



## The Jahmee Inquisition...

From as-Sawaa'iq al-Mursalah 'alal-Jahmiyyah wal-Mu'attilah  
Of Shaykh ul-Islam, Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyyah

Brought to you by SalafiPublications.Com

### Chapter Two: Ta'weel is Divided Into That Which Is Sound, Correct (Saheeh) and that Which Is False (Baatil) <sup>1</sup>

The sound and correct ta'weel is actually the first two types (covered previously) which are:

- 1) the reality of the actual meaning and what something becomes, or ends up as, or is outwardly expressed as, or occurs or
- 2) explanation and elucidation of the meaning (i.e. tafseer and bayaan).

And this ta'weel incorporates that which is decisive (muhkam), unclear (mutashaabih), the command (amr) and information (khabar).

Jaabir bin Abullaah said, in the hadeeth of the farewell pilgrimage, "And the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) used to be amongst us, the Qur'aan would be revealed upon him, and he would know its ta'weel, hence whatever he acted upon from it, we acted upon it also."<sup>2</sup>

Thus, his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam's) knowledge of the ta'weel of it, is actually his knowledge of its explanation (tafseer) and what it indicates and directs to, and his acting by it is actually the ta'weel (fulfilment, outcome) of what he has been commanded with and prohibited.

And the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) entered Makkah for the Umrah, and 'Abdullaah bin Rawaahah was holding on to his camel, and he said (in poetry):

<sup>1</sup> "As-Sawaa'iq al-Mursalah" (1/181-201).

<sup>2</sup> [SAHEEH: Muslim (2/887), Abu Dawood (5/364 - Awn al-Ma'bood), Ibn Maajah (2/1023), ad-Daarimee (1/375)].

Remove the disbelievers from his path, remove, for every goodness is in His Messenger, O Lord I am a believer in leadership, I know the right of Allaah by his acceptance, We fought you upon it's (i.e. the Qur'aan's) ta'weel, just like we fought you for actual revelation (tanzeel), with a blow that would remove one from his resting place (i.e. residence) and would make one forget his intimate friend.

Ibn Hishaam opined, "[The verse] "We fought you upon it's (i.e. the Qur'aan's) ta'weel", until the end of the poetic verses are actually from 'Ammar bin Yaasir on a different day to this one (i.e. the day of the conquest of Makkah). And the evidence for that is that Ibn Rawaahah was intending the Mushrikeen, but the Mushrikeen did not actually affirm the revelation to begin with, but rather, he fought based upon a ta'weel (of the Qur'aan) those who actually affirmed it."<sup>3</sup>

But this is not binding, if the poetry is authentic from Ibn Rawaahah, since what is intended by fighting them upon the ta'weel (of the Qur'aan) is actually the ta'weel of His, the Most High's saying, **"Certainly, you will enter al-Masjid al-Haram, if Allaah wills, secure..."** (al-Fath 48:27).

And their entry into al-Masjid al-Haram was in the last year, while being secure and safe, then this is the actual ta'weel (i.e. expression, outcome, fulfilment) of this dream that the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) saw, and which Allaah revealed in His Book. And this shows that the above poetry is appropriate for addressing the Kuffaar (i.e. it is in reference to the Kuffar).

It then remains to be said that "there was no actual fighting, such that it can be said that "We fought you...". [So in reply to this] it is said, that this is a form of instilling fear and making a threat, meaning "if you fight us, then we will fight

---

<sup>3</sup> [Translator's Note]: Ibn Hishaam is presenting the view that these verses of poetry by someone other than Ibn Rawaahah, and on a different day to the day of the conquest of Makkah, with the reason that in the poetry there exists "We fought you upon it's ta'weel" and so Ibn Hishaam is saying that since the Mushrikeen did not actually affirm the revelation to begin with, then it cannot be in reference to them. Since, one can only fight against another person based upon his ta'weel (i.e. explanation, understanding) of the Qur'aan if the other person also affirms the Qur'aan. However, Ibn al-Qayyim is refuting this viewpoint and explaining that the type of ta'weel being referred to in the poetry is the one which has the meaning "outcome, fulfilment, enactment" and it is in reference to what has been mentioned in the Qur'aan in which Allaah guarantees that the Believers will enter into Makkah (in conquest), safe and sound (i.e. they will conquer it). So when the Believers entered into Makkah, then this was actually a ta'weel (i.e. fulfilment) of this particular verse – and that this is what is meant in the words of Ibn Rawaahah.

you, and we would have fought you upon [both] the ta'weel and the tanzeel [of the Qur'aan]”.

However, in any of the above two considerations, the intent behind ta'weel (in this poetry) is not to take the word away from its true and real meaning to its metaphorical meaning.

Also from this (type of ta'weel) is the [what is indicated in the] saying of az-Zuhree, “The fitnah occurred while the companions of Muhammad were in abundance, and they agreed that all wealth and blood that was taken by way of ta'weel (interpretation) of the Qur'aan is mere wastage, and they treated them (i.e. those who took wealth and blood by way of ta'weel of the Qur'aan) just like the people of Jaahiliyyah”. He means that the two parties in the fitnah, both of them fought each other based upon their ta'weel (interpretation) of the Qur'aan, which is its tafseer (explanation), and upon what was apparent to each of the groups from it, until it led them to fight. Hence, the people of the Camel, and those of Siffeen, they both fought each other based upon the ta'weel (interpretation) of the Qur'aan. And that group used it as evidence, and this group also used it as evidence. Yes, the false (baatil) ta'weel was that of the people of Shaam, due to his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam's) saying, to 'Ammaar, “The oppressive group will [fight and] kill you.”<sup>4</sup>

But then they said, “We did not kill him, but those who brought him to us, until they put him in front of our archers, they are the ones who killed him”. And this is a false ta'weel (explanation) that is in opposition to the true and real meaning of the word (i.e. in the above hadeeth), and its apparentness. For the one who killed him was the one who killed him directly, and not the ones whose help he solicited (in killing him). And for this reason, those who were more worthy of [knowledge] of the truth and of the reality amongst them refuted them (in this false ta'weel) of their's by saying “Thus [in light of your argument, it can equally be said that], the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and his companions, they are the ones who actually killed Hamzah and the martyrs with him, because they brought them there until they made them come under the swords of the Mushriks”.

Also from this (type of ta'weel) is the saying of Urwah bin Zubair, when he reported the hadeeth of Aa'ishah, “The prayer was made obligatory in sets of two rakahs (i.e. each prayer was two rakahs), then the prayer for the one who is resident was increased to four, whereas the prayer of the traveller was left as it was (i.e. two rakahs only).” So then someone said to him, “Then why did Aa'ishah complete her prayers (i.e. with four rakahs) during the journey? So he

---

<sup>4</sup> [SAHEEH: Bukhaari (1/541 – Fath ul-Baaree), Muslim (4/2235)].

replied, “She acted (ta’awwalat, i.e. based upon interpretation) as Uthmaan acted (ta’walla)”. [SAHEEH: Bukhaaree (2/569 – Fath ul-Baaree), Muslim (1/478)].

However, his intent here was not that Aa’ishah and Uthmaan interpreted the verses related to shortening the prayers in opposition to their apparent meanings, but his intent was that they interpreted an evidence which admitted the permissibility of completing (the prayers to four rakahs), hence, they acted in accordance with (what the evidence required and allowed to them). Thus, their acting in accordance with it was actually its ta’weel (i.e. outcome, fulfilment), for acting in accordance with the evidence for a particular command (amr) is its ta’weel (enactment, fulfilment). Just as the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) used to enact (yata’awwal) His, the Most High’s saying, **“So glorify the praises of Your Lord, and seek His forgiveness”** (Nasr 110:3), by fulfilling this order by his saying [in rukoo’ and sujood], “Subhaanak allaahumma Rabbanaa wa bi hamdika Allaahuma ighfirlee” (Sublime you are O Allaah, O our Lord, and praise be to you. O Allaah forgive me). And similarly, Aa’ishah and Uthmaan used to enact His saying, **“So when you are secure and safe, then establish the prayer...”** (Nisaa 4:103) [based upon their understanding] that completing the prayer (with four rakahs) is from its establishment (iqaamah).

It has also been said that Aa’ishah interpreted in the following manner, that since she was the Mother of the Believers, she was their mother wherever she was, hence, it is as if she is a resident amongst them (wherever she was), and that Uthmaan was the Imaam of the Muslims, thus wherever he was, that place was his place of residence, or that he had intended on settling in Minaa, or that he had taken a wife and whoever had taken a wife then he is not judged as being a traveller. Or that the bedouins increased in number in that season, and hence, he wanted to show them how the obligatory prayer is performed and that it is four rakahs, and other such ta’weels, which they thought are evidences that restrict the absoluteness (of the command) of shortening prayers, or which specify the generality of the command – even though all of them are quite weak.

And the truth is what is contained in the guidance of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), for he used to be the Imaam of the Muslims and Aa’ishah was the Mother of the Believers, in his life and after his life, and she had shortened the prayers alongside him, and Uthmaan was not resident in Makkah, but it reached him that the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) had allowed it for three days for the muhaajir (the emigrant) as a concession, after he had completed the rituals (of Hajj). And the traveller, when he gets married during his journey, the judgement of being a resident is not

established for him, merely on account of marriage, so long as his intent and resolution is not to remain (at that place) and to end the journey.

So, in summary, the ta'weel that is in agreement with what is actually indicated by the texts, and whatever the Sunnah has come with, and is in concordance with it, is the sound, correct ta'weel. And as for the ta'weel which is in opposition to what the texts indicate and what the Sunnah has come with, then it is a corrupt ta'weel<sup>5</sup>. And there is no difference in this between the issues of information (khabar) and command (amr). And every ta'weel that agrees with what the Messenger came with is accepted, and whatever opposes it is rejected.

And the false ta'weel is of various types:

**The First:** [A ta'weel] that the word cannot plausibly allow on account of the way it is composed (in the sentence), such as making ta'weel of his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam's) saying, "...until the Lord of Honour places His Foot (Rijlahu) over it..."<sup>6</sup>, that the word "ar-rijl" refers to "a group of people", since this is not known at all in the language of the Arabs.

**The Second:** [A ta'weel] that the word cannot allow on account of its specific construction in the dual or plural form – even though it may allow it in its singular form, such as the ta'weel of His saying, "...to whom I have created with both My Hands" (Sad 38:75), to mean "qudrah" (power).

---

<sup>5</sup> [Translators Note]: So the intent behind the previous examples that Ibn al-Qayyim has used is to show that the ta'weel that is made can be correct and sound if by the ta'weel a person arrives at what is actually intended and desired by the particular text in question, be it something that comprises khabar (information) only or something that comprises a command (amr), or be it something that is muhkam (decisive, clear) or be it mutashaabih (unclear). Or it can be false, if a person fails to arrive at what is actually desired and intended by the words be that in relation to information, or a command, or something that is decisive and clear, or something that is unclear. Thus, the examples given above are illustrations of ta'weels that were erroneous, while the ta'weels that were made in these cases, were of the correct and affirmed types of ta'weel which are a) the ta'weel that is indicated in the Qur'aan and b) the ta'weel with the meaning of tafseer and bayaan.

Ibn al-Qayyim is illustrating that ta'weel – even if it is of the two correct and affirmed types – then it can still be erroneous, if the person fails to arrive at what is actually intended by the text. And that this is an erroneous, false ta'weel.

After this Ibn al-Qayyim will move on to explain the various false types of ta'weels that the Jahmiyyah and Negators perform of the texts.

<sup>6</sup> [SAHEEH: Bukhaaree (8/595 – Fath ul-Baaree), Muslim (4/2186,2187)]

**The Third:** [A ta'weel] that the word cannot allow on account of its sequence and composition (in the sentence) – even though it may allow it in a different sequence (in a sentence), such as the ta'weel of His saying, **“Do they wait for anything other than that the Angels should come to them, or that your Lord should come, or that some of the signs of Your Lord should come...”** (al-An'aam 6:158), that the coming (ityaan) of the Lord means the coming of some of His signs (aayaat), which are actually His command (amr). However, the sequence of the sentence rejects this completely, for it is impossible for it to be carried to mean that, on account of the division, repetition, and categorisation that occurs in the verse (i.e. that the Angels, and Allah, and the Signs will come, and the word “come” being repeated for all three).

And like the ta'weel of his saying, “Verily, you will see your Lord with your eyes, just like you see the full moon on a clear night, without there being any clouds, and just like you see the sun on an afternoon, without there being any clouds”<sup>7</sup>. So making ta'weel of the vision (the seeing) that has been mentioned in this particular sequence of words with something that opposes its reality, and its apparent meaning is completely impossible, and it is in reality rejection and denial (of the text) but which is being concealed as “ta'weel” by the one who does this.

**The Fourth:** That [ta'weel of a word] whose usage has never been authored (i.e. written) with that particular meaning in the language of the speaker, even though it may have been authored (with that meaning) due to a later convention. And this is a matter in which many people have erred, and in which their understandings have strayed, in that they made ta'weel of many of the words that occur in the texts with a meaning that has never been written for that word at all in the language of the Arabs, even though it may have been used in the convention of the later scholars. And this is something that needs to be pointed out as much lying has been made against Allaah and His Messenger on account of it.

So for example, a group made ta'weel of His saying, **“...but when it (the star) set (afala)...”** (al-An'aam 6:76), to mean “harakah” (movement), and then they said, “He (i.e. Ibraaheem) argued that on account of its movement (harakah) it cannot have Ruboobiyyah (i.e. be the Lord) [since harakah (movement) is not permitted for Allaah]. And this is completely unknown in the language in which the Qur'aan was revealed – not even in a single place [in the body of oral and written Arabic tradition, has it occurred] that ufool (setting) is actually harakah (movement).

---

<sup>7</sup> [SAHEEH: Bukhaaree (13/419,420,421 – Fath ul-Baaree), Muslim (1/167) – and the hadeeth has been reported by 30 companions]

Likewise, the ta'weel of “al-Ahad” (the One) to mean that it is the thing, one part of which cannot be distinguished from another. Then they said that if He (Allaah) was above the Throne, He would not then have been One (Ahad). So the ta'weel of “al-Ahad” with this particular meaning is not known to a single Arab, and nor to the people of the language, and nor has its usage with this meaning known to have occurred in a single place in the language of the people, rather it is the convention of the Jahmiyyah, the Philosophers and the Mu'tazilah and whoever agreed with them.

And also like the ta'weel of His saying, “...**then he ascended (istawaa) over the Throne**” (al-A'raaf 7:54), that the meaning is “he then embarked upon (turned to) creating the ‘Arsh”, for this is not known in the language of the Arabs, rather not in the language of any of the other nations, that when someone “turns to something” that it is said “he made istiwaa (ascension) over it”. So it is not said to the one who stood to embark upon a journey, “he has made istiwaa over it”, and nor to the one who embarked upon any action, such as reading or writing, or constructing something, that “he made istiwaa over them”, or to the one who turned towards food that “he made istiwaa over the food”. So this is the language of the people, and their words and their customs are present, and yet none of this (type of speech) exists at all.

And this ta'weel is falsified from many different angles, and we shall mention them in the relevant place, and had there not been amongst them except that this entails rejection (takdheeb) of Allaah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) by the one who made this ta'weel, it would have been sufficient. For it has been established in the Saheeh that, “Allaah determined the decrees of the creation before He created the heavens and the earth by fifty-thousand years, and His Throne was above the water”<sup>8</sup>, hence, His Throne was present before the creation of the heavens and the earth by more than fifty-thousand years, so how can it be said that He created the heavens and the earth in six days then he turned to create the Throne?

And when ta'weel contains a rejection (takdheeb) of the Messenger, then that is sufficient for its falsehood. And most of the ta'weels of the people are actually of this nature, and there will soon pass by you (in this discourse) from them (the refutation of the baatil ta'weels) that which is the pleasure of the eye of every Muwahhid and the tear of the eye of every Mulhid (deviant).

**The Fifth:** That [ta'weel of the word] which has been employed in writing with that particular meaning, however it has been used in this case in a composition [in sentence] other than the type of composition which occurs in the text (i.e in

---

<sup>8</sup> [SAHEEH: Muslim (4/0244), Tirmidhi (6/362, with something similar to it)]

the Qur'an and Sunnah), hence, the muta'awwil (the one who makes ta'weel) allows ta'weel of it in this particular composition which in fact does not allow it, basing this upon the fact that it has come in another composition which actually does allow making that particular ta'weel of it.

And this is from the greatest of mistakes and of deception. Such as making ta'weel of His saying, the Most High, **“What prevented you from prostrating to whom I have created with both My Hands”** (Sad 38:75), to mean “ni'mah” (favour), and there is no doubt that the Arabs do say, “li fulaan 'indee yad” (So and so has a favour with me), and 'Urwah Ibn Mas'ood said to as-Siddeeq, “Had it not been that you have a favour (law laa yadun laka 'indee) from me that I have not recompensed, I would have responded to you”<sup>9</sup>. However the occurrence of “yad” in this particular composition in which Allaah, the Sublime, has annexed an action to Himself, and then this action is also transitive to the “yad” (Hand) by way of the preposition “baa” (with), which is just like saying “I wrote with the pen”, but meaning the hand, and then making this specific to someone whom He had chosen for Himself, Aadam, as opposed to anyone else, just like He specified al-Maseeh (Eesaa) for blowing into him from His spirit, and like He specified Moosaa for speaking to him directly, without any intermediary, then this is from that which makes it impossible to make ta'weel of “yad” (Hand) to mean “ni'mah” (favour), even though in another composition [in sentence] it is correct to do that. Hence, just because it is possible for a word to carry a particular meaning within a given composition in sentence, does not mean that it can carry this particular meaning in all possible compositions (of this word) in sentence.

Similar to this is His saying, **“Some faces that day shall be shining and radiant. Looking at their Lord.”** (Qiyaamah 75:22-23), it is impossible to make ta'weel of the looking (nadhara) to mean “waiting for the reward”, since he annexed the looking to the faces which is where the looking actually occurs from, and then he also made it transitive by the preposition “ilaa” (towards, meaning “looking towards”), which when it is connected to the verb “nadhara” (to look), then it refers to the looking of the eye, and nothing else.

And describing the faces with radiance, then this cannot be attained except in the presence of that with which pleasure is found, not by being disturbed by having to wait for it. Hence, it is impossible alongside this composition (in the verse) for ta'weel to be made of “nadhara” (looking) by other than actual seeing (ru'yah) – even though “nadhara” can also be with the meaning of “intidhaar” (waiting), for it has been used in His saying, **“Wait for us (undhuroonaa), let us take something from your light..”** (al-Hadeed 57:13), and also His, the Most

---

<sup>9</sup> [SAHEEH: Bukhaaree (5/330 Fath ul-Baaree)]



High's saying, "...and see with what answer the Messengers return" (an-Naml 27:35).

And also similar to this (false type of ta'weel) is the saying of the deceiving Jahmee, "When a Mushabbih (anthropomorphist) says to you, "**ar-Rahmaan ascended over the throne**" (Ta Ha 20:5), then reply to him, "To us, "Arsh" carries seven meanings, and "Istiwaah" has five meanings. So which meaning is actually intended? For the Mushabbih will be confused and he does not know what he is saying".

So it said in reply to his oppressive ignorant, who bewilders and is himself bewildered: Woe be to you, what sin is there is upon the Muwahhid who you and your associates have called a mushabbih, when he has only said to you whatever Allaah Himself has said, and by Allaah, if he had been a Mushabbih as you claim, then Allaah and His Messenger would be more befitting of this (accusation) from you, since this person has not exceeded the text itself.

As for you saying that the "arsh" has seven meanings and that "istiwaah" has five meanings, then this is talbees on your behalf, and it is form of confounding the ignorant ones, and is a clear lie, for there is only one meaning for the Arsh of Rahmaan that He ascended over, even though the word "arsh" from the point of view in its occurrence in a sentence can carry numerous meanings. For the "laam" (in the verse) is for definitiveness, and hence the throne on account of this becomes something specified and unique, and it is the Arsh of the Lord, Exalted is His Majesty, and this is the elevated seat (sareer) over His dominion (mulk), which all of the Messengers are agreed upon, and which all of the nations have affirmed, except those who shunned the Messengers.

And as for your saying that "istiwaah" has numerous meanings, then this is another deception, for "istiwaah" which is made transitive with the particle "alaa" (upon) does not have except a single meaning. And as for "istiwaah" which is general and unrestricted, then it can have a number of meanings, for the Arabs say, "istawaa kadhaa, idhaa intahaa wa kamula" (he reached such and such (state or condition), when he finished and became complete), such as in His, the Most High's saying, "**And when he attained his full strength (istawaa) and was perfect (in manhood)...**" (al-Qasas 28:14).

And you also say, "istawaa kadhaa idhaa saawaahu" (it settled, when it became level, equivalent), such as their saying, "the water and plank became level (istawa al-maa wal-khasbhah)", and "the day and night became equivalent (istawa al-laylu wan-nahaar)". And you also say "istawaa ilaa kadhaa", when he faced it and embarked upon it, in height and elevation, such as when some elevates to a roof, or a mountain. And also "istawaa 'alaa kadhaa", meaning

when he rises over it and ascends over it. The Arabs do not know anything other than this [understanding of] Istiwa'a, when it comes in this particular composition (i.e. made transitive with the particle 'alaa, over).

Just like as it occurs textually in His saying, "**And when he attained his full strength and was perfect (in manhood)...**" (al-Qasas 28:14), it does not carry any meaning other than this one (i.e. that he reached perfection and finished in his maturing and growing), and just like it occurs textually in their saying, "the day and night became equivalent", and its meaning does not carry any other meaning but this.

Therefore, leave alone this deception, for it does not bring anything upon you except hatred from Allaah and from those who believe.

**The Sixth:** The word whose usage has been employed [by convention] with a meaning that is apparent, but its usage has not been employed in the interpolated (mu'awwal) meaning, or its usage has been employed for this meaning, but very rarely. Hence, to make ta'weel of this word when it comes in this manner, and to carry its meaning upon other than that which is conventionally used is falsehood, for this contains deception, and deceit, and contradicts what is clear [in speech], and what is guidance.

And when they desire to employ such a word with other than its conventional meaning, they surround it with other pointers (qaraa'in) that would indicate their intent (i.e. what they mean by the word) to the listener, in case the listener's understanding actually grasps the actual meaning of the word, [before they have been able to present him with their interpolated meaning].

And whoever reflects upon the language of the people, and the perfection of this language, and wisdom contained in its construction, then he will realise the correctness of this.

As for when they come to a particular word which has a meaning that has been employed (in written authorship), and then they remove it from this meaning, and then use it for other than its meaning, despite the fact that there are pointers which indicate emphatically, that they meant its original meaning, then this is the most impossible of matters (for them).

An example of this is His saying, the Most High, "**And Allaah spoke to Musaa directly**" (an-Nisaa 4:164). And his (sallallahu alaihi wasallam's) saying, "There is none of you except that His Lord will speak to him, without there being between Him and him a translator who will interpret for him, and nor any

screen that screens him”<sup>10</sup>, and also his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam’s) saying, ““Verily, you will see your Lord with your eyes...”<sup>11</sup>. And this is the nature of the vast majority of the texts that mention the Attributes [as becomes clear to him] whose chest Allaah has expanded to acceptance of them, and to rejoicing with what Allaah has revealed upon His Messenger concerning them (the Attributes) – when he reflects upon them. He will see that they (the mentioning of the Attributes) are surrounded with pointers, indicators, and what only further emphasises (the meaning), and all of this negates the ta’weel (interpolation) of the one who interpolates.

**The Seventh:** Every ta’weel that causes the original and base meaning of the text to be nullified is itself futile. Such as the ta’weel of his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam’s) saying, “Whichever woman performs her own nikaah (marriage) without the permission of her guardian, then her nikaah is false”<sup>12</sup>, by carrying it to mean the slave-girl. Since, this ta’weel, despite the fact that it severely contradicts the apparent wording, it also nullifies the original text, which is his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam’s) saying (in what follows), “But if (her husband) enters her, then she has the right to the dowry, due to his making lawful her private parts for himself”. But as for the dowry of the slave-girl, then it is actually the right of the master. Then they go on to say that they carry it to mean “writing down” (i.e. that the dowry is indeed for the slave-girl and that the master only is responsible for its writing down, as a contract), and again this also nullifies the original, and base meaning of the text from another angle.

And this is because the text has come with the word “ayyu” which is used as a condition (shart), which is one of the particles used to indicate generality, and then it is also strengthened by the particle “maa”, which necessitates the emphasis upon the generality already indicated, and additionally, it has also mentioned “imra’ah” without the definite article, during the mention of the condition, and this again necessitates generality. And the text also linked the futility of the marriage to a description that is appropriate for the marriage (to be described with) and which necessitates the judgement (of its futility) merely by its presence, and this is that she performs her own nikaah. And the text also indicated the reason that necessitates the futility of the marriage, which is that she has lied upon her guardian and attributed that which is false to him. And the text also emphasises the futility of the marriage three times. Hence, to carry

---

<sup>10</sup> [SAHEEH: Bukhaaree (13/423 – Fath ul-Baaree), Musnad Ahmad (4/256,377)]

<sup>11</sup> [SAHEEH: Bukhaaree (13/419,420,421 – Fath ul-Baaree), Muslim (1/167) – and the hadeeth has been reported by 30 companions]

<sup>12</sup> [SAHEEH: Abu Daawood (2/98,99 – Awn al-Ma’bood), at-Tirmidhi (4/54,55), Ibn Majah 1/605), Musnad Ahmad 6/47), al-Haakim (2/168), Irwaa ul-Ghaleel of al-Albaani (2/243)]

the meaning of the hadeeth and the present it in a form that very rarely occurs, then this nullifies the actual desired intent behind the hadeeth. And when you reflect upon the generality of the ta'weels of the Jahmiyyah, you will find them to be of this nature, rather even worse and reprehensible.

**The Eighth:** The ta'weel of a word which has a clear, apparent meaning, and which when applied unrestrictedly, cannot have any other meaning other than it, by way of an obscure meaning which none but the unique ones from amongst the specialists (in the language), or those of rhetorical speech (Kalaam) can actually discern. Such as the ta'weel of word "al-Ahad" - which is actually understood by the common people and the specific people (with greater knowledge and insight) – so the ta'weel of this to mean "an essence (dhaat) that is devoid of all attributes (i.e. has not a single attribute), and which does not admit to two meanings from any angle whatsoever". And if this was possible to exist externally (i.e. outside of one's imagination), then it could not be known except after laying some extensive, and very difficult foundations (for it to be conceived). Then how can it be when it is actually impossible for this to be the case in external reality? Rather, this is something that the mind alone makes binding (but is not externally possible). Then, they seek to find evidence for its external existence (i.e. they conceive of this idea in their mind – which cannot exist externally - then they seek to deduce proof for its outward existence). Thus, in light of this, it is impossible to use a word that is well known and famous to every one with a particular meaning that is extremely obscure and hidden, and what is similar in example to this will come soon if Allaah, the Most High, wills.

**The Ninth:** The ta'weel which necessitates the negation of the meaning which entails complete ascendancy and nobility and then to lower it to another meaning which is lower than the original meaning by many levels. This is similar to removing (i.e. lowering) a ruler from his dominion and authority of rule to a level other than that of the king by a great deal.

And this is like the ta'weel of the Jahmiyyah of His saying, "**And He is al-Qaahir (all-Powerful, Compelling), above His servants**" (al-An'aam 6:18), and also His saying, "They fear their Lord who is above them" (an-Nahl 16:50), and whatever is similar to this to mean that it refers to the highness of nobility (sharf), just like the saying, "the dirham is above the fals (small coin)" and "the deenaar is above the dirham".

So just reflect upon the ta'teel (negation, divestment) of those who interpolate the reality of this unrestricted highness, which is actually from the special characteristics of Ruboobiyyah and which necessitates the greatness of the Lord, the Majestic, and then decrease this to something the extent of which is

that His rank (i.e. evaluation of His worth, standing) is above the rank of the Sons of Aadam, and that He is more noble than them.

And likewise, their ta'weel of Allaah's uluww (highness, ascendancy) with this same meaning, and that it is like the ascendancy of gold over silver. Likewise, their ta'weel of His Istiwaa over the Throne to mean His power over it, and that He is one who conquers it and is a victor (ghaalib) over it. So O Allaah, how amazing, have the intellects gone astray and have the senses perished, and have the intelligent ones doubted that He, the Sublime, is actually powerful over His throne, a victor over it, until He Himself, the Sublime, has to inform about it in seven places in His Book, all with just a single word, and in not a single of these places is there a meaning that the Interpolators (Mu'awilloon) have contrived. And so all of this praise and veneration (i.e. in these seven verses) is actually to inform us that He is powerful over His Throne, victorious over it, and all of this is after He created the seven heavens and the earth.

And do you see that Allaah, the Sublime, was not a victor over His Throne, having power over it during the period that is more than fifty-thousand years, and then this power and victory over the throne came to Him, after He created this universe?!

**The Tenth:** The ta'weel of a word with a meaning for which there is not indicative evidence from the sequence (of wording in the sentence), and nor is there any additional pointers (in the text) which requires this meaning. And the likes of this is not intended or desired by al-Mobeen, al-Haadee, in His words. Since, if He had actually intended this particular meaning, He would have surrounded the word with additional pointers that indicate the meaning that is opposed to its apparent meaning, such that the one who is listening is not drawn into any confusion, or error. And Allaah, the Sublime, revealed His words, as an explanation and as guidance. Hence, if he desired (a meaning) opposed to the apparent meaning (of the words), and did not surround (His words) with additional pointers which indicate the meaning that would lead others to come to understand it, then it would not be an explanation and nor guidance.

So these are some of the angles by which the correct, sound ta'weel is differentiated between the false ta'weel, and with Allaah do we seek aid.

## **Benefits and Lessons From This Tribunal**

1. Following the previous tribunal – in which we heard the explanation of the affirmed meanings and types of “ta’weel” – we continue today, with the hearing of the sound, correct, ta’weel and the false (baatil) ta’weel – all in order to illustrate that the Jahmite in the stand, does not abide by the ta’weel that is known and affirmed, but something which is in reality, blatant tahreef (distortion) of the texts of the Sharee’ah.

2. Ta’weel is the reality of the actual meaning, and what something is outwardly expressed as, or its occurrence, or what it leads to and becomes. It also means “tafseer”, which is the explanation and elucidation of what the texts of the Sharee’ah actually indicate. Thus, the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) would make “ta’weel” of the Qur’aan by his actions – i.e. showing how the Qur’aan is to be implemented and acted upon, and this is the “ta’weel” of the Qur’aan. And this also refers to matters of knowledge (khabar), just like it refers to matters of action.

3. In light of that, there can be a ta’weel that is sound, correct, which is actually in conformity with what is actually desired and intended by the text, and there can also be a ta’weel which is actually incorrect and opposed to what is intended and desired.

4. Ibn al-Qayyim gave a number of examples of the false ta’weel at the beginning of this paper, examples of ta’weels that are actually made whilst attempting to arrive at the intended and desired meaning behind something, but which are nevertheless erroneous. They include

- a) The poetry of Ibn Rawaahah, and correcting Ibn Hishaam’s erroneous interpretation of it
- b) The saying of az-Zuhree concerning the fighting that is justified by way of ta’weel of the Qur’aan and a refutation of the erroneous ta’weel of the saying of Allaah’s Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) to ‘Ammar, “The oppressive group will [fight and] kill you.”
- c) The ta’weel of a verse in the Qur’aan to refer to the completion of prayers (to four rakahs) for the traveller

5. Following these three examples, Ibn al-Qayyim, then goes on to list ten types of the false ta’weel (which is resorted to by the Jahmite Negators) – all of which is false, and has no basis. And in reality all of the ta’weels of the Jahmiyyah fall into any of these ten types – by which they deceive the people, distort the Book of Allaah and confuse the ignorant folk. So know these types and take caution!