of His saying: {That He may cut down a section of the disbelievers or suppress them so that they turn back disappointed.} {Not for you is the decision; whether He turns to them [in mercy] or punishes them; for indeed, they are wrongdoers} [Āl 'Imrān: 127-128]. It is established in the Saḥīḥ [collections] {that the Prophet (peace be upon him) used to supplicate against or curse a group of the disbelievers in the Qunūt. When Allāh revealed this verse, he abandoned that.} So it is known that its meaning is the singling out of the Lord Almighty with the decision (Amr), and that no one other than Him has the decision. Rather, if Allāh Almighty wills, He cuts down a section of the disbelievers, and if He wills, He suppresses them so they turn back in loss, and if He wills, He turns to them in mercy, and if He wills, He punishes them. This is like what He said in the other verse: {Say, 'I possess not for myself any benefit or harm except what Allāh wills. If I had knowledge of the unseen, I would have acquired much good, and no evil would have touched me.} [Al-A'rāf: 188]. Similar to this is the saying of Allāh Almighty: {They say, 'If we had any say in the matter, we would not have been killed here.} {Say, 'Indeed, the matter belongs entirely to Allāh.} [Āl 'Imrān: 154].

2. His saying: {And you threw not, [O Muḥammad], when you threw, but it was Allāh who threw} [Al-Anfāl: 17] was not intended to mean that the action of the servant is the action of Allāh Almighty—as a group of the mistaken ones assume. For if that were correct, it should be said to everyone, such that it would be said to the walker: You did not walk when you walked, but Allāh walked; and it would be said to the rider: And you did not ride when you rode, but Allāh rode; and it would be said to the speaker: You did not speak when you spoke, but Allāh spoke; and the like would be said to the eater, the drinker, the faster, the one praying, and so forth. Consistently applying this necessitates that it be said to the disbeliever: You did not disbelieve when you disbelieved, but Allāh disbelieved; and it be said to the liar: You did not lie when you lied, but Allāh lied. Whoever says such things is a disbelieving atheist, outside of reason and religion. However, the meaning of the verse is that the Prophet (peace be upon him) on the day of Badr threw at them, and it was not within his power to make the throw reach all of them. For when he threw dust at them and said: 'May the faces be disfigured!', it was not within his power to make that reach all of them. So Allāh Almighty made

that throw reach all of them by His power. He says: And you did not make it reach when you cast, but Allāh made it reach. So the throwing that He affirmed for him is not the throwing that He negated from him, for this would necessitate combining two contradictories. Rather, He negated from him the reaching and delivery, and affirmed for him the casting and throwing. Likewise, if one shoots an arrow and Allāh makes it reach the enemy in a way that breaks the norm, it was Allāh Who made it reach by His power.

3. If it were assumed that the meaning intended by this verse is that Allāh is the Creator of the actions of the servants, then this meaning is true. Al-Khalīl (Ibrāhīm) said: {Our Lord, and make us Muslims [in submission] to You} [Al-Baqarah: 128]. So Allāh is the One Who made the Muslim a Muslim. And Allāh Almighty said: {Indeed, mankind was created anxious,} {When evil touches him, impatient,} {And when good touches him, withholding} [Al-Ma'ārij: 19-21]. So Allāh is the One Who created him anxious. However, this does not mean that Allāh is the servant, nor that the existence of the Creator is the existence of the created, nor that Allāh indwells in the servant. So the statement that Allāh is the Creator of the actions of the servants is true, and the statement that the creation indwells in the created, or that His existence is the existence of the created, is false. These people transition from the statement of Oneness of Lordship to the statement of Ĥulūl and Ittīhād, and this is the essence of misguidance and heresy.

4. His saying: {Indeed, those who pledge allegiance to you—they are actually pledging allegiance to Allāh} [Al-Fath: 10] did not mean 'Indeed, you are Allāh.' Rather, it meant 'Indeed, you are the Messenger of Allāh and the conveyor of His command and prohibition, so whoever pledges allegiance to you has pledged allegiance to Allāh,' just as whoever obeys you has obeyed Allāh. It did not mean by that that the Messenger is Allāh. However, the Messenger commanded what Allāh commanded. So whoever obeyed him has obeyed Allāh, as the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: {Whoever obeys me has obeyed Allāh, and whoever obeys my commander has obeyed me. And whoever disobeys me has disobeyed Allāh, and whoever disobeys my commander has disobeyed me.} And it is known that his commander is not him [the Prophet]. Whoever thinks regarding His saying: {Indeed, those who pledge allegiance to you—they are actually pledging allegiance to Allāh} that the meaning intended is that your action is the action of Allāh, or the meaning intended is that Allāh indwells in you, and the like, then he—along with his ignorance and misguidance, rather his disbelief and heresy—has stripped the Messenger of his unique characteristic and made him like others. This is because if the intended meaning were Allāh being the actor of your action, this would be a decree shared between him and the rest of creation. And [it would imply that] whoever pledged allegiance to Abū Jahl pledged allegiance to Allāh, and whoever pledged allegiance to Musaylimah the Liar pledged allegiance to Allāh, and whoever pledged allegiance to the leaders of the factions pledged allegiance to Allāh. And according to this assumption, the one pledging allegiance is also Allāh, so Allāh would have pledged allegiance to Allāh, since Allāh is the Creator of this one and that one. Likewise, if the doctrine of the proponents of Ĥulūl, Waḥdah, and Ittīhād is adopted, then it is general according to them, applying to this one and that one, so Allāh would have pledged allegiance to Allāh. And this is said by many

of the shaykhs of these proponents of Indwelling and Union, to the extent that when one of them is commanded to fight the enemy, he says: 'Should I fight Allāh? I am not able to fight Allāh,' and similar speech that we have heard from their shaykhs, and whose corruption and their misguidance therein we have explained to them more than once.

As for specific Ḥulūl, it is not the saying of these [proponents of Waḥdah]; rather, it is the saying of the Christians and those extremists who agree with them. And it is also false. For Allāh, Glorified is He, said to him [the Prophet]: {Not for you is the decision} [Āl 'Imrān: 128]. And He said: {And that when the Servant of Allāh stood up supplicating Him} [Al-Jinn: 19]. And He said: {Exalted is He who took His Servant by night} [Al-Isrā': 1]. And He said: {And if you are in doubt about what We have sent down upon Our Servant} [Al-Baqarah: 23]. And He said: {Certainly was Allāh pleased with the believers when they pledged allegiance to you under the tree, and He knew what was in their hearts, so He sent down tranquility upon them and rewarded them with an imminent conquest} {And much war booty which they will take. And ever is Allāh Exalted in Might, Wise} [Al-Fatḥ: 18-19]. So His saying: {Certainly was Allāh pleased with the believers when they pledged allegiance to you under the tree} explains His saying: {Indeed, those who pledge allegiance to you—they are actually pledging allegiance to Allāh}. This is why He said: {The hand of Allāh is over their hands}. And it is known that the hand of the Prophet (peace be upon him) was with their hands; they were shaking his hand and striking upon his hand in the pledge of allegiance. So it is known that the hand of Allāh over their hands is not the hand of the Prophet (peace be upon him). However, the Messenger is the servant of Allāh and His Messenger, so he took the pledge from them on behalf of Allāh, and made a covenant with them and contracted with them on behalf of Allāh. So those who pledged allegiance to him pledged allegiance to Allāh Who sent him and commanded him to take their pledge. Do you not see that whoever appoints a person as an agent, contracting with the agent is a contract with the principal? And whoever appoints a representative for him in making a treaty with a people, and he makes a treaty with them on behalf of the one who appointed him, they are considered to have made a treaty with the one who appointed him? And whoever appoints a man as an agent in contracting a marriage or giving in marriage, the principal is the spouse for whom the contract was concluded? And Allāh Almighty has said: {Indeed, Allāh has purchased from the believers their lives and their properties [in exchange] for that they will have Paradise} [At-Tawbah: 111], the verse. This is why He said at the end of the verse [Al-Fatḥ: 10]: {And whoever fulfills what he has covenanted with Allāh—He will grant him a great reward}.

So it becomes clear that the saying of that faqīr is the correct saying, and that if Allāh has said to His Prophet: {Not for you is the decision}, then what are we? And it is established from him (peace be upon him) in the Saḥīḥ [collections] that he said: 'Do not exaggerate in praising me as the Christians exaggerated in praising the Messiah, son of Maryam. I am only a servant, so say: the Servant of Allāh and His Messenger.'

As for the saying of the speaker:

*You have not been absent from the heart nor from my eye  
Between you and us, there is no 'between'*

This is a saying built upon the saying of these [proponents of Waḥdah], and it is false and contradictory. For its basis is that he sees Allāh with his eye, yet it is established in the Saḥīḥ from the Prophet (peace be upon him) that he said: {And know that none of you will see his Lord until he dies}. The Imams of the Muslims have agreed that none of the believers sees Allāh with his eyes in this world. They only disputed regarding the Prophet (peace be upon him) specifically, although the vast majority of the Imams hold that he did not see Him with his eyes in this world. The authentic, established reports from the Prophet (peace be upon him), the Companions, and the Imams of the Muslims indicate this. It is not established from Ibn ‘Abbās, nor from Imam Aḥmad and their likes, that they said Muḥammad saw his Lord with his eyes. Rather, what is established from them is either the unqualified mention of seeing or its qualification as being with the heart.

There is nothing in any of the established ḥadīths of the Mi’rāj stating that he saw Him with his eyes. And his saying: {My Lord came to me last night in the best form}—the ḥadīth reported by At-Tirmidhī and others—occurred in Madinah in a dream; this is how it has come explained. Likewise, the ḥadīth of Umm Aḷ-Ṭufayl, the ḥadīth of Ibn ‘Abbās, and others—which mention seeing his Lord—occurred in Madinah, as has come explained in the ḥadīths. The Mi’rāj occurred in Makkah, as Allāh Almighty said: {Exalted is He who took His Servant by night from Al-Masjid Al-Farām to Al-Masjid Al-Aqṣā} [Al-Isrā’: 1]. Discussion on this has been elaborated elsewhere. It is established by the text of the Qur’ān that Mūsā was told: {You will never see Me} [Al-A’rāf: 143], and that seeing Allāh is greater than sending down a book from the sky, as Allāh Almighty said: {The People of the Scripture ask you to bring down to them a book from the heaven. But they had asked of Mūsā even greater than that when they said, ‘Show us Allāh outright’} [An-Nisā’: 153]. So whoever says that any person sees Him [in this world] has claimed that he is greater than Mūsā ibn ‘Imrān, and his claim is greater than the claim of one who claimed that Allāh sent down upon him a book from the sky.

People hold three views regarding seeing Allāh:

1. The Companions (Ṣaḥābah), the Successors (Ṭābi’ūn), and the Imams of the Muslims hold that Allāh will be seen in the Hereafter with eyesight, manifestly, and that no one sees Him in this world with his eyes; but He is seen in dreams, and hearts attain—from unveilings (mukāshafāt) and witnessings (mushāhadāt)—what is appropriate to their state. Among people are those whose heart’s witnessing becomes so strong that they think they saw that with their eyes; and he is mistaken. Witnessings of the heart occur according to the servant’s faith (imān) and knowledge (ma’rifah) in an imaginal form (ṣūrah mithāliyyah), as has been elaborated elsewhere.
2. (The second view) is the view of the negating Jahmiyyah, that He is not seen in this world nor in the Hereafter.
3. (The third) is the view of those who claim that He is seen in this world and the Hereafter.

The Ḥulūliyyah Jahmiyyah combine negation and affirmation, saying: He is not seen in this world nor in the Hereafter, and He is seen in this world and the Hereafter. This is the view of Ibn ‘Arabī—the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ—and his likes. Because the absolute existence pervading all beings is not seen, and that is the

existence of the Truth according to them. Then, whoever affirms the Essence says: He is seen manifesting in it. And whoever differentiates between the absolute and the specific says: He is only seen restricted by a form. The saying of these people revolves between two matters: denying the vision of Allāh and affirming the vision of created things, and they make the created thing the Creator, or they make the Creator indwelling in the created. Otherwise, their differentiation between the essences established externally and their existence is the saying of those who say that the non-existent is a 'thing' externally, which is a false saying. And they have added to it that they made the very existence of the created thing the existence of the Creator. As for differentiating between the absolute and the specific—while the absolute cannot be absolute in external reality—it necessitates that the Lord be non-existent, and this is the denial and negation of the Lord.

And if they make Him established externally, they make Him a part of the existing things, so the Creator becomes a part of the created, or an accident subsisting in the created. All of this is known necessarily to be corrupt, and this has been elaborated elsewhere.

As for its contradiction, his saying: 'You have not been absent from the heart nor from my eye... Between you and us, there is no 'between' necessitates otherness, and that the addressee is other than the addresser, and that the addresser has an eye and a heart from which the addressee is not absent; rather, the heart and the eye witness him, and the witness is other than the witnessed. And his saying: 'Between you and us, there is no 'between' contains the affirmation of the first-person pronoun and the second-person pronoun, and this is an affirmation of two. If they say: These are manifestations and loci of manifestation, it is said [in response]: If the manifestations and loci of manifestation are other than the Manifest and the One Manifesting, then duality is established and unity is nullified. And if He is identical to them, then multiplicity is nullified. So combining them is a contradiction.

And the saying of the speaker:

*Separate from the darkness of nature and be united with Allāh  
Otherwise, all your claims are impossible*

If he intends absolute Ittiḥād: then the one separating is the one separating, and it is nature and the darkness of nature, and he is the one addressed by the saying: 'and be united with Allāh,' and he is the one addressed by the saying: 'all your claims are impossible,' and he is the one saying this statement. And in that lies a contradiction that is not hidden.

And if he intends restricted Ittiḥād: then it is impossible. Because if the Creator and the created were to unite, then if after the union they remain two—as they were before the union—that is multiplicity (ta'addud) and not Ittiḥād. And if they transformed into a third thing—just as water and milk unite, or fire and iron, and the like, which the Christians affirm with their saying about union—it would necessitate that the Creator has transformed and His reality has changed, like all other things that unite with something else; for it must necessarily transform. And this is impossible for Allāh Almighty; He is exalted above it. Because transformation necessitates the non-existence of what was existing, and the Lord Almighty is Necessary in Existence by His Essence and His necessary Attributes; non-existence is impossible for any of that. And because

the necessary Attributes of the Lord are attributes of perfection, so the non-existence of any of them is a deficiency, and Allāh is far above that. And because the union of the created with the Creator necessitates that the servant be described with the eternal Attributes necessary to the Essence of the Lord, and that is impossible for the originated, created servant. For the servant is necessarily characterized by origination, neediness, and lowliness. And the Lord Almighty is necessarily characterized by eternality, self-sufficiency, and might. And He—Glorified is He—is Eternal, Self-Sufficient, Mighty in Himself; the opposite of that is impossible for Him. So the union of one of them with the other necessitates that the Lord be described with the opposite of His attributes: such as origination, poverty, and lowliness; and the servant be described with the opposite of his attributes: such as eternality, intrinsic self-sufficiency, and intrinsic might. All of that is impossible, and elaborating on this would be lengthy.

This is why Al-Junayd was asked about Tawḥīd, and he said: 'Tawḥīd is singling out the originated from the eternal.' So he clarified that it is necessary to distinguish the originated from the Eternal. This is why the Imams of the Muslims agreed that the Creator is distinct from His creation; there is nothing of His Essence in His creation, nor anything of His creation in His Essence. Rather, the Lord is Lord, and the servant is servant: {There is no one in the heavens and earth but that he comes to the Most Merciful as a servant.} {He has enumerated them and counted them a [full] counting.} {And all of them are coming to Him on the Day of Resurrection alone} [Maryam: 93-95].

And if the speaker of this verse intended descriptive Ittiḥād: which is that the servant loves what Allāh loves and hates what Allāh hates, and is pleased with what pleases Allāh and is angered by what angers Allāh, and commands what Allāh commands and forbids what Allāh forbids, and allies with those whom Allāh allies with and opposes those whom Allāh opposes, and loves for Allāh's sake and hates for Allāh's sake, and gives for Allāh's sake and withholds for Allāh's sake; such that he is in agreement with his Lord Almighty—then this meaning is true, and it is the reality of faith and its perfection. As in the ḥadīth reported by Al-Bukhārī from Abū Hurayrah from the Prophet (peace be upon him) that he said: {Allāh Almighty says: Whoever shows enmity to a walī of Mine, I have declared war against him. My servant does not draw near to Me with anything more beloved to Me than the religious duties I have enjoined upon him, and My servant continues to draw near to Me with supererogatory works so that I shall love him. When I love him I am his hearing with which he hears, his seeing with which he sees, his hand with which he strikes, and his foot with which he walks. So by Me he hears, by Me he sees, by Me he strikes, and by Me he walks. Were he to ask [something] of Me, I would surely give it to him, and were he to seek refuge with Me, I would surely grant him refuge. I do not hesitate about anything I am going to do more than I hesitate about taking the soul of My faithful servant: he hates death and I hate hurting him, but it is inevitable for him}. This ḥadīth is used as evidence by the proponents of Waḥdah, but it is evidence against them for many reasons:

Among them: His saying: {Whoever shows enmity to a walī (friend/ally) of Mine I have declared war against him}. So He affirmed an enemy waging war, and a walī who is other than the enemy, and He affirmed for Himself, Glorified is He, both this one and that one. These are three [distinct entities]. Then He said: {My

servant does not draw near to Me with anything more beloved to Me than the religious duties I have enjoined upon him, and My servant continues to draw near to Me with supererogatory works so that I shall love him}. So He affirmed a servant drawing near to Him with obligatory duties, then with supererogatory works, and that he does not cease drawing near with supererogatory works until He loves him. So when He loves him, the servant hears by Him, sees by Him, strikes by Him, and walks by Him. According to them [the proponents of Waḥdah], He is, before the servant draws near with supererogatory works and after it, identical to the servant and identical to other created beings. So He is his stomach and his thigh; they do not restrict that to the four limbs mentioned in the ḥadīth. The ḥadīth is specific to a restricted state, while they speak of absoluteness and generalization. So where is this [ḥadīth] in relation to that [doctrine]?

Likewise, they may use as evidence what is in the Saḥīḥ ḥadīth: {Indeed, Allāh will manifest Himself to them on the Day of Resurrection, then He will come to them in a form other than the form in which they saw Him the first time, and He will say: 'I am your Lord.' They will say: 'We seek refuge in Allāh from you. This is our place until our Lord comes to us. When our Lord comes, we will recognize Him.' Then He will come to them in the form in which they saw Him the first time, and He will say: 'I am your Lord.' They will say: 'You are our Lord.'} They make this an argument for their saying that He is seen in this world in every form, rather, He is every form.

This ḥadīth is also evidence against them in this regard. For according to them, there is no difference between this world and the Hereafter. And according to them, He—in the Hereafter—is the deniers who said, 'We seek refuge in Allāh from you. This is our place until our Lord comes to us.' These atheists say that the recognizer recognizes Him in every form, and that those who denied Him on the Day of Resurrection in some forms did so due to the deficiency of their knowledge. This is ignorance on their part, for those who denied Him on the Day of Resurrection and then recognized Him when He manifested Himself to them in the form in which they saw Him the first time are the Prophets and the believers. And their denial was something for which He, Glorified and Almighty, praised them, for He tested them with that so that they would not follow other than the Lord Whom they worshipped. This is why He said in the ḥadīth: 'And He asks them and makes them firm, and the caller has already called out: 'Let every people follow what they used to worship.'

Then it is said to these atheists: If, according to you, He is the Manifest in every form, then He is the Denied One and He is the Denier. As one of these said to another: 'Whoever told you that there is anything in existence besides Allāh has lied.' The other said to him: 'Then who is the one who lied?' Ibn 'Arabī mentioned that he entered upon a disciple of his in seclusion who needed to relieve himself, and the disciple said: 'I see nothing other than Him upon which to urinate.' His shaykh said to him: 'And that which comes out of your stomach, where is it from?' He said: 'You have relieved me.' Two shaykhs from among them, this At-Tilimsānī and Ash-Shīrāzī, passed by a dead, mangy dog. Ash-Shīrāzī said to At-Tilimsānī: 'Is this also from His essence?' At-Tilimsānī said: 'Is there anything outside of it?'

At-Tilimsānī had misguided a pious, ascetic shaykh in Bayt Al-Maqdis named

Abū Ya'qūb Al-Maghribī Al-Mubtalā, until he used to say: 'Existence is one, and it is Allāh, and I do not see the One, nor do I see Allāh.' And he would say: 'The Book and the Sunnah speak of the duality of existence, but existence is one, there is no duality in it.' And he would make this statement a form of glorification for himself, reciting it as one recites glorification.

As for the poet's saying:

*When the ardent lover reaches perfection in passion  
And is absent from the Remembered in the overpowering force of the  
Remembrance  
He truly witnesses when passion witnesses Him  
That the prayer of the recognizers is from disbelief*

This statement—besides being disbelief—is the statement of an ignorant person who cannot comprehend what he is saying. For annihilation and absence mean being absent through the Remembered from the Remembrance, and through the Known from the Knowledge, and through the Worshipped from the Worship; until that which did not exist perishes, and He Who never ceases remains. This is the station of annihilation which occurs to many wayfarers due to their inability to achieve perfect witnessing that corresponds to reality. This is unlike the legislative annihilation, whose substance is annihilation through His worship from the worship of anything else, and through His love from the love of anything else, and through fear of Him from fear of anything else, and through obedience to Him from obedience to anything else. For this is the realization of Tawḥīd and faith.

As for the third type of annihilation—which is annihilation from the existence of 'other' such that one sees the existence of the Creator as the existence of the created—this is the saying of these atheists, the proponents of Waḥdah (Unity of Being).

The point here is that his saying: 'is absent from the Remembered' is the statement of an ignorant person. For this is not praiseworthy at all. Rather, what is praiseworthy is to be absent through the Remembered from the Remembrance, not to be absent from the Remembered in the overpowering forces of the Remembrance. Unless, perhaps, he meant that he became absent from the Remembered, so he witnessed the created, and witnessed that it is the Creator, and witnessed existence only as one, and similar corrupt witnessings. This is the witnessing of the people of heresy, not the witnessing of the monotheists. And by my life, whoever witnesses this heretical witnessing, indeed sees the prayer of the recognizers as disbelief.

[The saying:] 'The universe calls out to you, 'Do you not hear me? Who composed my scattered parts and who dispersed me? Look, that you may see me, an instructive sight. There is nothing besides the existence of the One Who brought me into existence.' This is from the sayings of these atheists, and their sayings are contradictory disbelief, false in reason and religion. For if there were nothing in it except the existence of the One Who brought it into existence, then that existence would be the calling universe, and it would be the addressed one being called, and it would be the composed and dispersed scattered parts, and it would be the addressee who was told: 'Look.' In that case, the Necessary, Eternal, Pre-existent Existence would have brought itself into existence, dispersed itself, and composed itself. This is combining two contradictories. For

the Necessary by Himself cannot be an effect, something made. And the one thing cannot be creator and created, eternal and originated, necessary by itself and necessary through another. For this is combining two contradictories.

The Necessary is that whose essence does not accept non-existence, and the possible is that whose essence accepts non-existence. So it is impossible for the one thing to be accepting of non-existence and not accepting of non-existence. The Eternal is that whose existence has no beginning, and the originated is that which has a beginning. So it is impossible for the one thing to be eternal and originated. Were it not that their intent by this saying is known, it could have been intended by it: 'There is nothing besides the existence which the One Who brought me into existence created,' and the attribution of existence to Allāh would be an attribution of possession. But it is known that he did not intend this, and because this expression is not used for this meaning. Rather, what is intended by 'the existence of Allāh' is the existence of His Essence, not the existence of His creatures.

Likewise, the saying of the speaker: 'The essence of the existence of the universe is, for creation, a witnessing that no existent has existence besides the Truth.' His intent by it is that the existence of the universe is the very existence of the Truth. This is the saying of the proponents of Waḥdah. Otherwise, if he intended that the existence of every existent among the created beings is from the Truth Almighty—so nothing has existence from itself, but rather its existence is from its Lord, and things, considered in themselves, deserve nothing but non-existence, and they only obtained existence from their Creator and Originator, so they are perpetually in need of Him, not independent of Him for an instant, neither in this world nor in the Hereafter—he would have intended a correct meaning, which is what the people of reason and religion, from the first and the last, hold. These proponents of Waḥdah: their saying is contradictory. This is why they say: 'The thing and its opposite.' Otherwise, his saying: 'From Him and to Him He originates and repeats' contradicts waḥdah. For who is the originator and the returner, from Him and to Him, if there is only One?

And his saying: 'And I am not, in the fabric of the universe, a thing, because I am like an impossible shadow' contradicts waḥdah, because the shadow is other than the owner of the shadow. So if he likens the created to the shadow, it necessitates affirming two, just as if he likened it to the ray, for the ray of the sun is not the very disk of the sun. Likewise, if he likened it to the light of the lamp, etc. The Christians liken *Ḥulūl* and *Ittihād* to this. I said to one of them who was present with me and spoke something of this: 'So if you liken the created to the ray belonging to the sun and fire, and the Creator to the fire and the sun, then there is no difference in this between the Messiah and others. For everything besides Allāh—according to this—is like the ray and the light. So what is the difference between the Messiah and Ibrāhīm and Mūsā? Rather, what is the difference between him and all other created beings according to this?' I kept repeating this statement to him; and there was a group in the gathering, until he understood it well, and it became clear to him and to those present that their saying is false, having no reality, and that what they affirm for the Messiah is either impossible in the case of everyone, or shared between the Messiah and others. And in both estimations, singling out the Messiah with that is false. I mentioned to him that there is no sign brought by the Messiah except that Mūsā brought something greater than it.

For the Messiah (peace be upon him), although he came with the reviving of the dead, the dead whom Allāh revived at the hand of Mūsā were more numerous, like those who said: {We will never believe you until we see Allāh outright,' so the thunderbolt took you} [Al-Baqarah: 55], then Allāh resurrected them after their death, as He said: {Then We revived you after your death} [Al-Baqarah: 56]. And like the one who was struck with part of the cow [cf. Al-Baqarah: 73], and other examples. And more than one prophet came with the reviving of the dead, and the Christians affirm that. As for turning the staff into a snake: this is greater than reviving the dead. For the dead person had life in him, so life was returned to a place where life had been. But making a dry piece of wood into an animal that swallows staffs and ropes: this is more profound in power and rarer. For Allāh revives the dead, but He does not [ordinarily] make wood into snakes. As for sending down the table from the sky: manna and quail used to descend upon the people of Mūsā every day, and water gushed forth for them from the rock [cf. Al-Baqarah: 60], which is greater than that. For sweet food or meat constantly is more magnificent in its type and greater in its measure than what was on the table, such as olives, fish, and other things. I mentioned to him similar points, demonstrating that singling out the Messiah for Ittiḥād and the claim of divinity has no basis, and that all other things mentioned regarding him are either shared between him and other created beings, or shared between him and other prophets and messengers, while some messengers like Ibrāhīm and Mūsā may be more perfect in that than him. As for his creation from a woman without a man: the creation of Ḥawwā' from a man without a woman is more wondrous than that. For he [ʿĪsā] was created from the womb of a woman, and this is customary, unlike creation from the rib of a man, for this is not customary. So there is no matter mentioned regarding the Messiah (peace be upon him) except that someone else among the children of Ādam shared in it or in something greater than it. Thus, it is known definitively that singling out the Messiah is false, and that what they claim for him, if it is possible, then he has no exclusive claim to it, and if it is impossible, then it has no existence in him nor in anyone else. This is why these proponents of Ittiḥād said: The Christians only disbelieved due to specification. This is also false, for in Ittiḥād there is generality and specificity. The point here is that the comparison made by the proponents of Ittiḥād, likening one of them to the impossible shadow, contradicts their statement of Waḥdah.

Likewise, the saying of the other:

*I yearn for Him, and He is my heart  
Does any lover besides me yearn for his own heart?  
My gaze is veiled from Him, as He is my seer  
His distance is only due to His extreme nearness*

This—along with the disbelief and Ittiḥād he intended by it—is contradictory speech. For a thing yearning for its own essence is contradictory. This is why he said: 'Does any lover besides me yearn for his own heart?' And his saying: 'His distance is only due to His extreme nearness' is contradictory. For there is no nearness nor distance according to the proponents of Waḥdah, as that requires two, one of whom approaches the other. The one does not approach its own essence, nor distance itself from its own essence.

As for the saying of the speaker: 'Tawḥīd has no tongue, and all tongues are its

tongue,' this is also from the saying of the proponents of Waḥdah. And it—along with its disbelief—is a contradictory statement. For it is known necessarily from the religion of Islam that the tongue of polytheism cannot be the tongue of Tawḥīd. And that the sayings of the polytheists who said: {Do not leave your gods and do not leave Wadd or Suwā' or Yaghūth and Ya'ūq and Nasr} [Nūh: 23], and those who said: {We only worship them that they may bring us nearer to Allāh in position} [Az-Zumar: 3], and those who said: {And we are not ones to leave our gods for your saying, nor are we believers in you.} {We only say that some of our gods have possessed you with evil} [Hūd: 53-54], and those who said: {Burn him and support your gods} [Al-Anbiyā': 68], and the like of these—this is not the tongue of Tawḥīd. As for the contradiction of this saying according to their own principle: if existence is one, then affirming multiplicity is a contradiction. So if one speaker says: 'Existence is one,' and another says: 'It is not one; rather, it is multiple,' these two sayings are contradictory, so it is impossible for one of them to be the other. And when a speaker says: 'All tongues are its tongue,' he has explicitly affirmed multiplicity in his saying: 'All tongues,' and that necessitates that this tongue is not that tongue. So multiplicity is established, and waḥdah is nullified.

Every statement of these [people] and others refutes their own principle, for they are compelled to affirm multiplicity. If they say: 'Existence is one' meaning that existing things share in the concept named 'existence', then this is correct. However, the existing things that share in the concept named 'one'—the existence of this one is not identical to the existence of that one. Rather, this is sharing in the general, universal name, like sharing in the names that grammarians call generic nouns (ism al-jins), and which logicians divide into genus, species, differentia, property, and common accident. Sharing in these names necessitates the distinctness of the essences and the fact that one of the two participants is not the other. This is something by which it is known that the existence of the Truth is distinct from the existence of created beings. Indeed, it is more distinct than the distinctness of this existent from that existent. If the existence of the celestial sphere is distinct from and different to the existence of the atom and the mosquito, then the existence of the Truth Almighty is more greatly distinct from the existence of every created thing than the distinctness of the existence of that created thing from the existence of another created thing.

This and other points demonstrate the falsehood of the saying of that shaykh when he said: 'None knows Tawḥīd except the One, and expression about Tawḥīd is not valid, because it can only be expressed by an 'other', and whoever affirms an 'other' has no Tawḥīd.' For this statement—along with its disbelief—is contradictory. His saying: 'None knows Tawḥīd except the One' necessitates that there is a One who knows it, and that someone other than Him does not know it. This is differentiating between one who knows it and one who does not know it, and affirming two, one of whom knows it and the other does not know it, and affirming otherness between one who knows it and one who does not know it. So his saying after this: 'and whoever affirms an 'other' has no Tawḥīd' contradicts this. And his saying: 'expression about Tawḥīd is not valid' is disbelief by the consensus of the Muslims. For Allāh has expressed His Tawḥīd, and His Messenger expressed His Tawḥīd, and the Qur'ān is filled with the mention of Tawḥīd. Rather, Allāh only sent the Messengers and revealed the Books with

Tawhīd. Allāh Almighty has said: {And ask those We sent before you of Our messengers; did We make besides the Most Merciful deities to be worshipped?} [Az-Zukhruf: 45]. And Allāh Almighty said: {And We sent not before you any messenger except that We revealed to him that, 'There is no deity except Me, so worship Me.'} [Al-Anbiyā: 25]. If expression about it were not valid, no one would have uttered it. And the best that speakers have uttered is Tawhīd, as the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: {The best remembrance is Lā ilāha illallāh, and the best supplication is Al-ḥamdulillāh}. And he said: {Whoever's last words are Lā ilāha illallāh will enter Paradise}.

However, the Tawhīd to which these atheists refer—which is waḥdat al-wujūd—is something impossible in itself, whose realization in external reality cannot be conceived. For specific, individual waḥdah is impossible between two multiple things. But existence is one in the type of existence, meaning that the name 'existent' is a general name that encompasses everyone, just as the name 'body', 'human', and the like, encompass every body and every human. And this body is not that one, and this human is not that one. Likewise, this existence is not that one.

And his saying: 'it can only be expressed by an 'other'.' It is said to him: Firstly, expression about Tawhīd is done through speech, and Allāh expresses His Tawhīd through His Speech. Allāh's Speech, His Knowledge, His Power, and other attributes of His: the Salaf and the Imams do not apply the statement to them that they are Allāh, nor do they apply [the statement] that they are other than Allāh. Because the term 'other' may be intended to mean that which is distinct from something else, and the attributes of Allāh are not distinct from Him. And it may be intended to mean that which is not identical to it, and the attribute of Allāh is not identical to Him. So according to one of the two usages, it is said that it is other than Him, and according to the other usage, it is not said that it is 'other'. For this reason, neither term is used unqualifiedly except when accompanied by an explanation of the intended meaning, lest the innovator say, 'If the attribute of Allāh is other than Him, then everything that is other than Allāh is created,' and thereby use that as a means to make the Knowledge of Allāh, His Power, and His Speech not an attribute subsisting in Him, but rather created in something else. For in this lies such negation of the Creator's attributes and denial of His perfection as constitutes the greatest heresy, and it is the saying of the Jahmiyyah whom the Salaf and the Imams declared disbelievers with an absolute declaration—although the specific individual is not declared a disbeliever except after the establishment of the proof, the abandonment of which constitutes disbelief.

Also, it is said to these atheists: If there were nothing in existence other than Him in any way whatsoever, it would necessitate that the speech of creation, their eating, drinking, marriage, fornication, disbelief, polytheism, and all the abominations they commit, are the very existence of Allāh. It is known that whoever makes this an attribute of Allāh is among the greatest of people in disbelief and misguidance. So whoever says that it is the essence of the existence of Allāh is even more disbelieving and misguided. For attributes and accidents cannot be the essence of the existent that subsists by itself. The Imams of these atheists, like Ibn 'Arabī, say:

'And every speech in existence is His speech, Whether it be prose or poetry to

us.'

So they make the speech of created beings—including disbelief, lies, and other things—the speech of Allāh. As for this atheist [being discussed], he went further than these, making the speech of creation and their worship the very essence of His existence; he did not make that speech belonging to Him, rather he denied that this is speech belonging to Him, lest he affirm an 'other' for Him.

It is known through the Book, the Sunnah, the consensus, and through necessary rational sciences, the affirmation of [entities] other than Allāh Almighty, and that everything besides Him among the created beings is other than Allāh Almighty; it is not Allāh, nor an attribute among the attributes of Allāh. This is why Allāh censured whoever worshipped other than Him—and if there were no 'other', the censure would not be valid. Allāh Almighty said: {Say, 'Is it other than Allāh that you order me to worship, O ignorant ones?'} [Az-Zumar: 64]. And Allāh Almighty said: {Say, 'Is it other than Allāh I should take as a protector, Creator of the heavens and the earth?'} [Al-An'ām: 14]. And Allāh Almighty said: {Is there any creator other than Allāh who provides for you from the heaven and earth?} [Fāṭir: 3]. And Allāh Almighty said: {Say, 'Then is it other than Allāh I should seek as judge while it is He who has revealed to you the Book explained in detail?'} [Al-An'ām: 114].

Likewise, the saying of the speaker: 'I found love to be other than the intended goal, because it can only be from an 'other' to an 'other', and 'other' is not there. And I found Tawhīd to be other than the intended goal, because Tawhīd can only be from a servant to a Lord. And if people were just, they would not see a worshipper nor a worshipped.' This is speech containing such disbelief, heresy, and contradiction as is not hidden.

For the Book, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Muslims have affirmed Allāh's love for His believing servants and their love for Him. Like His saying Almighty: {but those who believe are stronger in love for Allāh} [Al-Baqarah: 165]. And His saying: {He loves them and they love Him} [Al-Mā'idah: 54]. And His saying: {more beloved to you than Allāh and His Messenger} [At-Tawbah: 24]. And His saying: {Indeed, Allāh loves the righteous} [Āl 'Imrān: 76; At-Tawbah: 4, 7], {loves the good-doers} [Al-Baqarah: 195; Āl 'Imrān: 134, 148; Al-Mā'idah: 13, 93], {loves those who are constantly repentant and loves those who purify themselves} [Al-Baqarah: 222], {loves those who act justly} [Al-Mā'idah: 42; Al-Ḥujurāt: 9; Al-Mumtaḥanah: 8]. And the Prophet (peace be upon him) said in the Saḥīḥ ḥadīth: {There are three qualities for which whoever is characterized by them finds the sweetness of faith: He to whom Allāh and His Messenger are dearer than all else; he who loves a person only for Allāh's sake; and he who hates to return to disbelief after Allāh has saved him from it as he hates to be thrown into the fire}. The Salaf of the Ummah and its Imams have agreed upon affirming Allāh Almighty's love for His believing servants and their love for Him. This is the foundation of the religion of Al-Khalīl Ibrāhīm, the Imam of the Ḥunafā' (peace be upon him). The first to manifest denial of this in Islam was Al-Ja'd ibn Dirham, so Khālid ibn 'Abdullāh Al-Qasrī sacrificed him on the Day of Adḥā in Wāsiṭ, saying: 'O people, offer your sacrifices, may Allāh accept your sacrifices. For I am sacrificing Al-Ja'd ibn Dirham; he claimed that Allāh did not take Ibrāhīm as a Khalīl and did not speak to Mūsā directly. Exalted is Allāh far above what Al-Ja'd says!' Then he descended and slaughtered him.

His saying: 'Love can only be from an 'other' to an 'other', and 'other' is not there' is false speech from every angle. For his saying 'it can only be from an 'other' is not correct, for a person loves himself, and he is not 'other' than himself. And Allāh loves Himself. And his saying 'other' is not there' is false, for the created is other than the Creator, and the believers are other than Allāh, and they love Him. So the claim is false. Each of the two premises of the argument is false—his saying 'it can only be from an 'other' to an 'other' and his saying 'other' is not there'—for the 'other' exists, and love can be from the lover for himself. This is why many of the proponents of Ittīhād contradict him in this statement and say [things] like what Ibn Al-Fārid' said.

Likewise, his saying: 'Tawhīd can only be from a servant to a Lord. And if people were just, they would not see a worshipper nor a worshipped.' Both premises are false. For Tawhīd can be from Allāh for Himself, for He singles Himself out in Oneness by Himself, as Allāh Almighty said: {Allāh witnesses that there is no deity except Him} [Āl 'Imrān: 18]. The Qur'ān is filled with Allāh's Tawhīd of Himself. He has singled Himself out in Oneness by Himself, as in His saying: {And your god is one God} [Al-Baqarah: 163]. And His saying: {And Allāh has said, 'Do not take for yourselves two deities. He is but one God} [An-Naḥl: 51]. And His saying: {So know that there is no deity except Allāh} [Muḥammad: 19], and similar examples. As for the second premise: his saying 'if people were just, they would not see a worshipper nor a worshipped'—besides being the utmost in disbelief and heresy—is contradictory speech. For if there were no worshipper and no worshipped there, but all is one, then who are those who are not just? If they are Allāh, then Allāh would be the one who is not just. And if they are other than Allāh, then the 'other' is established. Then, if they interpret it according to their disbelief and say that Allāh is the one who is not just, and He is the one who eats, drinks, and disbelieves—as many of them say, like what one of them said to his shaykh: 'The faqīr, when he is sound, eats by Allāh.' The other said to him: 'The faqīr, when he is sound, Allāh eats.' Ibn 'Arabī and other shaykhs of theirs have explicitly stated that He is the one who hungers and thirsts, gets sick, urinates, marries, and is married, and that He is described with every deficiency and fault, because that is perfection according to them. As he said in 'Al-Fuṣūṣ': 'So the High in Himself is the one who possesses the perfection by which He encompasses all existential matters and non-existential relations, whether they are praiseworthy according to custom, reason, and law, or blameworthy according to custom, reason, and law. And that belongs only to the One named Allāh specifically.' And he said: 'Do you not see the Truth appearing with the attributes of originated things, and He informed about that concerning Himself, and with attributes of deficiency and blame? Do you not see the created appearing with the attributes of the Creator? So they are all, from beginning to end, attributes of the servant, just as the attributes of the servant, from beginning to end, are attributes of Allāh Almighty.'

The one who speaks such words contradicts himself therein. For it is said to him: 'So you are the perfect one in yourself, who sees no worshipper and no worshipped. We will treat you according to the requirement of your doctrine.' So he is beaten, pained, insulted, and slapped. And if he complains about the one who did that to him, and protests and cries out because of it, and weeps, it is said to him: 'There is no 'other' there, nor worshipper, nor worshipped. So no one other than you did this to you. Rather, the striker is the struck, the insulter is the

insulted, and the worshipper is the worshipped.' If he says: 'He complained about himself and protested against himself,' it is said to him also: 'Then say: He worshipped himself.' If he affirms an oppressor and an oppressed, and they are one, it is said to him: 'Then affirm a worshipper and a worshipped, and they are one.' Then it is said to him: 'This one who laughs and strikes: is he the same as this one who weeps and cries out? And this one who is full and quenched: is he the same as this one who is hungry and thirsty?' If he acknowledges that he is other than him, he affirms otherness. And if he affirms otherness between this one and that one, then [otherness] between the worshipper and the Worshipped is more fitting and appropriate. And if he says: 'Rather, he is he'—he is treated like the Sophists, for this saying is among the ugliest forms of sophistry. It is said: 'So if he is he, then we will strike you and kill you, and the thing killed itself and destroyed itself.' A person may wrong himself with sins, so he says: {Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves} [Al-A'râf: 23], because his self commanded him to evil, and {the soul is indeed a persistent enjoiner of evil} [Yûsuf: 53]. But the aspect of its commanding is not the aspect of its acting; rather, there must be some kind of multiplicity, either in essence or in attributes. Everyone knows through sense perception and necessity that this man who wronged that one is not him, nor is he like the man who wronged himself. If this is the case among created beings, then the Creator is more greatly distinct from created beings than this one is from that one. Glorified and Exalted is He far above what the wrongdoers say!

Were it not that the proponents of this saying have become numerous, apparent, and widespread, and they are, according to many people, the masters of mankind, the shaykhs of Islam, the people of Tawhîd and verification, and the best of the people of the Path—to the extent that they prefer them over the Prophets, Messengers, and major shaykhs of the religion—we would have no need to explain the corruption of these sayings and clarify this misguidance. But it is known that misguidance has no limit, and that when intellects become corrupt, there remains no conceivable limit to their misguidance. So Glory be to the One Who differentiated between the human species, making some among them the best of the worlds, and making some among them worse than the devils. However, likening these [proponents of Wahdah] to the Prophets and Saints is like likening Musaylimah the Liar to the Master of the People of Intellect [Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him)]. It is this [likening] that necessitates Jihâd against these atheists who corrupt the world and the religion. The purpose here is to refute these sayings and clarify guidance from misguidance.

As for the repentance of one who said them and his dying upon Islam, this returns to the All-Knowing King. For Allāh accepts repentance from His servants and pardons misdeeds. It is possible that He has accepted the repentance of the proponents of these statements. Allāh Almighty is Forgiver of sin, Acceptor of repentance, severe in punishment. And the sin, however great, and the disbelief, however gross and immense, repentance erases all of that. Allāh, Glorified is He, does not deem any sin too great to forgive for one who repents. Rather, He forgives polytheism and other sins for the repentant, as Allāh Almighty said: {Say, 'O My servants who have transgressed against themselves [by sinning], do not despair of the mercy of Allāh. Indeed, Allāh forgives all sins. Indeed, it is He who is the Forgiving, the Merciful.} [Az-Zumar: 53]. This verse is general and

absolute because it is for the repentant. As for His saying: {Indeed, Allāh does not forgive association with Him, but He forgives what is less than that for whom He wills} [An-Nisā': 48, 116], it is restricted and specific, because it is regarding those who do not repent; He does not forgive polytheism for them, and what is less than polytheism is subject to the will of Allāh Almighty.

As for the story mentioned about the one who said he swallowed the entire universe and wanted to say, 'I am the Truth,' and its sister [story] about which it was said: 'Divinity is only claimed by the most ignorant of Allāh's creation or the most knowledgeable of Allāh's creation'—it is from this category.

The faqir who said: 'Allāh did not create anyone with less intellect than one who claimed he is a god—like Pharaoh and Nimrod and their likes'—is the one who was correct, spoke the truth, and was sound in his discourse. However, these atheists venerate Pharaoh and his likes and claim they are better than Mūsā and his likes. To the extent that Bahā' Ad-Dīn 'Abd As-Sayyid, who was the judge of the Jews and embraced Islam, and his Islam was good (may Allāh have mercy on him), told me that he had met with Ash-Shirāzī, one of the shaykhs of these people, who invited him to this saying and made it attractive to him. He related that to me, so I explained to him the misguidance of these people and their disbelief, and that their saying is of the same category as the saying of Pharaoh. He said to me: When Ḥasan Ash-Shirāzī invited him to this saying, he ['Abd As-Sayyid] said to him: 'This saying of yours resembles the saying of Pharaoh.' He [Ash-Shirāzī] said: 'Yes, and we are upon the saying of Pharaoh.' 'Abd As-Sayyid at that time had not yet embraced Islam, so he said: 'I will not leave Mūsā and go to Pharaoh.' He [Ash-Shirāzī] said to him: 'Why?' He said: 'Because Mūsā drowned Pharaoh.' So he [Ash-Shirāzī] was silenced. He ['Abd As-Sayyid] argued against him using the decreed victory with which Allāh aided Mūsā, not based on him being a truthful messenger. I said to 'Abd As-Sayyid: 'And he admitted to you that he is upon the saying of Pharaoh?' He said: 'Yes.' I said: 'Then with the admission of the opponent, there is no need for evidence. I wanted to explain to you that their saying is the saying of Pharaoh, so since he has admitted this, the objective is achieved.'

These statements and their likes are among the greatest falsehoods. We have drawn attention to some of what helps to understand their meaning and that it is false. It is obligatory to condemn them. For condemning this evil which is prevalent among many Muslims is more fitting than condemning the religion of the Jews and Christians, by which Muslims are not [usually] misguided, especially since the sayings of these [proponents of Waḥdah] are worse than the sayings of the Jews, Christians, and Pharaoh. Whoever knows their meaning and believes it is among the hypocrites whom Allāh commanded to fight in His saying Almighty: {O Prophet, strive against the disbelievers and the hypocrites and be harsh upon them} [At-Tawbah: 73; At-Taḥrīm: 9]. Hypocrisy, when it becomes great, its possessor is worse than the disbelievers among the People of the Book, and he will be in the lowest depths of the Fire.

These statements have no acceptable interpretation. Even if it were supposed that some of them could potentially bear a correct meaning in the language, they would only be interpreted that way if the intent of their author were unknown. But the intent of these people is known, just as the religion of the Jews, Christians, and Rāfidāh is known. They have authored books on this, composed

poems, and [produced] speech where parts explain other parts. Their intent is known necessarily, so no one disputes that except an ignorant person who is not paid attention to. It is obligatory to explain their meaning and expose their underlying aim to whoever thinks well of them and it is feared that he might think well of them or be misguided. For their harm to the Muslims is greater than the harm of poisons they eat without knowing they are poisons, and greater than the harm of thieves and traitors whom they do not know are thieves and traitors. For the utmost harm of those [latter ones] is the death of a person or the loss of his wealth, and this is a calamity in his worldly life which might be a cause for mercy for him in the Hereafter. But these [proponents of Waḥdah] give people the drink of disbelief and heresy in the vessels of the Prophets of Allāh and His Saints, and they wear the clothes of the Mujāhidīn in the way of Allāh while inwardly they are among those who wage war against Allāh and His Messenger. They present the speech of disbelievers and hypocrites in the molds of the words of the verifying Saints of Allāh. So a man enters among them thinking he will become a believer and a saint of Allāh, but he becomes a hypocrite and an enemy of Allāh.

I once gave them an analogy of a group who took a party of pilgrims to perform Hajj with them, but they took them to Cyprus to Christianize them. One of their followers, whose misguidance had become clear to him, said to me: 'If they took us to Cyprus, they would make us Christians, but these people would make us worse than Christians.' And the matter is as this speaker said. I have seen and heard from those who thought these people were among the Saints of Allāh and that their speech was the speech of the recognizers and verifiers—people who are among the people of goodness and religion—more than I can count. Among them are those who entered into their heresy, understood it, and became one of them. And among them are those who believed in what they did not know, venerated what they did not understand, and affirmed the unknown. These are the best of the misguided factions, and they are like those who venerate the enemies of Allāh and His Messenger without knowing they are the enemies of Allāh and His Messenger, and ally with the polytheists and the People of the Book, thinking they are among the people of faith and possessors of intellect. Due to these ignorant people who venerate them, such evil has entered upon the Muslims as none can count except the Lord of the Worlds. This answer did not allow for more than this discourse. And Allāh knows best what is correct.



## The Heresy In The Book Fuṣūṣ Al-Ĥikam

### Question

He was asked:

What do the masters, the scholars, the Imams of the religion, and the guides of the Muslims—may Allāh be pleased with them all—say regarding the speech contained in the book ‘Fuṣūṣ Al-Ĥikam’ and similar speech which is apparent in the belief of its speaker: that the Lord and the servant are one thing, there is no difference between them, and that there is no ‘other’ there? Like one who said in his poetry: ‘I and He are one, there is nothing with us.’ And like: ‘I am the one I love, and the one I love is I.’ And like: ‘If you were Laylā, and Laylā were I.’ And like the saying of one who said: ‘If people knew the Truth, they would not see a worshipper nor a worshipped.’ The reality of these sayings was not in the Book of Allāh, nor in the Sunnah, nor in the speech of the Rightly Guided Caliphs and the righteous Salaf. The one who says this claims that he loves Allāh, while Allāh Almighty says: {Say, [O Muḥammad], ‘If you should love Allāh, then follow me, [so] Allāh will love you’} [Āl ‘Imrān: 31]. And Allāh mentioned the best of His creation with servitude in more than one place. He Almighty said about the Seal of His Messengers (peace be upon him): {And He revealed to His Servant what He revealed} [An-Najm: 10]. Likewise, He said regarding ‘Īsā (peace be upon him): {He was not but a servant upon whom We bestowed favor} [Az-Zukhruf: 59]. And Allāh Almighty said: {Never would the Messiah disdain to be a servant of Allāh, nor would the angels near [to Him]} [An-Nisā’: 172]—the verse. The Christians are disbelievers for saying the like of this saying about ‘Īsā alone, so how about one who holds this belief: sometimes regarding himself, and sometimes regarding beautiful forms, among women and beardless youths? And they say: This belief has a hidden secret and an inward truth, and it is among the realities which none can access except the elite of the elite of creation. So, is there in these sayings a hidden secret which is obligatory upon whoever believes in Allāh and the Last Day, His Books, and His Messengers, to strive to adhere to and reach its realities—as these people claim—or is its inward meaning like its outward meaning? Is this mentioned belief the reality of faith in Allāh and His Messenger and what he brought, or is it disbelief itself? Is it obligatory upon the Muslim to follow in that the saying of the scholars of the Muslims, the inheritors of the Prophets and Messengers, or should he stop with the saying of these misguided misguiders? And if one abandons what the Imams of the Muslims have agreed upon and agrees with these mentioned people, what will be Allāh’s affair with him on the Day of Judgment? Give us a ruling, may you be rewarded, may the Generous Allāh reward you.

### Answer

Shaykh Al-Islām Taqī Ad-Dīn Abū Al-'Abbās Aḥmad ibn 'Abd Al-Ḥalīm ibn 'Abd As-Salām Ibn Taymiyyah (may Allāh have mercy on him) answered:

In the name of Allāh, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful.

All praise is due to Allāh, Lord of the Worlds. What is contained in the book 'Fuṣūṣ Al-Ḥikam' and similar speech: indeed, it is disbelief inwardly and outwardly; and its inward meaning is uglier than its outward meaning. This is called the doctrine of the proponents of Waḥdah, the proponents of Ḥulūl, and the proponents of Ittihād. They call themselves the Verifiers. These are of two types: a type that says this absolutely, as is the doctrine of the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ, Ibn 'Arabī, and his likes: such as Ibn Sab'īn, Ibn Al-Fārid', Al-Qūnawī, Ash-Shushtarī, At-Tilimsānī, and their likes, who say: Existence is one. And they say: The existence of the created is the existence of the Creator. They do not affirm two existents, one of which created the other. Rather, they say: The Creator is the created, and the created is the Creator.

They say: The existence of idols is the existence of Allāh, and the worshippers of idols worshipped nothing but Allāh. They say: The Truth is described with everything the created is described with, including attributes of deficiency and blame. They say: The worshippers of the calf worshipped none but Allāh, and Mūsā rebuked Hārūn because Hārūn rebuked them for worshipping the calf, and Mūsā was, according to their claim, among the recognizers who see the Truth in everything, rather they see Him as the essence of everything. And Pharaoh was truthful in his saying: {I am your lord, the most high} [An-Nāzi'āt: 24], rather, he was the essence of the Truth. And similar things said by the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ. The greatest of their verifiers says: The Qur'ān is entirely polytheism because it differentiated between the Lord and the servant; Tawḥīd is only in our speech. It was said to him: If existence is one, then why is the wife lawful and the mother forbidden? He said: All is one according to us, but these veiled ones said: Forbidden. So we said: Forbidden upon you.

Likewise is what is in the poetry of Ibn Al-Fārid' in his poem which he named 'Naẓm As-Sulūk', like his saying:

*To her are my prayers, at the station I perform them  
And I bear witness therein that she prayed to me  
Both of us are one praying one, prostrating to  
Its reality, in union, in every prostration  
None prayed to me but myself, nor was  
My prayer for other than me in performing every prostration*

And his saying:

*I have never ceased being her, nor has she ceased being me  
No difference, rather my essence loved my essence*

And his saying:

*To me, a messenger I was, sent from me  
And my essence, by my signs, deduced about me*

The sayings of these people and their likes: their inward meaning is greater disbelief and heresy than their outward meaning. For it might be thought that their outward meaning is of the category of the speech of the recognizing shaykhs, the people of verification and Tawḥīd. But as for their inward meaning,

it is greater disbelief, falsehood, and ignorance than the speech of the Jews, Christians, and idol worshippers. This is why every one of them who was more knowledgeable of the inward meaning and reality of the doctrine—like At-Tilimsānī—was greater in disbelief and immorality. For he was among the most knowledgeable of these people about this doctrine and the most expert in its reality, and that led him to action. He used to venerate Jews, Christians, and polytheists, permit forbidden things, and author books for the Nuṣayriyyah according to their doctrine, affirming them therein upon their polytheistic creed. Likewise, Ibn Sabʿīn was one of the Imams of these people, and he possessed such disbelief and magic—which is called *Simiyaʿ* (natural magic/illusion)—and agreement with the Christians, Qarmatians (*Qarāmiṭah*), and Rāfidah as suited his principles. So everyone who was more expert in the inward meaning of this doctrine and agreed with them upon it was more manifest in disbelief and heresy. As for the ignorant ones who think well of the saying of these people and do not understand it, believing it to be of the category of the speech of the recognizing shaykhs who speak correct words that many people do not understand—these, you find among them Islam, faith, and adherence to the Book and the Sunnah according to their traditional faith, and you find among them acknowledgment of these [proponents of *Waḥdah*], thinking well of them, and submitting to them according to their ignorance and misguidance. It is inconceivable that anyone praises these people except a disbelieving atheist or an ignorant misguided person.

These are of the category of the Jahmiyyah who say: Allāh, by His Essence, indwells in every place. But the proponents of *waḥdat al-wujūd* have realized this doctrine more greatly than the realization of others among the Jahmiyyah.

As for the second type: it is the saying of those who affirm *Ḥulūl* and *Ittiḥād* in a specific [being], like the Christians who said that about the Messiah ʿĪsā, and the extremists who say that about ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib and a group of his household, and the *Ḥākimiyyah* who say that about Al-Ḥākīm, and the *Ḥallājīyyah* who say that about Al-Ḥallāj, and the *Yūnusiyyah* who say that about Yūnus, and the likes of these who affirm the divinity of some human beings and indwelling and union in them, and do not make that absolute in everything. Among these are those who say that about some women and beardless youths, or some kings, or others. The disbelief of these is worse than the disbelief of the Christians who said: Allāh is the Messiah, son of Maryam. As for the first group [proponents of *Waḥdah*], they speak of absoluteness. They say: The Christians only disbelieved due to specification. The sayings of these are worse than the sayings of the Christians and contain contradictions of the same category as those in the sayings of the Christians. This is why they speak of *Ḥulūl* at times, *Ittiḥād* at others, and *waḥdah* at others, for it is a doctrine contradictory in itself. This is why they confuse whoever does not understand it.

All of this is disbelief inwardly and outwardly by the consensus of every Muslim. Whoever doubts the disbelief of these people after knowing their saying and knowing the religion of Islam is a disbeliever, like one who doubts the disbelief of the Jews, Christians, and polytheists.

However, these people liken to something else, which is what occurs to some recognizers in the station of annihilation, unification, overwhelming ecstasy, and intoxication. For it may occur to one of them—due to the strength of the

overwhelming influence of ecstasy and remembrance upon him—a state in which he becomes absent from himself and others. So he becomes absent through his Worshipped from his worship, and through his Known from his knowledge, and through his Remembered from his remembrance, and through his Existent from his existence.

Something like this may occur to some lovers of certain created beings. As they mention that a man loved another, and the beloved threw himself into the sea, so the lover threw himself in after him. He said to him: 'I fell; what made you fall?' He said: 'I became absent through you from myself, so I thought that you were I.' And they recite:

*The glass became fine and the wine became clear  
And they resembled each other, so the matter became ambiguous.  
As if there were wine and no cup  
And as if there were a cup and no wine*

This state occurs to many wayfarers, and it is not a necessary state for every wayfarer, nor is it a praiseworthy goal. Rather, the persistence of intellect, understanding, and knowledge, along with Tawhīd inwardly and outwardly—like the state of our Prophet (peace be upon him) and his Companions—is more perfect and complete than this. The meaning which they call annihilation is divided into three categories: annihilation from the worship of 'other', annihilation from the witnessing of 'other', and annihilation from the existence of 'other'.

1. The first: is to be annihilated through the worship of Allāh from the worship of anything else, and through fear of Him from fear of anything else, and through hope in Him from hope in anything else, and through reliance upon Him from reliance upon anything else, and through love of Him from love of anything else. This is the reality of Tawhīd and sincerity with which Allāh sent His Messengers and revealed His Books, and it is the realization of 'Lā ilāha illallāh'. For every deification of other than Allāh vanishes from his heart, and no deification of other than Allāh remains in his heart. Everyone who is more perfect in this Tawhīd is more virtuous in the sight of Allāh.

2. The second: is to be annihilated from witnessing anything besides Allāh. This is what many Sufis call the state of overwhelming ecstasy, annihilation, unification, and the like. This has virtue from the aspect of the heart's turning towards Allāh, but it has deficiency from the aspect of not witnessing the matter as it truly is. For if one witnesses that Allāh is the Lord of everything, its Sovereign, and its Creator, and that He is the Worshipped, there is no god but Him, the One Who sent the Messengers and revealed the Books, and commanded obedience to Him and obedience to His Messengers, and forbade disobedience to Him and disobedience to His Messengers; and witnesses the realities of His Names, Attributes, and Rulings, in creation and command—he would be more complete in knowledge, witnessing faith, and verification than one who is annihilated through witnessing one meaning from witnessing another meaning. Witnessing the distinction within the unification and the multiplicity within the unity is the correct, corresponding witnessing. However, if something overcomes a person with which he is unable to witness both this and that, he is excused due to inability, not praised for deficiency and ignorance.

3. The third: Annihilation from the existence of 'other'. This is the saying of the atheists, the proponents of Waḥdah, like the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ and his followers, who say: The existence of the Creator is the existence of the created, and there is no 'other' nor 'besides' in reality. The saying of these people is greater disbelief than the saying of the Jews, Christians, and idol worshippers.

Furthermore, the friendship/alliance of Allāh is agreement with Him by loving what He loves, hating what He hates, being pleased with what He is pleased with, being displeased with what He is displeased with, commanding what He commands, forbidding what He forbids, allying with His allies, and opposing His enemies. As in Saḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī from Abū Hurayrah from the Prophet (peace be upon him) that he said: {Allāh Almighty says: Whoever shows enmity to a wali of Mine, I have declared war against him. My servant does not draw near to Me with anything more beloved to Me than the religious duties I have enjoined upon him, and My servant continues to draw near to Me with supererogatory works so that I shall love him. When I love him I am his hearing with which he hears, his seeing with which he sees, his hand with which he strikes, and his foot with which he walks; so by Me he hears, by Me he sees, by Me he strikes, and by Me he strives; Were he to ask [something] of Me, I would surely give it to him, and were he to seek refuge with Me, I would surely grant him refuge; I do not hesitate about anything I am going to do more than I hesitate about taking the soul of My faithful servant: he hates death and I hate hurting him, but it is inevitable for him}. This is the most authentic ḥadīth reported regarding the Awliyā'. The atheists and proponents of Ittiḥād use it as evidence for their saying because of His statement: 'I am his hearing, his seeing, his hand, and his foot.' But the ḥadīth is evidence against them for many reasons:

Among them, His saying: {Whoever shows enmity to a wali of Mine, I have declared war against him}. So He affirmed an enemy waging war, and a wali who is other than the enemy, and He affirmed for Himself, both this one and that one.

Among them, His saying: {My servant does not draw near to Me with anything more beloved to Me than the religious duties I have enjoined upon him}. So He affirmed a servant drawing near to his Lord, and a Lord Who enjoined obligatory duties upon him.

Among them, His saying: {and My servant continues to draw near to Me with supererogatory works so that I shall love him}. So He affirmed one drawing near, One drawn near to, a Lover, and a beloved other than Him. All of this refutes their saying: Existence is one.

Among them, His saying: {When I love him I am his hearing with which he hears, his seeing with which he sees}, etc. For He granted His servant these things after His love for him. According to them, He is one before the love and after it. And according to them, He is these limbs: his stomach, his private parts, his hair, and everything. There is no multiplicity nor plurality in existence according to them. However, they affirm ranks, loci of manifestation, and manifestations. If they make these existent, they contradict their own saying. And if they make them established in non-existence—as Ibn 'Arabī says—or make them the specific particulars while the Absolute is the Truth—they would have based that on the saying of those who say: The non-existent is a 'thing', and the saying of those

who made universals established externally, additional to the specific particulars. The first is the saying of a faction of the Mu'tazilah, and it is the saying of Ibn 'Arabī. The second is the saying of a faction of the philosophers, and it is the saying of Al-Qūnawī, the companion of Ibn 'Arabī. Both sayings are false according to rational people. This is why At-Tilimsānī was more astute than both of them, so he did not affirm anything beyond existence. As it was said:

*And the sea is nothing but the wave, nothing else  
Even if the multiplicity of the numerous differentiates it*

However, these misguided ones among the philosophers and the Mu'tazilah did not say: The existence of the created is the existence of the Creator. But these atheists said: This is that. This is why they came to speak of Ḥulūl from one aspect, because existence is in all essences, or the reverse; and of Ittīhād from one aspect, due to their unification. The reality of their saying is waḥdat al-wujūd.

There are other aspects in the ḥadīth that indicate the corruption of their saying.

The ḥadīth is true, as the Prophet (peace be upon him) informed. For the walī of Allāh, due to the perfection of his love for Allāh and his obedience to Allāh, his perception remains for Allāh and by Allāh, and his action for Allāh and by Allāh. So what he hears that the Truth loves, he loves, and what he hears that the Truth hates, he hates. What he sees that the Truth loves, he loves, and what he sees that the Truth hates, he hates. There remains in his hearing and seeing a light by which he distinguishes between truth and falsehood. As the Prophet (peace be upon him) said in the ḥadīth agreed upon for its authenticity: {O Allāh, place light in my heart, and light in my sight, and light in my hearing, and light on my right, and light on my left, and light above me, and light below me, and light in front of me, and light behind me, and grant me light}. The walī of Allāh possesses such agreement with Allāh that the beloved and the hated, the commanded and the forbidden, and the like become united [in purpose]. So the beloved of the Truth becomes his beloved, the hated of the Truth his hated, the commanded of the Truth his commanded, the ally of the Truth his ally, and the enemy of the Truth his enemy. Indeed, when a created being loves another created being with perfect love, something like this occurs between them, such that one may feel pain at the other's pain and take pleasure in his pleasure. This is why he (peace be upon him) said: {The parable of the believers in their affection, mercy, and compassion for each other is that of a single body; when one limb suffers, the whole body responds to it with sleeplessness and fever}. This is why the believer is pleased by what pleases the believers and displeased by what displeases them. Whoever is not like that is not one of them.

This Ittīhād that exists between the believers is not that the essence of one of them is identical to the essence of the other, nor that it indwells in it. Rather, it is their agreement and Ittīhād in faith in Allāh and His Messenger and the branches thereof: like love of Allāh and His Messenger, and love of what Allāh and His Messenger love. If this is conceivable between believers, then when the servant is in agreement with his Lord Almighty in what He loves and hates, commands and forbids, and the like, which the Lord loves from His servant, how could the essence of one of them be the other, or indwelling in it?

So, if you understand these principles of Ḥulūl and Ittīhād, both absolute and

specific, which are false, and [distinguish them] from what belongs to the states of the people of faith, the friendship/alliance of Allāh Almighty, agreement with Him in what He loves and is pleased with, and the consequences thereof, the answer to the questioner's issues will become clear to you. These people may find in the speech of some shaykhs ambiguous, general words, and they interpret them according to corrupt meanings, just as the Christians did with what was transmitted to them from the Prophets. They abandon the clear and follow the ambiguous.

So the saying of the speaker: 'The Lord and the servant are one thing, there is no difference between them' is explicit disbelief, especially if it includes every created servant. As for if he intended by that the believing servants of Allāh and His pious allies, then these, He loves them and they love Him, and they agree with Him in what He loves, is pleased with, and commands. Allāh is pleased with them, and they are pleased with Him. Since they are pleased with what He is pleased with and displeased with what He is displeased with, the Truth is pleased with their pleasure and angered by their anger, as that is concomitant from both sides.

It is not said about the best of these: 'The Lord and the servant are one thing, there is no difference between them.' But it is said about the best of creation as Allāh Almighty said: {Indeed, those who pledge allegiance to you—they are actually pledging allegiance to Allāh. The hand of Allāh is over their hands} [Al-Fatḥ: 10]. And He said: {He who obeys the Messenger has obeyed Allāh} [An-Nisā': 80]. And He said: {Allāh and His Messenger are more worthy to be pleased} [At-Tawbah: 62]. And He said: {Indeed, those who abuse Allāh and His Messenger—Allāh has cursed them in this world and the Hereafter} [Al-Aḥzāb: 57], and similar examples. As for all other servants: Allāh is their Creator, their Owner, and their Lord, and the Creator of their power and their actions. Then, whatever of their actions agrees with His love and pleasure, He loves its people and honors them. And whatever of them is among what displeases Him and He hates, He hates its people and humiliates them. The actions of the servants are effects, created by Allāh; they are not an attribute of His, nor an action subsisting in His Essence. His saying Almighty: {And you threw not, [O Muḥammad], when you threw, but it was Allāh who threw} [Al-Anfāl: 17], its meaning is: And you did not make it reach when you cast, but Allāh made the thrown object reach. For {the Prophet (peace be upon him) had thrown a handful of dust at the polytheists and said: 'May the faces be disfigured!'} So Allāh made it reach the faces and eyes of the polytheists. The power of the Prophet (peace be upon him) was incapable of making it reach them. Throwing has a beginning, which is the casting, and an end, which is the reaching. Allāh affirmed the beginning for His Prophet with His saying: {when you threw}, and negated the end from him and affirmed it for Himself with His saying: {but it was Allāh who threw}. Otherwise, it is not permissible for the affirmed to be identical to the negated, for this is a contradiction.

Allāh Almighty—although He is the Creator of the actions of the servants—does not describe Himself with the attribute of the one in whom those actions subsist. So He does not call Himself one who prays, nor one who fasts, nor one who eats, nor one who drinks. Glorified and Exalted is He far above what the wrongdoers say!

The saying of the speaker: 'There is no 'other' there,' if he intends by it what the proponents of Waḥdah intend, i.e., there is no existent 'other' besides Allāh, then this is explicit disbelief. If there were no 'other' there, He would not have said: {Is it other than Allāh I should take as a protector?} [Al-An'ām: 14], nor would He have said: {Is it other than Allāh that you order me to worship, O ignorant ones?} [Az-Zumar: 64]. For they used to order him to worship idols. If there were no other than Allāh, His saying would not be correct: {Is it other than Allāh that you order me to worship, O ignorant ones?}. Nor would He have said: {Then is it other than Allāh I should seek as judge while it is He who has revealed to you the Book explained in detail?} [Al-An'ām: 114]. Nor would Al-Khalil have said: {Then do you see what you have been worshipping?} {You and your ancient forefathers?} {Indeed, they are enemies to me, except the Lord of the worlds} [Ash-Shu'arā': 75-77]. Nor would he have said: {Indeed, I am disassociated from that which you worship,} {Except for He who created me; and indeed, He will guide me} [Az-Zukhruf: 26-27]. For Ibrāhīm did not oppose his Lord, nor did he disassociate himself from his Lord. If those deities which they and their ancient forefathers used to worship were not other than Allāh, Ibrāhīm would have disassociated himself from Allāh and opposed Allāh—and far be it from Ibrāhīm to do that!

These atheists, at the beginning of their affair, negate the Attributes and say: Is the Qur'ān Allāh or other than Allāh? If it is said to them: Other than Allāh. They say: Then other than Allāh is created. And at the end of their affair, they say: There is no existent other than Allāh, or they say: The universe is neither He nor other than Him. And they say:

'And every speech in existence is His speech, Whether it be prose or poetry to us.'

They condemn the people of the Sunnah when they affirm the Attributes and do not apply the name 'other' to them, while they themselves do not apply the name 'other' to created beings. I have heard this contradiction from their shaykhs, for they are in manifest misguidance.

As for the poet's saying in his poetry: 'I am the one I love, and the one I love is I?' And his saying: 'If you were Laylā, and Laylā were I.' This poet only intended by this positional Ittiḥād, like the union of one of two lovers with the other, where one loves what the other loves and hates what he hates, and says what he says and does what he does. It is resemblance and similarity, not the union of essence with essence, as he became absorbed in his beloved until he was annihilated through him from seeing himself. Like the saying of the other: 'I became absent through you from myself, so I thought that you were I.' So either he is mistaken, absorbed in annihilation, or he meant similarity, resemblance, and the unity of the desired and the feared, not essential Ittiḥād. If he intended essential union—while being rational about what he says—then he is a liar, a fabricator, deserving the punishment of fabricators.

As for the saying of the speaker: 'If people saw the Truth, they would not see a worshipper nor a worshipped,' this is of the category of the saying of the atheistic proponents of Ittiḥād who do not differentiate between the Lord and the servant. The explanation of the saying of these has preceded. These people combine misguidance and error, between the desires of error in their stomachs and private parts, and the misleading trials. In the ḥadīth from the Prophet

(peace be upon him), he said: {Indeed, the most fearful thing I fear for you are the desires of error in your stomachs and your private parts}. Until the matter reaches the point with one of them that he desires beardless youths and claims that the Lord Almighty manifested Himself in one of them. They say: He is the monk in the hermitage; and these are manifestations of beauty. One of them kisses the beardless youth and says: 'You are Allāh.' It is mentioned about one of them that he used to approach his son and claim that he was Allāh, Lord of the Worlds, or that he created the heavens and the earth. One of them says to his companion: 'You created this, and you are it,' and similar things. May Allāh revile a faction whose god whom they worship is the place they lie upon and spread out! Upon them is the curse of Allāh, the angels, and all people. Allāh will not accept from them any ransom or compensation.

Whoever says: 'The saying of these people has a hidden secret and an inward truth, and it is among the realities which none can access except the elite of the elite of creation,' is one of two men: either he is among the major heretics, the people of heresy and absurdity, or he is among the major people of ignorance and misguidance. The heretic must be killed. The ignorant person is informed of the reality of the matter; if he insists on this false belief after the proof has been established against him, he must be killed.

However, their saying does have a hidden secret and an inward reality that only the elite of creation know. And this secret is more severe disbelief and heresy than its outward appearance. For their doctrine has subtlety, obscurity, and hiddenness that many people may not understand. This is why you find many common people of religion, goodness, and worship reciting the poem of Ibn Al-Fārid, finding ecstasy in it, and venerating it, thinking it is from the speech of the people of Tawhīd and Recognition, while he does not understand it nor the intent of its speaker. Likewise, the speech of these people is heard by groups known for knowledge and religion, but they do not understand its reality. So they either suspend judgment about it, or express their doctrine with the expression of one who has not understood the reality; or they condemn it with a general condemnation without knowledge of its reality, and the like. This is the state of most people with them. Their Imams, when they see someone who has not understood the reality of their saying, they covet him and say: 'This is from the scholars of formalities, the people of the outward, and the people of the husk.' They say: 'This knowledge of ours is only known through unveiling and witnessing, and this requires conditions.' They say: 'This is not your nest, so move on from it,' and similar things, which contain veneration for it, enticement towards it, and portrayal as ignorant whoever has not reached it. If they see him knowledgeable of their saying, they attribute him to being one of them and say: 'He is among the major recognizers.'

If he shows condemnation of them and declares them disbelievers, they say: 'This one has adopted the description of condemnation to complete the ranks and loci of manifestation.' This is what they say about the Prophets and their prohibition of idol worship. All of this and its likes are things I have seen and heard from them. Their misguidance is great, their falsehood is immense, and their deception is severe. Allāh Almighty makes manifest the guidance and religion of truth with which He sent His Messenger, that He may make it superior over all religion. And sufficient is Allāh as Witness. And Allāh knows best.



## What The People Of Knowledge And Faith Are Upon

Regarding that which the People of Knowledge and Faith, from the first and the last generations, are upon, concerning what resembles the false *Ĥulūl* and *Ittiḥād* but is actually true—even if it is called *Ĥulūl* or *Ittiḥād*—and it is that which the People of Islam, the People of the Sunnah and the Community, and the People of Knowledge and Certainty from all groups are upon, based on the indications of the Book and the Sunnah.

As for *Ĥulūl*: there is no doubt that whoever knows something, an effect and quality of it must remain in his heart. His state after knowing it is not like his state before knowing it, such that knowledge would be a mere relation, like highness and lowness. For when that which is high descends, its highness ceases, and when that which is low ascends, its lowness ceases; but knowledge does not cease; rather, its effect remains in every state. If, along with knowing Him, one loves Him, or hopes in Him, or fears Him, these states have another effect and quality beyond mere knowledge and awareness, even though the two may be concomitant. If one mentions Him with his tongue, these effects become greater. And if one submits to Him with all his limbs, that is greater and greater still.

These meanings are, in principle, common to every perceiver and perceived object, every lover and beloved, every rememberer and remembered object, whether it be in the manner of worship, like the worship of Allāh alone, without partner—or the worship of rivals, like those {who take rivals besides Allāh, loving them as they should love Allāh} [Al-Baqarah: 165]—or not in the manner of worship, like the love of brothers, children, women, homelands, and other such created things.

So, the believer who has faith in Allāh with his heart and limbs—his faith combines the knowledge of his heart and the state of his heart: the heart's affirmation and the heart's submission. It also combines the speech of his tongue and the action of his limbs, even if the foundation of faith is what is in the heart, or what is in the heart and on the tongue. Thus, there must be in his heart affirmation of Allāh and submission to Him; this is the speech of his heart, and this is the action of his heart, which is acknowledgment of Allāh. Knowledge precedes action, perception precedes movement, affirmation precedes submission, and recognition precedes love, even though they may be concomitant. However, the heart's knowledge necessitates its action, as long as no prevailing counterforce exists, and its action necessitates its affirmation, since there can be no volitional movement or love except arising from awareness. But movement and love may contain corruption if the awareness and perception are not sound. 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz said: 'Whoever worships Allāh without knowledge causes more corruption than rectification.' As for

righteous action, both inwardly and outwardly, it can only arise from knowledge. This is why Allāh and His Messenger commanded the worship of Allāh, turning repentantly to Him, making the religion sincerely for Him, and similar commands. For these terms encompass both knowledge and action together: the heart's knowledge and its state, even if the speech of the tongue and the action of the limbs are also included therein, for the existence of sound branches necessitates the existence of roots. This is evident, and the purpose here is not to elaborate on it, but rather the purpose is...<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Thus in the original text.



## The Necessity Of The Believer's Heart Being Established In The Knowledge And Love Of Allāh

Which is that the believer must necessarily have established in his heart, from the knowledge of Allāh and love for Him, that which necessitates that the Known and Beloved One has effects in his heart which resemble Ḥulūl in some respects—not that it is the indwelling of the essence of the Known and Beloved One, but rather it is faith in Him and knowledge of His names and attributes. Allāh the Exalted said: {Allāh is the Light of the heavens and the earth. The example of His light is like a niche...} [An-Nūr: 35]. Ubayy ibn Ka'b said: 'The example of His light in the heart of the believer.' So these are the lights that occur in the hearts of the believers. It has been said regarding the saying of the Exalted: {And whoever disbelieves in faith, his work has become worthless} [Al-Mā'idah: 5] that it refers to disbelief in that [faith residing in the heart]. For whoever disbelieves in the acknowledgment—which is the affirmation of Allāh, His angels, His books, His messengers, and submission to Him, encompassing belief and compliance with the obligation of duties, the prohibition of forbidden things, and the permission of permissible things—he is a disbeliever. For the objective intended for us from the revelation of the Books and the sending of the Messengers is the attainment of faith for us. So whoever disbelieves in this has disbelieved in that [revelation and messengership].

This may be called the likeness and the representation, because it might be said that knowledge is a representation of the known object in the knower. Likewise, love may involve a representation of the beloved in the lover. Then, among people, some claim that every knowledge and every love contains this representation, as asserted by a group of philosophers. And among them are those who deny the occurrence of any aspect of this representation in any knowledge or love. The sound position is that a form of representation and imagination may occur for some knowers and lovers, to the point that one imagines the form of the beloved, while sensory imagination may not occur. And this representation is not of the same kind as the reality at all. Rather, since knowledge corresponds to and agrees with the known object, not contradicting it, there exists between the correspondent and the corresponded, the agreeer and the agreed upon, a type of affinity and similarity, and some type among the types of representation. For a parable is struck for something due to its sharing with it in some aspects, and here there is certainly some sharing and some resemblance. It has been said regarding the saying of the Exalted: {There is nothing like unto Him} [Ash-Shūrā: 11] and His saying: {And His is the loftiest description in the heavens and the earth} [Ar-Rūm: 27] that it refers to this [representation/description in the heart].

In a transmitted report: 'My earth did not contain Me, nor My heaven, but the

heart of My pure, pious, gentle, tender believing servant contained Me.' And it is said: 'The heart is the house of the Lord.' This is the servants' portion from their Lord and their share of faith in Him. As came from one of the Salaf who said: 'If one of you loves to know his station with Allāh, let him look at the station of Allāh in his heart. For indeed, Allāh places the servant in relation to Himself according to how the servant places Him in his heart.' This has been narrated as marfū' in the ḥadīth of Ayyūb ibn 'Abdullāh ibn Khālid ibn Šafwān from Jābir ibn 'Abdullāh, reported by Abū Ya'lā Al-Mawšīlī and Ibn Abī Ad-Dunyā in Kitāb adh-Dhikr.

This is why the sons of Ya'qūb said: {We will worship your God and the God of your fathers, Ibrāhīm and Ishāq} [Al-Baqarah: 133]. For the divinity of Allāh varies in their hearts across immense degrees; it increases and decreases, and they differ therein with a disparity whose extremes cannot be grasped, to the extent that it is established in the Šaḥīḥ from the Prophet (peace be upon him) regarding two individuals: {This one is better than an earth full of the likes of that one.} So one human being became better than an earth full of his own kind; this is a tremendous disparity, the like of which does not occur among other animals. It is to this meaning that one alluded who said: 'Abū Bakr did not surpass you by virtue of abundant prayer or fasting, but rather by something that settled firmly in his heart.' And that is certainty and faith. Related to this is his saying: {I was weighed against the Ummah and I outweighed it; then Abū Bakr was weighed against the Ummah and he outweighed it; then 'Umar was weighed against the Ummah and he outweighed it; then the scale was lifted.} And he said, as narrated from him by Aš-Šiddīq [Abū Bakr]: {'O people, ask Allāh for certainty and well-being, for no one has been given anything better after certainty than well-being.} Reported by At-Tirmidhī, An-Nasā'ī in Al-Yawm wa al-Laylah, and Ibn Mājah. Raqabah ibn Mišqalah said to Ash-Sha'bi: 'May Allāh grant you the certainty towards which souls find rest and upon which reliance is placed in religion.' In Kitāb az-Zuhd by Imām Aḥmad, from [Sayyār, and Ja'far narrated to us, from 'Imrān al-Qašīr]<sup>1</sup>, he said: Mūsā said: 'O Lord, where do I find You?' He said: 'O Mūsā, with those whose hearts are broken for My sake. I draw near to them a handspan each day; were it not for that, their hearts would burn.'

Expression regarding this meaning may be expanded such that one says: 'There is nothing in my heart but Allāh,' 'I have nothing but Allāh.' Just as the Prophet (peace be upon him) said in the authentic ḥadīth from Allāh: {'Did you not know that My servant so-and-so was sick? Had you visited him, you would have found Me with him.} And it is said [in poetry]:

'He dwells in the heart, inhabiting it... I do not forget him, that I should [need to] remember him.'

And it is said:

'Your image is in my eye, Your remembrance on my tongue... Your abode is in my heart, so where could You be absent?'

This level can strengthen immensely until it is expressed by terms like manifestation, unveiling, and the like, by the consensus of rational people. Accompanying it is nearness to Him, as the Prophet (peace be upon him) said:

---

<sup>1</sup> Omission in the printed text; the bracketed text is from Kitāb az-Zuhd by Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (389).

{‘The closest a servant is to his Lord is when he is prostrating.’} And Allāh the Exalted said in the Ḥadīth Qudsī: {‘Whoever draws near to Me a handspan, I draw near to him an arm’s length.’}

However, does the servant’s drawing near to Allāh involve movement towards Allāh or towards certain places? They agree that movement of the servant’s body towards certain honored places, where faith in Allāh—through knowledge of Him, remembrance of Him, and worship of Him—is manifested, does occur, such as the Hajj to His House and heading towards His mosques. Related to this is the saying of Ibrāhīm: {‘Indeed, I am going to my Lord; He will guide me’} [Aṣ-Ṣāffāt: 99]. As for the movement of his spirit towards places like the heavens and others, the majority of the people of Islam affirm it, while the Sabian Peripatetic philosophers and those who agree with them deny it. As for the movement of his spirit or body towards Allāh, the people of sound innate disposition and the Ahl as-Sunnah wa al-Jamā’ah affirm it, while many of the ahl al-kalām deny it.

As for the nearness of Allāh to His servant: is it subsequent to the servant’s drawing near and his approach, which consists of his knowledge or action, or is there another nearness from the Lord? There is discussion on this, but this is not the place for it. Those who affirm only the former [that Allāh’s nearness is dependent on the servant’s] hold two views regarding the Lord’s nearness:

1. That it is His manifestation and appearance to him.
2. That, along with that, it is the servant’s closeness to Him and his approach, which occurs through his action and movement.

Nearness also has another meaning, which is closeness in the sense of appropriateness or similarity, as when it is said: ‘This is close to that.’ But this is not the place for it.



## Two Distinct Essences Do Not Become One Entity Unless They Transform Into A Third Essence

As for what resembles Ittihād: Indeed, two distinct essences cannot have the entity of one unite with the entity of the other, nor the entity of its attribute with the entity of the other's attribute, unless they undergo transformation after union into a third essence, like the union of water and milk. For after union, they become a third thing, neither pure water nor pure milk. As for their uniting while both remain after union as they were before, this is impossible. From this, it is known that it is impossible for Allāh to unite with His creation, for His transformation is impossible.

Rather, what unite are the causes and the rulings in the object [of focus], and the names and attributes unite in type—like two loving close friends where one comes to love the very thing the other loves and detest what the other detests, finding pleasure in what pleases the other and pain in what pains the other. This involves levels and degrees that cannot be precisely defined. So their names and attributes have become of one type. And the entity of the rulings and causes related to them—which are, for example, the beloved object and the disliked object—is one and the same entity, like the Messenger whom all believers love. They are united in their love for him, meaning their beloved object is one, and the love of this one is of the same type as the love of that one, not that it is the exact same entity.

This applies to the union of people with one another, which is the brotherhood and close friendship based on faith about which the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: {The likeness of the believers in their mutual affection, mutual mercy, and mutual kindness is that of a single body; when one limb complains, the rest of the body calls out to it with fever and sleeplessness.} Reported by both [Al-Bukhārī and Muslim] in the two Ṣaḥīḥs. So the believer is made, in relation to another believer, like one limb to another limb, joined together by a single soul. This is why Allāh called the believing brother a 'self' for his brother in more than one place in the Book and the Sunnah. The Exalted said: {So do not claim yourselves to be pure} [An-Najm: 32]. And He said: {There has certainly come to you a Messenger from among yourselves} [At-Tawbah: 128]. And He said: {Certainly did Allāh confer [great] favor upon the believers when He sent among them a Messenger from themselves} [Āl 'Imrān: 164]. And He said: {greet yourselves} [An-Nūr: 61]. And He said: {so kill yourselves} [Al-Baqarah: 54].

So, when the believing servant turns repentantly to his Lord, worships Him, and aligns himself with Him until he comes to love what his Lord loves and hate what his Lord hates, command what his Lord commands and forbid what his Lord forbids, be pleased with what pleases his Lord and be angered for what angers

his Lord, give to whom his Lord gives and withhold from whom his Lord withholds—he is the servant about whom the Prophet (peace be upon him) said, as narrated by Abū Dāwūd from the ḥadīth of Al-Qāsim from Abū Umāmah: {‘Whoever loves for Allāh, hates for Allāh, gives for Allāh, and withholds for Allāh has indeed perfected faith.’} This servant’s religion has become entirely for Allāh, and he has fulfilled the purpose for which he was created, which is worship. Thus, the rulings of these attributes he possesses and their causes have united with the rulings of the Lord’s attributes and their causes. And they are at various levels in that; if one is a prophet, he has a level of alignment with Allāh that others do not have, and the Messengers are above that, and the Messengers of Firm Resolve are greater still, and our Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him) possesses the greatest station of intercession in every standing.

This alignment is the permissible Ittihād, whether it is obligatory or recommended. It is regarding matters like this that the texts of the Book and the Sunnah have come. Allāh the Exalted said: {Indeed, those who pledge allegiance to you, [O Muḥammad]—they are actually pledging allegiance to Allāh. The hand of Allāh is over their hands} [Al-Fatḥ: 10]. And He said: {Allāh and His Messenger are more worthy that they should please Him} [At-Tawbah: 62]. And the Exalted said: {He who obeys the Messenger has obeyed Allāh} [An-Nisā’: 80]. And the Exalted said: {Indeed, those who abuse Allāh and His Messenger} [Al-Aḥzāb: 57]. And the Exalted said: {...more beloved to you than Allāh and His Messenger} [At-Tawbah: 24]. And the Exalted said: {Say, ‘The spoils are for Allāh and the Messenger’} [Al-Anfāl: 1]. From this category is the saying of the Messiah—if this wording is authentically established from him—‘I and the Father are one; whoever has seen me has seen the Father,’ and similar statements. For it is like the saying of the Exalted: {Indeed, those who pledge allegiance to you, [O Muḥammad]—they are actually pledging allegiance to Allāh} [Al-Fatḥ: 10], and His saying: {He who obeys the Messenger has obeyed Allāh} [An-Nisā’: 80], and other such expressions that contain resemblance.



## The Hadiths And Verses Regarding Nearness Do Not Imply Ittihād

And there has come regarding the ‘friends of Allāh’, who are the pious, a type of this [alignment]. Al-Bukhārī narrated in his Ṣaḥīḥ from Abū Hurayrah that the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: {Allāh the Exalted says: ‘Whoever shows enmity to a friend of Mine, I have declared war against him. My servant does not draw near to Me with anything more beloved to Me than the religious duties I have enjoined upon him, and My servant continues to draw near to Me with supererogatory works until I love him. When I love him, I am his hearing with which he hears, his sight with which he sees, his hand with which he strikes, and his foot with which he walks. Were he to ask [something] of Me, I would surely give it to him; and were he to seek refuge in Me, I would surely grant him refuge. I do not hesitate about anything I am going to do as I hesitate about taking the soul of My believing servant: he dislikes death, and I dislike hurting him, but it is inevitable for him.’}

The first thing in the ḥadīth is His saying: {‘Whoever shows enmity to a friend of Mine, I have declared war against him.’} He made enmity towards His servant, the walī, enmity towards Himself. So the entity of His enemy is the entity of His servant’s enemy, and the entity of enmity towards His walī is the entity of enmity towards Himself; they are not two distinct things. However, Allāh is not the entity of His servant, nor is the manner of enmity towards His servant the entity of the manner of enmity towards Himself; rather, they align in type.

Then He said: {‘When I love him, I am his hearing, his sight, his hand, and his foot.’} And in a narration outside the Ṣaḥīḥ: {‘So through Me he hears, through Me he sees, through Me he strikes, and through Me he walks.’} His saying: ‘Through Me he hears, through Me he sees, through Me he strikes, through Me he walks’ clarifies the meaning of His saying: {‘I am his hearing, his sight, his hand, and his foot.’} It does not mean that He becomes the pupil, the fat, the nerve, or the foot itself. Rather, He remains the objective sought through these limbs and faculties, and He is like them in that regard. For the servant’s perception and movement occur according to his limbs and faculties. So when his perception and movement are through the Truth—not in the sense of the creation of perception and movement, for this is a common factor shared between those He loves and those He does not love—rather, the beloved of the Truth receives from the Truth this aid according to his share of divine accompaniment, Lordship, and Divinity; for each of these matters has general and specific aspects.

In Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, from Abū Hurayrah, from the Prophet (peace be upon him): {Allāh the Exalted says: ‘My servant, I fell ill, and you did not visit Me.’ He will say: ‘O Lord, how could I visit You when You are the Lord of the worlds?’ He will say: ‘Did you not know that My servant so-and-so was ill? Had you visited him, you

would have found Me with him. My servant, I was hungry, and you did not feed Me.' He will say: 'O Lord, how could I feed You when You are the Lord of the worlds?' He will say: 'Did you not know that My servant so-and-so was hungry? Had you fed him, you would have found that [reward] with Me.'

So in this ḥadīth, He mentioned the two true meanings and negated the two false meanings, and He explained them. His saying: 'I was hungry and I was ill' is wording implying union that affirms the truth [of alignment/connection]. And His saying: {'you would have found Me with him'} and {'you would have found that [reward] with Me'} is a negation of essential union by negating the false [interpretation] and affirming the distinction of the Lord from the servant. His saying: {'you would have found Me with him'} uses a locative term; through both [affirmation and negation], the true meaning of the true indwelling is established, which is through faith, not through the essence. And it interprets His saying: {'I fell ill, and you did not visit Me.'} For if the Lord were the entity of the sick and hungry person, then when one visited him or fed him, one would have found Him to be him, and would have found Him to have eaten.

In His saying regarding the sick person: {'found Me with him'} and regarding the hungry person: {'you would have found that [reward] with Me'}, there are two fine distinctions. For the sick person whose visit is recommended and with whom Allāh is found is the believer in his Lord, aligned with his God, who is His walī. As for the one being fed, there might be generality therein, applying to every hungry person whose feeding is recommended, for Allāh says: {Who is it that would loan Allāh a goodly loan so He may multiply it for him many times over?} [Al-Baqarah: 245]. So whoever gives charity, whether obligatory or recommended, has indeed loaned Allāh, Glorified is He, through what he gave to His servant. It is established in the Ṣaḥīḥ from the Prophet (peace be upon him) that he said: {'Whoever gives charity equal to a date from good earnings—and Allāh accepts only that which is good—Allāh takes it in His Right Hand and nurtures it for him as one of you nurtures his foal or young camel, until it becomes like the great mountain.'} And he said: {'Indeed, charity falls into the hand of the Truth before it falls into the hand of the asker.'}

However, the more likely interpretation is that this servant mentioned in relation to hunger is the same one mentioned in relation to illness, namely the servant who is a walī, in whom there is a type of union [i.e., alignment], even though Allāh rewards feeding the dissolute and the non-Muslim under protection. Analogous to the loan is aid/victory, as in the saying of the Exalted: {...and that Allāh may make evident who helps Him and His messengers unseen} [Al-Fadīd: 25] and His saying: {If you aid Allāh, He will aid you} [Muḥammad: 7], and the like. However, aid has a meaning [of being attributed to Allāh], but one would not say regarding the like of it, 'I was hungry.' So Allāh mentioned in the Qur'ān the loan and aid and attributed them to Himself—this [loan] relates to provision and that [aid] relates to victory. And in the ḥadīth came visiting the sick. These three are mentioned in the saying of the Exalted: {...and the patient in poverty and hardship and during battle} [Al-Baqarah: 177] and His saying: {Hardship and adversity touched them, and they were shaken} [Al-Baqarah: 214]. The ḥadīth only addresses the matters of hardship and adversity because these affect the individual addressed by His saying: {'My servant, I fell ill and I was hungry'}, and for that reason He admonished him. As for aid, it usually requires a number [of people]; thus, blame is not typically placed on any specific

individual for it. Or perhaps the purpose of the ḥadīth is admonition. And in the Qur'ān, there is aid and lending, but not visiting the sick, because aid and lending have a generality that is not specific to one person over another. As for visiting the sick, it is only for one with whom the Truth is found.



## Regarding Two Meanings Which Are the Reality of Religion, Certainty, and Faith

So these two meanings are correct and established; indeed, they are the reality of religion, certainty, and faith. As for the first—which is Allāh being in his heart through knowledge and love—this is obligatory upon everyone, and every believer must have it. If he fulfills his obligation, he is moderate; if he neglects part of his obligation, he is wronging himself; and if he neglects it entirely, he is a disbeliever in his Lord.

As for the second—which is aligning with his Lord in what He loves and hates, and what pleases Him and displeases Him—this, in its absolute sense, is only for the foremost, those brought near, who draw near to Allāh through supererogatory acts—which He loves but did not make obligatory—after [performing] the obligatory duties which He loves, makes obligatory, and punishes the one who abandons them. This is why these individuals, when they performed the beloved acts of the Truth—consisting of inward and outward words and deeds, encompassing recognition, spiritual states, and burdens/responsibilities—Allāh the Exalted loved them. So He said: {‘...and My servant continues to draw near to Me with supererogatory works until I love him.’} They performed what He loves, so He loved them, for the recompense is of the same type as the deed, related to it like an effect to its cause.

It should not be imagined that what is meant by that is that the servant performs the entirety of every single movement that Allāh loves, for this is impossible. Rather, the objective is that he performs what he is capable of from inward and outward actions. And from the inward actions, he is able to perform more than he performs of the outward actions, as one of the Salaf said: ‘The strength of the believer is in his heart, and his weakness is in his body; the strength of the hypocrite is in his body, and his weakness is in his heart.’ This is why he (peace be upon him) said: {‘A person is with whom he loves.’} And he said: {‘Indeed, in Madinah there are men who, whenever you traversed a path or crossed a valley, they were with you; they were held back by a valid excuse.’} And he said: {‘So they are equal in reward’} in the ḥadīth about the one capable of spending and the one incapable, who said: {‘If I had the like of what so-and-so has, I would do with it the like of what he did.’} For when they became equal in the action of the heart, and one of them had a physical excuse, they became equal in recompense. As the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: {‘When the servant falls ill or travels, the like of the deeds he used to perform while healthy and resident are recorded for him.’}



## Regarding Some Who Were Overcome By Spiritual State And Fell Into A Type Of Ĥulūl Or Ittiĥād

Some of those overcome by spiritual state may fall into a type of Ĥulūl or Ittiĥād; for union contains truth and falsehood. However, when something overcomes him that causes his intellect to be absent or annihilates him from awareness of anything besides his beloved, and that was not due to any sin on his part, he is excused, not punished for it, as long as he is not rational—for the pen is lifted from the insane person until he recovers. If he was mistaken in that, he falls under His saying: {Our Lord, do not impose blame upon us if we have forgotten or erred} [Al-Baqarah: 286], and He said: {And there is no blame upon you for that in which you have erred} [Al-Aĥzāb: 5].

This is like what is narrated about two men, one of whom loved the other. The beloved fell into the sea, and the other threw himself in after him. [The beloved] said: 'I fell in, but what made you fall in?' He replied: 'I became absent from myself through you, so I thought you were me.' This state afflicts many people of love and spiritual will, whether concerning the Truth or otherwise. Even if it contains deficiency and error, one becomes absent through his beloved from his own love and from himself; absent through the One remembered from his remembrance; absent through the One known from his recognition; absent through the One witnessed from his witnessing; and absent through the One Existent from his own existence. At that point, he does not perceive distinction, nor his own existence. He might say in this state: 'I am the Truth,' or 'Glory be to Me,' or 'There is nothing in this cloak but Allāh,' and the like, while he is intoxicated by the ecstasy of love, which is pleasure and joy without discernment. Such an intoxicated person's state is 'folded away and not narrated', provided his intoxication was not due to a forbidden cause. However, if the cause was forbidden, the intoxicated person is not excused.

As for the proponents of Ĥulūl, among them are those who are overcome by the heart's witnessing and its manifestation to the point that they imagine they have seen Allāh with their physical eyes. This is why a group of upright worshippers mentioned this, mistakenly on their part. It is established in Ṣaĥīĥ Muslim from An-Nawwās ibn Sam'ān: That the Prophet (peace be upon him), when mentioning the Dajjāl and his claim to lordship, said: 'And know that none of you will ever see his Lord until he dies.' This meaning is narrated from the Prophet (peace be upon him) through other numerous, sound chains regarding the ḥadīth of the Dajjāl. For when he [the Dajjāl] claimed lordship, the Prophet (peace be upon him) mentioned two clear distinguishing signs apparent to everyone. First: that he is one-eyed, and Allāh is not one-eyed. Second: that none

of us will ever see his Lord until he dies. He only mentioned this regarding the Dajjāl, despite his being a disbeliever, because of the extraordinary feats that will appear through him, which strengthen the doubt in the hearts of the common people.



**When The Doctrine Of Specific Ittiḥād Is Known From What Resembles Ḥulūl And Ittiḥād In Which There Is Some Element Of Truth, What Is Contained Within The Absolute [Ittiḥād] Regarding That Also Becomes Clear**

So, when specific Ittiḥād is understood from that which resembles Ḥulūl or Ittiḥād containing some element of truth, what is contained within the absolute [Ittiḥād] regarding that also becomes clear.

We say: There is no doubt that Allāh is the Lord of the worlds, Lord of the heavens and the earths and what is between them, Lord of the Mighty Throne, Lord of the East and the West, there is no god but Him, so take Him as Disposer of affairs, your Lord and the Lord of your first forefathers, Lord of mankind, King of mankind, God of mankind. He is the Creator of all things, and He is, over all things, Disposer of affairs. He created the two mates, the male and the female, from a sperm-drop when it is emitted. He is the Lord of all things and their Sovereign. He is the Owner of Dominion; He gives dominion to whom He wills and takes dominion away from whom He wills. He honors whom He wills and humiliates whom He wills. In His hand is [all] good. And He is over all things competent. To Him belongs whatever is in the heavens and whatever is on the earth and whatever is between them and whatever is beneath the soil. The Most Merciful [who is] above the Throne established. To Him belongs dominion, and to Him belongs praise, and He is over all things competent. {There is no creature except that He holds its forelock. Indeed, my Lord is on a straight path} [Hūd: 56]. The hearts of the servants and their forelocks are in His hand. There is no heart except that it is between two fingers of the Most Merciful; if He wills to make it upright, He makes it upright, and if He wills to make it deviate, He makes it deviate. He is the One who makes [one] laugh and weep, and makes [one] wealthy and content. He is the One who sends the winds as good tidings before His mercy and sends down rain from the sky, giving life thereby to the earth after its lifelessness, and dispersing therein every [kind of] moving creature. He is {the One Who created the heavens and the earth and made the darkness and the light. Then those who disbelieve equate [others] with their Lord} [Al-An'ām: 1]. {So whoever Allāh wants to guide—He expands his breast to [contain] Islam; and whoever He wants to misguide—He makes his breast tight and constricted as though he were climbing into the sky. Thus does Allāh place defilement upon those who do not believe} [Al-An'ām: 125]. {And He is Allāh; there is no deity except Him. To Him is due praise in the first [life] and the Hereafter. And His is

the command, and to Him you will be returned} [Al-Qaṣaʿ: 70]. He is the Ever-Living, the Self-Subsisting Sustainer of all, whom neither drowsiness overtakes nor sleep. He is the Maintainer of justice, the One Sustaining every soul for what it has earned, the Creator, the Inventor, the Fashioner. {And there is no creature on earth but that upon Allāh is its provision} [Hūd: 6]. What Allāh wills [happens]; there is no power except by Allāh. So what Allāh wills, is, and what He does not will, is not. And there is no might nor power except by Allāh. And there is no refuge from Him except to Him.

These meanings and what resembles them from the meanings of His Lordship, His dominion, His creation, His provision, His guidance, His aid, His benevolence, His kindness, His management, and His making; then what is connected to that, such as His being All-Knowing of everything and All-Powerful over everything, and His being All-Hearing, All-Seeing—no hearing distracts Him from another hearing, nor do requests confuse Him, nor does He weary of the insistence of those who insist. He sees the crawling of the black ant on a smooth rock in a pitch-dark night. All of this is true. It is the pure monotheism of Lordship.

Along with this, He {gave each thing its form and then guided [it]} [Ṭā-Hā: 50] and {perfected everything He created} [As-Sajdah: 7] and {began the creation of man from clay} [As-Sajdah: 7]. {This is the workmanship of Allāh, who perfected all things} [An-Naml: 88]. All good is in His two Hands. He is the Most Merciful of the merciful. He is more merciful to His servants than a mother is to her child, as the Prophet (peace be upon him) swore to that, saying: {By Allāh, Allāh is indeed more merciful to His servants than this mother is to her child.} [This points] towards these meanings which necessitate the comprehensiveness of His wisdom, His perfection, His benevolence in the creation of everything, the vastness of His mercy and its greatness, and that it precedes His anger. All of this is true.

These two fundamental principles—the universality of His creation and Lordship, and the universality of His benevolence and wisdom—are two immense principles. Even though among people are those who disbelieve in part of the first, like the Qadariyyah who exclude the actions of servants from His creation and attribute them purely to the action of one possessing choice, or the Naturalists who sever the attribution of action to Allāh, Glorified is He, and attribute it either to nature, or to a body possessing nature, or to a celestial sphere, or to a soul, or other such things from His creation which are incapable of sustaining themselves, let alone sustaining others. And among people are those who reject part of the second [principle], or turn away from it, imagining some of His creation to be devoid of His benevolent creation and perfection, and devoid of His wisdom, and thinking His mercy is deficient and incapable—[these are] from the Iblisi or Majūsi Qadariyyah and others.

Since this is the case, all existent beings are signs for Him, witnessing, indicating, and manifesting what He is deserving of from the Most Beautiful Names and the Lofty Attributes. And based on the requirements of His names and attributes, He created the existent beings. For the womb is a derivative from the Most Merciful; He created the womb and derived its name from His name. He is the Provider, Owner of Power, the Firm, who provides for whom He wills without account. He is the Guide, the Helper, who guides whom He wills to a straight path and gives victory to His messengers and those who believe in the life of this

world and on the Day when the witnesses will stand forth. He is the Wise, the Knowing, the Merciful, who has manifested from the effects of His knowledge, wisdom, and mercy that which none can enumerate except Him.

So He is the Lord of the worlds, and the worlds are filled with the effects of His names and attributes contained within them. {And there is not a thing except that it exalts [Allāh] by His praise, but you do not understand their [way of] exalting} [Al-Isrā': 44]. Among people are those who perceive the indication and testimony within them through knowledge and recognition. And whoever Allāh opens his hearing for, hears the echoing praise of the mountains and the birds, and knows the speech of the birds.

If His appearance and manifestation are interpreted according to this meaning [i.e., seeing His signs and effects in creation], then this is correct. However, the terms 'appearance' and 'manifestation' contain ambiguity, as we shall clarify, Allāh willing. And if the speaker says: 'I saw nothing except that I saw Allāh before it'—because He is its Lord, and the Lord precedes the servant; or 'I saw Allāh after it'—because it is His sign, evidence, and witness, and knowledge of the signified comes after the signifier; or 'I saw Allāh in it'—in the sense of the appearance of the effects of the Maker in His creation—then this is correct. Indeed, the entire Qur'ān clarifies this and indicates it. It is the religion of the Messengers and the way of those upon whom Allāh has bestowed favor from among the Prophets, the truthful, the martyrs, and the righteous. It is the creed of the Muslims, the People of the Sunnah and the Community, and those who fall under them from the people of knowledge and faith, possessors of recognition and certainty, the pious friends of Allāh.



## Regarding Error In That [Matter]

Then, indeed, many of the people who turn towards Allāh, when they devote themselves to His remembrance, worship, and turning repentantly to Him, witness with their hearts this encompassing Lordship and this general surrounding—for He encompasses all things. He, Glorified is He, is the Truth who created the heavens and the earth, and {Among His signs is that the heaven and the earth stand by His command} [Ar-Rūm: 25]. {And the sun, the moon, and the stars are subjected by His command. Unquestionably, His is the creation and the command} [Al-A'rāf: 54]. {He did not create the heavens and the earth and what is between them except in truth} [Al-Aḥqāf: 54]. He, Glorified is He, is the Light of the heavens and the earth. {Allāh is the Light of the heavens and the earth. The example of His light is like a niche wherein is a lamp...} [An-Nūr: 35]. He, Glorified is He, with Him there is no night and no day. The light of the heavens is from the light of His Face. Thus said 'Abdullāh ibn Mas'ūd: 'He does not sleep, nor is it befitting for Him to sleep. He lowers the Scale and raises it. The deeds of the night are raised to Him before the deeds of the day, and the deeds of the day before the deeds of the night. His veil is Light or Fire. Were He to remove it, the splendors of His Face would burn everything His sight perceives of His creation.' Thus said the Prophet (peace be upon him) in the ḥadīth agreed upon [by Al-Bukhārī and Muslim] from Abū Mūsā.

So the servant may witness the common factor among created things, which is the existing truth within them that encompasses them, and he may think that it is the Creator, due to its correspondence with Him in a type of generality, whereas it is only His making and His creation. Then he may ascend to a veil from His veils of light or fire and think that it is Him. Then he may ascend to His light and what appears of the effects of His attributes. Thus, some of these individuals may fall into something resembling the doctrine of absolute, general Ittīhād. If Allāh overtakes them with His mercy, such that they hold fast to the rope of Allāh and follow the guidance of Allāh, they come to know that all of this is created by Allāh, that the Creator is not the creation, and that all of them are servants of Allāh. Perhaps this occurs in a type of annihilation or intoxication, in which case one is mistaken, although that may be forgiven him if it was due to a cause that was not forbidden, just as we mentioned its counterpart regarding specific Ittīhād.



## Just As Lordship Bears Witness, So Does General Divinity

And just as one witnesses His Lordship, His encompassing management of the world, His wisdom, and His mercy, likewise one witnesses His general Divinity. For He is {the One Who in the heaven is God and on the earth is God} [Az-Zukhruf: 84]—God in the heaven and God on the earth. {Whoever is within the heavens and earth asks Him; every day He is bringing about a matter} [Ar-Raḥmān: 29]. Likewise His saying: {And He is Allāh, [the only deity] in the heavens and on the earth} [Al-Anʿām: 3]—according to one of the two views, based on the reading of one who pauses at the phrase {and on the earth}. For the meaning is: He is Allāh in the heavens, and He is Allāh on the earth; there is none in them who is Allāh besides Him. Although this resembles His saying: {And He is the One Who in the heaven is God and on the earth is God} [Az-Zukhruf: 84], it is more emphatic than it. Similar to it is His saying: {Had there been within them [i.e., heaven and earth] gods besides Allāh, they both would have been ruined} [Al-Anbiyāʾ: 22]. And He has said: {And His is the loftiest description in the heavens and the earth. And He is the Exalted in Might, the Wise} [Ar-Rūm: 27]. And the Exalted said: {The seven heavens and the earth and whatever is within them exalt Him. And there is not a thing except that it exalts [Allāh] by His praise, but you do not understand their [way of] exalting} [Al-Isrāʾ: 44]. And He said: {So is it other than the religion of Allāh they desire, while to Him have submitted [all] those within the heavens and earth, willingly or by compulsion, and to Him they will be returned?} [Āl ʿImrān: 83]. And the saying of the Exalted: {And to Allāh prostrates whoever is within the heavens and the earth, willingly or by compulsion, and their shadows [as well] in the mornings and the afternoons} [Ar-Raʿd: 15]. And His saying: {Do you not see that to Allāh prostrates whoever is in the heavens and whoever is on the earth and the sun, the moon, the stars, the mountains, the trees, the moving creatures, and many of the people?} [Al-Ḥajj: 18]. And the saying of the Exalted: {And to Him belongs whoever is in the heavens and the earth. All are devoutly obedient to Him} [Ar-Rūm: 26]. {And He is the One Who begins creation; then He repeats it, and that is easier for Him. And His is the loftiest description in the heavens and the earth} [Ar-Rūm: 27]. And His saying: {Whatever is in the heavens and whatever is on the earth exalts Allāh, and He is the Exalted in Might, the Wise} [Al-Ḥadid: 1, Aṣ-Ṣāff: 1]. {Whatever is in the heavens and whatever is on the earth exalts Allāh, the Sovereign, the Pure, the Exalted in Might, the Wise} [Al-Jumuʿah: 1, At-Taghābun: 1].

And similar meanings related to His Divinity, the submission and surrender of created beings to Him, their neediness towards Him, their asking Him, and the supplication of creation to Him—whether it be the supplication of worship or

the supplication of asking, or both together. Even one who turns away from Him in times of choice, {when adversity touches you at sea, lost are [all] those you invoke except for Him} [Al-Isrā': 67]. {Is He [not best] who responds to the desperate one when he calls upon Him} [An-Naml: 62].

We testify that every object of worship besides Him, from His Throne down to the depths of His earth, is indeed false, except His Noble Face. Just as we testify that all of them are utterly dependent on Him for their beginning, we testify that they are utterly dependent on Him for their end; otherwise, they would be false.

So these meanings, wherein lies the turning of created beings to Him as God and their attachment to Him, and the former meanings, wherein lies His Lordship over them and His creation of them, necessitate knowing that He is the Lord of mankind, the King of mankind, the God of mankind, and that He is the Lord of the worlds, there is no god but Him. Created beings possess nothing from themselves; rather, they are pure non-existence and sheer negation. Whatever existence they possess is from Him and through Him. Then, indeed, to Him is their destination and their return. He is their object of worship and their God. It is not right that any should be worshipped except Him, just as none created them except Him, due to what He inherently deserves and uniquely possesses of the attributes of Divinity, in which He has no partner, nor equal, and {There is nothing like unto Him} [Ash-Shūrā: 11].

Thus, He is the First, before Whom there is nothing; He is the Last, after Whom there is nothing; He is the Manifest, above Whom there is nothing; and He is the Hidden, beyond Whom [or closer than whom] there is nothing. He is with us wherever we are. We know that His accompaniment with His servants is of various types, and they are in degrees regarding it. Likewise is His Lordship over them, and their servitude by which they are subjected to Him. Likewise is their turning to Him as God, His Divinity to them, and their worship by which they are worshippers. Likewise is His nearness to them and their nearness to Him.



## The Exposition Of Pure Falsehood In Ĥulūl And Ittiḥād

So this concerns what resembles Ittiḥād or Ĥulūl in a specific individual, like a prophet or a righteous man, and the like. We have explained what it contains of pure truth and what it contains of truth mixed with falsehood. We shall explain, Allāh willing, what it contains of pure falsehood.

This category [resemblance in a specific person] only occurs concerning one who worships Allāh, Glorified is He, and takes Him as an ally, or is thought to do so. For it is through that [worship and allegiance] that the Divinity of Allāh appears in His servant, and the servant's turning in repentance to his Lord and his alignment with Him in His love, pleasure, command, and prohibition appear.

Another category may be confused with this: namely, the effects of His Lordship that the Lord manifests in some of His servants, even if that [manifestation] is not something commanded, nor is it worship of Him. Examples include the dominion and authority He grants to some ruling kings, who may be Muslim or may not be, like Fir'awn and Jinkishān [Genghis Khan] and their ilk; the provision and wealth He bestows upon some of His servants; the beauty He portions out to some of His servants, male and female. Likewise, the knowledge and recognition He bestows, or the spiritual states He grants, or the extraordinary feats He gives, consisting of types of unveilings and influences, whether these [recipients] are believers or disbelievers, like the one-eyed Dajjāl and his like.

For in this [second] category, more effects of Lordship and rulings of power appear in the specific servant than appear in others, just as in the first category, more effects of Divinity and rulings of the Sacred Law appear than appear in others. The two categories may combine in one servant, as they combine in the angels, the prophets, and the saints, such as our Prophet (peace be upon him), the Messiah son of Maryam, and others.

This [second] category alone pertains to the rulings of the cosmic words, just as the first category pertains to the rulings of the religious words. For events only occur by the will and power of Allāh. The Prophet (peace be upon him) used to seek refuge, take refuge, and command seeking refuge in the perfect words of Allāh, which no righteous person nor wicked person can transgress. Thus, the words by which Allāh brought the created beings into existence, no righteous or wicked person exits from their scope. So there is no dominion, authority, wealth, beauty, knowledge, state, unveiling, or influence except that it is by His will, His power, and His perfect words. However, some of that is beloved to Allāh and commanded, and some of it is hated by Allāh and forbidden; rather, [some is] permitted or pardoned.

Since it occurs by the will of Allāh, His power, and His word, and none other than Him has power over that, and it is attributed to Allāh from the perspective of His Lordship and dominion, there exists between it and the first category [alignment through worship] a commonality and resemblance that caused some groups to err regarding the command of Allāh, making it one and the same in both categories. Indeed, they also erred regarding the Lord Himself, equating some of the subjected servants from the second category with some of the worshipping servants from the first category. They entered into [belief in] union and indwelling from this angle, to the point that some worshipped Fir'awn and the Dajjāl, while others worshipped beautiful forms and the like, claiming these are manifestations of beauty. These people disbelieved sometimes in the acts of worship and faith, and at other times in the One Worshipped.

Since the purpose here is to explain the truth concerning that, or what contains truth, we have mentioned this. As for the first point [of clarification]: Allāh, Glorified is He, has differentiated through the Qur'ān and through faith between His religious command and His cosmic creation. For Allāh, Glorified is He, is the Creator of all things, the Lord of all things, and the Sovereign of all things—equal in that are essences, their attributes, and their actions. What Allāh wills, is, and what He does not will, is not. Nothing exits from His will, and nothing comes into being except by His will. The Majūsi Qadariyyah from this Ummah and others have denied parts of this, being those who claim that Allāh did not create the actions of His servants—angels, jinn, humans, and animals—nor does He have the power to do more good for His servants than He has done for them; indeed, [they claim He does not even have power] over their actions. So [according to them] He is not powerful over all things. Or [they claim] that whatever sins occur, happen contrary to His will and intent. They are misguided innovators, opposing the Book, the Sunnah, the consensus of the predecessors of the Ummah, and what is known through reason and spiritual experience.

Then, opposing them were a people worse than them: the Mushrikiyyah Qadariyyah, who saw that actions occur by His will and power, so they said: {Had Allāh willed, we would not have associated partners [with Him], nor would our fathers, nor would we have forbidden anything} [Al-An'ām: 148]. [They argue that] if Allāh hated something, He would have removed it; nothing exists in the world except what Allāh loves and is pleased with; there is no such thing as a sinner; 'I disbelieve in a Lord who is disobeyed'; and even if this person disobeyed the command, he has obeyed the will. They might argue using compulsion, making the servant compelled, and the compelled is excused, and the action belongs to Allāh therein, not to him, so there is no blame on him.

These people are disbelievers in the books of Allāh and His messengers, and in the command of Allāh and His prohibition, His reward and His punishment, His promise and His threat, His religion and His law—a disbelief in which there is no doubt. They are greater disbelievers than the Jews and Christians, indeed, greater disbelievers than the Sabians and -Barāhimah who affirm rational governance. For these [Jabriyyah] disbelieve in divine religions and laws, and in rational signs and governance. As for the first group [Qadariyyah Majūsiyyah], declaring them disbelievers involves details for which this is not the place.

These [Jabriyyah] are enemies of Allāh and enemies of all His messengers,

indeed, enemies of all rational human beings, nay, enemies of their own selves. For this position is one that no one can consistently maintain or act upon for even an hour of time, as its consequence is that one does not repel the oppression of an oppressor, nor punish an aggressor, nor punish a wrongdoer, neither with the like of his wrongdoing nor with more than it. Most of these people only allude to this [doctrine] when it suits their own desires, to lift blame from themselves. Otherwise, if this [logic] is applied to them by someone else, they confront him, fight him, and transgress against him too, stopping at no limit and showing no regard for kinship or covenant concerning a believer. Rather, they are as Allāh said: {and man undertook it. Indeed, he was unjust and ignorant} [Al-Aḥzāb: 72]—oppressors, ignorant ones, like predatory beasts, acting according to pure whims and deflecting blame and censure from themselves, or [avoiding] what is obligatory upon them like commanding good and forbidding evil, by [invoking] false compulsion and by observing the executed decree, while turning away from the command and prohibition. They do not act similarly towards one who transgresses against them, oppresses them, or harms them; nor even towards one who falls short in [fulfilling] their rights; nor even towards one who obeys Allāh by commanding what Allāh commanded and forbidding what Allāh forbade. I have elaborated on these Qadariyyah and the first group, and mentioned the Iblisi Qadariyyah elsewhere. The purpose here is only to point out the loci of the positions.

Allāh has differentiated in His Book between the two categories: between fulfilling His cosmic words and following His religious words. This [distinction applies] in His command, His will, His decree, His judgment, His permission, His sending, and His sending forth.

He said regarding the religious, legislative command: {Indeed, Allāh commands justice, good conduct, and giving to relatives...} [An-Nāḥl: 90]; {Indeed, Allāh commands you to render trusts to whom they are due...} [An-Nisā': 58]; {Indeed, Allāh commands you to slaughter a cow} [Al-Baqarah: 67].

And He said regarding the cosmic, decretive command: {His command is only when He intends a thing that He says to it, 'Be,' and it is} [Yā-Sīn: 82]; {The command of Allāh has come, so be not impatient for it} [An-Nāḥl: 1]. Likewise His saying: {And when We intend to destroy a city, We command its affluent but they defiantly disobey therein} [Al-Isrā': 16], according to one of the interpretations.

And He said regarding the religious, legislative will: {Allāh intends for you ease and does not intend for you hardship} [Al-Baqarah: 185]; {Allāh wants to make clear to you [the lawful from the unlawful] and guide you to the ways of those before you and accept your repentance} [An-Nisā': 26]; {Allāh does not intend to make difficulty for you} [Al-Mā'idah: 6].

And He said regarding the cosmic, decretive will: {So whoever Allāh wants to guide—He expands his breast to [contain] Islam; and whoever He wants to misguide—He makes his breast tight and constricted} [Al-An'ām: 125]; {And my advice will not benefit you—although I wished to advise you—if Allāh should intend to put you in error} [Hūd: 34]; {Those are the ones for whom Allāh does not intend to purify their hearts} [Al-Mā'idah: 41].

Through this combination and differentiation, the ambiguity regarding the issue of the legislative command—whether it necessitates the cosmic will or

not—is removed. For the sound position is that it does not necessitate the cosmic, decretive will, even though it necessitates the religious, legislative will.

And He said regarding religious permission: {Whatever you have cut down of [their] palm trees or left standing on their roots—it was by permission of Allāh} [Al-Ĥashr: 5].

And He said regarding cosmic permission: {...but they do not harm anyone with it except by permission of Allāh} [Al-Baqarah: 102].

And He said regarding the religious decree: {And your Lord has decreed that you not worship except Him} [Al-Isrā': 23]—meaning, your Lord commanded that.

And He said regarding the cosmic decree: {And He completed them as seven heavens within two days} [Fuṣṣilat: 12].

And He said regarding the religious judgment: {O you who have believed, fulfill [all] contracts. Lawful for you are the animals of grazing livestock except for that which is recited to you [in prohibition]—hunting not being permitted while you are in the state of iḥrām. Indeed, Allāh judges what He intends} [Al-Mā'idah: 1]; And He said: {That is the judgment of Allāh; He judges between you} [Al-Mumtaḥanah: 10]; And He said: {Then is it the judgment of [the time of] ignorance they desire? But who is better than Allāh in judgment for a people who are certain [in faith]?} [Al-Mā'idah: 50].

And He said regarding the cosmic judgment: {'So I will never leave [this] land until my father permits me or Allāh decides for me, and He is the best of judges'} [Yūsuf: 80]. The two judgments may be combined, such as in His saying: {Legislation is not but for Allāh} [Al-An'ām: 57, Yūsuf: 40, 67]. Likewise His action: {And Allāh judges with truth} [Ghāfir: 20].

And He said regarding the two types of sending and sending forth: {It is He who has sent among the unlettered a Messenger from themselves} [Al-Jumu'ah: 2]; {We sent against you servants of Ours—those of great military might} [Al-Isrā': 5]. And His saying: {Indeed, We have sent you as a witness and a bringer of good tidings and a warner} [Al-Faḥ: 8]; {We have already sent Our messengers with clear evidences} [Al-Ĥadīd: 25]. And He has said: {Do you not see that We have sent the devils upon the disbelievers, inciting them forcefully [to sin]?} [Maryam: 83]. And He said: {And We have sent the fertilizing winds} [Al-Ĥijr: 22].



## How The Disbelief Of The Proponents Of Ĥulūl And Ittiḥād Regarding The Object Of Worship Leads Them To Worship Some Created Beings Based On The Specious Argument Of Ĥulūl And Ittiḥād

As for their disbelief regarding the Object of Worship: If they have a desire for some created beings, they may worship them based on the specious argument of corrupt Ĥulūl or Ittiḥād. For example, those who worship beautiful forms, saying, ‘This is a manifestation of beauty,’ or [worship] the obeyed, tyrannical king, saying, ‘He is a manifestation of majesty,’ or ‘a lordly manifestation,’ and the like. Yet, there is no type of true Ittiḥād or Ĥulūl in these created beings. However, it resembles that in which there is truth from one angle, as both [types of phenomena] are by Allāh and from Allāh, and belong to Allāh. This is why the proponents of absolute Ĥulūl and Ittiḥād equate the two, as we shall explain, Allāh willing.

So these proponents of specific Ittiḥādiyyah and Ĥulūliyyah—who specify it to certain created things in which there is no [true] worship or reward—are merely an offshoot of those [other groups]. They possess nothing of the truth, nor even a semblance of truth like those others possess [in the form of] ambiguous words from some prophets and righteous people. Rather, these ones possess the saying of Fir’awn: {I am your lord, the most high} [An-Nāzi’āt: 24] and {I have not known you to have a god other than me} [Al-Qaṣaṣ: 38], and the saying of the Dajjāl: ‘I am your lord,’ and the like. So these words they possess are from the words of the disbelievers and hypocrites. They also possess the confusion of cosmic realities with religious matters. And cosmic realities are general, having no specificity. This is why these individuals are more deeply involved in absolute Ĥulūl and Ittiḥād than in specific [union], in terms of belief and speech, even if, from the perspective of spiritual state and desire, they specify certain entities—as actually happens—due to the specious argument of its being distinguished by some cosmic rulings. We shall discuss them, Allāh willing, under [the topic of] corrupt indwelling. I have only mentioned them here because I wanted to mention everything that has a tinge of union or indwelling related to truth. So I have drawn attention to that so that the locus of their misguidance may be understood.

When the reality of these matters is known, the reality of {the saying of the Prophet (peace be upon him): ‘The truest word spoken by a poet is the word of Labīd: Lo! Everything besides Allāh is falsehood’} is known. For falsehood is the opposite of truth, and Allāh is the Manifest Truth. Truth has two meanings: First, the existent, established. Second, the intended, beneficial, like the saying of the

Prophet: {The Witr [prayer] is a right/truth}..

Falsehood is also of two types:

1. First, the non-existent. When something is non-existent, the belief in its existence and reporting its existence are false, because the belief and report follow the object believed in and reported about; they are sound if it is sound and false if it is false. So if the object believed in and reported about is false, the belief and report are likewise false, which is lying.

2. Second, that which is not beneficial or useful, like His saying, Exalted is He: {And We did not create the heaven and the earth and what is between them aimlessly} [Ŝād: 27], and like the saying of the Prophet: {Every amusement a man engages in is falsehood, except his shooting with his bow, his training of his horse, and his playing with his wife, for these are from the truth}. And his saying about 'Umar: {Indeed, this is a man who does not love falsehood}. That which has no benefit in it—commanding it is false, intending it is false, and acting upon it is false; since acting upon it, intending it, and commanding it are false. From this is the saying of the scholars: Acts of worship and contracts are divided into sound and invalid. The sound is that upon which its effect follows and by which its objective is achieved. The invalid is that upon which its effect does not follow and by which its objective is not achieved. This is why the deeds of the disbelievers are invalid. For the disbeliever, by virtue of being a disbeliever, believes in what has no existence and reports about it, so that is false; and he worships what whose worship does not benefit him, acts for it, and commands it, so that is also false. However, since they have actions and sayings, they come to resemble the people of truth. Therefore, Allāh the Exalted said: {But those who disbelieve—their deeds are like a mirage in a lowland which a thirsty one thinks is water until, when he comes to it, he finds it is nothing but finds Allāh before Him, and He will pay him in full his due; and Allāh is swift in account} [An-Nūr: 39]. And the Exalted said: {Those who disbelieve and avert [people] from the way of Allāh—He will waste their deeds. And those who believe and do righteous deeds and believe in what has been sent down to Muḥammad—and it is the truth from their Lord—He will remove from them their misdeeds and amend their condition. That is because those who disbelieve follow falsehood, and those who believe follow the truth from their Lord. Thus does Allāh present to the people their comparisons} [Muḥammad: 1-3]... up to His saying: {...and do not invalidate your deeds} [Muḥammad: 33]. And He said: {And We will regard what they have done of deeds and make them as dust dispersed} [Al-Furqān: 23]. And the Exalted said: {Do not invalidate your charities with reminders [of it] or injury as does one who spends his wealth only to be seen by the people and does not believe in Allāh and the Last Day. His example is like that of a smooth rock upon which is dust and is hit by a downpour that leaves it bare. They are unable [to keep] anything of what they have earned} [Al-Baqarah: 264]. So He explained that reminding [of charity] and injury invalidate the charity, making it false, not truth, just as showing off and lack of faith invalidate spending as well. He made it general with His saying: {and do not invalidate your deeds}, meaning, do not make them false, having no benefit, reward, or use.

A group of people, including proponents of Ittiḥādiyyah and others like Ibn

'Arabī, have erred. They considered that truth is simply the existent, so every existent thing is truth. They said: 'There is no falsehood in the world, since there is no non-existence in the world.' They said: 'Disbelief is merely the non-existence of a partner, for example.' They were only led astray by the ambiguous term. For a thing has two levels: a level considering its essence—it is either existent, thus being truth, or non-existent, thus being falsehood. And a level considering its existence in minds, tongues, and fingertips [writing], which is knowledge, speech, and writing. Belief, report, and writing are matters that follow the thing itself. If they correspond and agree [with the thing], they are truth; otherwise, they are falsehood. So if we report about the existent truth that it is existent truth, and about the non-existent falsehood that it is non-existent falsehood, the report and belief are truth. If it is the opposite, it is falsehood, even though the report and belief are existing matters. So its being truth or falsehood is in consideration of its reality being reported about, not in consideration of itself. It is not permissible to absolutely state that it is truth merely because it exists, except with a context clarifying the intent. Likewise, action, intent, and command are only truth in consideration of their intended reality. If it is achieved and is beneficial, it is truth. If it is not achieved, or what is achieved has no benefit, it is falsehood. Based on these two considerations, there comes to be in existence that which is falsehood, as indicated by the Book, the Sunnah, and consensus, along with what agrees with that from reason, spiritual experience, and unveiling—contrary to the claim of this misguided, misleading group. Allāh the Exalted said: {He sends down from the sky, rain, and valleys flow according to their capacity, and the torrent carries a rising foam. And from that [ore] which they heat in the fire, desiring adornments and utensils, is a foam like it. Thus Allāh presents [the example of] truth and falsehood. As for the foam, it vanishes, [being] cast off; but as for that which benefits the people, it remains on the earth. Thus does Allāh present examples} [Ar-Ra'd: 17]. He likened what descends from the sky upon the hearts—of faith and Qur'ān—which then mixes with misleading doubts and desires, to the rain whose torrent carries foam, and to gold, silver, iron, etc., when melted by fire, carrying foam which [the fire] casts far from the heart [metal]. He made that foam the example of that falsehood which has no benefit. As for what benefits people from water and minerals, it is like the beneficial truth, which settles and remains in the heart. His saying, Exalted is He, has already been mentioned: {Those who disbelieve and avert [people] from the way of Allāh—He will waste their deeds...} up to His saying: {... That is because those who disbelieve follow falsehood, and those who believe follow the truth from their Lord. Thus does Allāh present to the people their comparisons} [Muḥammad: 1-3]. So He, Glorified is He, informed that the reason for wasting the deeds of those who disbelieved, such that they did not benefit them, and [the reason] that the deeds of those who believed benefited them, expiating their sins and Allāh amending their condition, is that the former followed falsehood in word and deed, belief and practice, report and command, while the latter followed the truth from their Lord, and did not follow what was from other than their Lord, even if it were true in some aspect. This confirms what we have said: the report and action follow the object reported about and the object intended by the action. If that [object] is false, having no reality, the follower is likewise [false], even if it exists. Likewise, what was mentioned previously of His saying: {Do not invalidate your charities...} [Al-Baqarah: 264] and His saying: {and do not invalidate your deeds} [Muḥammad: 33], and similar

instances of invalidating what has passed and existed—it is only non-existence due to the lack of its benefit, not the non-existence of its essence. For its essence has passed, just as deeds that were not invalidated have passed. So how can it be said: ‘There is no falsehood in existence’? Then they make this a pretext for [claiming] that the existent entity, which contains truth and falsehood, is the entity of Allāh, because He is the Truth, and they do not distinguish between the Creator-Truth and the created-truth? So ponder how such speech encompasses these two false premises! And how they caused the minds of the weak to slip with this specious argument! They said: His saying ‘Lo! Everything besides Allāh is falsehood’ [means] falsehood is the non-existent, so everything besides Allāh is non-existent. The existent is not non-existent. Therefore, the existent contains nothing ‘other’; the ‘other’ is only non-existence. This is built upon the two false premises. First: Their saying that falsehood is the non-existent. It is not so; rather, the non-existent is false, but not every existent thing is [prevented from being] false. Rather, within the existent is that which is truth and that which is false, as mentioned before: namely, actions that do not benefit, reports that are not true, and what falls under these two, such as intentions and beliefs. Second: Even if there were no falsehood except the non-existent, then the existent would be truth, and every existent thing might be called truth with an explanatory context, considering its existence, even if it is false due to the absence of its [true beneficial] reality by which the term ‘truth’ could be applied to it. However, truth is of two types: Creator-Truth and created-truth.

Indeed, the Prophet (peace be upon him), in the ḥadīth agreed upon [by Al-Bukhārī and Muslim] narrated by Ibn ‘Abbās, used to say when he stood up at night: {O Allāh, to You is praise; You are the Lord of the heavens and the earth and whoever is in them. To You is praise; You are the Light of the heavens and the earth and whoever is in them. To You is praise; You are the Sustainer of the heavens and the earth and whoever is in them. You are the Truth, Your word is truth, Your promise is truth, Paradise is truth, Hellfire is truth, the Prophets are truth, and Muḥammad is truth. O Allāh, to You I submit, in You I believe, upon You I rely, to You I turn in repentance, by You I argue, and to You I seek judgment}. When it becomes clear that there exists in reality that which is false, and among it is that which is truth from Allāh’s creation but is not Allāh Himself, their obfuscation becomes apparent in their saying: ‘Falsehood is the ‘other’, which is non-existence; as for the existent, it is He.’ Furthermore, the ḥadīth itself is evidence against them. For his saying: ‘Lo! Everything besides Allāh is falsehood’ is a general expression that includes every existent thing besides Allāh. For the word ‘thing’ universally includes everything existent, by agreement. It also includes what has mental, verbal, or written/drawn existence, even if it lacks real existence, such as non-existent and impossible things. So this is a clear text that many existent things are false. It is not permissible to intend by it: ‘Every non-existent thing, besides Allāh, is false,’ for five reasons:

1. He excluded Allāh the Exalted—Who is the Manifest Truth—from an affirmative statement. Such an exclusion indicates inclusion [of the excluded item in the original general term], unlike exclusion from a non-affirmative context, like His saying: {They have no knowledge of it except the following of assumption} [An-Nisā’: 157], for that does not indicate inclusion. If the meaning were: ‘Every non-existent thing, besides Allāh, is false,’ it would necessitate that the Truth, Exalted is He, is non-existent, and this is the falsest

of falsehoods.

2. 'Everything' is explicit text referring to existence; it is not permissible to restrict it to non-existent things, by agreement.

3. The non-existent does not enter into the term 'everything' according to the People of the Sunnah and the generality of rational people, let alone being exclusively referred to by it.

4. If the meaning were: 'Every non-existent thing is false,' this would be stating the obvious; indeed, the word 'non-existence' is more indicative of negation than the word 'falsehood'. So how can the clear be explained by the obscure?

5. Fifth: If he intended this, he would have said: 'Everything besides Allāh is false,' for this expression is closer to potentially meaning what these heretics intend than the actual wording, even though that expression also does not indicate their intended meaning.

Since the meaning of the ḥadīth is not what they claimed, it is known that everything besides Allāh is false according to the two aspects of falsehood whose explanation preceded.

First—which relates to the intended and beneficial. Falsehood is that which there is no benefit in intending. Everything besides Allāh—if it is the object of intention and action [for its own sake]—that [intention and action] is false, and commanding it is false. This resembles the state of the polytheists who used to worship other than Allāh, or worship Allāh without Allāh's command or His legislation. If it is said: 'Then the falsehood is the intention and action itself, not the entity intended.' I say: Rather, the intended entity itself is false in the aspect for which it was intended, as came in the ḥadīth: {I testify that every object of worship, from Your Throne down to the depths of Your earth, is false except Your Noble Face}. That is because if falsehood originally means non-existence, and non-existence is the negated, then a thing is negated due to the negation of its existence entirely, like His saying, Exalted is He: {He neither begets nor is born, nor is there to Him any equivalent} [Al-Ikhlāṣ: 3-4], and {There is nothing like unto Him} [Ash-Shūrā: 11], and His saying: {Allāh has not taken any son, nor has there ever been with Him any deity} [Al-Mu'minūn: 91], and His saying: {There is no god but Allāh}, and the saying of the Prophet (peace be upon him): {There is no prophet after me}. And it may be negated due to the negation of its benefit, its purpose, and its defining characteristic by which it is what it is, as we mentioned. For that in which there is no benefit is false, and the false is non-existent. This is like {his (peace be upon him) saying when asked about soothsayers: 'They are nothing'}. Related to this is the saying of Allāh, Exalted is He: {O People of the Scripture, you are [standing] on nothing until you uphold the Torah, the Gospel, and what has been revealed to you from your Lord} [Al-Mā'idah: 68]. And a thing may be negated due to the negation of its perfection and completeness, either absolutely or relative to something else, like the saying of the Prophet (peace be upon him): {The truly poor is not the one who goes around [begging] whom a morsel or two, or a date or two, suffices. Rather, the truly poor is the one who does not find sufficiency to make him self-sufficient, nor is he recognized so that charity may be given to him, nor does he ask people importunately}. Similar to that is his saying about the bankrupt and the childless. Examples of each of these three categories are numerous. So the thing intended for a purpose is false, negated, if its benefit and purpose are negated.

Thus, everything besides Allāh cannot rightfully be worshipped or sought for help. This intended meaning is negated from everything besides Allāh, so it is false. Everything besides Allāh cannot rightfully be an ultimate recourse intended, nor worshipped, and there is no benefit in intending it, nor utility in worshipping it or seeking its help: so it is false. This is clear. This is a preserved generality from which nothing is excluded. Its explanation is: Everything besides Allāh is either intended for its own sake or intended for the sake of something else. That which is intended for something else is like bread intended for eating, clothes for wearing, weapons for defense, and the like—namely, the tangible things Allāh created for the benefit of the children of Ādam. These are only intended for something else, not for their own essence. Likewise, wealth, by which benefit is sought or harm repelled, is only intended for something else, not for itself. Everything intended for something else—the truly intended object is that other thing. This [means] is desired for its sake, such that if that other thing, intended for itself, is achieved [all is well], otherwise this [means] becomes something with no use or benefit, falling into the category of falsehood which is negated, about which it is said: ‘It is nothing,’ and ‘It is false,’ and it is relegated to non-existence. Thus, it is established that if, in every intention, an object intended for its own sake is not achieved, it is false. And the object intended for its own sake, if it is not Allāh, is false. For the object intended for its own sake is the object of worship. Whoever worships other than Allāh, [his worship] is false, and his object of worship is false, because there is no benefit in it nor in its worship; rather, that is pure harm. Allāh the Exalted said: {He invokes one whose harm is nearer than his benefit} [Al-Ĥajj: 13]. This is general for every object of worship. This is the reality of religion. For Allāh only created creation for His worship alone, without partner, and He subjected to them what is in the heavens and what is on the earth so they may seek aid through it for His worship. So whoever does not seek aid through these things for His worship, all his work and intention is false, having no benefit, but rather containing harm. Thus, it is established that every intention and intended object besides Allāh is false, whether intended for itself or for something other than Allāh. The only truth is that Allāh be intended, or that which is used to seek aid for intending Allāh be intended. This is the verification of his saying: ‘Lo! Everything besides Allāh is falsehood’ according to one of the two aspects of truth and falsehood, which is its being intended and sought—and this is the more apparent of its two aspects.

Second: Everything besides Allāh is non-existent by itself; it possesses no existence, movement, action, or benefit for others from itself, as all of that is Allāh’s creation, origination, invention, and fashioning. So all things, if Allāh were to abandon them, would be false; His mere abandonment of them and His not sustaining them through His creation and provision would suffice for their non-existence and falsity. Since they are false in themselves—and truth belongs only to Allāh, is by Allāh, and is from Allāh—the speaker’s saying is true: ‘Lo! Everything besides Allāh is falsehood’ based on two considerations:

1. First: That His creation, according to this understanding, is not independent of Him, nor subsisting by other than Him, nor external to Him. So it is included under His name by way of dependency, not because it is part of the named entity. Often, things are included under a comprehensive name or general terms by way of dependency, not because they are part of the named entity. For example, if one said: ‘I sold you this horse,’ its shoe would

be included. If a speaker said: 'Zayd entered my house,' his clothes would be included under the ruling of his name. Likewise, if it is said: 'I carried Zayd,' or 'Zayd rode the animal.' If it is said: 'Banū Hāshim,' their freed slaves are included, due to his (peace be upon him) saying: {The mawlā (freed slave/ally) of a people is one of them}. Sometimes an ally or a sister's son might be included; this is well-known in the speech of the Arabs and the people of historical accounts (ahl al-maghāzi).

2. Second consideration: When the speaker says: 'The people came, mā khalā Zaydan (except Zayd),' 'khalā' here is a defective verb (fi'l nāqis) from the sisters of 'kāna,' and 'Zaydan' is in the accusative (manšūb) governed by it. It contains an implicit nominative pronoun (dāmīr marfū') referring back to 'mā,' the sister of 'alladhī,' which is the relative pronoun (al-mawšūlah). This clause is the relative clause (šilah) of 'mā.' The underlying meaning would be: 'The people came, those who are khalā Zaydan (excluding Zayd).' However, 'mā' can refer to singular, dual, or plural, and the pronoun refers back to its form more often than its meaning. Thus, saying: 'I saw mā ra'aytahu min ar-rijāl (what I saw of the men)' is better than saying: 'mā ra'aytuhum min ar-rijāl (what I saw them of the men).' And the structure: {And among them is he who listens to you (wa minhū man yastamī'u ilayk)} [Yūnus: 42, Muḥammad: 16] is more frequent and eloquent than saying: 'man yastamī'ūn (who listen [plural]).' For this reason, it became strong, so 'mā khalā Zaydan' stands in place of 'alladhī khalā (he who excluded),' 'alladhīna khalaw (those who excluded),' 'allātī khalawna (those [fem.] who excluded),' and the like. You say: 'The women stood, mā khalā Hindan (except Hind).' The word 'mā' either has a grammatical position (mawd') min al-'rāb), being a description (waṣf) of what precedes it, or accusative indicating state (naṣb 'alal-ḥāl), or it has no position. If the meaning is: 'Everything, in the state of its being devoid of Allāh (khalūwwihī 'an Allāh), is false,' or 'Everything that excluded Allāh (khalā Allāha) is false,' or 'All things, while being such that they excluded Allāh, or which excluded Allāh, are false'—then their 'excluding Allāh' (khalūwwuhā Allāha) might imply the meaning of their being empty of Him (khalūwwihā minhu). It is known that whenever they are empty of Him, meaning devoid of Him, they are false. Their subsistence is only by not being abandoned by Him, but rather being sustained by Him. And this...<sup>1</sup> in the original, besides other particles of exception.

And the origin of this meaning is intended from this...<sup>2</sup> in the saying of the Prophet (peace be upon him).

This Tawḥīd and its explanation mentioned regarding his saying: 'Lo! Everything besides Allāh is falsehood (bāṭil)' is similar to what is mentioned in His saying, Exalted is He: {Everything will perish except His Face (Kullu shay'in ḥālikun illā wajhahu)} [Al-Qaṣāṣ: 88], after His saying: {...so do not be an assistant to the disbelievers. And let them not avert you from the verses of Allāh after they have been revealed to you. And invite [people] to your Lord. And never be of the polytheists. And do not invoke with Allāh another deity. There is no deity except Him. Everything will perish except His Face. To Him belongs the judgment, and to Him you will be returned} [Al-Qaṣāṣ: 86-88]. Mentioning this after forbidding

<sup>1</sup> Blank space in the original text.

<sup>2</sup> Blank space in the original text.

polytheism (ash-shirk) and invoking another god with Him, and His saying: {There is no deity except Him (Lā ilāha illā huwa)}, necessitates the more apparent of the two interpretations, which is that everything will perish except what was for His Face/Sake (li-wajhihi)—entities, actions, and otherwise. It is narrated from Abū al-Āliyah, he said: 'Except what was intended for His Face/Sake (illā mā urida bihi wajhuhu).' And from Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq: 'Except His religion (illā dinahu).' Their meanings are one. It has been narrated from 'Ubādah ibn aṣ-Ṣāmit, he said: 'The world will be brought on the Day of Resurrection, and it will be said: Separate what was for Allāh from it. He said: So what was for Allāh from it will be separated, then the rest of it will be commanded [to be taken] and cast into the Fire.' It has been narrated from 'Alī what is general. In the Tafsīr of Ath-Tha'labī, from Ṣāliḥ ibn Muḥammad, from Sulaymān ibn 'Amr, from Sālim al-Afṭas, from Al-Ḥasan and Sa'īd ibn Jubayr, from 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib: 'A man asked him [for something], but he did not give him anything. So he said: I ask you by the Face of Allāh (bi-wajhillāh). 'Alī said to him: You lie! You did not ask me by the Face of Allāh. The Face of Allāh is only the Truth (al-Ḥaqq). Do you not see His saying: {Everything will perish except His Face}? Meaning the Truth. Rather, you asked me by your created face (bi-wajhika al-khalaq).' And from Mujāhid: 'Except Him (illā huwa).' And from Ad-Ḍaḥḥāk: 'Everything will perish except Allāh, Paradise, Hellfire, and the Throne.' And from Ibn Kaysān: 'Except His dominion (illā mulkahu).' That is because the word 'wajh' resembles, in origin, 'jihah' (direction), like 'wa'd' and 'idah' (promise), 'wazn' and 'zinah' (weight), 'wasl' and 'ṣilah' (connection), 'wasm' and 'simah' (mark). However, its [verbal noun form] fi'lāh has its fā' [first root letter] deleted, and it is more specific than fi'l, like akl and iklah (eating/morsel). So it can be a verbal noun (maṣdar) meaning 'turning towards' (tawajjuh) and 'intention' (qaṣd), as the poet said: 'I seek Allāh's forgiveness for a sin I cannot count, Lord of the servants, to Him is the turning (al-wajh) and the action.' Then, the object (ma'ūl) may be named by it, which is the intended object turned towards, as in the name 'khalq' (creation) and 'dirham ḍarb al-amīr' (dirham of the emir's minting) and their likes. And the agent (fā'il) turning towards may be named by it, like the face (wajh) of an animal. It is said: 'I intended this wajh,' meaning this direction (jihah) or side (nāḥiyah). Related to this is His saying: {And to Allāh belong the east and the west, so wherever you turn, there is the Face of Allāh (Wa lillāhil-mashriqu wal-maghribu fa-aynamā tuwallū fa-thamma wajhullāh)} [Al-Baqarah: 115], meaning the Qiblah of Allāh and the direction (wujhah) of Allāh. Thus said the majority of the Salaf, even if some counted it among the Attributes (ṣifāt). It might indicate the Attribute in a way that requires consideration. That is because the meaning of His saying: {wherever you turn (tuwallū)} means 'you turn yourselves towards' (tatawallaw), i.e., 'you face' (tatawajjahū) and 'you direct yourselves towards' (tastaqbilū). It takes one object, meaning 'turn towards it' (yatawallāhā). Similar to 'waliya' and 'tawallā' are 'qadima' and 'taqaddama,' 'bayyana' and 'tabayyana,' as He said: {Do not put [yourselves] before Allāh and His Messenger} [Al-Ḥujurāt: 1], and He said: {clear immorality (bi-fāḥishatin mubayyinah)} [An-Nisā': 19, Aṭ-Ṭalāq: 1]. It is the direction (wajh) that belongs to Allāh and which Allāh commanded us to face. For His saying: {And to Allāh belong the east and the west} indicates that the Face/Direction of Allāh is there, from the east and the west which belong to Allāh, as in the verse of the Qiblah: {The foolish among the people will say, 'What has turned them away from their qiblah, which they used to face?' Say, 'To Allāh belong the east

and the west. He guides whom He wills to a straight path'} [Al-Baqarah: 142]. So when they asked about the reason for turning away from the Qiblah, He informed that the east and the west belong to Him.

As for the word 'wijhah,' like His saying: {And for each [religious community] is a direction (wijhah) toward which it faces} [Al-Baqarah: 148], it might also be thought that it is a verbal noun like 'wajh,' similar to 'wa'dah' with 'wa'd,' and that it was left sound [with the 'w'] and its fā' [first root letter] was not deleted. But it is not so. Because if it were a verbal noun, its 'w' would have been deleted, becoming 'jihah.' It would have been said 'wa likulli jihah' or 'wajh.' Rather, the fi'lāh form here means the object (maf'ūl), like 'qiblah' (what is faced), 'bid'ah' (what is innovated), 'dhibhah' (what is slaughtered), and the like. So 'qiblah' is what is faced, 'wijhah' is what is turned towards, 'bid'ah' is what is innovated, and 'dhibhah' is what is slaughtered. This is why it remained sound and its fā' was not deleted, because the deletion only occurs from the verbal noun (maṣḍar), not from other nouns like adjectives and what resembles them, such as nouns of place, time, instrument, object, etc. As for the saying of some jurists (fuqahā') that 'wajh' is derived from 'muwājahah' (facing/confrontation), there is no evidence for it. Indeed, it has been opposed by those who said it is derived from 'wajāhah' (prominence/dignity). Both are weak. Rather, 'muwājahah' is derived from 'wajh,' just as 'mushāfahah' (oral communication) is derived from 'shafah' (lip), 'munāzarah'—in the sense of confrontation—is derived from 'naẓar' (sight), and 'mu'āyanah' (witnessing) from 'ayn' (eye). As for deriving 'wajh' (the face, the one turning) from 'wajh' (the turning), this is more plausible, because his turning (tawajjuh) is his specific action in which he does not depend on another, unlike 'muwājahah' which requires two parties. Man is indeed striving, aiming (ḥārith hammām), and his aim (hamm) is his turning (tawajjuh). He only turns with this limb towards whatever he intends and turns towards. From this category is His saying, Exalted is He: {Yes [on the contrary], whoever submits his face [i.e., self] to Allāh while being a doer of good will have his reward with his Lord} [Al-Baqarah: 112]. And His saying, Exalted is He: {And who is better in religion than one who submits his face [i.e., self] to Allāh, while being a doer of good and following the religion of Ibrāhīm, inclining toward truth?} [An-Nisā': 125]. And the saying of the Khalīl [Ibrāhīm], our Prophet, and the believers in prayer: {Indeed, I have turned my face toward He who created the heavens and the earth, inclining toward truth, and I am not of those who associate others with Allāh (Wajjahtu wajhiya lilladhī faṭaras-samāwāti wal-ardā ḥanīfan wa mā ana minal-mushrikīn)} [Al-An'ām: 79]. And His saying, Exalted is He: {Say, '[O Muḥammad], My Lord has ordered justice and that you maintain yourselves [in worship] toward Him at every place of prostration, and invoke Him, sincere to Him in religion.' Just as He originated you, you will return [to life]} [Al-A'rāf: 29]. And His saying: {So direct your face toward the religion, inclining to truth. [Adhere to] the fiṭrah of Allāh upon which He has created all people} [Ar-Rūm: 30]. And His saying: {So direct your face toward the correct religion} [Ar-Rūm: 43]. And His saying: {And [commanded], 'Direct your face toward the religion, inclining to truth, and never be of those who associate others with Allāh} [Yūnus: 105]. And the saying of the Prophet (peace be upon him) to the one he taught the supplication for sleep: {O Allāh, I submit myself to You, and I turn my face to You (Allāhumma aslamtu nafsi ilayk, wa wajjahtu wajhī ilayk)}. And Zayd ibn 'Amr ibn Nufayl said: 'I submitted my face to the One to Whom the clouds

submit, carrying sweet, pure water.’ So these are three expressions: ‘aslama wajhahu’ (submitted his face), ‘wajjaha wajhahu’ (turned his face), and ‘aqāma wajhahu’ (established/directed his face). Early commentators said regarding His saying ‘aslama wajhahu’: meaning, he made his religion and action sincere for Allāh. Some said: he entrusted his affair to Allāh. It has been said: he submitted and humbled himself to Allāh. This third [meaning] befits the necessary submission (al-islām al-lāzim). For his ‘wajh’ is his intention (qaṣd) and turning (tawajjuh), which is the root of his action, the action of his heart, which is the sovereign of his body. When his heart turns, his face also follows in turning. Thus, the intention, which is the origin from the heart (which is the origin), entails the action, which is the follower from the face and the rest of the body (which is the follower). So he has submitted his inward and outward action, and his inward and outward limbs, to Allāh; meaning, he has surrendered it to Him and made it sincere for Allāh, as in the necessary submission, which is His saying: {I have submitted to the Lord of the worlds} [Al-Baqarah: 131], and His saying about Bilqīs: {Indeed, I have wronged myself, and I submit with Sulaymān to Allāh, Lord of the worlds} [An-Naml: 44], and His saying about Ibrāhīm and Ismā’il: {Our Lord, and make us Muslims [in submission] to You and from our descendants a Muslim nation [in submission] to You} [Al-Baqarah: 128]—meaning, obedient, sincere. Likewise, turning the face (tawjih al-wajh) toward the One Who created the heavens and the earth is turning one’s intention, will, and worship. That entails [the turning of] the face and other [limbs]; otherwise, merely turning the limb without the heart’s action benefits nothing. Az-Zajjāj said regarding His saying: {Wajjahtu wajhiya (I have turned my face)}: ‘Meaning, I have made my intention through my worship and my Tawhīd for Allāh, Lord of the worlds.’ Likewise His saying: {wa aqimū wujūhakum (and establish/direct your faces)}. For the ‘faces’ (wujūh) which are the intentions and aims, which are the action of the heart and the root of religion, are sometimes established upright and sometimes made to deviate, as the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: {There is no heart among the hearts of the servants except that it is between two fingers of the fingers of the Most Merciful; if He wills to make it upright, He makes it upright, and if He wills to make it deviate, He makes it deviate}. So establishing the face upright is the opposite of making it deviate and incline, and it is the straight path. So if one makes his intention upright and directs it straight, not deviating right or left, his intention is for Allāh, Lord of the worlds, as He said: {neither eastern nor western} [An-Nūr: 35]. Likewise, Ar-Rabī’ ibn Anas said: ‘Make your prostration purely for Allāh,’ so do not prostrate except to Allāh. It is narrated from Ad-Dahhāk and Ibn Qutaybah: ‘When the prayer time arrives and you are at a mosque, pray in it, and let none of you say: I will pray [only] in my mosque’—as if he meant: pray to Allāh at every mosque, do not specify one mosque over another. Based on these two sayings, what we mentioned [about intention] is plausible. It is narrated from Mujāhid, As-Suddī, and Ibn Zayd: ‘Turn towards the Ka’bah wherever you are in prayer.’ According to this, establishing the face (iqāmat al-wajh) means facing the Ka’bah. This requires consideration, for this verse is Makkan, and the Ka’bah was only mandated [as Qiblah] in Madinah, unless what is meant by establishing the face is the facing [direction] commanded [at that time].

The dispute only arose here because of His saying: {at every mosque (‘inda kulli masjid)}, unlike His saying: {So direct your face toward the religion, inclining to

truth (fa-aqim wajhaka lid-dīni ḥanīfan}). So His saying: {Everything will perish except His Face (kullu shay'in hālikun illā wajhahu)} means His religion, His will, His worship. The verbal noun (mašdar) is sometimes annexed to the agent (fā'il) and sometimes to the object (maf'ul). This is their saying: 'what was intended for His Face/Sake (mā urīda bihi wajhuhu).' It is analogous to His saying: {Had there been within them [i.e., heaven and earth] gods besides Allāh, they both would have been ruined} [Al-Anbiyā': 22]. So every object of worship besides Allāh is false (bāṭil), and everything that is not for His Face/Sake is perishing (hālik), corrupt (fāsid), false (bāṭil). The context (siyāq) of the verse indicates this, and it contains the other meaning as well. For Divinity (al-ilāhiyyah) necessitates Lordship (ar-rubūbiyyah); hence He said: {To Him belongs the judgment, and to Him you will be returned} [Al-Qaṣāṣ: 88].

There is another view regarding this, stated by many people of knowledge: that the 'face' (al-wajh) in sayings like 'aslama wajhahu,' 'aqim wajhaka,' and 'wajjahtu wajhī' refers to the apparent face, just as it does by agreement in His saying: {We have certainly seen the turning of your face toward the heaven} [Al-Baqarah: 144], and in His saying: {so turn your faces toward it} [Al-Baqarah: 144], and in His saying: {then wash your faces} [Al-Mā'idah: 6]. The 'Face' has appeared in the Attributes of Allāh in places in the Book and Sunnah, but this is not the place for them. They said: However, when the face is turned, the rest of the person follows; when it is submitted, the rest of the person is submitted; and when it is established upright, the rest is established upright, because it is the first of the apparent limbs to turn for the one intending and seeking. This is why it is often mentioned in a way that implies the rest of its owner, and it is used to refer to him. But is this a matter of conventional reality that shifts the name from specific to general, or does the linguistic reality remain, and it is a matter of implication? There are two views on this. Likewise regarding other limbs, such that if one said to his slave: 'Your hand or your foot is free,' or said to his wife: 'Your hand or your foot is divorced if you give me a thousand,' then cut off the limb before the giving. Whoever says the expression refers to the whole will enact the divorce and emancipation. Whoever says the name refers only to the limb, emancipation does not extend to the rest of the whole according to him, due to lack of partial emancipation, and he says nothing occurs in this scenario. To this principle returns the meaning of the saying of those who said: {Everything will perish except His Face}, just as has been said regarding His saying: {Everyone upon the earth will perish, And there will remain the Face of your Lord, Owner of Majesty and Honor (Kullu man 'alayhā fān. Wa yabqā wajhu rabbika dhul-jalāli wal-ikrām)} [Ar-Raḥmān: 26-27]. For the remaining of His Face, described with Majesty and Honor, is the remaining of His Essence (dhāt).



## The Ittiḥād Of One Essence With Another Is Invalid

As for the Ittiḥād of the servant's essence with the Lord's essence—rather, even the union of one servant's essence with another servant's essence, or the Ḥulūl of one reality within another reality, like the indwelling of water in a vessel—this is definitively false. Indeed, such a thing is false even regarding a servant with another servant; for one's essence does not unite with the other's essence, nor does the essence of one of them indwell within the essence of the other. This is precisely what the proponents of Ittiḥādiyyah and Ḥulūliyyah—from the Christians and others, such as the extremists of this Ummah and others—have fallen into. It is a newly occurring union between two essences that were distinct, then supposedly became united, or the indwelling of one within the other. This is clearly false.

And even more false than this is the statement of those who say: 'He has always been One, and there was never any multiplicity at all. Multiplicity exists only in the veil [This applies] whether one asserts absolute oneness, or the oneness of absolute existence excluding the individuated [existence], or the oneness of existence excluding the fixed essences in non-existence. These [views], and the one before them [i.e., Ittiḥād/Ḥulūl], are the doctrines of the people of disbelief and misguidance, just as the first [view mentioned implicitly, i.e., affirming distinction and the correct relationship] is the doctrine of the people of faith, knowledge, and guidance.

And whoever disbelieves in the truth regarding that, or believes in the falsehood... they are at two opposite extremes, like the Jews and the Christians. As for the believers, they believe in the truth of that, without its falsehood. The Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of His Messenger contain guidance and light, and in them is the explanation of the Straight Path: the path of those upon whom Allāh has bestowed favor—the Prophets, the Truthful, the Martyrs, and the Righteous.

As for affirming the truth regarding that—which is what occurs for the Prophets of Allāh and His Friends, who are the God-fearing from among the Foremost and those who follow a middle course, and what may occur of that for every believer, such as their love for Allāh the Exalted and His love for them, and their pleasure with Him and His pleasure with them—Allāh the Exalted has said: {Allāh will bring forth a people whom He loves and who love Him, humble toward the believers, mighty against the disbelievers, striving in the way of Allāh, and fearing not the blame of any blamer} [Al-Mā'idah: 54]. And He the Exalted said: {And [yet], among the people are those who take other than Allāh as equals [to Him]. They love them as they [should] love Allāh. But those who have believed are stronger in love for Allāh} [Al-Baqarah: 165]. And He the Exalted said: {And spend in the way of Allāh and do not throw [yourselves] with your [own] hands

into destruction [by refraining]. And do good; indeed, Allāh loves the doers of good} [Al-Baqarah: 195]. And He the Exalted said: {But yes, whoever fulfills his commitment and fears Allāh—then indeed, Allāh loves the righteous} [Āl ‘Imrān: 76]. And He the Exalted said: {So as long as they are upright toward you, be upright toward them. Indeed, Allāh loves the righteous} [At-Tawbah: 7]. And He said: {So fulfill their treaty to them for the remainder of their term. Indeed, Allāh loves the righteous} [At-Tawbah: 4]. And He said: {So come to them from where Allāh has ordered you. Indeed, Allāh loves those who are constantly repentant and loves those who purify themselves} [Al-Baqarah: 222]. And He said: {Within it are men who love to purify themselves; and Allāh loves those who purify themselves} [At-Tawbah: 108]. And He said: {So make settlement between them in justice and act justly. Indeed, Allāh loves those who act justly} [Al-Ḥujurāt: 9]. And He said: {Indeed, Allāh loves those who fight in His cause in a row as though they are a [single] structure joined firmly} [Aṣ-Ṣaff: 4]. And He said: {Say, [O Muḥammad], ‘If you should love Allāh, then follow me, [so] Allāh will love you’} [Āl ‘Imrān: 31]. And He said: {Say, [O Muḥammad], ‘If your fathers, your sons...} until His statement: {...are more beloved to you than Allāh and His Messenger and jihad in His cause’} [At-Tawbah: 24]. And He said: {And Allāh took Ibrāhīm as an intimate friend} [An-Nisā’: 125]. And He said: {And the first forerunners [in the faith] among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār and those who followed them with good conduct—Allāh is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him} [At-Tawbah: 100]. And He said: {Those—He has decreed within their hearts faith and supported them with spirit from Him. And We will admit them to gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they abide eternally. Allāh is pleased with them, and they are pleased with Him} [Al-Mujādilah: 22]. And He said: {Those are the best of creatures.} {Their reward with their Lord is gardens of perpetual residence beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever, Allāh being pleased with them and they with Him} [Al-Bayyinah: 7-8].

And the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: {‘Indeed, Allāh loves the servant who is God-fearing, self-sufficient, and inconspicuous.’} {‘Indeed, Allāh is Beautiful and loves beauty.’} {‘Indeed, Allāh is Clean and loves cleanliness.’} {‘Indeed, Allāh is One and loves the odd number.’} {‘Indeed, Allāh loves noble morals and hates base ones.’} And he said: {‘Indeed, Allāh is pleased with three things for you: that you worship Him and associate nothing with Him, that you hold fast all together to the rope of Allāh and not become divided, and that you advise sincerely whoever Allāh has put in charge of your affairs.’}

And in the Qur’ān, there is much mention of selection, choosing, drawing near, intimate discourse, calling out, close friendship, and the like. Likewise in the Sunnah. This is something upon which the predecessors among Ahl As-Sunnah wa Al-Jamā’ah and the people of recognition, worship, knowledge, and faith have agreed. A group of heretical hypocrites—resembling the Sabians and those who agree with them, and resembling the Jews and Christians from among the Jahmiyyah or those in whom there is some Jahmism, even if the Sunnah is predominant in them—have opposed its reality.

So, sometimes they deny that Allāh takes anyone as a close friend, or loves anyone, or shows affection to anyone, or speaks to anyone, or speaks [at all]. They distort the words from their contexts. They interpret that sometimes as His beneficence towards His servants, sometimes as His will to be beneficent

towards them. And sometimes they deny that Allāh loves or takes as a close friend. And they distort the words from their contexts regarding the servant's love for Him, [interpreting it] as the intention to obey Him, or loving Him because of His beneficence.

As for the denial of falsehood: Allāh has declared Himself free from having a parent or offspring, and He declared whoever assigns to Him offspring, a parent, or a partner to be a disbeliever. Thus, He the Exalted said in the Sūrah that is equivalent to one-third of the Qur'ān—which is the description of the Most Merciful, and nothing has been authentically reported from the Prophet (peace be upon him) regarding the virtue of any sūrah of the Qur'ān like what has been authentically reported regarding its virtue, to the extent that the masters of ḥadīth memorization dedicated specific compilations to its virtue, like Ad-Dāraquṭnī, Abū Nu'aym, and Abū Muḥammad Al-Khallāl, and the compilers of the Ṣaḥīḥ collections narrated multiple ḥadīths concerning it—He said therein: {Say, 'He is Allāh, [who is] One. Allāh, the Eternal Refuge. He neither begets nor is born, Nor is there to Him any equivalent.'} [Al-Ikhlās: 1-4].

And upon this Sūrah, the Imāms rely for Tawḥīd, like Imām Aḥmad, Al-Fuḍayl ibn 'Iyād, and others among the Imāms before and after them.

So, He negated from Himself origins, branches, and peers, which encompasses everything to which created beings are related—humans, animals, angels, jinn, and even plants and the like. For there is nothing among created beings except that it must have something corresponding to it: either an origin, or a branch, or a peer, or two of these, or all three. This is apparent in humans, jinn, and animals.

As for the angels, although they do not procreate through reproduction, they have likenesses and similarities. This is why He, Glorified is He, said: {And of all things We created two mates; perhaps you will remember.} [Adh-Dhāriyāt: 49] {So flee to Allāh.} [Adh-Dhāriyāt: 50]. Some of the Salaf said [regarding the first verse]: 'Perhaps you will remember' means: so that you may know that the Creator of the pairs is One.

Therefore, this Sūrah contains a refutation against those who disbelieved from among the Jews, Christians, Sabians, Magians, and Polytheists. For His statement {He neither begets} is a refutation of the claim of those who say He has sons and daughters from among the angels or humans, such as those who say the angels are the daughters of Allāh, or who say the Messiah or 'Uzayr is the son of Allāh, just as Allāh the Exalted said about them: {But they have attributed to Allāh partners—the jinn, while He created them—and have fabricated for Him sons and daughters without knowledge} [Al-An'ām: 100].

And Allāh the Exalted said: {So inquire of them, [O Muḥammad], 'Does your Lord have daughters while they have sons? Or did We create the angels as females while they were witnesses?' Unquestionably, it is out of their falsehood that they say, 'Allāh has begotten,' and indeed, they are liars. Has He chosen daughters over sons? What is [wrong] with you? How do you judge? Then will you not remember? Or do you have a clear authority? Then bring your scripture, if you should be truthful.' And they have claimed between Him and the jinn a lineage, but the jinn have already known that they [who made such claims] will surely be brought [to punishment]} [Aṣ-Ṣāffāt: 149-158].

And Allāh the Exalted said: {The Jews say, 'Uzayr is the son of Allāh'; and the

Christians say, 'The Messiah is the son of Allāh.' That is their statement from their mouths; they imitate the statement of those who disbelieved before. May Allāh destroy them; how are they deluded? They have taken their scholars and monks as lords besides Allāh, and [also] the Messiah, the son of Maryam} [At-Tawbah: 30-31]. He informed that this is an imitation of the statement of those who disbelieved before. It has been said that these were their predecessors. And it has been said [they were] the polytheists of Arabia, but there is consideration regarding both [views]. For the polytheists of Arabia who said this were not before the Jews and Christians, nor were their predecessors from among them. Perhaps it refers to the polytheistic Sabians who were before Mūsā and the Messiah in the land of Shām, Egypt, and elsewhere, who considered the angels to be His children, as we shall explain.

And Allāh the Exalted said: {And they attribute to Allāh what they dislike, and their tongues assert the lie that they will have the best [outcome]} [An-Nāḥl: 62]—this is the statement of those Arabs who said the angels are the daughters of Allāh. And Allāh the Exalted said: {And they assign to what they do not know a portion of that which We have provided them. By Allāh, you will surely be questioned about what you used to invent. And they assign to Allāh daughters—exalted is He!—and for themselves is what they desire. And when one of them is informed of [the birth of] a female, his face becomes dark, and he suppresses grief. He hides himself from the people because of the ill of which he has been informed. Should he keep it in humiliation or bury it in the dust? Unquestionably, evil is what they decide. For those who do not believe in the Hereafter is the description of evil; and for Allāh is the highest attribute. And He is the Exalted in Might, the Wise} [An-Nāḥl: 56-60].

And Allāh the Exalted said: {And they assign to Him from His servants a portion. Indeed, man is clearly ungrateful. Or has He taken daughters out of what He creates and chosen you for sons? And when one of them is given good tidings of that which he attributes to the Most Merciful as a likeness [i.e., a daughter], his face becomes dark, and he suppresses grief. So is one brought up in ornaments while being during conflict unclear [in argument]? And they have made the angels, who are servants of the Most Merciful, females. Did they witness their creation? Their testimony will be recorded, and they will be questioned} [Az-Zukhruf: 15-19].

And this extent [of error] for which Allāh faulted those Arabs who made the angels His daughters, despite their own dislike for having daughters, has its parallel among the Christians. For they attribute a son to Allāh, yet they deem it unfitting for the great ones among their religious leaders that any of them should have a consort or offspring. Thus, they attribute to Allāh what they dislike for the great ones of their religion.

And Allāh the Exalted said: {And they say, 'The Most Merciful has taken a son.' You have certainly brought forth a monstrous thing. The heavens almost rupture therefrom and the earth splits open and the mountains collapse in devastation, That they attribute to the Most Merciful a son. And it is not appropriate for the Most Merciful that He should take a son. There is no one in the heavens and earth but that he comes to the Most Merciful as a servant. He has certainly enumerated them and counted them precisely. And all of them are coming to Him on the Day of Resurrection alone} [Maryam: 88-95].

And Allāh the Exalted said: {O People of the Scripture, do not commit excess in your religion or say about Allāh except the truth. The Messiah, 'Īsā, the son of Maryam, was but a messenger of Allāh and His word which He directed to Maryam and a soul [created at a command] from Him. So believe in Allāh and His messengers. And do not say, 'Three'; desist—it is better for you. Indeed, Allāh is but one God. Exalted is He above having a son. To Him belongs whatever is in the heavens and whatever is on the earth. And sufficient is Allāh as Disposer of affairs. Never would the Messiah disdain to be a servant of Allāh, nor would the angels near [to Him]. And whoever disdains His worship and is arrogant—He will gather them to Himself all together. And as for those who believed and did righteous deeds, He will give them in full their rewards and grant them extra from His bounty. But as for those who disdained and were arrogant, He will punish them with a painful punishment, and they will not find for themselves besides Allāh any protector or helper} [An-Nisā': 171-173].

So, He forbade the People of the Scripture from exaggeration in religion and from saying about Allāh anything but the truth. He mentioned the true statement regarding the Messiah, then said to them: {So believe in Allāh and His messengers}, because they disbelieved in Allāh through their Trinitarianism and disbelieved in His messengers through [belief in] Ittiḥād and Ḥulūl. Thus, they disbelieved in the two foundations of general Islām, which are the testimony to Allāh's Oneness in Divinity and the testimony to the Messengers' Messengership. He mentioned that the Messiah and the angels do not disdain His worship because some people considered the angels His children, like the Messiah, and they worshipped the angels and the Messiah.

This is why He said: {It is not for a human [prophet] that Allāh should give him the Scripture and authority and prophethood and then he would say to the people, 'Be servants to me rather than Allāh,' but [instead, he would say], 'Be knowledgeable lords [devoted to Allāh] because of what you have taught of the Scripture and because of what you have studied.' Nor would he order you to take the angels and prophets as lords. Would he order you to disbelief after you had been Muslims?} [Al 'Imrān: 79-80]. So He mentioned the angels and the prophets together.

And He has negated in His Book concerning Himself both begetting and taking offspring altogether. He said: {And say, 'Praise to Allāh, who has not taken a son and has had no partner in [His] dominion and has no [need of a] protector out of weakness.'} [Al-Isrā': 111]. And He the Exalted said: {Allāh has not taken any son, nor has there ever been with Him any deity} [Al-Mu'minūn: 91]. And He said: {He to whom belongs the dominion of the heavens and the earth and who has not taken a son and has had no partner in dominion} [Al-Furqān: 2]. And He said: {And We did not create the heaven and the earth and that between them in play. Had We intended to take amusement, We could have taken it from Ourselves, if We were to do [such a thing]. Rather, We dash the truth upon falsehood, and it destroys it, and thereupon it departs. And for you is woe over that which you describe. To Him belongs whoever is in the heavens and the earth. And those near Him are not prevented by arrogance from His worship, nor do they tire. They exalt [Him] night and day [and] do not slacken. Or have they taken gods from the earth who resurrect [the dead]? Had there been within them [i.e., the heavens and earth] gods besides Allāh, they both would have been ruined. So exalted is Allāh, Lord of the Throne, above what they describe} [Al-

Anbiyā': 16-22].

And He said: {And they say, 'The Most Merciful has taken a son.' Exalted is He! Rather, they [i.e., those they call children, like angels] are [but] honored servants. They cannot precede Him in speech, and they act upon His command. He knows what is [presently] before them and what will be after them, and they cannot intercede except on behalf of one whom He approves. And they, from fear of Him, are apprehensive} [Al-Anbiyā': 26-28].

And it is well-known that those who {fabricated for Him sons and daughters without knowledge} [Al-An'ām: 100], and those who said, {'Allāh has begotten,' and indeed, they are liars} [Aṣ-Ṣāffāt: 151-152], and those who said, {'The Messiah is the son of Allāh'} [At-Tawbah: 30] and {'Uzayr is the son of Allāh'} [At-Tawbah: 30]—their rational ones did not intend a physical begetting of the type of animal birth, by the separation of a part from His male [aspect] into His female [aspect] from which the offspring comes. For the Christians and the Sabians are agreed on negating that. Likewise, the polytheists of Arabia, I do not think their rational ones believed that. Rather, they described a conceptual, spiritual begetting, similar to what the Christians say: that the Essence which is Allāh from one aspect, and is the Word from another aspect, clothed itself with a human being created from Maryam. So they say the Divinity clothed itself with the humanity. Thus, its exterior—which is the armor and shirt—is human, and its interior—which is the one clothed—is Divinity, which is the Son, who is the Word, due to the generation of this one from the Father, who is the essence of Existence.

So this sonship, according to them, is composed of two principles:

1. That the essence which is the Word is generated from the essence which is the Father, like the generation of knowledge and speech from the knowing speaker.
2. That this essence united with the Messiah and clothed itself with him. And that essence is the Father from one aspect, and it is the Son from another aspect.

For this reason, Allāh sometimes relates from them that they say: 'The Messiah is the son of Allāh,' and sometimes that they say: {'Allāh is the Messiah, the son of Maryam'} [Al-Mā'idah: 17, 72]. As for His relating from them that they said: {'Allāh is the third of three'} [Al-Mā'idah: 73], the commentators say [this refers to]: Allāh, the Messiah, and his mother, as He said: {O 'Isā, Son of Maryam, did you say to the people, 'Take me and my mother as deities besides Allāh?'} [Al-Mā'idah: 116]. This is why He said in the context of the discussion: {The Messiah, son of Maryam, was not but a messenger; [other] messengers have passed on before him. And his mother was a supporter of truth} [Al-Mā'idah: 75]—meaning, the utmost [status] of the Messiah is Messengership, and the utmost [status] of his mother is being truthful; they do not reach Divinity. So this is the argument for this [interpretation], and it is apparent. However, some people claim that what is meant by that [i.e., 'third of three'] are the three hypostases, which are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. But there is consideration regarding this [view].

As for His statement: {But they have attributed to Allāh partners—the jinn, while He created them—and have fabricated for Him sons and daughters

without knowledge. Exalted is He and high above what they describe. Originator of the heavens and the earth. How could He have a son when He does not have a consort and He created all things? And He is, of all things, Knowing} [Al-An'ām: 100-101]. His statement {Originator of the heavens and the earth} means their Originator, just as He mentioned similarly in [Sūrah] Al-Baqarah. The meaning is not that His heavens and earth are wondrous, as the Arabic might allow were it not for the context. Because the objective is to negate what they claimed by fabricating sons and daughters for Him, and [negate] His having taken a son.

And this is negated by its opposite: His being the Originator of the heavens. Then He said: {How could He have a son?}, and mentioned three proofs negating that. First: His not having a consort; this negates the customary begetting. Second: His statement {and He created all things} negates conceptual begetting, which is generation, because His creating all things contradicts their being generated from Him. Third: His statement {And He is, of all things, Knowing} resembles—and Allāh knows best—[an argument directed at specific groups]. Since the Christians claimed that the one united with [ʿĪsā] is the Word, which they interpret as Knowledge, and the Sabians who advocate generation and causation do not consider Him knowledgeable of all things—He mentioned that He is {of all things, Knowing} to affirm this attribute for Himself, as a refutation of the Sabians, and to negate it from other than Him, as a refutation of the Christians.

If this is the case, then the statement of those who advocate the generation of the Intellects and Souls—which they claim are the angels—is more explicit in their saying that He begot the angels and that they are His sons and daughters than the statement of the Christians. This includes those philosophers who associate themselves with Islām. Indeed, I know a prominent figure among them who was asked about the Intellect and the Soul and replied: 'They are like the male and the female.' So he made them like the son and the daughter. They consider them generated from Him through the generation of the effect from the cause; thus, He cannot separate His essence from His effect, nor His effect from Him, just as He cannot separate Himself from Himself—like the relationship of the sun's ray with the sun, and even more inseparable.

These [philosophers] say that these spirits which He 'begot' are connected to the celestial spheres—the sun, moon, and stars—like the connection of the Divinity to the body of the Messiah. So they worship them just as the Christians worshipped the Messiah. However, they are greater disbelievers in many respects, and they are more deserving of the label of polytheism than the Christians. For they worship what they know is separate from Allāh and is neither He nor an attribute from His attributes. The Christians, [on the other hand], claim they only worship what united with Allāh, not what He 'begot' from among the effects.

Then, those who worshipped the angels, the stars, the spirits of humans, and their bodies took idols made according to their forms and natures. This was one of the greatest causes of idol worship.

This is why the Close Friend [of Allāh], the Imām of the Monotheists, addressed those who worshipped the stars, the sun, and the moon, and those who worshipped idols, despite their polytheism and their acknowledgment of the Originator of all. Allāh has mentioned their story in the Qur'ān in more than one

place. Those were the polytheistic Sabians whom Nimrūd ruled. Their scholars were the philosophers from the Greeks and others, who were in the land of Shām, Al-Jazīrah, 'Irāq, and elsewhere, and the islands of the sea before the Christians. They were in these lands during the days of Banī Isrā'īl, and they were the ones who used to fight Banī Isrā'īl, sometimes prevailing and sometimes being overcome. Sanḥārīb, Bukhtanaššar, and their like were the kings of the Sabians after Al-Khalīl. And Nimrūd was the one [ruling] in his time.

Thus, it becomes clear from this how the Qur'ān contains the refutation of the statements of those who preceded this Ummah, and the disbelievers and hypocrites within it, regarding the affirmation of begetting for Allāh—even if many people do not understand the Qur'ān's indication towards [refuting] these statements. Because that requires two things: understanding their statement in meaning, not merely in wording, and understanding the meaning of the Qur'ān and combining the two. Then you will find that the meaning they intended has been indicated by the Qur'ān in its mention and refutation.

As for the 'taking of offspring', it is sometimes interpreted as the same as begetting. It belongs to the category of actions, not the category of attributes, as a faction of the Christians says regarding the Messiah.



## The Negation Of Offspring From Allāh, And The Negation Of His Being A Father

So this is the negation of His—Glorified is He—being a father to anything or taking anything as offspring, in any manner of begetting or taking of offspring whatsoever.

As for the negation of His being born: it entails the negation of His being generated in any way of generation from any human or anything else generated from other than Him. So it is a refutation against those who said, 'The Messiah is Allāh.' And a refutation against the Dajjāl who will say, 'I am Allāh.' And a refutation against those extremists of this Ummah who claimed divinity for a human being—regarding 'Alī, some of Ahl Al-Bayt, or some Shaykhs. Just as some people said that about 'Alī and a faction of Ahl Al-Bayt, and they said it about the Prophets too. And some people said it about Al-Ĥallāj, some about Al-Ĥākīm in Egypt, some about Shaykh 'Adī, some about Yūnus Al-Qunaynī, and some generalize it to [all] Shaykhs and deem all of this correct. So His statement—Glorified is He—{nor is born} [Al-Ikhlās: 3] is a negation of all of this, for all of these were born, and Allāh {nor is born}.

This is why when Allāh mentioned the Messiah in the Qur'an, He said: 'Son of Maryam,' unlike [how He referred to] the rest of the Prophets. Like His statement: {They have certainly disbelieved who say, 'Allāh is the Messiah'} [Al-Mā'idah: 17, 72] and His statement: {The Messiah, son of Maryam, was not but a messenger; [other] messengers have passed on before him} [Al-Mā'idah: 75], and His statement: {When Allāh said, 'O 'Īsā, Son of Maryam, remember My favor upon you and upon your mother'} [Al-Mā'idah: 110], and His statement: {O 'Īsā, Son of Maryam, did you say to the people, 'Take me and my mother as deities besides Allāh?'} [Al-Mā'idah: 116], and His statement: {And We made the son of Maryam and his mother a sign} [Al-Mu'minūn: 50], and His statement: {And [for] their saying, 'Indeed, we have killed the Messiah, 'Īsā, the son of Maryam, the messenger of Allāh'} [An-Nisā': 157].

And in that are two benefits:

1. An explanation that he was born, whereas Allāh {nor is born}.
2. Attributing him to Maryam, that he is her son, not the son of Allāh.

As for His statement: {Never would the Messiah disdain...} [An-Nisā': 172] and His statement: {And the Jews say, 'Uzayr is the son of Allāh'; and the Christians say, 'The Messiah is the son of Allāh'} [At-Tawbah: 30], He was relating their statement which they uttered. They had attributed him to Allāh as His son, so they did not include in that statement of theirs 'the Messiah, son of Maryam'.

And His statement: {Nor is there to Him any equivalent [Al-Ikhlās: 4]} negates partners and rivals. It includes everyone who makes anything an equal to Allāh

in any of the exclusive characteristics of Lordship, such as creating the creation, or Divinity, such as worship of Him, supplicating to Him, and the like.

So these are points that clarify the inclusion within the Book of Allāh of the refutation of the statement of anyone who believes in divinity for any human being, whether through Ittiḥād, Ḥulūl, or otherwise.



## How The Ittiḥādiyyah Go Beyond [The Claim Of] Allāh Taking A Son To [The Claim Of] The Lord Uniting With Him

As for these heretics: their disbelief is not limited to [claiming] that He begot something, or took a son, or that He is a born human due to the Lord uniting with him. For all of this necessitates affirming two distinct things, one of which united with the other or indwelt in it. This is only said by those who affirm specific, restricted Ittiḥād or specific, restricted Ḥulūl. But according to these [heretics], there is nothing other than Him nor besides Him. He did not create anything, nor is He the Lord of anything, nor the Owner of anything. He has no servant nor worshipper, nor a caller who calls upon Him that He might answer him, nor one in distress who turns to Him in desperation that He might answer him, nor an asker who asks of Him that He might answer him. Rather, the servant only witnesses these meanings when he is veiled from witnessing the absolute waḥdah in his imagination. So when the veil of his heart is lifted, according to them, he sees that there are not two [entities] in any way whatsoever, such that one could be a creator and the other created, or one a worshipper and the other a Lord, or one a parent and the other born, or one a partner to the other, or an intercessor with Him, such that one might draw near to Him through the worship of that [intercessor].

This is the view of the experts among them, like At-Tilmisānī and Ibn Al-Fārid; At-Tilmisānī is more knowledgeable of the realities of their doctrine.

As for Ibn ‘Arabī, he says: All of this pertains to the essences fixed in non-existence, not to anything existing. As for Existence, it is inconceivable that there should be within it a Lord and a servant, a Creator and a created, a caller and a responder. Rather, when Existence flowed upon the essences and manifested within them, differentiation occurred due to the essences; like the differentiation of light in glass due to its varying colors.

The Qur’ān refutes these [people] in innumerable places. The stories Allāh narrated about Fir’awn, who is their chief, contain a refutation against them. For Fir’awn denied the Lord of the Worlds and that Mūsā had a God he could ascend to, yet he did not deny this existence which is the world. Likewise, these [heretics] only affirm this existence which is this world—there is nothing else besides it, according to them. They say: He is Allāh, and He is the Great Human.



## A Letter From The Imām To Abū Al-Faṭḥ Naṣr Al-Manbijī

Shaykh al-Islām—may Allāh sanctify his soul—said:

In the Name of Allāh, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful

From Aḥmad ibn Taymiyyah: To the Shaykh, the recognizer, the exemplar, the wayfarer, the ascetic, Abū Al-Faṭḥ Naṣr—may Allāh open upon his inner and outer self what He opened upon the hearts of His friends, grant him victory over the devils of humankind and jinn in his public and private life, establish through him the Muḥammadan way that conforms to His Law, and reveal through him the religious reality that distinguishes between His creation and His obedience, His will and His love; so that the distinction becomes clear to people between the cosmic words and the religious words, and between the truthful, righteous believers and those hypocrites who imitate them, just as Allāh differentiated between them in His Book and His Sunnah.

To proceed: Indeed, Allāh Almighty has bestowed upon the Shaykh, and bestowed blessings through him, inner and outer blessings in religion and worldly life. He has granted him, among the elite of the Muslims—those who desire neither haughtiness nor corruption on earth—a high station and divine love, because of the excellent recognition and intention Allāh Almighty has granted him. For knowledge and will are the foundation for the path of guidance and worship. Allāh sent Muḥammad with the most perfect love within the most perfect recognition. Thus, through the love of Allāh and His Messenger—which is the foundation of deeds—he eliminated the love that involves association and vagueness, as Allāh Almighty says: {And [yet], among the people are those who take other than Allāh as equals [to Him]. They love them as they [should] love Allāh. But those who believe are stronger in love for Allāh} [Al-Baqarah: 165]. And Allāh Almighty says: {Say, [O Muḥammad], ‘If your fathers, your sons, your brothers, your wives, your relatives, wealth which you have obtained, commerce wherein you fear decline, and dwellings with which you are pleased are more beloved to you than Allāh and His Messenger and jihād in His cause, then wait until Allāh executes His command.’} [At-Tawbah: 24].

For this reason, faith-based love is what necessitates the tasting of faith and the religious finding, as reported in the two Ṣaḥīḥs from Anas, who said: The Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) said: {‘There are three qualities for which anyone who is characterized by them will find the sweetness of faith in his heart: one for whom Allāh and His Messenger are more beloved than anything else; one who loves a person only for Allāh’s sake; and one who hates to return to disbelief after Allāh has saved him from it, as much as he hates to be thrown into the Fire.’} So he made finding the sweetness of faith contingent

upon the surpassing love for Allāh and His Messenger, upon love for His sake within Him [i.e., for Allāh], and upon hating the opposite of faith. And in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim from Al-'Abbās, who said: The Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) said: {He has tasted the flavour of faith who is pleased with Allāh as Lord, with Islam as religion, and with Muḥammad as Messenger.}

So he made tasting the flavour of faith contingent upon contentment with these fundamentals, just as he made finding contingent upon love. This was so that he could differentiate between the tasting and finding which is the foundation of outward deeds and the fruit of inward deeds, and between what Allāh and His Messenger commanded and other things. As Sahl ibn 'Abdullāh At-Tustarī said: 'Every finding not attested to by the Book and the Sunnah is false,' since everyone who loves something has a taste according to his love. This is why Allāh Almighty challenged those claiming His love with His saying: {Say, [O Muḥammad], 'If you should love Allāh, then follow me, [so] Allāh will love you and forgive you your sins.'} [Āl 'Imrān: 31]. Al-Ḥasan Al-Baṣrī said: 'A people during the time of the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) claimed that they loved Allāh, so He challenged them with this verse.' Thus, He made the servant's love for Allāh necessitate following His Messenger, and He made following His Messenger necessitate the Lord's love for His servant. He mentioned the description of those who love [Him] in His saying: {Allāh will bring forth [in place of them] a people He will love and who will love Him, [who are] humble toward the believers, powerful against the disbelievers; they strive in the cause of Allāh and do not fear the blame of a critic.} [Al-Mā'idah: 54]. So He described the loving and beloved ones with the description of perfection with which Allāh described His Messenger, combining the meaning of majesty and beauty, which was differentiated in the two religions before us: namely, severity and might towards the enemies of Allāh, and humility and mercy towards the friends of Allāh and His Messenger. This is why one finds many who possess a vague, absolute finding and love, as a prominent figure among them said about it:

*Displaced from the homeland  
Distanced from dwelling  
Weeping over the ruins and trace  
Loving, but not knowing for whom*

So the Shaykh—may Allāh be good to him—Allāh has placed within him light and recognition—which is the foundation of love and will—by which the specific, Muḥammadan, faith-based love is distinguished from the vague, common love. Just as this vagueness occurs in love, it also occurs in Tawḥīd. Allāh Almighty says in the Mother of the Book [Al-Fātiḥah], which is obligatory upon the servant—and required in every prayer—to say: {It is You we worship and You we ask for help.} [Al-Fātiḥah: 5]. It is established in the authentic Hadith that Allāh says: {I have divided the prayer between Myself and My servant into two halves: half of it is for Me and half of it is for My servant, and My servant shall have what he asks for. When the servant says: {Praise be to Allāh, Lord of the worlds}, Allāh says: My servant has praised Me. When he says: {The Most Gracious, the Most Merciful}, Allāh says: My servant has extolled Me. When he says: {Sovereign of the Day of Recompense}, He says: My servant has glorified Me (or He says: My servant has entrusted his affairs to Me). When he says: {It is You we worship and You we ask for help}, He says: This verse is between Me and My

servant in two halves, and My servant shall have what he asks for. When he says: {Guide us to the straight path—The path of those upon whom You have bestowed favor, not of those who have evoked [Your] anger or of those who are astray}, He says: These are for My servant, and My servant shall have what he asks for.}

For this reason, it is narrated that Allāh revealed one hundred and four books, the meanings of which He gathered in the Qur'ān; the meanings of the Qur'ān in Al-Mufaššal [the later, shorter sūrahs]; the meanings of Al-Mufaššal in the Mother of the Book [Al-Fātiḥah]; and the meanings of the Mother of the Book in these two phrases: {It is You we worship and You we ask for help.} This meaning Allāh has reiterated in verses like His saying: {So worship Him and rely upon Him} [Hūd: 123], and His saying: {Upon Him I have relied, and to Him I turn back [in repentance]} [Hūd: 88], and His saying: {Upon Him I have relied, and to Him is my return} [Ar-Ra'd: 30]. {And the Prophet (peace be upon him) used to say in his sacrificial rites: 'Allāhumma hādihā minka wa laka' [O Allāh, this is from You and for You].}

So He, Glorified is He, is deserving of Tawḥīd, which is invoking Him and dedicating the religion sincerely to Him: the invocation of worship through love, repentance, obedience, glorification, reverence, awe, hope, and similar meanings related to His divinity and worship; and the invocation of request and seeking aid through reliance upon Him, seeking refuge in Him, asking of Him, and similar acts He, Glorified is He, does according to the requirements of His Lordship. He, Glorified is He, is the First and the Last, the Hidden and the Manifest. This is why the perfect Law came with the name 'Allāh' in worship and the name 'Rabb' (Lord) in supplication. The one praying or remembering says: Allāhu Akbar (Allāh is Greatest), Subḥān Allāh (Glory be to Allāh), Al-ḥamdulillāh (Praise be to Allāh), Lā ilāha illā Allāh (There is no god but Allāh). The phrases of the Adhān are: Allāhu Akbar, Allāhu Akbar... to its end, and so forth. And in supplication: {Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves} [Al-A'rāf: 23], {My Lord, forgive me and my parents} [Nūh: 28], {My Lord, for the favor You bestowed upon me, I will never be an assistant to the criminals} [Al-Qaṣa': 17], {My Lord, indeed I have wronged myself, so forgive me} [Al-Qaṣa': 16], {Our Lord, forgive us our sins and the excess [committed] in our affairs and plant firmly our feet} [Āl 'Imrān: 147], {My Lord, forgive and have mercy, and You are the best of the merciful} [Al-Mu'minūn: 118], and so forth.

Many of those who turn towards [Allāh] and are wayfarers witness in their journey the perfect Lordship and Self-Subsistence that encompasses every created thing, including essences and attributes. These matters subsist through the cosmic words of Allāh, with which the Prophet (peace be upon him) used to seek refuge, saying: {I seek refuge in the perfect words of Allāh, which neither the righteous nor the wicked can overcome, from the evil of what He created, brought into being, and fashioned; from the evil of what descends from the sky and what ascends therein; from the evil of what He created in the earth and what emerges therefrom; from the evil of the trials of the night and day; and from the evil of every night-visitor except one that visits with good, O Most Gracious}.

Thus, he becomes absent and annihilated through this Lordly Tawḥīd from what he is also commanded and required to do, which is what the Truth loves

and is pleased with from the Divine Tawhīd: namely, worshipping Him alone without partner, obeying Him and obeying His Messenger, commanding what He commanded, forbidding what He forbade, loving for His sake and hating for His sake. Whoever turns away from this Tawhīd [of worship] and adheres only to the first [Tawhīd of Lordship] resembles the polytheistic Qadariyyah who said: {If Allāh had willed, we would not have associated partners [with Him], nor would our fathers} [Al-Anʿām: 148]. And whoever adheres to the second [Tawhīd of worship] without the first [Tawhīd of Lordship] is among the Magian Qadariyyah who claim that Allāh did not create the actions of the servants nor did He will all contingent beings, as the Muʿtazilah and Rāfidāh say, and as appears in the speech of many theologians and jurists. The first [error, focusing only on decree] is followed by groups of libertines who cast off commands and prohibitions, using it only [to justify] their desires, otherwise it is inconsistent. It is common among the pseudo-devout who deviate from the Sharīʿah, like Khafw al-ʿAdū and others. For they have ascetic practices and acts of worship containing things not commanded, which produce spiritual states in them, some of which are corrupt. They resemble, in some ways, monks and worshippers of idols. This is why Shaykh ʿAbd Al-Qādir said: ‘Many men, when they enter into the divine decree, stop. But for me, a window was opened in it, so I contended with the decrees of the Truth, by the Truth, for the Truth. The true friend is one who contends with the decree, not one who passively conforms to it.’ What the Shaykh said, he spoke on the tongue of the Muḥammadan way, meaning that the Muslim is commanded to do what Allāh ordered and repel what Allāh forbade, even if its causes have been decreed. Thus, he repels the decree of Allāh with the decree of Allāh, as came in the Hadith narrated by Aṭ-Ṭabarānī in his book Ad-Duʿāʾ from the Prophet (peace be upon him): {Indeed, supplication and affliction meet between the heaven and the earth.} And in At-Tirmidhī: {It was said: O Messenger of Allāh, what is your view on medicines we use for treatment, incantations we use for seeking cure, and precautions we take for protection—do they repel anything from Allāh’s decree? He said: ‘They are part of Allāh’s decree.’}

These two meanings are alluded to in the Hadith also narrated by Aṭ-Ṭabarānī from the Prophet (peace be upon him) that he said: {Allāh says: O son of Ādam, there are only four [matters]: one is for Me, one is for you, one is between Me and you, and one is between you and My creation. As for that which is for Me: it is that you worship Me, associating nothing with Me. As for that which is for you: it is your deeds, for which I will reward you when you need it most. As for that which is between Me and you: from you is the supplication, and upon Me is the response. As for that which is between you and My creation: approach people with what you would love them to approach you with.}<sup>1</sup>

Then, regarding the comprehensive Tawhīd that combines Tawhīd of Divinity and Lordship, or the Tawhīd of either one: the servant has three stations therein:

First: The station of distinction and multiplicity, by [witnessing] His blessings through the multiplicity of created things and commanded duties.

Second: The station of gathering and annihilation, whereby one becomes absent through the One witnessed from one’s own witnessing; through the One worshipped from one’s own worship; through the One unified from one’s own

---

<sup>1</sup> Thus in the original.

act of unifying; through the One remembered from one's own remembrance; and through the One loved from one's own love. This is annihilation from perceiving otherness, and it is the annihilation of the deficient. As for the perfect, Muḥammadan annihilation: it is annihilation from the worship of otherness, seeking help from otherness, and intending the face of otherness. This is in the third level, which is witnessing distinction in gathering and multiplicity in unity. Thus, one witnesses the subsistence of contingent beings, despite their diversity, through the establishment of Allāh Almighty alone and His Lordship. One sees that {there is no creature but He holds it by its forelock} [Hūd: 56], that He is Guardian over all things, that He is the Lord of the Worlds, and that the hearts of the servants and their forelocks are in His hand. There is no creator other than Him, nor benefactor, nor harmer, nor giver, nor withholder, nor protector, nor honorer, nor humiliator besides Him. One also witnesses the performance of commanded duties, despite their multiplicity, and the abandonment of doubtful matters, despite their multiplicity, for Allāh alone, without partner.

This is the comprehensive, universal religion in which all the Prophets shared, and the general Islam and general faith. The Meccan sūrahs were revealed with it. It is indicated by Allāh Almighty's saying: {He has ordained for you of religion what He enjoined upon Nuḥ and that which We have revealed to you, [O Muḥammad], and what We enjoined upon Ibrāhīm and Mūsā and 'Īsā—to establish the religion and not be divided therein.} [Ash-Shūrā: 13], and by His saying: {And ask those We sent before you of Our messengers; did We make besides the Most Merciful deities to be worshipped?} [Az-Zukhruf: 45], and by Allāh Almighty's saying: {And We certainly sent into every nation a messenger, [saying], 'Worship Allāh and avoid Ṭāghūt (false deities).'} [An-Naḥl: 36]. This is why Al-Bukhārī titled a chapter on it: 'Chapter: What Has Come Regarding the Religion of the Prophets Being One.' Allāh Almighty has said: {Indeed, those who believed and those who were Jews or Christians or Sabians [before Prophet Muḥammad]—those [among them] who believed in Allāh and the Last Day and did righteousness—will have their reward with their Lord, and no fear will there be concerning them, nor will they grieve.} [Al-Baqarah: 62]. So He included among the four communities: {those [among them] who believed in Allāh and the Last Day and did righteousness}. This was before abrogation and alteration. He specified the believers at the beginning of the verse, which refers to the specific, legislative faith about which He said: {To each among you We prescribed a law and a method.} [Al-Mā'idah: 48]. The shir'ah is the Sharī'ah (Law), and the minḥāj is the Ṭarīqah (Path/Method). The comprehensive religion is the religious reality, and Tawḥīd of Lordship is the cosmic reality. Thus, the intended religious reality and the existing cosmic reality are agreed upon among the Prophets and Messengers.

As for the Islamic Law and Method, they are for the Ummah of Muḥammad: {the best nation produced for mankind} [Al 'Imrān: 110]. The Medinan sūrahs were revealed with them, as it was in the Prophet's city of Medina that the laws were legislated, the practices were established, and the rulings, obligations, and punishments were revealed.

So this Tawḥīd is what the Messengers brought and the Books were revealed with, and to it the Mashāyikh of the Path and the scholars of religion refer. However, some possessors of spiritual states may experience, during the state of deficient annihilation, intoxication and absence from otherness, and

intoxication is found without discernment. So one might say in that state: 'Subhānī' (Glory to me!) or 'Mā fi al-jubbah illā Allāh' (There is nothing in the cloak but Allāh) or similar words attributed to Abū Yazīd Al-Bisṭāmī or other sound individuals. The words of the intoxicated are folded away, not narrated, nor acted upon, provided his intoxication was not caused by something forbidden related to worship or a prohibited means. But if the cause was forbidden, the intoxicated person is not excused. There is no difference in that between physical and spiritual intoxication; intoxication of bodies is through food and drink, intoxication of souls is through forms/images, and intoxication of spirits is through sounds/voices. It is in such a state that those who erred did so by claiming specific Ittiḥād and Ḥulūl, similar to the claim of the Christians regarding the Messiah, the claim of the extremists regarding 'Alī and the Ahl al-Bayt, and the claim of some ignorant extremists regarding figures like Al-Ḥallāj or Al-Ḥākīm in Egypt or others. Perhaps they confused qualitative/legal Ittiḥād with specific/essential Ittiḥād.

The first [qualitative/legal Ittiḥād] is like what Muslim narrated in his Ṣaḥīḥ from Abū Hurayrah, from the Prophet (peace be upon him), who said: {Allāh says: My servant fell ill, and you did not visit Me.' He says, 'How could I visit You when You are the Lord of the worlds?' He says, 'Did you not know that My servant so-and-so fell ill? Had you visited him, you would have found Me with him. My servant was hungry, and you did not feed Me.' He says, 'My Lord, how could I feed You when You are the Lord of the worlds?' He says, 'Did you not know that My servant so-and-so was hungry? Had you fed him, you would have found that [reward] with Me.'} He explained what He spoke in this Hadith—that it refers to the hunger of His servant and beloved—by His saying: {you would have found that [reward] with Me} and did not say, 'you would have found Me having eaten it,' and by His saying: {'you would have found Me with him'} and did not say, 'you would have found Me to be him.' This is because the lover agrees with his beloved such that one is pleased with what pleases the other, commands what he commands, hates what he hates, dislikes what he dislikes, and forbids what he forbids. These are the ones for whose pleasure the Truth is pleased and for whose anger He is angered. The absolute perfect one among these is Muḥammad (peace be upon him). This is why Allāh Almighty said concerning him: {Indeed, those who pledge allegiance to you—they are actually pledging allegiance to Allāh.} [Al-Faṭḥ: 10], and He said: {And Allāh and His Messenger are more worthy that they should please Him} [At-Tawbah: 62], and He said: {He who obeys the Messenger has obeyed Allāh.} [An-Nisā': 80]. There have come in the Gospel in the hands of the Christians ambiguous words; if it is authentic that the Messiah said them, then this is their meaning, such as his saying, 'I and my Father are one,' and 'Whoever has seen me has seen my Father,' and the like. Through these, the Christians went astray, as they followed the ambiguous, as Allāh mentioned about them in the Qur'ān when the delegation of Najrān came to the Prophet (peace be upon him) and debated with him about the Messiah. It has come in the authentic Hadith narrated by Al-Bukhārī from Abū Hurayrah, who said: The Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) said: {'Whoever shows enmity to a friend of Mine, I have declared war against him. My servant does not draw near to Me with anything more beloved to Me than the religious duties I have enjoined upon him, and My servant continues to draw near to Me with supererogatory works until I love him. When I love him, I am his

hearing with which he hears, his sight with which he sees, his hand with which he strikes, and his foot with which he walks. Through Me he hears, through Me he sees, through Me he strikes, and through Me he walks.’ So He informed in this Hadith that when the servant draws near to Him, the Glorious Truth, through recommended supererogatory acts which Allāh loves, after the obligatory duties, the Truth loves him in this manner. He has erred who claimed that this is the nearness of nawāfil and that the nearness of farā'id is for him [the servant] to be Him [Allāh], for Allāh does not accept a supererogatory act until the obligatory duty is performed. Thus, this nearness combines the obligatory and supererogatory duties. These meanings and similar ones are the principles of the doctrine of the people of the Islamic Path, the followers of the Prophets and Messengers.

It has reached me that some people mentioned in your esteemed presence the discourse regarding the doctrine of the Ittiḥādiyyah. I had previously written a letter to your esteemed self in which the situation necessitated, without specific intent, that I make a subtle reference (ishārah laṭīfah) to the state of these people. By Allāh, the intention was not directed at any specific individual. Rather, the Shaykh is the gathering place of the believers, so it is upon us to assist him in religion and worldly matters in a manner befitting him. As for these Unionists, someone requested the supplicant [Ibn Taymiyyah] to reveal the reality of their affair. I have written a book on that which may perhaps be sent to the Shaykh. Our master, Shaykh 'Imād Ad-Dīn, has written epistles on that. Allāh Almighty knows—and He is sufficient as Knower—that were it not that I see repelling the harm of these people from the people of the path to Allāh Almighty, those wayfaring towards Him, as one of the greatest obligations—similar to repelling the Tatars from the believers—the believers in Allāh and His Messenger would have no need for the secrets of the Path to be revealed and its veils torn. However, the Shaykh—may Allāh Almighty be good to him—knows that the objective of the Prophetic call, indeed the objective of creating creation, revealing the Books, and sending the Messengers, is {that the religion, all of it, should be for Allāh} [Al-Anfāl: 39]. This is the call of creatures to their Creator, as Allāh Almighty said: {Indeed, We have sent you as a witness and a bringer of good tidings and a warner} {And one who invites to Allāh, by His permission, and an illuminating lamp.} [Al-Aḥzāb: 45-46]. And He, Glorified is He, said: {Say, 'This is my way; I invite to Allāh with insight, I and those who follow me.} [Yūsuf: 108]. And Allāh Almighty said: {And indeed, [O Muḥammad], you guide to a straight path -} {The path of Allāh, to whom belongs whatever is in the heavens and whatever is on the earth. Unquestionably, to Allāh do [all] matters evolve.} [Ash-Shūrā: 52-53].

These people have misrepresented to the wayfarers the Tawḥīd—which Allāh Almighty revealed the Books with and sent the Messengers with—by [presenting] the union which they named Tawḥīd, while its reality is the negation of the Maker and the denial of the Creator. Previously, I used to be among those who thought well of Ibn 'Arabī and revered him, due to the benefits I saw in his books, such as his words in many parts of Al-Futuḥāt, Al-Kunh, Al-Muḥkam al-Marbūṭ, Ad-Durrah al-Fākhīrah, Maṭāli' an-Nujūm, and the like. We had not yet become aware of the reality of his objective, nor had we studied Al-Fuṣūṣ and similar works. We used to gather with our brothers in Allāh, seeking the truth and following it, and uncovering the reality of the Path.

When the matter became clear, we recognized what was obligatory upon us. When respected Mashāyikh arrived from the East and asked about the reality of the Islamic Path, the Islamic religion, and the true state of these people, clarification became necessary. Likewise, wayfaring men, people of truthfulness, wrote to us from the regions of Ash-Shām, requesting that I mention the comprehensive points regarding the reality of their objective. The Shaykh—may Allāh Almighty support him with the light of his heart and the intelligence of his soul, and realize his intention of advising Islam and its people and his wayfaring brothers—should do in this matter what he hopes will earn the pleasure and forgiveness of Allāh, Glorified is He, in this world and the Hereafter.

Regarding these people who spoke on this matter: no news of them has been known since the emergence of the Tatar state. Otherwise, the old Ittiḥād was the specific Ittiḥād. This is because the division is fourfold, for each of Ittiḥād and Ḥulūl is either specific to a person or absolute. As for specific union and indwelling: like the saying of the Christians, the extremists among the Rāfidāh regarding the Imāms, and among the ignorant poor and Sufis regarding the Mashāyikh—they affirm it in a specific individual. Either through Ittiḥād, like the union of water and milk, which is the view of the Jacobites, who are [found among] the Sudanese, Ethiopians, and Copts; or through Ḥulūl, which is the view of the Nestorians; or through union in one aspect but not another, which is the view of the Melkites.

As for absolute Ḥulūl, which is that Allāh Almighty, in His essence, indwells in everything; this is attributed by the people of the Sunnah and the Salaf to the early Jahmiyyah, and they used to declare them disbelievers for that. As for what these [later figures] brought forth of general Ittiḥād, I do not know anyone who preceded them in it except those who denied the existence of the Maker, like Fir'awn and the Qarāmiṭāh. This is because the reality of their position is that they hold that the very existence of the Truth is the very existence of creation, and that the existence of the essence of Allāh, Creator of the heavens and the earth, is the same as the existence of created beings. Thus, it is inconceivable according to them that Allāh Almighty created anything other than Himself, nor that He is the Lord of the Worlds, nor that He is Rich while everything else is poor. However, they diverged into three paths, and most who look into their words do not understand the reality of their position because it is an obscure matter.

They say that all essences were fixed in non-existence, their essence being eternal, even the essences of animals, plants, minerals, movements, and rests. And that the Existence of the Truth flowed onto those essences. So their existence is the Existence of the Truth, but their essences are not the Essence of the Truth. They differentiate between Existence and Fixedness. 'What you were in your fixedness, you manifested in your existence.' They say that Allāh, Glorified is He, did not give anyone anything, nor enrich anyone, nor make anyone happy or miserable. Rather, His existence flowed onto the essences. So, 'Praise only yourself, and blame only yourself.'

They say that this is the secret of predestination, and that Allāh Almighty only knew things by virtue of His seeing them fixed in non-existence, external to His sacred Self. They say that Allāh Almighty is not able to change a single atom of the universe, and that they [the recognizers] may know things from the same

perspective that Allāh, Glorified is He, knew them, so their knowledge and Allāh Almighty's knowledge are from a single source. And that they can be superior to the Seal of the Messengers in some aspects, because they take from the source from which the angel who reveals to the Messengers took. They say that they have never worshipped other than Allāh, nor is it conceivable that they worship other than Allāh Almighty, and that the worshippers of idols worshipped none but Allāh, Glorified is He. And that His saying, Almighty is He: {And your Lord has decreed that you worship none but Him} [Al-Isrā': 23] means He judged/determined, not commanded. For nothing has been worshipped besides Allāh in any object of worship, because Allāh Almighty never decrees anything except that it occurs. They say that the call to Allāh Almighty is a deception towards the one called, for he was never absent [from Allāh] from the beginning to be called to the goal. And that the people of Nūh said: {Do not leave your gods and do not leave Wadd or Suwā'} [Nūh: 23] because if they had left them, they would have left a portion of the Truth equivalent to what they left of them; because the Truth has a face in every object of worship, which is known by whoever knows it and denied by whoever denies it. And that differentiation and multiplicity are like limbs in the perceived form and like the spiritual faculties in the spiritual form. And that the recognizer among them knows who was worshipped and in which form He appeared such that He was worshipped. For the ignorant one says, 'This is a stone, this is a tree,' while the recognizer says, 'This is a divine manifestation that should be venerated.' Thus, he does not restrict [worship]. For the Christians only disbelieved because they specified. And the idol worshippers only erred in that they restricted themselves to worshipping some manifestations, while the recognizer worships everything. And Allāh also worships everything, because things are His nourishment through the names and rulings, and He is their nourishment through existence. He is poor in need of them, and they are poor in need of Him. He is the intimate friend of everything in this sense. They make Allāh's Beautiful Names merely relations and connections between existence and fixedness, and they are not non-existent matters. They say: Among His Beautiful Names is Al-'Alī. High above what? There is nothing but Him. Upon what? There is no other than Him. So the named things are originated things, and they are the high ones in themselves, and they are nothing but Him. He married none but himself, and slaughtered none but himself. The speaker is the same as the listener. And that Mūsā only rebuked Hārūn when he forbade them from worshipping the calf due to his narrowness and lack of breadth, and that Mūsā was broader in knowledge, so he knew that they worshipped none but Allāh. And that the highest thing worshipped is desire, and that everyone who {has taken as his god his [own] desire} [Al-Jāthiyah: 23], has worshipped none but Allāh. Fir'awn, according to them, was one of the greatest recognizers, and the magicians affirmed his truthfulness in his saying: {I am your Lord, the Most High} [An-Nāzi'āt: 24] and in his saying: {I have not known you to have a god other than me} [Al-Qaṣāṣ: 38]. I used to address some misguided intellectuals revealing their affair, saying that the reality of their position is the reality of the saying of Fir'awn, the denier of the existence of the Creator, the Maker. Until someone narrated to me from many of their leaders that they acknowledge and say: 'We follow the view of Fir'awn.'

All these meanings are the saying of the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ [Ibn 'Arabī]. Allāh

Almighty knows best upon what [state] the man died. May Allāh forgive all Muslim men and women, and believing men and women, the living among them and the dead. {Our Lord, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith and put not in our hearts [any] resentment toward those who have believed. Our Lord, indeed You are Kind and Merciful.} [Al-Ĥashr: 10].

The point is: the reality of what is contained in the book Al-Fuṣūṣ—which is attributed to the Prophet (peace be upon him) as having brought it—is such that if a Muslim understands it, he knows by necessity that all the Prophets and Messengers, and all the Awliyā' and the righteous, indeed all the common folk of the religious communities—Jews, Christians, and Sabians—declare their innocence before Allāh Almighty from some of this saying, let alone all of it! We know that the polytheists, worshippers of idols, and the disbelievers among the People of the Book acknowledge the existence of the Maker, the Creator, the Originator, the Fashioner—Who created the heavens and the earth and made the darknesses and the light—their Lord and the Lord of their first forefathers—the Lord of the East and the West. None of them says that He is the same as the created things, nor the essence of the manufactured things, as these [heretics] say. They even say that if the heavens and the earth were to cease, the reality of Allāh would cease! This [doctrine] is composed of two foundations:

3. First: That the non-existent is a thing fixed in non-existence—as many of the Mu'tazilah and Rāfidāh say. This is a doctrine false according to reason which conforms to the Book, the Sunnah, and consensus. Many of the theologians of the affirmers [of attributes]—like Al-Qādī Abū Bakr—declared those who say this to be disbelievers. These people only erred because they did not differentiate between Allāh's knowledge of things before their existence—and that they are affirmed with Him in the Mother of the Book in the Preserved Tablet—and their being fixed externally outside of Allāh Almighty's knowledge. For the doctrine of the Muslims, Ahl as-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah, is that Allāh, Glorified and Almighty is He, wrote the decrees of creation in the Preserved Tablet before He created them. So they differentiate between knowledge-based existence and external, real existence. This is why the first thing revealed to the Messenger of Allāh (peace be upon him) was the Sūrah: {Read! In the name of your Lord who created -} {Created man from a clinging clot.} {Read! And your Lord is the Most Generous -} {Who taught by the pen -} {Taught man that which he knew not.} [Al-'Alaq: 1-5]. He mentioned the four levels: real existence which He created, written existence which corresponds to the verbal which indicates the knowledge-based, and He clarified that Allāh Almighty knew it. This is why He mentioned teaching by the pen, for it necessitates the [other] three levels. This saying—meaning the saying of those who say: the non-existent is a thing fixed in itself, external to Allāh Almighty's knowledge—although it is false and its evidence [of falsehood] is clear, it was innovated in Islam about four hundred years ago. Ibn 'Arabī agreed with its proponents, and it is one of the two foundations of his doctrine found in Al-Fuṣūṣ.

4. That the existence of originated, created things is the very existence of the Creator, not other than Him nor besides Him. This is what he [Ibn 'Arabī] innovated and was unique in holding, compared to all the Mashāyikh and scholars who preceded him. It is the saying of the rest of the Ittiḥādiyyah. However, Ibn 'Arabī is the closest of them to Islam and has better speech in

many places, for he differentiates between the Manifest and the manifestations. He affirms the command and prohibition and the laws as they are, and he commands wayfaring with much of what the Mashāyikh commanded regarding morals and acts of worship. This is why many worshippers take their wayfaring practices from his words and benefit from that, even if they do not comprehend his realities. As for those among them who understand it and agree with him, his position has become clear.

(As for) his companion, Aṣ-Ṣadr Ar-Rūmī, he was philosophically inclined, so he is further from the Sharī'ah and Islam. This is why the wicked At-Tilmisānī, nicknamed Al-'Affīf, used to say: 'My former Shaykh [Ibn 'Arabī] was spiritualized-philosophizing, and the other [Aṣ-Ṣadr Ar-Rūmī] was philosophizing-spiritualized'—meaning Aṣ-Ṣadr Ar-Rūmī—for he had studied under him but did not meet Ibn 'Arabī. In the book *Miftāḥ Ghayb al-Jam' wa al-Wujūd* and elsewhere, he [Ar-Rūmī] says that Allāh Almighty is Absolute Existence and Particular Existence, just as one differentiates between the absolute animal and the particular animal, and the absolute body and the particular body. The absolute does not exist except externally as absolute; the absolute is only found within external particulars. So the reality of his saying is that Allāh, Glorified is He, has no existence at all, nor reality, nor fixedness, except the very existence inherent in created beings. This is why he and his Shaykh [Ibn 'Arabī] say that Allāh Almighty is never seen, and that He has, in reality, no name nor attribute. They explicitly state that the essence of the dog, the pig, urine, and excrement is His very existence—Exalted is Allāh above what they say!

(As for) the wicked At-Tilmisānī: he is the most malicious of the group and the most deeply entrenched in disbelief. For he does not differentiate between existence and fixedness as Ibn 'Arabī does, nor does he differentiate between the absolute and the particular as Ar-Rūmī does. Rather, according to him, there is no other nor besides in any way whatsoever. The servant only witnesses otherness as long as he is veiled. When his veil is lifted, he sees that there is no other to clarify the matter for him. For this reason, he used to permit all forbidden things. Trustworthy sources narrated from him that he used to say: 'The daughter, the mother, and the unrelated woman are one thing; there is nothing forbidden in that for us. It is only these veiled ones who said 'forbidden,' so we say 'forbidden for you'.' He used to say: 'The Qur'ān is entirely polytheism, there is no Tawḥīd in it. Tawḥīd is only in our words.' He used to say: 'I do not adhere to any single Sharī'ah.' When speaking nicely, he would say: 'The Qur'ān leads to Paradise, and our words lead to Allāh Almighty.' He explained the Beautiful Names based on this principle of his. He has a collection of poetry in which he composed things, and his poetry, in terms of poetic craft, is good; but it is as was said: 'Pork in a china dish.' He composed a creed for the Nuṣayriyyah. The reality of their position is that the Truth is like the sea, and the parts of existing things are like its waves.

As for Ibn Sab'īn: in Al-Budd and Al-Īhā'ah, he also affirms the unity of existence and that there is no other. Likewise, Ibn Al-Fāriḍ' at the end of *Naẓm as-Sulūk* [The Poem of the Way]. However, he did not explicitly state whether he holds the view of At-Tilmisānī, Ar-Rūmī, or Ibn 'Arabī. He is closer to the words of At-Tilmisānī. But I have not seen among them anyone who disbelieved with such disbelief—which no one ever disbelieved before—like At-Tilmisānī and another called Al-Balyānī from the Mashāyikh of Shīrāz.

From his [Al-Balyānī's] poetry:

*And in everything He has a sign  
Indicating that it is His very essence*

Also:

*And you are nothing other than the cosmos, rather you are its very essence  
And this secret is understood by one who tastes it*

Also:

*And my hand delights if it passes over my body  
Because I, in reality, am none other than you*

Also:

*What is wrong with your camel that it does not settle?  
And why does your shadow not cease moving?  
For soon you will know that your journey was  
Only unto yourself, when you reach the destination*

Also:

*The affair is but a single pattern  
There is no praise nor blame in it  
It is only custom that has specified  
And nature and the Lawgiver in judgment*

Also:

*O my blamer, you forbid me and command me  
But ecstasy is a truer forbidder and commander  
If I obey you and disobey ecstasy  
I return blind From direct vision to the illusions of reports  
For the very thing you call me to, if you verify it  
You will see it is the forbidden thing, O my neighbor!*

Also:

*And the sea is but the wave, nothing else  
Though the multiplicity of the numbered differentiates it*

And similar poems, and in prose, what is innumerable. They deceive the ignorant into thinking that they are the Mashāyikh of Islam and the Imāms of guidance for whom Allāh Almighty established a truthful mention in the Ummah, like Sa'īd ibn Al-Musayyib, Al-Ḥasan Al-Baṣrī, 'Umar ibn 'Abd Al-'Azīz, Mālik ibn Anas, Al-Awzā'ī, Ibrāhīm ibn Adham, Sufyān Ath-Thawrī, Al-Fudāyl ibn 'Iyād, Ma'rūf Al-Karkhī, Ash-Shāfi'ī, Abū Sulaymān, Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Bishr Al-Ḥāfi, 'Abdullāh ibn Al-Mubārak, Shaqīq Al-Balkhī, and countless others. Down to the later ones like Al-Junayd ibn Muḥammad Al-Qawārīrī, Sahl ibn 'Abdullāh At-Tustarī, 'Amr ibn 'Uthmān Al-Makkī, and those after them—down to Abū Ṭālib Al-Makkī, down to the likes of Shaykh 'Abd Al-Qādir Al-Kīlānī, Shaykh 'Adī, Shaykh Abū Al-Bayān, Shaykh Abū Madyan, Shaykh 'Aqil, Shaykh Abū Al-Wafā', Shaykh Raslān, Shaykh 'Abd Ar-Raḥīm, Shaykh 'Abdullāh Al-Yūnīnī, Shaykh Al-Qurashī, and the likes of these Mashāyikh who were in the Ḥijāz, Ash-Shām, Iraq, Egypt, the Maghrib, and Khurāsān, from the earliest and the latest. All of these are agreed on declaring these—and those who are more likely [to be excused] than them—as disbelievers, and [agreed] that Allāh,

Glorified is He, is not His creation, nor a part of His creation, nor an attribute of His creation. Rather, He, Glorified and Almighty is He, is distinct in His sacred Self, separate by His magnificent Essence from His creatures. This is what the four divine Books came with: the Tawrah, the Injil, the Zabur, and the Qur'an. Upon this Allāh Almighty created His servants according to their innate disposition, and to this sound intellects testify.

I often used to think that the emergence of people like these was one of the greatest causes for the emergence of the Tatars and the effacement of the Sharī'ah of Islam, and that these people are the precursors of the Dajjāl, the one-eyed liar who will claim that he is Allāh. For according to these people, everything is Allāh, but some things are greater than others and more magnificent. As for the view of the author of Al-Fuṣūṣ [Ibn 'Arabī], some manifestations and loci of manifestation are greater due to the greatness of their essence fixed in non-existence. As for the view of Ar-Rūmī, some particulars are greater, for some particulars of a universal are greater than others. As for the rest [like Tilmisānī], all are parts of Him, and some parts are greater than others. So the Dajjāl, according to these people, is like Fir'awn, among the senior recognizers, and greater than the Messengers after our Prophet Muḥammad (peace be upon him), Ibrāhīm, Mūsā, and 'Īsā (peace be upon them). Mūsā fought Fir'awn who claimed Lordship, and Allāh Almighty will give power to the Messiah of Guidance—about whom it was [falsely] said that he is Allāh Almighty, while he is innocent of that—over the Messiah of Error who said that he is Allāh.

This is why some people used to wonder about the Prophet (peace be upon him) saying: {'Indeed, he is one-eyed'} and his saying: {'And know that none of you will see his Lord until he dies.'} Ibn Al-Khaṭīb denied that the Prophet (peace be upon him) said this, because the signs of originatedness and deficiency on the Dajjāl are clearer than needing to use the fact that he is one-eyed as evidence. But when we saw the reality of the saying of these Ittīhādiyyah and pondered what the Christians and the Ḥulūliyyah fell into, the reason for the Prophet's (peace be upon him) guidance to his Ummah with this sign became apparent. For he was sent as a mercy to the worlds. If many people permit the appearance of the Lord in human form, or say that He is the human, then using the one-eyedness as evidence against him is a proof for the negation of divinity from him. A person from among our best companions—who used to lean towards Ittīhād then repented from it—addressed me long ago and mentioned this Hadith, and I explained its reasoning to him. A person came to us who used to claim that he was the Seal of the Awliyā'. He alleged that when Al-Ḥallāj said, 'Anā al-Ḥaqq' (I am the Truth), it was Allāh Almighty Who was speaking on his tongue, just as a Jinnī speaks on the tongue of a possessed person. And that when the Companions heard the words of Allāh Almighty from the Prophet (peace be upon him), it was of this category. I explained to him the corruption of this, and that if it were so, the Companions would have been in the position of Mūsā ibn 'Imrān, and whoever was addressed by these [supposedly possessed individuals] would be greater than Mūsā; because Mūsā heard the divine speech from the tree, whereas these people would be hearing it from the speaking Jinn!

This is said by a group of the Ittīhādiyyah, but most of them are ignorant, not differentiating between the general, absolute Ittīhād followed by the wicked At-Tilmisānī and his ilk, and the specific Ittīhād followed by the Christians and the

extremists.

The Salaf (predecessors) of the Ummah and the masters among the Imāms used to consider the disbelief of the Jahmiyyah greater than the disbelief of the Jews, as stated by ‘Abdullāh ibn Al-Mubārak, Al-Bukhārī, and others. They used only to allude and rarely stated explicitly that His essence is in a place [i.e., above creation]. As for these Unionists, they are more malicious and more disbelieving than those Jahmiyyah. However, the Salaf and the Imāms were more knowledgeable of Islam and its realities. For many people today may not understand the severity of their condemnation of the doctrine until they ponder it and are granted the light of guidance. When the Salaf became aware of the secret of the saying, they recoiled from it. This is as some people said: ‘The theologians of the Jahmiyyah worship nothing, and the worshippers of the Jahmiyyah worship everything.’ This is because their theologian has no divinity or worship in his heart, so he describes his Lord with attributes of non-existence and inanimateness. As for the worshipper, there is divinity and worship in his heart, and the heart only intends something existing, not something non-existent. So he needs to worship created things: either Absolute Existence, or some manifestations like the sun, the moon, humans, idols, and so forth. For the saying of the Unionists combines every form of polytheism in the world. They do not unify Allāh, Glorified and Almighty is He; rather, they unify the common factor between Him and created beings. Thus, {they equate [others] with their Lord.} [Al-An’ām: 1].

This is why a trustworthy source told me that Ibn Sab’īn wanted to go to India and said that the land of Islam could not contain him, because India has polytheists who worship everything, even plants and animals. This is the reality of the Unionists’ saying. I know people who are occupied with philosophy and theology and have adopted devotion according to the path of these Unionists. When they begin to describe the Lord, Glorified is He, theologically, they say, ‘He is not such, He is not such,’ and describe Him as not being the Lord of creatures as Muslims say, but rather they deny the attributes of the Creator that the Messengers brought. Then, when one of them attains a taste and finding, he adopts devotion, follows the path of the Unionists, and says that He is all existing things. If it is said to him, ‘Where does that negation stand in relation to this affirmation?’ he says, ‘That is my finding, and this is my taste.’ It should be said to this deviant: Every taste and finding that does not conform to the belief, then one or both of them are false. Tastes and findings are merely results of knowledge and beliefs. For the knowledge of the heart and its state are interconnected. The finding, love, and state are proportional to the level of knowledge and recognition. If these people had followed the path of the Prophets and Messengers, who commanded the worship of Allāh Almighty alone, without partner, and described Him with what He described Himself and His Messengers described Him—and followed the path of the Foremost Predecessors—they would have trodden the path of guidance and found the coolness of certainty and the delight of the eye. For the matter is as some people said: The Messengers came with detailed affirmation and general negation, while the atheist Sabians came with detailed negation and general affirmation. The Qur’ān is filled with Allāh Almighty’s sayings in affirmation: {Indeed, Allāh is Knowing of all things} [Al-Baqarah: 231, etc.], {over all things competent} [Al-Baqarah: 20, etc.], and that He is All-Hearing, All-Seeing, {has encompassed all

things in mercy and knowledge} [Ṭāhā: 98]. And in negation: {There is nothing like unto Him} [Ash-Shūrā: 11], {Nor is there to Him any equivalent} [Al-Ikhlās: 4], {Do you know of any similarity to Him?} [Maryam: 65], {Exalted is your Lord, the Lord of might, above what they describe.} {And peace upon the messengers.} [Aṣ-Ṣāffāt: 180-181].

This letter, although I have prolonged the discussion in it for the Shaykh—may Allāh Almighty support Islam through him and benefit the Muslims with the blessing of his breaths, the goodness of his intentions, and the light of his heart—what is in it are concise points. It is not possible to explain these matters [fully] in a letter. However, I mentioned to the Shaykh—may Allāh Almighty be good to him—what the situation required me to mention. The carrier of the letter is fully occupied and in a hurry. I ask Allāh the Great to rectify the affairs of the Muslims, their common folk and their elite, and guide them to what brings them near [to Him], and to make the Shaykh among the callers to good about whom Allāh, Glorified is He, said: {And let there be [arising] from you a nation inviting to [all that is] good, enjoining what is right and forbidding what is wrong, and those will be the successful.} [Āl 'Imrān: 104].



## Regarding Al-Ĥallāj and One Who Claims to Hold His Beliefs

### Question

Shaykh al-Islām—may Allāh sanctify his soul—was asked:

What do the Imāms of Islam say about Al-Ĥallāj? And regarding someone who says, 'I believe what Al-Ĥallāj believed,' what is obligatory upon him? And he says that he [Al-Ĥallāj] was killed unjustly, just as some prophets were killed? And he says: Al-Ĥallāj is one of the friends of Allāh? What is obligatory upon him for saying this? And was he [Al-Ĥallāj] killed by the sword of the Sharī'ah?

### Answer

He answered:

Al-ĥamdulillāh. Whoever believes what Al-Ĥallāj believed from the doctrines for which Al-Ĥallāj was killed, he is a disbeliever, an apostate, by the consensus of the Muslims. For the Muslims only killed him for [belief in] Ĥulūl and Ittiḥād and the like from the doctrines of the people of heresy and deviation, such as his saying: 'Anā Allāh' (I am Allāh), and his saying: 'A god in the heaven and a god on the earth.' It is known by necessity from the religion of Islam that there is no god but Allāh, and that Allāh is the Creator of everything, and everything besides Him is created, and {Indeed, every being within the heavens and earth but comes to the Most Merciful as a servant.} [Maryam: 93]. Allāh Almighty said: {O People of the Scripture, do not commit excess in your religion or say about Allāh except the truth.} [An-Nisā': 171] the verses. And Allāh Almighty said: {They have certainly disbelieved who say, 'Allāh is the Messiah, the son of Maryam.'} [Al-Mā'idah: 72] the two verses. So the Christians, whom Allāh and His Messenger declared disbelievers and upon whose disbelief the Muslims agreed, one of their greatest claims was Ĥulūl and Ittiḥād with the Messiah, son of Maryam. Therefore, whoever affirms Ĥulūl and Ittiḥād in someone other than the Messiah—like what the extremists say about 'Alī, and what the Ĥallājiyyah say about Al-Ĥallāj, and the Ĥākimiyyah about Al-Ĥākīm, and the likes of these—their saying is worse than the saying of the Christians, because the Messiah, son of Maryam, is superior to all of these. These people are of the same kind as the followers of the Dajjāl, who will claim divinity to be followed, even though the Dajjāl will say to the sky, 'Rain!' and it will rain, and to the earth, 'Sprout!' and it will sprout; and to the ruin, 'Bring forth your treasures!' and the treasures of gold and silver will come out with him; and he will kill a believing man, then command him, and he will rise. Despite this, he is the one-eyed, the liar, the Dajjāl. So whoever claims divinity without these extraordinary feats is

lesser than this Dajjāl. Al-Ĥallāj had tricks and types of magic, and there are books attributed to him on magic. In sum, there is no dispute among the Ummah that whoever affirms the indwelling of Allāh in humans and His union with them, and that a human can be a god and this [human] is one of the gods, then he is a disbeliever whose blood is permissible. It was for this that Al-Ĥallāj was killed.

Whoever says that Allāh spoke on the tongue of Al-Ĥallāj, and that the words heard from Al-Ĥallāj were the words of Allāh, and that Allāh was the one saying on his tongue, ‘Anā Allāh’ (I am Allāh), then he is a disbeliever (kāfir) by the consensus (ittifāq) of the Muslims. For Allāh does not indwell in humans, nor has He spoken on the tongue of a human. Rather, He sends the Messengers with His word, so they say from Him what He commanded them to convey. Thus, He says on the tongues of the Messengers what He commanded them to say, just as the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: {‘Indeed, Allāh said on the tongue of His Prophet: Sami’a Allāhu liman ḥamidah (Allāh hears whoever praises Him).’} For regarding each of the sender and the messenger, it can be said that he speaks on the tongue of the other, just as Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal said to Al-Marwadhī: ‘Say on my tongue whatever you wish,’ and as it is said: ‘This person says on the tongue of the Sultan such-and-such.’ The meaning of such [phrases] is understood. But [to say] that Allāh Himself is the speaker on the human, just as the Jinnī speaks on the tongue of the possessed: this is explicit disbelief.

However, if such a saying appears from someone whose intellect is absent, for whom the pen has been lifted because he is overwhelmed in a state of annihilation or intoxication, then he spoke it in a state where the pen was lifted from him. So although the saying is false, the speaker is not held accountable. Something like this happens to one overcome by the power of love combined with weakness of intellect, as it is said that a beloved threw himself into the sea, and the lover threw himself in after him. [The beloved] said, ‘I fell in, why did you fall in after me?’ He replied, ‘I became absent in you from myself, so I thought that you were me.’ Some people may reach a station where they become absent through their object of worship from their worship, through their object of remembrance from their remembrance, and through their object of knowledge from their knowledge. If this person’s discernment departs and he becomes absent of intellect—such that the pen is lifted from him—he is not punished for what he spoke in this state, while knowing that it is error and delusion, and that it is a deficient state not befitting the friends of Allāh.

What is narrated about Al-Ĥallāj regarding the appearance of miracles for him at the time of his killing, such as his blood writing on the ground: ‘Allāh, Allāh,’ or showing joy at being killed, or the like: all of it is lies. The Muslims have collected the reports about Al-Ĥallāj in many places, as mentioned by Thābit ibn Sinān in Akhbār al-Khulafā’—and he witnessed his execution—and as mentioned by Ismā’īl ibn ‘Alī Al-Khuṭabī in Tārīkh Baghdād—and he witnessed his killing—and as mentioned by Al-Ĥāfiẓ Abū Bakr Al-Khaṭīb in his Tārīkh, and as mentioned by Al-Qādī Abū Ya’lā in Al-Mu’tamad, and as mentioned by Al-Qādī Abū Bakr ibn Aṭ-Ṭayyib and Abū Muḥammad ibn Ḥazm and others, and as mentioned by Abū Yūsuf Al-Qazwīnī and Abū Al-Faraj ibn Al-Jawzī in what they compiled of his reports. Shaykh Abū ‘Abd Ar-Raḥmān As-Sulamī mentioned in Ṭabaqāt aṣ-Ṣūfiyyah that most of the Mashāyikh expelled him from the Path. Abū Al-Qāsim Al-Qushayrī did not mention him in his Risālah

among the Mashāyikh whom he counted as Mashāyikh of the Path. We do not know of any of the Imāms of the Muslims who mentioned Al-Ḥallāj favorably, neither among the scholars nor among the Mashāyikh. However, some people suspend judgment regarding him because they do not know his affair. The most favorable view among those who think well of him says: His killing was necessary outwardly, so the killer is a striver and the killed is a martyr. This is also an error. The statement of the one who says he was killed unjustly is a false statement. For the necessity of killing him based on the heresy he manifested is an obligatory matter by the consensus of the Muslims. However, since he used to manifest Islam outwardly and conceal heresy inwardly to his companions, he became a heretic. When he was seized and imprisoned, he manifested repentance. The jurists are in dispute regarding accepting the repentance of a zindīq. Most of them do not accept it, which is the school of Mālik and the people of Medina, and the school of Aḥmad according to the more famous of the two narrations from him, and it is one of the two opinions in the school of Abū Ḥanifah, and a view in the school of Ash-Shāfiʿī. The other opinion is that his repentance is accepted. They have agreed that if someone like this is killed, it is not said that he was killed unjustly.

As for the statement of the one who says: Al-Ḥallāj is one of the friends of Allāh.

The speaker of this is certainly ignorant, speaking about what he does not know. [This would be true] even if the statements of the people of heresy had not appeared from Al-Ḥallāj. For the friend of Allāh is one who dies upon the friendship of Allāh, loving Him and being pleased with Him. Testifying to this for anyone other than those for whom the Prophet (peace be upon him) testified Paradise is not permissible according to many or most of the scholars. A group of the Salaf, like Ibn Al-Ḥanafīyah and ‘Alī ibn Al-Madīnī, held that one should not testify to that for anyone other than the Prophet (peace be upon him). Some of them said: Rather, whoever gains widespread praise among the Muslims, it is testified for him, because {‘The Prophet (peace be upon him) had a funeral procession pass by him, and they praised [the deceased] well, so he said: ‘It is affirmed, it is affirmed.’ Then another funeral procession passed by him, and they spoke ill of [the deceased], so he said: ‘It is affirmed, it is affirmed.’ He said: ‘This funeral, you praised it well, so I said Paradise is affirmed for it. And this funeral, you spoke ill of it, so I said the Fire is affirmed for it. You are Allāh’s witnesses on earth.’} So if it is permitted to testify for some people that they are friends of Allāh inwardly, either by a text or by the testimony of the Ummah—then Al-Ḥallāj is not among these. The majority of the Ummah criticizes him and considers him among the people of heresy—[This is the case] even if one were able to discern about some people that they are friends of Allāh and the like, which is specific to some righteous people.

So this person who praised Al-Ḥallāj and agreed with him on his belief is deviant in several ways:

1. He does not know that regarding someone killed by the sword of the Shariah for heresy, it is not said that he was killed unjustly and was a friend of Allāh. Al-Jahm ibn Ṣafwān, Al-Ja’d ibn Dirham, Ghaylān Al-Qadārī, Muḥammad ibn Sa’id Al-Maṣlūb, Bashshār ibn Burd Al-A’mā, As-Suhrawardī, and many like them were killed, and the people of knowledge and religion did not say about them that they were killed unjustly or were friends of Allāh.

So why is Al-Ḥallāj singled out from these? As for the Prophets, the disbelievers killed them. Likewise, the Companions who were martyred, the disbelievers killed them. ‘Uthmān, ‘Alī, Al-Ḥusayn, and others like them were killed by the Khawārij, the rebels; they were not killed by a ruling of the Shariāh according to the schools of the jurists, the Imāms of the religion like Mālik, Ash-Shāfi‘ī, Abū Ḥanīfah, Aḥmad, and others. For the Imāms are agreed on the sanctity of the blood of these [latter figures], while they are agreed on [the permissibility of] the blood of Al-Ḥallāj and his likes.

2. Discerning the friends of Allāh is only possible for one who knows the path of friendship, which is faith and piety. Among the greatest aspects of faith and piety is to avoid the doctrines of the people of heresy—like the people of Ḥulūl and union. So whoever agrees with Al-Ḥallāj on such a doctrine is not knowledgeable of faith and piety, thus he cannot be knowledgeable of the path of the friends of Allāh; therefore, it is not permissible for him to distinguish between the friends of Allāh and others.

3. This speaker has informed that he agrees with him [Al-Ḥallāj] on his doctrine, so he is of his kind. His testimony for his [Al-Ḥallāj’s] friendship is a testimony for himself, like the testimony of the Jews, Christians, and Rāfiḍāh for themselves that they are upon the truth. A person’s testimony for himself regarding something where his falsehood or truthfulness is unknown is rejected. So how [can it be accepted] for himself and his group who are proven by the Book, the Sunnah, and consensus to be people of delusion?

4. It may be said: As for Al-Ḥallāj having repented at death between himself and Allāh, or not having repented, this is unseen which Allāh knows about him. As for him only speaking this [heresy] during a state of being overwhelmed, this is not the case. Rather, he used to author books and say it while present and awake. It was mentioned earlier that absence of intellect can be an excuse for the lifting of the pen. Likewise, a doubt which prevents the establishment of proof may be an excuse outwardly. Even if this were assumed, it would not be permissible to say he was killed unjustly, nor to say one agrees with him on his belief, nor to testify to what is not known. So how [can these things be said] when the matter is contrary to that? The most a Muslim believer could do, if excusing Al-Ḥallāj, is to claim overwhelming state or doubt regarding him. But to agree with him on what he was killed for, this is the state of the people of heresy and deviation. Likewise, whoever does not permit the killing of someone like him is one who has deviated from the religion of Islam.

Our duty is only to know the Tawḥīd we have been commanded with and to know the path of Allāh we have been commanded with. We know through both of these that what Al-Ḥallāj said is false and that killing the likes of him is obligatory. As for the specific individual himself, did he have inwardly some matter for which Allāh would forgive him, such as repentance or otherwise? This matter rests with Allāh, and no one has any need to know the reality of that. And Allāh knows best.



## Is One Who Says ‘There Is Nothing Except Allāh’ a Disbeliever?

### Question

Shaykh al-Islām and the Proof of Mankind, Abū Al-‘Abbās Ibn Taymiyyah (may Allāh be pleased with him) was asked:

About someone who says: ‘There is nothing except Allāh (mā thamma illā Allāh).’ A person said, ‘Whoever says these words has disbelieved.’

### Answer

He answered (may Allāh be pleased with him):

Al-ḥamdulillāh. The saying of the speaker, ‘Mā thamma illā Allāh,’ is an ambiguous phrase that can bear a correct meaning and a false meaning. If he means: There is no Creator but Allāh, no Lord but Allāh, none answers the distressed and provides for the servants but Allāh; He is the One Who gives and withholds, lowers and raises, honors and humbles; He is the One Who deserves that help be sought from Him, reliance be placed upon Him, refuge be sought in Him, and servants turn to Him; for indeed, there is no preventer of what He gives, no giver of what He prevents, and the wealth/might of the wealthy/mighty is of no avail against Him—as Allāh Almighty said in the Opening of the Book: {It is You we worship and You we ask for help} [Al-Fātiḥah: 5], and Allāh Almighty said: {So worship Him and rely upon Him} [Hūd: 123], and He said: {Say, ‘He is my Lord; there is no deity except Him. Upon Him I have relied, and to Him is my return.’} [Ar-Ra’d: 30]. All these meanings are correct and are from explicit Tawḥīd, and the Qur’ān came with them.

Thus, servants should not fear anyone but Allāh, as Allāh Almighty said: {So fear them not, but fear Me} [Al-Mā’idah: 44], and Allāh Almighty said: {Those to whom people said, ‘Indeed, the people have gathered against you, so fear them.’ But it [only] increased them in faith, and they said, ‘Sufficient for us is Allāh, and [He is] the best Disposer of affairs.’} {So they returned with favor from Allāh and bounty, no harm having touched them.} until His saying: {That is only Satan who frightens [you] through his allies. So fear them not, but fear Me} [Āl ‘Imrān: 173-175]. Likewise, hope should not be placed in anyone but Allāh. Allāh Almighty said: {Whatever Allāh grants to people of mercy—none can withhold it; and whatever He withholds—none can release it thereafter. And He is the Exalted in Might, the Wise.} [Fāṭir: 2]. And Allāh Almighty said: {Say, ‘Then have you considered what you invoke besides Allāh? If Allāh intended me harm, are they removers of His harm; or if He intended me mercy, are they withholders of His mercy?’ Say, ‘Sufficient for me is Allāh; upon Him [alone] rely the [rightful]

relyers.} [Az-Zumar: 38]. And they should not rely except upon Allāh, as Allāh Almighty said: {And upon Allāh let the relyers rely}. [Ibrāhīm: 12, etc.]. And they should not worship anyone but Allāh, as Allāh Almighty said: {And they were not commanded except to worship Allāh, [being] sincere to Him in religion, inclining to truth, and to establish prayer and to give zakāh. And that is the correct religion.} [Al-Bayyinah: 5]. And they should not call upon anyone but Allāh, as Allāh Almighty said: {And [He revealed] that the mosques are for Allāh, so do not invoke with Allāh anyone.} [Al-Jinn: 18]. And Allāh Almighty said: {So do not invoke with Allāh another deity and [thus] be among the punished.} [Ash-Shu'arā': 213]. whether it is the invocation of worship or the invocation of request.

But if the speaker intends by 'Mā thamma illā Allāh' what the people of Ittīhād say; namely, that there is no existent except Allāh, and they say: 'Laysa illā Allāh' meaning, 'There is no existent except Allāh.' And they say: that the existence of created beings is the existence of the Creator, the Creator is the created, the created is the Creator, the servant is the Lord, and the Lord is the servant, and similar meanings held by the Ittīhādiyyah who do not differentiate between the Creator and the created, nor affirm the distinction between the Lord and the servant, and similar meanings found in the words of Ibn 'Arabī At-Ṭā'ī, Ibn Sab'īn, Ibn Al-Fārid', At-Tilmisānī, and others like them among the Ittīhādiyyah. Likewise, whoever affirms Ḥulūl, as the Jahmiyyah say, who claim that Allāh, in His essence, is in every place. And they make Him intermingled with created beings, to the extent that these people place Him in dogs, pigs, and impurities, or they make the existence of those things His existence. So whoever intends these meanings is a deviant heretic who must be asked to repent. If he repents, [fine]; otherwise, he is killed. And Allāh, Glorified and Almighty is He, knows best.



## Regarding the Prophet's Saying: 'Do not curse Time (Ad-Dahr), for indeed Allāh is Time (Ad-Dahr)'

### Question

Shaykh al-Islām (may Allāh have mercy on him) was asked:

About his (peace be upon him) saying: 'Do not curse Time (Ad-Dahr), for indeed Allāh is Time (Ad-Dahr).' Is this consistent with what the Ittiḥādiyyah say? Clarify that for us.

### Answer

He answered:

Al-ḥamdulillāh. His saying: {'Do not curse Time (Ad-Dahr), for indeed Allāh is Time (Ad-Dahr)'} is narrated with other wordings, such as His saying: {'Allāh says: The son of Ādam harms Me. He curses Time, and I am Time; in My hand is the command, I turn the night and the day.'} And in [another] wording: {'Do not curse Time, for indeed Allāh is Time; He turns the night and the day.'} And in [another] wording: {'The son of Ādam says, 'Woe to Time!' And I am Time.'}

So His saying in the Hadith, {'in My hand is the command, I turn the night and the day'} clarifies that what is meant is not that He is Time. For He has informed that He turns the night and the day, and Time is the night and the day. Thus, the Hadith itself indicates that He is the One Who turns Time and directs it, as indicated by His saying, Almighty is He: {'Do you not see that Allāh drives clouds? Then He brings them together, then He makes them into a mass, and you see the rain emerge from within it. And He sends down from the sky, from mountains [of clouds] within it, [masses of] hail, and He strikes with it whom He wills and averts it from whom He wills. The flash of its lightning almost takes away the sight.'} {Allāh alternates the night and the day. Indeed in that is a lesson for those who have vision.} [An-Nūr: 43-44]. And izjā' of the clouds means driving them. And al-wadq is the rain.

So He, Glorified is He, has clarified His creation of the rain and His sending it down upon the earth. For it is the cause of life on earth, as He, Glorified is He, {made from water every living thing} [Al-Anbiyā': 30]. Then He said: {Allāh alternates the night and the day}. Since His alternating the night and the day involves changing the conditions of the world through the sending down of rain, which is the cause of the creation of plants, animals, and minerals. And that is a cause for changing people from one state to another, which includes raising some people and lowering others.

And He, Glorified is He, has informed of His creation of Time in more than one place, such as His saying: {and made the darknesses and the light} [Al-An'ām: 1], and His saying: {And it is He who created the night and the day and the sun and the moon; all [heavenly bodies] in an orbit are swimming;} [Al-Anbiyā': 33], and His saying: {And it is He who has made the night and the day in succession for whoever desires to remember or desires gratitude.} [Al-Furqān: 62], and His saying: {Indeed, in the creation of the heavens and the earth and the alternation of the night and the day are signs for those of understanding.} [Āl 'Imrān: 190]. And other texts that clarify that He is the Creator of Time.

No rational person imagines that Allāh is Time. For Time is the measure of motion. And motion and its measure belong to the category of accidents and attributes that subsist in something else: like motion, rest, blackness, and whiteness. No rational person says that the Creator of the world belongs to the category of accidents and attributes that are dependent on substances and essences. For accidents do not subsist by themselves; rather, they are dependent on a locus in which they subsist. And that which is dependent on something other than itself does not exist by itself, but rather through that other. So it is needy of that other for its own existence. How then could it be the Creator? Then [consider] being self-sufficient and having everything else need Him—this is the attribute of the Creator, Glorified is He. So how can it be imagined that He belongs to the first type [i.e., dependent accidents]?

And the people of heresy—those who affirm waḥdah, Ḥulūl, or Ittîḥād—do not say that He is Time, nor that He is of the genus of accidents and attributes. Rather, they say He is the totality of the universe, or indwelling in the totality of the universe. So there is no ambiguity for them in the Hadith, even if it had not clarified therein that He—Glorified is He—is the Turner of the night and the day. How [could there be ambiguity] when the Hadith itself states that in His hand is the command, He turns the night and the day?

Once this is clarified: people have two well-known opinions regarding the Hadith, [held by] the companions of Aḥmad and others.

1. The first, which is the view of Abū 'Ubayd and most scholars, is that the statement in this Hadith was made to refute what the people of the Jāhiliyyah and those resembling them used to say. For when a calamity befell them or their aims were thwarted, they would start cursing Time and the era. One of them would say, 'May Allāh disgrace the Time that scattered our unity,' and 'May Allāh curse the era in which such-and-such happened.' Such expressions often occurred in the speech of poets and their likes, such as their saying: 'O Time, you did such-and-such.' They intend to curse the one who did those things, but they attribute them to Time, so the curse falls upon Allāh Almighty. Because He is the One Who did those things and brought them about, while Time is created by Him; He is the One Who turns it and directs it. The implied meaning is: The son of Ādam curses the one who did these things, and I [Allāh] did them. So when he curses Time, his intention is to curse the Doer. Even though he attributes the action to Time, Time has no action; rather, the Doer is Allāh alone. This is like a man against whom a judge ruled justly or a mufti issued a correct fatwa. And he starts saying, 'May Allāh curse whoever ruled this way or issued this fatwa.' And [suppose] that ruling or fatwa was actually from the judgment or fatwa of the Prophet (peace be

upon him), then the curse falls upon him [the Prophet]. Even though the curser—due to his ignorance—attributed the matter to the conveyor in reality. And the conveyor does have an action of conveying, unlike Time, which Allāh turns and directs.

2. The second opinion is the view of Nu'aym ibn Ḥammād and a group with him from the People of Hadith and the Sufis: That Ad-Dahr is one of the names of Allāh Almighty, and its meaning is the Eternal, the Pre-existent. They narrated in some supplications: 'Yā Dahru, Yā Dayhūru, Yā Dayhāru' [O Time/Eternal...]. This meaning is correct, because Allāh, Glorified is He, is the First, there is nothing before Him, and He is the Last, there is nothing after Him. So this meaning is correct; the dispute is only about whether He is named Dahr in every circumstance.

The Muslims have unanimously agreed—and it is something known through clear reason—that Allāh, Glorified and Almighty is He, is not the Dahr which is Time or that which functions like Time. For people are agreed that Time is the night and the day. Likewise, [Time is] that which functions similarly in Paradise, as Allāh Almighty said: {And they will have their provision therein, morning and afternoon.} [Maryam: 62]. They [the scholars] said: [This means] according to the measure of morning and afternoon in the worldly life. And in the Hereafter, Friday is the Day of Increase. Paradise has no sun or moon. But times are known by other lights which, it has been narrated, appear from beneath the Throne. So Time there is the measure of the motion by which those lights appear.

And is there beyond that a self-subsisting, flowing substance which is Ad-Dahr? This is something about which people have disputed. A group of the philosophers from the followers of Plato affirmed it, just as they affirmed abstract universals existing externally, which are called the Platonic Forms and the absolute forms. And they affirmed prime matter, which is matter abstracted from forms. And they affirmed the void as a self-subsisting substance.

As for the majority of rational people among the philosophers and others, they know that all of this has no reality externally. Rather, they are matters that the mind estimates and posits. So those who err think that what is fixed in minds is itself fixed externally outside of minds. Just as they thought similarly regarding absolute existence, despite their knowledge that the absolute, with the condition of absoluteness, exists in the mind. And there is nothing externally except specific things, which are the essences and the attributes that subsist in them. So there is no space/place except the body or what subsists in it. And no time except the measure of motion. And no matter abstracted from forms. Indeed, nor [is there] matter conjoined with them [forms] other than the body in which accidents subsist. And no form except what is an accident subsisting in the body, or what is a body in which an accident subsists. This and similar matters are elaborated upon elsewhere. The purpose here is only to draw attention to what relates to this concisely. And Allāh knows best.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> End of what is currently available from the Book of Tawḥīd of Lordship (Kitāb Tawḥīd ar-Rubūbiyyah). Followed by the Book of the Summary of the Creed of the Salaf (Kitāb Mujmal l'ṭiqād as-Salaf).