



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 Six: Concerning The Inability Of Those Who Make (False) Ta'weel To Corroborate The Difference Between That From The Verses And Hadeeths Of The Attributes Whose Ta'weel Is Permissible And Between That Whose Ta'weel Is Not Permissible¹

[1. Allaah Has Described Himself With Names, Attributes And Actions]

There is no doubt that Allaah, the Sublime, has described Himself with attributes and has named Himself with names, and has informed of certain actions for Himself.

Hence, He named Himself with "ar-Rahmaan" (the One Full of Mercy), "ar-Raheem" (the Merciful), "al-Malik" (the King), "al-Quddoos" (the Sanctified, Holy), "as-Salaam" (the One Free of all Deficiencies, the Bestower of Peace), "al-Mu'min" (the One Granting Security, Safety), "al-Muhaimin", "al-'Azeez" (the Mighty), "al-Jabbaar" (the Compeller), "al-Mutakabbir" (the Proudful One) and all of what He has mentioned concerning the Beautiful Names.

And He has described Himself with what He has mentioned from the attributes, such as what occurs in Surah Ikhlaas (112), the beginning of al-Hadeed (57), and the beginning of Taa Haa (20) and other than that. And He described Himself that He "loves" and is "angered" and that He "dislikes", and "hates" and is "pleased" and that He "arrives" (yajee') and that He comes (ya'tee) and that He descends to the lowest Heaven, and that He ascends (istawaa) over His Throne, and that He has knowledge, life, power, will, hearing, seeing, and a Face, and that He has two hands, and that He is above His servants, and that the Angels ascend to Him, and that the command comes

¹ "As-Sawaa'iq al-Mursalah" (1/220-233). The headings in square brackets have been added to the text to make it easier to read and follow. And this is a great and mighty chapter, by which the foundations of the Ash'ariyyah specifically are rocked, demolished and laid to ruins.

down from Him, and that He is near (qareeb) and that He is with (ma'a) those who do good, and that He is with (ma'a) the patient ones, and with the pious ones, and that the Heavens are rolled up in His Right Hand.

And His Messenger described Him as one who "rejoices", and "laughs", and that "the hearts of the servants are between His Fingers" and other such things from that which He and His Messenger have described Him with².

[2. After this is Established, Ask the Muta'awwil About His Position]

So it is said to the Muta'awwil (one who makes (false) ta'weel),

[i] Do you make ta'weel of all of this (i.e. everything) with other than its apparent [meaning], and do you forbid that it should be taken upon its reality³.

[ii] Or do you affirm everything upon its apparent [meaning] and upon its reality?

[iii] Or do you differentiate between some and others (i.e. between the various Names, Attributes and Actions)?

[3. If He Makes Ta'weel of Everything]

If you make ta'weel of everything, and you carry it upon other than the actual reality that it is upon, then that is manifest 'inaad (stubborn rejection) and clear kufr and a rejection (jahd) of ar-Ruboobiyyah (the Lordship of Allaah). In this case, you will not have [left yourself] any foundation for affirming a "Dhaat"⁴ for the Lord, Most High, and an attribute amongst His Attributes and nor an action from amongst his Actions.

² [Translators Note]: And all of that has been reported through sound, authentic narrations, that have been accepted by the Ummah, thus when the Jahmites and their offshoots could not reject them, they made ta'weel of them.

³ [Translators Note]: Meaning to affirm that the words are indicative of a certain reality (even though we do not know the exact nature of this reality, but nevertheless there is a reality to be affirmed).

⁴ [Translators Note]: What is intended by "dhaat" is that Allaah exists, separate from the creation, outside of it – neither being the creation itself, nor indwelling in it, and nor the creation indwelling in Him, being independent, free of need. Making ta'weel of everything in the Book and the Sunnah pertaining to Allaah's Names, Attributes and Actions would necessitate the non-existence of Allaah – and this is what led the Jahmiyyah to hold views and statements that necessitated this.

So if you accepted this for yourself and did not reject it, then you have joined with your brothers from the Heretical Dahriyyah (Materialists), those who do not affirm a Creator or a Lord for the universe.

[4. If He Differentiates Between Some And Others]

[4.1 Demolishing the First False Qaanoon: Making Ta'weel of Any Attribute of Allaah That The Creation is Also Described With]

If he says: I affirm a Creator and Maker for the universe, but I do not describe Him with an attribute that is also applicable to [anything from] His creation. And whenever He is described with some attribute that is found amongst the creation, I make ta'weel of it.

It is said in reply: Do these Names and Attributes with which He has described Himself, do they, (i.e. the wordings of the Names and Attributes) indicate established meanings, - is this a truth in itself - or do they not indicate this?⁵

If you negate (this truth) of their being indicative of established meanings, then this is the extremity of ta'teel (divestment). And if you affirm that their being indicative of meanings is an established truth, then it is said to you: What has made it permissible for you to make ta'weel of some as opposed to others, and what is the difference between what you have affirmed and negated, and about which you have remained silent concerning its negation or affirmation – from the point of view of Sharee'ah text and the intellect?

Since, the indication (dalaalah) of the texts that He has hearing, seeing, knowledge, power, will, life, and speech is just like the indication of the texts that He has mercy (rahmah), love (mahabbah), anger (ghadab), pleasure (ridaa), joy (farh), laughter (dahak), face (wajh), two hands (yadain). Thus, the indication of the texts (to a meaning that is established) is the same for all. So why do you negate the reality of His mercy, love, pleasure, anger, joy, laughter and make ta'weel of them, claiming that all of them are in reality, His will (iraadah) [i.e. all these are the same as "will", synonymous to it]

⁵ [Translators Note]: What is meant here, is that we are asking as to whether the words that have come, do these words indicate established meanings – and is this an established truth or not, namely that words do indicate established meanings with realities to them? And the answer to this must be yes, as this is a fact and known to all peoples, in all languages. If he answers no, then this is pure divestment, and negation (ta'teel).

And if you say: Because the affirmation of a will (iraadah, mashee'ah) does not necessitate tashbeeh or tajseem, whereas the affirmation of the realities of these attributes necessitates tashbeeh (resemblance to the creation) and tajseem (anthropomorphism), because they cannot be comprehended (imagined) except in the form of bodies⁶. For "rahmah" is something that is a natural instinct in animals, and "mahabbah" is the souls inclination towards that which will benefit it, and "ghadab" is the heart's blood being agitated to seeking revenge, and "farh" is the heart's blood flowing with ease, in order for what pleases him to bring about this pleasure (in him).

[So if he says that], then it is said in reply: Then likewise "iraadah" is the inclination of the soul to bringing about that which benefits it, and repelling that which harms it. And likewise, everything that you have affirmed of the attributes (i.e. the seven), they are all incidental parts (a'raad), which are established in bodies (ajsaam), as outwardly observed. For "ilm" is either an impression (intibaa', stamp, record) of that which is known (ma'loom) existing in the one who knows it, or it is an incidental attribute that is established with him, and likewise hearing, and seeing, and life, all of them are in the form of parts (a'raad), which are established in the one who is described with them. Hence, how can tashbeeh and tajseem be necessitated in the affirmation of those attributes, and not at the same time be necessitate for the affirmation of these (seven) attributes that you affirm?

And if you say: Because I affirm them in a manner in which they do not resemble our attributes (tamaathul) and are not likened with them (tashaabuh), then it is said in reply: Then if only you affirmed all of them in a manner in which they do not resemble or are likened (to the creation). And why have you understood that (i.e. affirmation of all the attributes, alongside the negation of likeness and resemblance) to be tashbeeh and tajseem and at the same time you have understood this (i.e. affirmation of only some attributes, with negation of likeness) to be Tawheed and tanzeeh?

⁶ [Translators Note]: This argument of the Muta'awwil is an indication that the Muta'awwil himself has made tashbeeh of Allaah's attributes. So he has thought evil of the texts of the Book and the Sunnah – as he has imagined them, from the very beginning to resemble the attributes of the creation. It is this which then leads to make ta'weel necessary. Thus, the disease began in his heart and he did not properly affirm the saying of Allaah **"There is nothing like Him..."** (ash-Shooraa 42:13), and also **"Do you know of an equal to Him"** (Maryam 19:65), and **"There is none that is equal, comparable to Him"** (112:4)

If only you had said that you affirm for him a Face, love, anger, pleasure, laughter that are not like the attributes found in the creation (i.e. there is no resemblance, or likeness).

And if you say that this cannot be comprehended by the intellect (i.e. it cannot be understood that He has these attributes without likeness to the creation), then it is said in reply, so how have you understood Him to have hearing, seeing, life, will, that is not like those same attributes of the creation?

[4.2 Demolishing the Second False Qaanoon: Making Ta'weel of That Whose Ta'weel the Intellect Allows and Indicates And Affirming (Without Ta'weel) That Whose Ta'weel the Intellect Does Not Indicate]

If you then say: I differentiate between that whose ta'weel can be made and that whose ta'weel cannot be made from the point of view of that whatever the intellect indicates (i.e. allows) affirmation of, its ta'weel is prohibited, such as the attributes of knowledge, life, power, hearing, seeing, and as for whatever the intellect does not indicate (affirmation of), then it is obligatory, or permissible to make ta'weel of it, such as the face, hands, laughter, joy, anger, pleasure. For precise action indicates the qudrah (power) of the doer, and his precision and exactness (in creating) indicates his knowledge, and diversification (in his creation) indicates iraadah, hence it is prohibited and impossible to differ from what the intellect indicates.

Then it is said in reply to you, firstly: Then likewise, showing benevolence, and favours and removing harm and removing others from difficulties all of that indicates "rahmah" just like diversification indicates iraadah, and likewise ennobling, choosing (some people over others) indicates "mahabbah" in the same manner as that which you have mentioned indicates iraadah. And similarly, humiliating, repelling, distancing and preventing, all of that indicates "maqt" (hatred) and dislike "bughd", just like what is opposite to all of this indicates love (hubb) and pleasure (ridaa). And similarly, punishment, revenge indicate "ghadab" just like its opposite indicates pleasure "ridaa".

And it is said secondly: If we were to accept, for argument's sake that the intellect does not indicate the affirmation of these attributes (that you negated), then at the same time, the intellect does not actually negate them either. And the revelation is actually independent evidence in and of itself. Rather, that ease and satisfaction is to be found with the revelation is greater than finding ease and satisfaction with mere intellect,

so therefore what exactly is it that has led you to negate what [the revelation] indicates and proves (of the affirmation of the attributes)?

And it is said to you thirdly: If the apparent meaning of the texts necessitates tashbeeh and tajseem, then it is necessitates it in all of the attributes (including the ones you affirm). So therefore, you ought to make ta'weel of all of them. And if it does not necessitate that, then it is not permissible for you to make ta'weel of any of them. And if you claim that some of the texts require it and others do not, then you are requested to distinguish between them both, and then the matter will simply go back to where it started.

[4.3 Demolishing the Third False Qaanoon: Affirming What the Ijmaa' Indicates Affirmation Of (Without Ta'weel) And Making Taw'eel of That Whose Affirmation is Not Indicated by Ijmaa']

However, when some of the more intelligent and shrewd ones amongst them came to understand this, they said, in order to find excuse for (i.e. justify) the difference: What the ijmaa' (consensus) indicates [affirmation of], such as the seven attributes, then ta'weel is not to be made of that and what the consensus does not indicate [affirmation of], then ta'weel is to be made of it.

And this as you can see is the most corrupt of differentiations (between that which can accept ta'weel and that which cannot), for what it means is that the established Ijmaa' has affirmed that which indicates tashbeeh and tajseem. So they have acknowledged here, that the Ijmaa' that has passed (before them) is an ijmaa' that has been affirmed and corroborated upon tashbeeh and tajseem. And this is a rebuke and revilement upon the Ijmaa', since the Ijmaa' is not established upon falsehood.

Then it is also said: If the Ijmaa' has in fact been made and established upon the affirmation of these attributes, whilst their apparent [meanings] necessitates tajseem and tasbheeh, then your negation (of these attributes) has been falsified (since the Ijmaa' is in opposition to what you have claimed), and if the Ijmaa' had not been established (for the affirmation of the attributes), then your differentiation by way of this (i.e. using this as a rule to differentiate between that which can accept ta'weel and that which cannot) is falsified.

Then it is also said: Your argument with the Mu'tazilah, they have not agreed with you in the affirmation of these attributes (the seven), so if you say that the Ijmaa' has been established before them (in affirmation of these attributes), then we say, **you have spoken the truth by Allaah**, and

those who actually agreed upon this, before you, upon the affirmation of these attributes (i.e. the seven), **then they agreed upon the affirmation of all the attributes, and they did not specify or restrict them to seven.** Rather, to limit them to seven is in opposition to the saying of the Salaf, and the saying of the Jahmiyyah and the Mu'tazilah [all of whom came before the Ash'ariyyah]. This is because prior to this people were of two parties: one that is Salafi and another that is Jahmee, then there arose the party of the Seveners [Sab'iyyah, those who affirm only seven (which is Ibn Kullaab, from whom Ash'ari took, in the middle stage of his life, before returning to the way of the Salaf)] – and this party took a saying that was in between those two sayings (i.e. of the Salaf and the Jahmiyyah). So the Salaf they never followed, and with the Jahmiyyah, they never remained.

[4.4 Demolishing the Fourth False Qaanoon: Making Ta'weel of That Which Is Outwardly a Limb And Affirming (Without Ta'weel) That Which Is Not Outwardly A Limb]

And then another party said: Whatever attribute is not outwardly a limb, or a part, such as knowledge, life, will, power, speech, then it is not made ta'weel of. And whatever is outwardly a limb, or body part, such as face, hands, foot, shin, finger, then that is specified for ta'weel, because its affirmation necessitates composition (tarkeeb, i.e. composition of several components) and tajseem.

Then the Affirmers say in reply: Our answer to you is the same as your answer to your disputants from the Jahmiyyah, and the Mu'tazilah, the Negaters of the Attributes, for they are the ones who say to you: If any attribute related to existence (wujood) was established with Allaah, such as hearing, seeing, knowledge, power, life, then it would require separate incidental parts (a'raad), and this would necessitate composition (tarkeeb) and tajseem (anthropomorphism), and divisibility (inqisaam). And this is just like you (the Ash'ariyyah) say, that if he had a face, hand, finger, this would necessitate composition, and divisibility. So in this case, whatever your reply is to those (the Jahmiyyah, Mu'tazilah) then it is also our reply to you.

If you then reply: We affirm these attributes (the seven) in a manner that does not render them incidental parts (a'raad), and we do not call them incidental parts (a'raad), then this does not necessitate composition (tarkeeb) and nor anthropomorphism (tajseem). Then it is said to them, and we too affirm the attributes that Allaah has affirmed for Himself - the ones that you have denied for Him - in a manner that does not necessitate parts and limbs, and the one who is described with them is

not said to be composed (murakkab), or a body (jism) or divisible (munqasim).

And if you then say: These attributes cannot be understood except as parts (ab'aad, ajzaa). And we say then likewise (the seven) cannot be understood except as incidental parts.

And if you say: That an incidental attribute ('arad) does not remain (eternally) and the attributes of Allaah (i.e. the seven that they affirm) remain, eternally, (i.e. always with Him, eternal, having no beginning and no end), then they are not incidental attributes (a'raad). So we say in reply, then likewise with parts (ab'aad), it is possible for these to be separate and cut off, and in the case of Allaah the Most High, this is impossible, hence His attributes (i.e. all of them) are not parts, and nor limbs, and the separation of the divine attributes from the one described with them is impossible, absolutely, in both types (i.e. the seven that you affirm and the rest that we also affirm) but as for the creation then it is possible for his incidental attributes (a'raad) and his parts (ab'aad) to separate from him.

[4.5 Demolishing the Fifth False Qaanoon: Argument By Equating and Differentiating Between the Attributes To Illustrate That They Must Be Negated]

And if you say: If the face was the same thing as the [attributes] of hand, and the eye and the shin and the finger (i.e they are all synonymous), then this is impossible, and if they are other than each other, then this necessitates tamyeez (distinction) and this necessitates tarkeeb (composition). Then we say to you: If hearing is the same entity as seeing and they are both the same attribute of knowledge, and this is the same entity as life and power (qudrah), then this is impossible. And if they are to be distinguished and separated, then this necessitates tarkeeb (composition). Therefore, whatever your answer is (to your opponents, the Jahmiyyah and the Mu'tazilah), then the answer is common (i.e. our answer to you is the same answer as yours to them).

So if you then say: We understand the attributes (that we affirm) not to be non-essential, incidental attributes (a'raad), that are established without a body (jism) that is confined [in space], even if they have no equal in what is outwardly observed (in the creation). Then we say: Then understand [all] of the attributes not to be non-essential incidental attributes that are established without a body confined [in space], even if they have no equal in what is outwardly observed.

And we do not reject the differentiation between these two types of attributes in essence (i.e. between those that do not outwardly imply parts, limbs and those that do), but this separation between the two is of no benefit to you in differentiating between the two types, namely that one necessitates tajseem (anthropomorphism), tashbeeh (resemblance) and tarkeeb (composition) and the other does not.

When this [argument and reasoning] became binding and it was thrust in the throats of the Jahmiyyah, they said that the subject is all one and same to us, we reject and negate everything (i.e. all Names and all Attributes).⁷

[5. Therefore, There Are Only Three Positions That Can Be Held In This Regard]

So it becomes clear that you can only choose between one of three matters. [A] That which is general negation (of everything) and pure ta'teel (divestment) (the way of the Jahmiyyah). Or [B] That you describe Allaah with whatever He described Himself, and whatever His Messenger described Him with, and you do not go beyond the Qur'aan and the Hadeeth, and in all of that you follow the path of the Salaf who have passed, those who are the most knowledgeable of the Ummah in this matter – both in terms of negation and affirmation, and who are the most severe in their veneration of Allaah, and in freeing and purifying Him (of defects) (tanzeeh), from that which does not befit His Majesty.

For the meanings that are understood from the Book and the Sunnah are not to be repelled by mere doubts, such that the way they are rejected falls under the aspect of “distorting the words from their places (i.e. proper meanings)”.

And nor is reflecting over them and [acquiring] knowledge of them to be abandoned, such that this [behaviour] resembles those who when they are reminded with the verses of their Lord, they face them with deafness and blindness.

And nor is it to be said that these are words whose meanings cannot be understood, and nor can the intent behind them be known, such that this [behaviour] resembles those who do not know anything from the Book except

⁷ [Translators Note]: Meaning, the Jahmiyyah, when they saw that what Ahl us-Sunnah, the Salafi Affirmers, refuted them with was the truth, then they rejected all the Names and all the Attributes, - and of the three groups (Jahmites, Mu'tazilites and Asha'rites), the Jahmites are the most coherent in their argument (even though it is falsehood) – and the most bewildered, confused, and contradictory are the Ash'arites – who are tossed here and there, with no coherence in their school of thought – and the bulk of the evidence and argument in this Tribunal is actually against them.

wishes. Rather, these are clear, manifest verses that indicate the most noble of meanings, and the loftiest meanings. Their realities are affirmed in the hearts of those who have been given knowledge and faith – they are affirmed with mere acceptance (of the meanings) without tashbeeh (resemblance), and tanzeeh (negating defects for Allaah) without ta'teel (negation, divestment). Just like all of the realities of the attributes of perfection are affirmed in their hearts in a similar manner.

Hence, the whole subject to them is a single, [uniform, coherent] subject, their hearts are at ease with it, and they have found quiescence in it, and so they became intimate [with Him] due to [their knowledge and acceptance of] His attributes of perfection, and his qualities of Loftiness – those which the Ignorants and the Divesters estranged themselves from. And they (the Affirmers) found ease in that which the Rejecters fled from, and they knew that the ruling upon the Attributes is like the ruling upon the Essence (Dhaat).

So just like His Essence, the Sublime, does not resemble the other beings (dhawaat), then His Attributes do not resembles the attributes (of the creation). Hence, whatever has come of [the mention of attributes] from the one who is infallible (i.e. the Messenger), then they took it with acceptance, and they faced it with ma'rifah (i.e. knowledge, meaning they took it as knowledge), and faith and affirmation, due to their knowledge that it is an attribute of one who has in resemblance to His Essence or in His Attributes.

Imaam Ahmad said, “Tashbeeh (resemblance) is when it is said “Hand like this hand, or face like this face. As for the affirmation of a hand which is not like the hands (of the creation) and a face which is not like the faces (of the creation), then this is just like the affirmation of an essence (dhaat), but not like the essences (in the creation), and also a life (hayaat) which is not like the life of others, and also hearing and seeing which is not like the hearing and seeing (of all those in the creation). And there is no path (that can be traversed) except this one or the path of pure ta'teel (divestment, negation) or [C] the path involving contradiction which does not allow for the one who is upon it a firm [coherent, uniform] footing to either negate (any attributes) or to affirm (any attributes), and in Allaah is success”.

[6. The Criterion, Standard Of Every Firqah Is Based Upon Its Own Innovated Foundations It Has Laid For Itself]

And the reality of the matter is that every faction makes ta'weel of that which opposes its creed and madhhab. Hence, the criterion between that whose ta'weel is allowed and that whose ta'weel is not allowed is actually the madhhab that [each faction] has tended to, and the principles that it has laid down. Hence, whatever agrees with these principles, they affirm it and do not make

ta'weel of it, and whatever opposes them, then if it is possible for them to reject it outright (i.e. the text) they reject it, otherwise, they make ta'weel of it.

For this reason, when the Raafidah established their hatred for the Sahaabah, they rejected everything that came concerning their virtues, and praise of them, or they made ta'weel of it.

And when the Jahmiyyah laid their foundations that Allaah does not speak and nor does He speak to anyone, and nor will He be seen with the vision (of the eyes), and that He is not above the Throne, separate from His creation, and that He does not have any Attribute that is established with Him – they then made ta'weel of everything that opposed what they had laid down (as their foundation).

And when the Qadariyyah laid down their foundation that Allaah, the Sublime, does not create the actions of His servants, and that He did not decree them for them, they made ta'weel of everything that opposed their foundations.

And when the Mu'tazilah laid the foundation of their saying concerning the implementation of the threat, and that whoever enters the Fire will never come out of it, they made ta'weel of everything that opposed it.

And when the Murji'ah laid their foundation that Imaan is merely knowledge (ma'rifah) and that it does not increase or decrease, they made ta'weel of everything that opposed their foundations.

And when the Kullaabiyyah laid their foundation that Allaah, the Sublime, cannot be described with that which is tied to His qudrah (power) and will [i.e. the attributes of action, sifaat fi'liyyah, those which are connected to His will, when He wills he performs them, such as istiwa, or nuzool and the likes], and they called this "hulool al-hawaadith" [i.e. the new occurrences, transformations], they made ta'weel of everything that opposed this foundation.

And when the Jabariyyah laid the foundation that the ability (qudrah) of the servant has no role or effect in (his) actions from any angle whatsoever, and that the movements of the servants is just like the blowing of the wind and the [subsequent] motions of the trees, they made ta'weel of everything that came in opposition to this.

And this in reality is the measure (i.e. criterion, standard) of ta'weel in the view of every sect, until even the blind-followers in the subsidiary matters (of fiqh and ahkaam), the followers of the Imaams, those who believe first in a madhhab, then they request a proof for it in accordance with the principle that

they have concerning that which accepts ta'weel and that which cannot accept ta'weel – which is whether it opposes the madhhab or agrees with it (respectively).

And whoever reflects upon the various sayings of the sects, and their various schools of thought, he will see this clearly and directly, and in Allaah lies success.

And every one of them makes ta'weel of evidence (daleel) that is heard (i.e. a textual evidence from the Book or the Sunnah), and then at the same time he affirms another text, which is equal to it, upon its apparent (meaning), or (he affirms) a text which would be more in need of ta'weel than [the text that he has actually made ta'weel of] (i.e he contradicts himself).

This is because they - at one and the same time - do not have any comprehensive, sound, uniform, reflective principle by which they can differentiate between that which can accept ta'weel and that which cannot accept ta'weel. Rather, it is merely a school of thought (madhhab) and mere principles (they have devised) and whatever their Shuyookh have said.

And further, it is never possible for the likes of these people to argue against the one who falsifies (their way) by way of a proof that is heard (i.e. a text found in the Book or the Sunnah) – since the path of ta'weel can also be taken towards it (i.e. in order to negate the validity of this proof), just like this person (the muta'awwil) himself takes the path of ta'weel towards that (from the Book and the Sunnah) which opposes his madhhab – and the explanation of this will come at its proper place if Allaah wills.

Benefits and lessons from this tribunal

1. Today's tribunal is focused upon the offshoots of the Jahmiyyah, specifically the Ash'ariyyah. It is necessary to give some background before continuing so that the observer can see more clearly, the mode of argument.

2. The Jahmiyyah: They negate all Names and Attributes and claim that Tawheed is to strip Allaah of every name and attribute that the creation can also be described with. Therefore, they negated every single attribute, including hearing, seeing, speech, will and others. They claimed that affirming any attribute for Allaah necessitates likening Him to the creation. Until some of them even reached the level where instead of affirming "existence" (wujood) for Allaah, they said instead "he is not absent" – in order to avoid affirming an attribute that is common between Allaah and the creation! So this is Tawheed to them, and this is the meaning of "al-Ahad" to the Jahmites – may Allaah fight them and sever their lips and protect the Muslims from their ilhaad.

4. The Mu'tazilah, then they took from the Jahmiyyah in the innovation pertaining to the Attributes save that they affirmed the Names, but made all of the attributes to be synonymous with Allaah's Dhaat (essence). In reality, they negated all of the Attributes, and claimed that all the Names affirmed for Allaah are synonymous (mutaraadifah). Thus, al-Baseer is actually the same as al-Raheem, and al-Ghafoor is the same as al-Hakeem, and so on. They claimed that all these names refer back to Allaah, and that Allaah cannot be described with attributes. Both the Jahmiyyah and the Mu'tazilah refute the Ash'ariyyah – and accuse the Ash'ariyyah of tajseem, and tashbeeh, because the Ash'ariyyah affirm seven attributes.

5. The Ash'ariyyah differ from the Jahmites and Mu'tazilites in that they affirm seven attributes for Allaah – life, knowledge, will, power, hearing, seeing, speech – claiming that these are proven by the intellect. The Ash'ariyyah have thus taken a position between the Jahmites and Mu'tazilah on the one hand and Ahl us-Sunnah on the other. However, their position is most ridiculous, incoherent and most contradictory – and is actually an insult to the intellect – since it is full of contradiction and double standards.

6. Once this has been established, the mode of argument in today's Tribunal begins. The Prosecution firstly alludes to what occurs in the Qur'aan of the affirmation of Names, Attributes and Actions for Allaah, in words that are clear and not ambiguous, with some examples of that. And additionally what has been reported in the Sunnah, in authentic narrations, reported by the trustworthy ones, of Attributes and Actions for Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic. This cannot be denied – and even though the collective body of

Jahmites, Mu'tazilites and Ash'arites – may attempt to cast doubt on some of what has been reported in the Sunnah specifically, by false principles – such as the claim that Aahaad hadeeth are not to be accepted in affairs of aqeedah, or that particular narrations are not authentic, and other such futile claims – despite that, they cannot deny that the Sunnah has come with these affairs, with authentic and dependable modes of transmission. So in turn, they resort to ta'weel – and this is common between all three, the Jahmites, the Mu'tazilah, and the Ash'ariyyah.

7. Once, this has been established and the three aforementioned groups have no option but to affirm what has been reported, then three questions are posed – and in reality, the rest of the discussion is focused mainly on the Ash'ariyyah. The questions are [i] Do you make ta'weel of every thing, the sum whole of what has been related concerning the Attributes and Actions, and take it away from its apparent meaning? [ii] Or do you affirm the sum whole of that upon its reality and its apparent meaning? [iii] Or do you differentiate between some and others.

8. Of course the reply of the opponent is in reply to the third question – since the Ash'ariyyah make ta'weel of some as opposed to others. Hence, the Prosecution will now examine and investigate what exactly is the principle by which they distinguish between that which can accept ta'weel and that which cannot – and whether they can remain coherent in any of this.

9. In their defence the Jahmite Offspring bring five lines of reasoning:

- a) That whenever Allaah is described with an attribute that is also applicable to the creation, then in this case, ta'weel can be made of it.
- b) That ta'weel should be made of whatever the intellect indicates, and that affirmation ought to be made of that whose ta'weel is not necessitated by the intellect.
- c) That whatever the Ijmaa' indicates should be accepted only with ta'weel, then ta'weel is made of it, and whatever is not like this, then it is affirmed without ta'weel.
- d) That whatever is understood to be outwardly a limb, then ta'weel is to be made of it and whatever is not understood to be outwardly a limb, then it is accepted.
- e) That it is impossible for all of these attributes (like face, eye, hand etc.) to be synonymous (i.e. the same thing), and if they are different to each

other, then this necessitates tarkeeb (composition, i.e. that Allah is made up of “parts”) – and hence it is obligatory to make ta'weel.

10. The Sunni Prosecution however, lays each of these five “qawaaneen” (devised, invented rules) to waste – and the generic form of reasoning in response to each of these “qawaaneen” is to illustrate the contradiction in the application of these “qawaaneen” when their proponents themselves affirm seven attributes (life, knowledge, power, will, hearing, seeing, speech). Thus whatever is used as an argument against the affirmation of the realities of what is besides these seven attributes (such as face, uluww (highness), hand, pleasure, anger, amazement etc.) – then this same argument applies to the seven that are affirmed. Otherwise, the siblings of the Jahmiyyah, fall into wicked and blatant contradiction.

11. And indeed the Ash'arites, fall into wicked and blatant contradiction, and their foolishness is exposed to the onlookers and observers, and all praise is due to Allaah. And indeed after this far reaching proof (al-hujjah al-baalighah), the Ash'arites have nothing to stand upon – except to continue in their deceit, pretence, fraud, and sham against Ahl us-Sunnah, the Salafis, the Atharis – by preying upon the ignorant amongst them, and beguiling them.

12. And in reality, there are only three positions that can ever be held on the Attributes of Allaah:

[A] Make general negation (of everything) and pure ta'teel (divestment).

[B] That you describe Allaah with whatever He described Himself, and whatever His Messenger described Him with, and you do not go beyond the Qur'aan and the Hadeeth, and in all of that you follow the path of the Salaf who have passed, those who are the most knowledgeable of the Ummah in this matter – both in terms of negation and affirmation

C] That you take the path involving contradiction which does not allow for the one who is upon it a firm [coherent, uniform] footing to either negate (any attributes) or to affirm (any attributes), and in Allaah is success”.

13. And this Tribunal has illustrated that every sect from the sects of Innovation has its own foundations (usool) that it has laid down – and in reality, these foundations are its criterion in every matter. So the acceptance or rejection of evidence, is primarily based upon whether the evidence agrees to their foundations or not – and based upon this, they either accept it, or make ta'weel (interpolation) of it.

Concerning The Inability Of Those Who Make (False) Ta'weel To Corroborate The Difference Between That From The Verses And Hadeeths Of The Attributes Whose Ta'weel Is Permissible And Between That Whose Ta'weel Is Not Permissible

ONLY THREE POSITIONS POSSIBLE

