

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

In the Name of Allāh,  
Whose Mercy encompasses the Believer and the non-believer in the present life,  
Whose Mercy is reserved for the Believer in the Afterlife.

May Allāh raise the rank, honor, and prestige of our beloved Muḥammad, and  
protect his nation from the sins and trials that he fears for it.

And may He raise the ranks of his Companions and their Followers, and those who  
join their procession in goodness.

Thereafter:

In these few pages is a mock discourse between two: an asker, who considers himself to be a Salafi, and an answerer, who is a Sunni Muslim.

It is a presentation of questions and answers gathered mostly from actual conversations, and also from documented questions and claims that those who call themselves Salafis pose, and from anticipated queries and responses that they would likely have. Then, those were all strung together in the flow of over 70 questions that you will see. Therefore, it is not a record of a single lengthy discussion, rather it is an arrangement of many conversations, questions, and answers presented as one discussion.

It will be clear for you that not everything posed after the letter "Q" is an actual question; sometimes it may be a comment or a statement that requires a response. Hence, in general, whatever comes after a capital letter "Q" is a question OR a comment of one who considers himself a Salafi, and it is posed as he poses it, as you will see. So the "Q" will be as if to say, "The one who calls himself a Salafi asks or says ..." And everything after the capital letter "A" is the response.

May Allāh make these "**Questions and Answers**" beneficial and enlightening, and a clarification of the true, authentic way of the Righteous Salaf, and of the correct path of Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama<sup>ah</sup>.

AMIN

## CONTENT

SECTION: WHO ARE AHLUS-SUNNAH & WHO ARE THE SALAF?.....	2
SECTION: ALLAH EXISTS WITHOUT A PLACE AND THE `AYAH OF ISTAWAA .....	8
SECTION: THE HADITH OF THE SLAVE GIRL.....	11
SECTION: THE HADITH OF DESCENT .....	14
SECTION: USING THE MIND .....	18
SECTION: ALLAH DOES NOT HAVE HANDS.....	20
SECTION: SCHOLARLY WARNING AGAINST IBN TAYMIYAH.....	25
APPENDIX 1: .....	33
APPENDIX 2: .....	35
APPENDIX 3: .....	37

## SECTION: WHO ARE AHLUS-SUNNAH & WHO ARE THE SALAF?

### 1. Q: What group should be followed according to the Sunnah?

A: What came in the Sunnah is the command to follow Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama<sup>ah</sup>. This is obligatory, and following another group is forbidden, because the Prophet ﷺ said (narrated by Abu Dawud):

وَسَتَفْتَرُقُ أُمَّتِي عَلَى ثَلَاثٍ وَسَبْعِينَ فِرْقَةً كُلُّهَا فِي النَّارِ إِلَّا وَاحِدَةً وَهِيَ الْجَمَاعَةُ

**"My nation will divide into 73 sects. All of them will be in Hell except one, which is The Jama<sup>ah</sup>".**

### 2. Q: Anyone may claim to follow Ahlus-Sunnah. Who are the real ones?

A: According to the Sunnah, Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama<sup>ah</sup> is the group that follows the creed of the Prophet ﷺ and his Companions, because in another version of the hadith about the 73 sects, the Prophet ﷺ said that the Saved Sect is:

مَا أَنَا عَلَيْهِ وَأَصْحَابِي

**"The group upon what my Companions and I are upon,"**

The first people who fit that description are the "Followers (Tabi<sup>un</sup>)". And Ahlus-Sunnah has always been the majority of the Nation ever since the Companions and their Followers.

### 3. Q: What is the proof that Ahlus-Sunnah are the majority?

A: The evidence is from the truthful religious texts, and therefore, history is also a testament to this fact:

- In the Book, Allah says:

﴿كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَتَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَتُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ﴾

**<You are the best nation sent out to the people. You bid the good and forbid the evil, and you believe in Allah >. (Surah Al-<sup>Imran</sup>, verse 110)**

In this <sup>ayah</sup>, Allah praises the Nation in general, and that implies that the praise is for the majority, and not for a small, secluded group.

- In the Sunnah, besides the Messenger calling them "the Jama<sup>ah</sup>", which itself implies that they are the majority, he said:

فَإِذَا رَأَيْتُمْ اِخْتِلَافًا فَعَلَيْكُمْ بِالسَّوَادِ الْأَعْظَمِ

**"If you see dissension amongst you, then adhere to 'as-sawadul-'a<sup>dham</sup> (the vast majority)'."**

- As for the history, it is known that the Companions did not break into sects. Therefore, in their generation, the majority, in fact, the entire group altogether, was upon one thing. Their difference was in detailed rules, which is a permissible difference, and no one differed in belief at their time except the hypocrites, and they were unable to spread their dissension. Rather, they kept their opposition and identities a secret, so they do not count. As for the next generation, the Followers, they stayed altogether on one creed during the time of Abu Bakr, then Umar after him, then Uthman after him, and there was no division until the time of Aliyy. The first group to deviate was the Khawarij, and there were only about 12,000 of them, which is still a gross minority. Furthermore, many thousands of them repented, i.e., most of them, then Aliyy fought the rest and wiped them out, except for less than 10 of them. Those few scattered and started the Khawarij group anew. Likewise, the Shiites, the Mu'tazilah, and other factions of misguidance never outnumbered Ahlus-Sunnah at any time in history. Until today, there is still one group that has always far outnumbered the others, and they are Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama<sup>ah</sup>. They also call themselves by another name: **the Sunni Muslims**.

#### 4. Q: So, are you a Salafi?

A: If you are asking me if I follow the Salaf, the answer is yes. I can show you documentation from the Salaf for all of my beliefs and practices. However, if you are asking me if I go around calling myself a "Salafi", the answer is emphatically "absolutely not!" This is something new. The authorities of the Salaf called themselves "Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama<sup>ah</sup>". An example is Imam At-Tahawiyy: he is from the time of the Salaf, and he said in his booklet about the Muslim creed, "This is a clarification of the creed of Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama<sup>ah</sup>."

#### 5. Q: And who are the Salaf?

A: The Salaf are the first three centuries after the Prophet's migration. They are the best centuries of Islam, as the Prophet ﷺ said:

حَيْرَ الْقُرُونِ قَرْنِي، ثُمَّ الَّذِينَ يَلُونَهُمْ، ثُمَّ الَّذِينَ يَلُونَهُمْ

**"The best of centuries is my century, then those who come after them, then those who come after them."**

#### 6. Q: So then isn't it obvious from this hadith that you should be a Salafi and follow the Salafi Da<sup>wah</sup>?

A: Again, if what you mean by following "the Salafi Da<sup>wah</sup>" is following the scholars of the Salaf, then yes, but that doesn't mean that one has to call himself a "Salafi", because using this name is new. They called themselves Ahlus-Sunnah. However, if what you mean by "following the Salafi Da<sup>wah</sup>" is following Ibn Taymiyah, Ibn Abdil-Wahhab, Al-'Albani, Ibn Baz, Ibn Uthaymeen, Fauzan, and that circle of individuals, then none of them are from the time of the Salaf, and the hadith does not

command us to follow them. If you think that they are the Salaf, then either you have been miseducated or you have misunderstanding. How could they be the Salaf when the earliest of all of these individuals is Ibn Taymiyah, and he is from the late 7th century - born 661 AH, almost 400 years AFTER the Salaf. It cannot be said that if someone does not follow these individuals that he does not follow the Salaf, nor can it be said that because he follows them that he does follow the Salaf. Following the Salaf is by following the scholars of those first three centuries, not contradicting them and correcting them.

**7. Q:** It is true that those people you just mentioned aren't the actual Salaf, but they are the modern Salafi scholars, meaning that they teach the WAY of the Salaf and according to the minhaj of the Salaf.

**A:** This is your claim, but I guarantee you that we can easily produce the documents of the Salaf in almost all of the fundamental issues of what those people you consider to be the modern upholders of the minhaj of the Salaf believe, and show you where those people you consider scholars contradict the Salaf.

**8. Q:** Like what?

**A:** We can show you the abundant documents from the famous, undisputed authorities of the Salaf saying explicitly that Allāh exists without a place or direction, that there are good innovations, that tawassul is permissible, etc. This is the real minhaj of the Salaf, and it contradicts the foundation of what you call the Salafi Da<sup>^</sup>wah.

**9. Q:** But if a scholar makes a mistake, we don't take it, even if he is from the Salaf!

**A:** That is true, but these are not mistakes. The issues I just mentioned are what the Salaf were altogether upon and consistently verifying. What is odd is that those people you think are modern scholars upholding the way of the Salaf have made it their business to correct the Salaf; to correct Imam Aṭ-Ṭahāwiyy and Al-Bukhāriyy, to correct Imam Abū Hanīfah and Ash-Shāfi<sup>^</sup>yy, to correct even Ibn <sup>^</sup>Umar and <sup>^</sup>A<sup>^</sup>ishah, all of whom are authorities of the Salaf, but they didn't find any mistake to correct from Ibn <sup>^</sup>Abdil-Wahhab!

**10. Q:** So you are saying that I do not follow the Salaf?

**A:** I cannot say what you follow as long as you don't show it outwardly, so Allāh knows best what you follow. By the way, the people who call themselves Salafis do not practice this matter that the Salaf practiced. Rather, it is enough for you to shave your beard or wear your pants below your ankle for them to label you, let alone showing the slightest non-compliance to their "modern authorities". The Salaf said that we leave people's inward matters to Allāh, and that we do not charge them with blasphemy or hypocrisy as long as they don't show it. The scholars said that someone might be attributed to or affiliated with a deviant group while he does not believe what they believe, or does not agree with

all of their beliefs. However, if you say opposite to what I just mentioned about the Salaf's beliefs, then you certainly do not follow the Salaf.

**11. Q: Then who follows the Salafi Da^wah today?**

**A:** I have already answered this question for you: the majority of the Nation, Ahlus-Sunnah, follows the Salaf, but that does not mean that they must call themselves "Salafis". Rather, using the name "Salafi Da^wah" or "Salafiyyah" or "Salafiyyoon", or "Salafi Minhaj", etc., to describe following Ibn Taymiyah, Ibn ^Abdil-Wahhab, Al-Albani, etc. is a new idea, which makes it an innovation.

**12. Q: It is not new! You already agreed that we have to follow the Salaf!**

**A:** Please pay close attention to my words, and do not only hear what you want to hear. I did not say that the Salaf is new. I said that calling oneself a "Salafi" or a "Salafi Muslim" is new. The Salaf didn't call themselves the Salafis. Even the fourth century, the generation directly after the first three which are the Salaf, although they weren't following anyone but the Salaf, didn't call themselves "the Salafis". Are you, coming more than 1,000 years later, more deserving of the name than them? Are you following the first three generations more closely than the fourth? If they weren't Salafis, what makes you a Salafi? Nor did the people of the fifth century call themselves Salafis, nor the sixth, nor the seventh, nor the eighth, etc. Maybe this trend started about only 50 years ago, if that. So it is new; it is an innovation most definitely! I do not describe myself as a "Salafi", just like the Muslims of old did not, but everything I believe and practice can be proven from the documents of the Salaf!

**13. Q: Untrue! I have seen plenty quotes of the scholars of old who say that they are Salafis.**

**A:** Then produce them. No, what they said is that we must follow the Salaf, not that they are "the Salafis". Those are two different things.

**14. Q: But we call ourselves the Salafis because we are calling BACK to the pure way of the Salaf!**

**A:** This is a claim from the perspective of someone looking at the Muslims as deviants. But look from our perspective: Muhammad Ibn ^Abdil-Wahhab comes 200 years ago claiming to call the Muslims back to the belief... so from where did he know it? Since he was not following the Muslims of his time, then either he was a Prophet who got revelation and knew what no one else did, and this is surely impossible, or else it is he who was the deviant.

Likewise Al-Albani: He came within the last 50 years commenting on the grades of hadiths that have already been graded 1,000 years ago. If he is correct, then the Muslims have been wrong for 1,000 years, and he is not following the Salaf, he is correcting them. If he is wrong, then he is the mischievous one perverting the hadith science, and still not following the Salaf!

The reality is that the overwhelming majority never stopped being upon the pure creed of the Salaf, and the sound ḥadīths were known before Al-Albānī appeared. Yes, the Muslims are now weak and sinful, but they are not deviants. They do not need to be called back to tawḥīd because they never left it! They need to return to religious education and practice, not a belief system that was lost and needs to be reintroduced. This nation has always been upon the truth and always will be. The Prophet ﷺ said, as narrated by Al-Bukhārīyy:

لَا تَزَالُ طَائِفَةٌ مِنْ أُمَّتِي ظَاهِرِينَ عَلَى الْحَقِّ لَا يَضُرُّهُمْ مَنْ خَالَفَهُمْ حَتَّى يَأْتِيَ أَمْرُ اللَّهِ

**"There does not cease to be a group from my nation that is obviously upon the truth. Those who oppose them will not harm them until comes the Command of Allāh (i.e., Judgement Day)."**

**15. Q: Then who are those people who are upon the truth, if it isn't the Salafis?**

**A:** They are called Ahlus-Sunnah, or the Sunni Muslims.

**16. Q: So you are basically saying that the Salafis are deviants?**

**A:** I have described for you who is the group that one should follow and I gave you evidence for that from the religious documents and history. If it is clear for you that the group that calls themselves "the Salafis" don't fit that description, then you have understood within yourself whether they are deviants or not.

**17. Q: Why do you keep saying, "the group that calls themselves the Salafis"? What do you call them?**

**A:** The Muslims call them the Wahhābis. They are named after Muḥammad Ibn ^Abdil-Wahḥāb An-Najdi. He was deemed a heretic by his own father, Shaykh ^Abdul-Wahḥāb, and his brother, Shaykh Sulaymān Ibn ^Abdil-Wahḥāb, and by his shaykhs. And he aided the British in fighting the Muslims. He claimed that the nation at large went astray and became polytheistic grave worshippers! He revived the teachings of Ibn Taymiyah who died in jail and was charged also with heresy.

**18. Q: So what is your advice to a Salafi?**

**A:** My advice to a person who calls himself a Salafi is to have an open mind and also to learn the history. Like I told you, the early generations after the Salaf didn't call themselves the Salafis, so for a group that claims to wage war against innovations, and to be revivers of the "minḥaj" of old, how do they accept to give themselves a name that no one in history had, and deem everyone other than themselves as deviants, and not see a contradiction in that?

And if you were to ask most who call themselves "Salafis", "What country was the Prophet from?" they would say, "Saudi Arabia," because they do not know the history of how those who currently call themselves "Salafis" aligned themselves with the non-Muslims to fight the Muslims and overthrow the country unjustly! No, the Prophet's land was called "Jazīrat Al-^Arab (the Arab Peninsula)". Find out

how most of the Arab Peninsula became "Saudi Arabia", who the Sa<sup>u</sup>d family is, what their religious affiliation is, and then see if you still accept to affiliate yourself with this new, innovated faction.

Also, if you understand the history of the scholars, and recognize that there are literally tens of thousands of scholars in this nation, you should realize that being suspicious of a Muslim because he does not follow Ibn Taymiyah is itself suspicious! How could it be obligatory to follow Ibn Taymiyah when the Prophet ﷺ said, as narrated by At-Tabaraniyy:

مَا مِنْ أَحَدٍ مِنْكُمْ إِلَّا يُؤْخَذُ مِنْ قَوْلِهِ وَيَتْرُكُ غَيْرَ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ

**"There is none of you but that his statements are accepted and rejected, except the Messenger of Allah."**

This means that the only one from whom we must take all of his statements is the Messenger of Allah.

**19. Q: But who claims that it is obligatory to follow Ibn Taymiyah?**

**A:** The people who call themselves Salafis do not usually say that it is obligatory to follow Ibn Taymiyah, but actions speak louder than words! If you test most of them by asking them, "What do you say about someone who does not take from Ibn Taymiyah?" Most likely, he will be suspicious of such a person, dislike him, and rush to label him a deviant. As for the Sunnis, they follow the imams of the Salaf; those who follow Ash-Shafi<sup>ʿ</sup>iyy do not distrust those who do not follow him, because there are others to be followed. Those who follow M<sup>a</sup>lik do not hate those who follow Ab<sup>u</sup> Han<sup>i</sup>fah, for example. Instead, they all love each other. But the way those who call themselves Salafis behave, it is as if all of the knowledge and trustworthiness from before Ibn Taymiyah found its way to Ibn Taymiyah, and all of the knowledge and trustworthiness that came after him goes back to him. By their presentation of the Religion, it is as if he is unavoidable, and whoever missed him has missed his deen! The fact is that the scholars of this nation are thousands upon thousands upon thousands. For the people who call themselves Salafis, it is impossible to be guided without following what they call "the Salafi Da<sup>ʿ</sup>wah" or the "Salafi Minhaj", and certainly it is absolutely impossible to follow their "minhaj" without following Ibn Taymiyah. This is problematic.

**20. Q: Then what is the difference between Ahlus-Sunnah and the Salaf?**

**A:** The Salaf of this nation are a part of Ahlus-Sunnah. Ahlus-Sunnah includes the Companions and those who follow them, and they are the majority of the nation. In general, the greatest authorities of Ahlus-Sunnah are the Salaf, who are the first three generations, or the first three centuries. The people of Ahlus-Sunnah after the Salaf are called "the Khalaf", not "the Salafis".

## SECTION: ALLAH EXISTS WITHOUT A PLACE AND THE `AYAH OF ISTAWAA

**21. Q:** ... OK, I see. You are saying that the group to follow is Ahlus-Sunnah, and that the Salaf is a part of Ahlus-Sunnah, and that the Salafis don't really follow the Salaf or Ahlus-Sunnah. That's deep. Now, what is this business about "Allah exists without a place?"

**A:** This is the correct creed taken from the Book, the Sunnah, the sound mind and the Salaf certainly repeated it and verified it. It means that Allah is not existing in any place. All directions, including "above", do not pertain to Him. He does not fill a space. He is not a body with dimensions and volume. And this does not mean that He is everywhere.

**22. Q:** So you are saying that Allah is "nowhere"?

**A:** "Nowhere" means not in any place. He existed before He created places and therefore He was not anywhere; before He created places there was no "where" for Him to be. This means there was no above or below before He created them. Before He created up, down, left, right, front and behind, He existed and there was literally no "where". So yes, I am saying that Allah is "nowhere" meaning: "existing without being in any place". However, if you mean by saying, "You are saying that Allah is nowhere!" to belittle what I am saying, then your belittling what I am saying, and your changing my statement: "Allah exists without a place" to: "Allah is nowhere" does not change the fact or weaken my argument. It is a powerful truth! I suggest you ask your questions with the intent to learn, and not to try to humiliate.

**23. Q:** Well, didn't Allah say that He is above?

**A:** Allah said that He is "fawq (above)", and that He is "aliyy (high)", but He did not say He is high "IN A PLACE" or above "BY DIRECTION". Those are the additions of the people who call themselves Salafis. You need to understand that "aboveness" and "highness" both have two meanings:

- 1) the literal physical meaning and,
- 2) the figurative meaning of status, greatness and majesty.

As for the literal physical meaning, that is the impossible meaning, because Allah is not like His creations, as He said: (Surah Ash-Shura, ayah 11)

﴿لَيْسَ كَمِثْلِهِ شَيْءٌ﴾

**"Nothing is whatsoever like Him."**

So, He is not physical, and He is not a body contained and restricted to directions like we are.

**24. Q:** But the Salaf said that Allah is where He said He is!

**A:** Correction: the people who call themselves "Salafis" say that. Allah never said He was anywhere.

**25. Q:** So you don't believe that "above" is a place?



**A:** I already told you that "above" has two meanings: a physical direction – which is impossible because Allāh is not a body with edges, and an allegorical meaning, which is the meaning of greatness, and this is valid to attribute to Allāh!

Look, when Allāh said (in Surah Al-Hadīd, ayah 4):

﴿وَهُوَ مَعَكُمْ أَيْنَ مَا كُنْتُمْ﴾

which literally translates as, "He is with you wherever you are", you did not consider "with you wherever you are" as a place, and instead you say it means: "He knows about you wherever you are".

And when Allāh said (in Surah Qaf, ayah 16):

﴿وَنَحْنُ أَقْرَبُ إِلَيْهِ مِنْ حَبْلِ الْوَرِيدِ﴾

which literally translates as "We are closer to him than the jugular vein", you didn't consider "closer than a jugular vein" as a place, and also said it means His Knowledge. And when Allāh said (in Surah Al-<sup>Alaq</sup>, ayah 19:)

﴿وَاسْجُدْ وَاقْتَرِبْ﴾

which literally says, "Prostrate and come closer", you didn't consider "coming closer" as a place. When Allāh said (Al-Baqarah 186):

﴿فَإِنِّي قَرِيبٌ﴾

which literally means, "Surely I am near", you didn't consider "near" as a place. So by the Lord of the Heavens and Earth, why are you picking and choosing "above" and "high" to refer only and absolutely necessarily and definitively to a place and nothing more? And why are you astonished that Ahlus-Sunnah did not say it means a place, when you have done the same thing?

**25. Q: What about the ayah of "istiwa`"? Is that not enough?**

**A:** The scholars of the Salaf have two ways to explain this ayah, and other ayahs like it:

1. The first method is not to specify any meaning for it. This means not to translate it, and not to pick any other word for it. They simply said, "Istawa, as He said about Himself." They did not say, "He rose over His throne as He said about Himself," nor "He sat," or "settled on the throne as He said about Himself." No, that is from the translators who call themselves Salafis. This method is the meaning of what Ash-Shafi'yy said: *"I believe in what came from Allāh according to whatever (meaning) Allāh willed, and in what came from the Messenger of Allāh according to whatever (meaning) the Messenger of Allāh meant."* This does not mean that he

takes it literally as some would suggest to you. It means that he is falling back from speaking about it.

2. The second method is to explain it with meanings that not only work in the language, but that are also befitting to His Majesty. So know that "istawā" has over ten meanings. Not all of them befit Allāh. For example:

Allāh says in Surah Al-Fath`ayah 29 about some crops:

﴿فَاسْتَوَىٰ عَلَىٰ سَوْفِهِ﴾

«It "istawā" (became erect) on its stalk.»

Straightening up does not befit Allāh because it would mean that He was crooked.

Allāh says in Surah Al-Qaṣaṣ`ayah 14 about Prophet Muṣā ﷺ:

﴿وَلَمَّا بَلَغَ أَشُدَّهُ وَاسْتَوَىٰ آتَيْنَاهُ حُكْمًا وَعِلْمًا﴾

«When he reached his prime and he "istawā (matured)", Allāh gave him prophethood and knowledge.»

Ripening and becoming "done" does not befit Allāh.

Allāh says about the Ark of Prophet Nuḥ ﷺ in Surah Hud`ayah 44:

﴿وَاسْتَوَتْ عَلَىٰ الْجُودِيِّ﴾

«It "Istawā (settled)" upon Mt. Judiyy.»

Some interpret the istiwa` of Allāh exactly as it means in this ayah; that He "settled" upon the throne, or was "firmly established" on it, so they unwittingly compared Allāh to a boat! The meaning of "settling" in this context is "landing" and "contacting", and Allāh is exalted from that. Also, Allāh is exalted from the meaning of "ascending upon or over", or "mounting", like in the other ayah about Prophet Nuḥ ﷺ and his Muslim followers in Surah Al-Mu`minun`ayah 28:

﴿فَإِذَا اسْتَوَيْتَ أَنْتَ وَمَنْ مَعَكَ عَلَى الْفُلِّ فَقُلِ الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ﴾

«When you and who is with you "istawa (ascend)" upon the Ark, then say, "Al-Ḥamdu Lillāh"»

**26. Q:** So what meanings befit Allāh according to you?

**A:** Not according to me; according to the Salaf. Firstly, remember that most of the Salaf, like Ash-Shafi`iyy did not indulge in specifying a meaning. However, several did. Among them was Mujāhid the student of Ibn `Abbāṣ. Al-Bukhariyy documented that he said, "Istawa: He dominated the Throne."

Also, Imam Al-Akhfash said in Ma<sup>^</sup>anil-Qur`an - and he is an authority of the Salaf, "Istawa over the <sup>^</sup>Arsh; He (Allah) is saying: "dominated", and the meaning of 'dominated' is: "had power over". Also At-Tabariyy, who is a leading mujtahid imam of the Salaf said in his tafsir that among the meanings of Istawa is "taking possession" and "subjugation". And there are still more.

**27. Q:** But if you say it means subjugated and dominated, that implies a struggle!

**A:** Firstly, no, it does not. Among Allah's Names is "Al-Qahhar (the Dominator)". Therefore, if this meaning were unbecoming, it would not have been a Name of Allah. Secondly, I told you that you cannot be a follower of the Salaf if you are correcting the Salaf. If you are correcting them, then they should be following you. The question is: If what the Salaf said does not comply with what Ibn Taymiyah or any of your modern figures said, which group is to be rejected and corrected? As for me, I follow Ahlus-Sunnah, and we take what the Salaf said over what your modern leaders say.

### SECTION: THE HADITH OF THE SLAVE GIRL

**28. Q:** But there is still the hadith of the slave girl. How do you explain the fact that the Prophet ﷺ asked her, "Where is Allah?", and that we use this question to test people's faith?

**A:** Had the Salaf understood this hadith as you do, they would have gone around asking people where Allah is as you do, but they did not.

**29. Q:** But it is enough that the Prophet ﷺ tested the slave girl's faith by asking "Where is Allah?" This is a Sunnah of the Prophet ﷺ.

**A:** Had the Salaf understood the hadith as you do, they would have gone around testing people's faith by asking them "Where is Allah?" because they would have known it as a Sunnah better than you do, but they did not. How could this be the way to test someone's faith when the Christians and Jews, if you were to ask them, would tell you that Allah is above? The way to test someone's faith is to ask them about the Shahadah, and that's what the Prophet ﷺ did with the slave girl in the OTHER version of this hadith, the one narrated by Imam Malik. If someone affirms that there is no God but Allah and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah, upon that you deem him faithful, and leave whatever may be in his heart to Allah, as the Salaf did. But if someone says, "God is above", or "God is in heaven", or something like that, this is not enough to deem him a Believer, because even non-believers believe that. The word of tawhid is the shahadah, not "where is God?"

**30. Q:** So you deny the hadith of the slave girl?

**A:** It is not a matter of denying it. This hadith needs proper explanation. Assuming it is authentic, it needs to be explained in conjunction with its other narrations that have other wordings. You cannot just take the narration you like, sweep the others under the carpet, then force your convictions upon the people by one version of a hadith that you misinterpret. The known hadith rule is that the versions of a

hadīth must be MERGED to be explained properly. In the version of Ibn Hibbān, he didn't ask her "Where is Allāh?" he asked her, "Who is your Lord?", and in the version of Malik, he asked her, "Do you testify that there is no God except Allāh?" This is how you test one's Islamic faith.

**31. Q:** I never heard of these versions of the hadīth.

**A:** That's only because your modern authorities kept them hidden from you. They gave you one alternative, and gave you a list of what books to avoid. You trusted them and never came across any information but theirs. The fact that you do not know it does not negate its validity. The question is if you are going to check it and if you do and you find it, will you ignore it?

**32. Q:** But do the other versions say that Allāh is NOT over the heavens?

**A:** First of all, even the version of Muslim that you are accustomed to does not say "above the heavens". It says "fis-samā'" which literally means IN THE SKY, not "over the heavens", so know that you have been deceived by the people you trust. They took advantage of your lack of Arabic and mistranslated the hadīth. Secondly, I just told you, the correct rule is to merge all of the versions of the hadīth to find the common meaning. The common meaning of all of them is that he was asking her about her belief, not about a place.

**33. Q:** And why did you say, "Assuming that the hadīth is authentic?" It is narrated by Muslim, so it is authentic.

**A:** Its authenticity is disputable. According to Muslim, it is authentic, but some of the scholars said that the hadīth is weak because it is disordered/inconsistent:

- One version seems to say, "Where is Allāh", while another says, "Do you testify that there is no God but Allāh ", and if you take each one by its face value, they are as different as night and day!
- In some versions she was a mute and could not speak at all, so she pointed to the sky, and in other versions she could speak.
- In some, the story was that she was tending a flock of sheep when a wolf escaped with one, so her master smacked her in the face, then regretted that and wanted to free her. In another, the story was that a man wanted to fulfil his dead mother's will and free a slave on her behalf.
- In some, the entire conversation was in sign language, because she was deaf and mute.
- In some versions, the man's name was Mu<sup>^</sup>awiyah Ibn Hakam, and in some he was Amr Ibn Hakam and yet in some it was a woman.

A hadīth cannot be evidence for the creed unless it is indisputably sound, and this hadīth's soundness is disputable.

**34. Q:** It seems that you put a lot of trouble to empty out the meanings of these proofs.

**A:** A lot of effort, not a lot of trouble - but not to empty out the meanings, rather to explain them properly. It always takes more effort to clean up a mess than to make it. We are the clean-up crew.

**35. Q:** Ok, you said that Allah never said that He was anywhere. Where did He say that He is NOT in a place?

**A:** The statements from Allah and His Messenger are more eloquent than to simply say, "He exists without a place." This is the statement of the scholars of the Salaf and the Khalaf, based on the explicit statements from Allah and His Messenger. For example:

- Allah says in Surah Ash-Shura ayah 11:

﴿لَيْسَ كَمِثْلِهِ شَيْءٌ﴾

**(Nothing is whatsoever like Him).**

If He were in a place, He would have uncountable similars. If He were in the sky, He would be like the Angels, the sun, moon and stars. If He were on earth, He would be like the humans, jinn, plants and animals. If He were above the sky, He would be like Paradise, the Kursiyy and the ^Arsh. If He were over the ^Arsh, He would be like the book over the ^Arsh.

- Allah also said (Surah Al-^Ankabut `ayah 6):

﴿إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَعَنِيَّ عَنِ الْعَالَمِينَ﴾

**<Allah has no need of the creations>.**

Had Allah been in the heavens, he would need the heavens so that He could be in them. Had He been over them, He would need them so that He could be over them! If He rose toward the sky, or over the ^Arsh, He would need it to rise toward it or over it. This is because it is obvious that if there was nothing to be over, He would not be over it, and if there was nothing to be in, He would not be in it!

These statements from the Qur`an are more eloquent than to just say, "Allah exists without a place".

The Sunnah of the Prophet is even more direct than that:

- Muslim narrated the hadith:

أَنْتَ الظَّاهِرُ فَلَيْسَ فَوْقَكَ شَيْءٌ وَأَنْتَ الْبَاطِنُ فَلَيْسَ دُونَكَ شَيْءٌ

**"You (Allah) are 'Adh-Dhahir' and there is nothing above You, and You are 'Al-Batin' and there is nothing below You."**

Al-Bayhaqiyy said in Al-`Asma` was-Sifat: "If there is nothing above Him and nothing below Him, then He is not in a place."

- Al-Bukhariyy narrated that the Prophet ﷺ said:

كَانَ اللَّهُ وَمَا يَكُنْ شَيْءٌ غَيْرُهُ

"Allah was, and there was nothing other than Him."

This explicitly proves that Allah existed without a place, because the place is other than Allah, and He existed and nothing other than Him existed, not even light, darkness or time.

**36. Q: But that is before the creation. What about after the creation?**

**A:** It is a well-documented creed of the Salaf that Allah does not change. Imam At-Tahawiyy said, "He never ceased to be attributed with His Attributes before His creation. He did not increase by their existence in any way that was not His Attribute before them." Abu Hanifah said, "Change occurs to the creation." Therefore, His Attributes before the creations are His Attributes after the creations, and whatever was not His Attribute before the creations is not His Attribute after the creations, like a place.

#### SECTION: THE HADITH OF DESCENT

**37. Q: What about the Hadith of Nuzul?**

**A:** This hadith is authentic, but it does not mean that Allah comes down to the sky. It means that the ANGEL comes down to the sky.

**38. Q: But it says, "OUR LORD descends to the lowest sky. If the Prophet meant the Angel, then why did he say, "our Lord"? Are you saying that the Prophet ﷺ did not say what he meant?**

**A:** No. It's not that the Prophet ﷺ said other than what he meant, rather some people do not understand what he meant. The Prophet ﷺ speaks according to the tongue of the Arabs, and examples of this speech as we are explaining it are very common. It is called "hadhful-mudaf (omission of the mudaf)". We knew that this is a case of *omitting the mudaf* because of the other versions of the hadith. Just like the hadith of the slave girl, all versions must be merged, and none should be neglected or hidden from the Believers. Tell me, what would you like first, other versions of the hadith, or examples of omitting the mudaf?

**39. Q: Let's hear other versions of the hadith first.**

**A:** In Fathul-Bari, Ibn Hajar gathered what clarifies the meaning:

- One of those narrations is "YUNZILU Rabbuna", with a transitive form of the verb, which means: "Our Lord makes descend", instead of "YANZILU Rabbuna" which is the famous

version with the intransitive form of the verb which SEEMS to mean "Our Lord descends". By putting these two versions together, it is known that what seems to mean "Our Lord descends" actually means: "Our Lord (makes) descend (an Angel)" or "The Angel of our Lord descends", meaning, He dispatches an Angel that descends. This is correct, because Allah is not a body small enough to fit within the limits of the sky, coming and going up and down. This is befitting of the Angels, not Allah.

- Also: An-Nasa'iyy narrates a version in ^Amalul-Yawmi Wal-Laylah

إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُمَهِّلُ حَتَّى يَمْضِيَ شَطْرُ اللَّيْلِ ثُمَّ يَأْمُرُ مُنَادِيًا يَقُولُ هَلْ مِنْ دَاعٍ فَيُسْتَجَابُ لَهُ

"Surely, after half of the night passes, our Lord commands a caller who says, "Is there a supplicant so that he would be answered? ..."

This version clarifies that the one who descends and calls out is the Angel.

**40. Q:** Wait! The most famous version of the hadith says:

يَنْزِلُ رَبُّنَا تَبَارَكَ وَتَعَالَى كُلَّ لَيْلَةٍ إِلَى السَّمَاءِ الدُّنْيَا حَتَّى يَبْقَى ثُلُثُ اللَّيْلِ الْآخِرِ يَقُولُ: مَنْ يَدْعُونِي، فَأَسْتَجِيبَ لَهُ مَنْ يَسْأَلُنِي فَأَعْطِيهِ، مَنْ يَسْتَغْفِرُنِي فَأَغْفِرَ لَهُ

"OUR LORD descends every night to the sky of the dunya ..." according to you this part means "the Angel of our Lord descends", but the hadith goes on to say: "... and HE – (meaning our Lord) – says, "Is there a supplicant so that "I" would answer him, is there one repentant so that "I" would forgive him, is there an asker so that "I" would grant him!" So you are claiming that the Angel answers the supplication and forgives the sins?

**A:** No, the Angel does not forgive the sins or answer the supplication. Realize, however, that your question is posed with the readiness to reject the other hadiths, because firstly, you just ignored the hadiths I gave you, and secondly, if you want to cling to this understanding, that Allah is the one who descends – it leaves you with no way to explain the OTHER versions just presented to you. This is truly why the laymen among those who call themselves Salafis never heard of these other versions of these hadiths that are their essential proofs. In other words, in order to explain the hadith according to its literal meaning and according to the way you WANT it to mean, you would have no choice but to actually REJECT, or at the very least, HIDE the versions that I have presented to you, although they are confirmed. Our explanation does not reject or hide ANY version, even the one you want to take literally. Yes, we do explain some versions with alternative explanations, I mean "non-literal" explanations that work in the Arabic language and comply with the Religion, but these alternative meanings are much better than outright denying and/or hiding versions of the hadiths. It is known about your imams that if one of you were to show them some of these other versions, merely to ask about them, they would say, "You should burn this."

That being said, the point of your question is taken, which is: "If it is the Angel that descends, how do we explain the pronouns like "I" and "He says", which refer to Allāh"? The way to explain those pronouns is not by hiding the other versions of the ḥadīth. The answer is that the Angel descends by the command of Allāh, as the other versions tell us, and the Angel CONVEYS from Allāh what Allāh says, using pronouns that show that Allāh is the speaker being conveyed from. Therefore, the true meaning is: Allāh dispatches a caller, which is a descending Angel, and He, CONVEYING FROM ALLĀH, says: "O people, Your Lord says: Is there a supplicant so that I may answer him...", etc. Like this, there is no contradiction.

**41. Q.** So you are saying that the Angel refers to himself as Allāh by saying, "So that I may answer him," and that means that he is conveying from Allāh? That doesn't make any sense!

**A:** May Allāh enable you to listen with an attentive heart. Please do not listen to what I have to say while already prepared to reject it. No, we are not saying that the Angel refers to himself as Allāh, and that is clear. We are only saying that the Angel conveys from Allāh. That is like the other ḥadīth in Al-Bukhārīyy and Muslim, when the Prophet ﷺ was in the heavens on the night of Al-Isrā` wal-Mi`raj, and he said:

فَلَمَّا جَاوَزْتُ نَادَى مَنَادٌ: أَمْضَيْتُ فَرِيضَتِي وَحَقَمْتُ عَنْ عِبَادِي

**"When I went beyond, a caller called out: 'I have ratified what I made obligatory, and I have lightened the burden for my slaves!'"**

So here, the caller was an Angel, and he was not referring to himself as Allāh by saying, "I have ratified what I made obligatory and lightened the burden for my slaves." Rather, he was CONVEYING from Allāh; it was as if he said: "Your Lord says: 'I have ratified what I made obligatory ...'"

This is valid Arabic, and not a farfetched explanation. Likewise, the Angel who descends conveys from Allāh, and that is further proven by the version of An-Nasa`iyy that I already gave you, that the Angel says, "Is there a supplicant so that he would be answered?" without those pronouns you are clinging to.

**42. Q:** Ma sha' Allāh, I don't know that ḥadīth about the Prophet ﷺ being in the heavens, so I'll have to check it. So explain omitting the Mudaf.

**A:** Yes, check it, and do the right thing when you find it. As for omitting the mudaf, there are so many examples that I'll only give a few:

1. In Surah Al-Baqarah `ayah 9, Allāh says:

﴿يُخَادِعُونَ اللَّهَ﴾

If taken literally, it would mean. "They deceive Allāh". This is certainly impossible since Allāh is eternally All-Knowing, so there must be an alternative explanation. Imam An-Nasafiyy, in his tafsīr,



said it means: "They deceived (the Messenger of) Allah". The "mudaf" is omitted, and the "mudaf `ilay-hi" takes its place.

2. In Surah Yusuf `ayah 83, we are informed that the sons of Ya^qub said:

﴿وَأَسْأَلِ الْقَرْيَةَ﴾

Literally it means, "Ask the village". It truly means: "Ask (the people of) the village". If we do not interpret it as having an omitted mudaf, the statement would mean: "Ask the houses and the bricks and the cobblestones and the well," etc., because those are the things that constitute the village in a literal sense.

3. In Surat Al-`An^am `ayah 158, Allah says:

﴿هَلْ يَنْظُرُونَ إِلَّا أَنْ تَأْتِيَهُمُ الْمَلَائِكَةُ أَوْ يَأْتِيَ رَبُّكَ﴾

This seems to mean, "Are they awaiting other than for the Angels to come to them, or for your Lord to come?" And this is probably how the people you favor explain the `ayah, because they don't think that Allah coming forth with Angels means that Allah would be like those Angels He comes with, according to their claim. However, this `ayah is clarified by Surat An-Nahl, `ayah 33 in which the mudaf is NOT omitted:

﴿هَلْ يَنْظُرُونَ إِلَّا أَنْ تَأْتِيَهُمُ الْمَلَائِكَةُ أَوْ يَأْتِيَ أَمْرُ رَبِّكَ﴾

<<Are they awaiting other than for the Angels to come, or for THE COMMAND OF your Lord to come?>>.

4. Even `ayah 22 in Surat Al-Fajr:

﴿وَجَاءَ رَبُّكَ﴾

which seems to mean: "Your Lord comes" was explained by 'Imam 'Ahmad himself as: "(The Power of) your Lord", which itself actually means; "the traces of His power shall manifest", which refers to the astounding horrors of Judgement Day, like the sun drawing near the heads of the creations. In another report from him, he said it means, "(the reward of) your Lord comes".

Likewise, the hadith of Nuzul truly means, "When the last third of the night comes, (the Angel of) our Lord descends, and says (O people, your Lord says): Is there a supplicant ..." The mudaf is omitted.

**43. Q: So what if someone doesn't care about any of that stuff you are saying?**

**A:** Ignoring references is not guidance. It is following the "hawa", which is the devious desire that drives the person to the corrupted creeds. Don't search for the meaning you want it to be, accept the meaning that is proven and reject the meaning that is disproven. Not caring about all of this "stuff" is just being stubborn, and it is the "zaygh (perversion)" of the heart that Allāh dispraises in those who take the ambiguous `ayahs literally. One must merge all versions, and also think critically about what he says and believes if he truly fears the punishment of Judgment Day. Consider this:

1. If Allāh descends to the lowest sky that would mean that all the higher skies, and Paradise and the Kursiyy and the ^Arsh would be above Him and He would be below them. I've already given you the ḥadīth that nothing is above Allāh and nothing is below Him.
2. But not just that, besides contradicting the ḥadīth, believing that Allah is below whatever He passed on His way down would mean that Allāh has a top and a bottom, which would mean that He has a left and a right, and a front and a behind. In other words, he would be a body.
3. Then according to this claim, He either descended head-first or foot-first – especially since those who call themselves Salafis say that he has a literal face and a literal foot – or facedown like a "belly flop" or backwards with His front towards the sky and His back towards the earth, and all of this is impossible! If any of that were possible, then even a "cannonball dive" would be possible. And just shutting your mind off from that doesn't save you from it or disprove it, because ignoring the problem doesn't make it go away.
4. If He descends to the sky, He would have to be small enough to FIT in the sky. How many people subconsciously imagine something coming down while there is a vast sky around it?
5. If He descends to the sky, He'd be crowded by Angels, because the sky is so packed with Angels that there's not even enough empty space for four fingers!
6. If He descends during the last part of the night, then after a few moments, it will be the last third of the night somewhere else, then again somewhere else; it is ALWAYS the last third of the night somewhere, just as when it is dawn or noon in one land, it will shortly become dawn or noon in the neighboring land. So according to that, Allāh is relentlessly going up and down, up and down, up and down, like a yo-yo, all over the earth, which is silly.

### SECTION: USING THE MIND

**44. Q:** Is it even permissible to think about Allāh like this? I think this is philosophy!

**A:** This is not philosophy. It is plain, regular thinking about the meaning and implication of a statement. What is not permissible is to shut your mind off on purpose; to intentionally ignore the implications of your statements and beliefs. This is a fact and not philosophy: If there were two people who believed that Allāh Himself descends to the lowest sky during the last third of the night, but they were both on different sides of the earth, then for the one who is actually in the last third of the night, he imagines that Allāh has come down, and for the other one, the one in the daytime, he imagines that Allāh is still

up above and that it is not yet time for Him to descend! This is along with the fact that probably neither of them has realized that he imagines something about the unimaginable Self of Allah!

**45. Q:** But isn't this applying the intellect to what Allah says? Aren't we obligated to believe what Allah informs us without trying to rationalize it?

**A:** Absolutely not! There is no evidence from the Book of Allah that forbids the slaves from thinking rationally. To the contrary, Allah commands it when He says in Surat Al-Hashr `ayah 2:

﴿فَاعْتَبِرُوا يَا أُولِيَ الْأَبْصَارِ﴾

<<Think (consider; ponder), O you who have vision (intelligence)!>>

And He dispraised those who did not use their minds when He repeatedly says throughout the Qur`an:

﴿أَفَلَا تَعْقِلُونَ﴾

<<Do you not use your minds?>>

And when He says in Surat Al-Mulk `ayah 10:

﴿وَقَالُوا لَوْ كُنَّا نَسْمَعُ أَوْ نَعْقِلُ مَا كُنَّا فِي أَصْحَابِ السَّعِيرِ﴾

<<And they will say, "Had only we listened or used our minds, we would not be inmates of the Inferno!">>

If our only choice is to believe in the Qur`an and the Sunnah without any mental or rational evidence, then how would we be able to talk to people who do not believe in the Qur`an and the Sunnah in the first place? The way to talk to them is to make sense to them. And what then would make us different from the Christians who say, "Don't ask, just believe!" Isn't it famous about the Muslims that they have logical arguments against the Christians' claim of a trinity, and that Jesus is God or the son of God? Likewise, we have logical arguments against those who believe that Allah is a body in the sky, even if they claim to be Muslims.

Don't you realize that your question implies that the Companions believed Prophet Muhammad ﷺ without any evidence that he was telling the truth, despite that their families and communities waged war on them and boycotted them and disowned them? Do you think that the Prophet telling them to pray, fast, give charity and be good to others was enough to convince them to bear all of that hardship, and that they were astonished by the idea of God being in the sky? No! It was because they rationally understood the truth that the Creator is not like anything; He is not a shape, form or color, and He exists without time, place or direction. This is the astonishing creed that appeals to the sound mind!

**46. Q:** But they had evidence: the Qur`an itself! Don't you believe that the Qur`an was Muhammad's greatest miracle?

**A:** Yes, it was his greatest miracle. However, if its explanation is strictly literal as those who call themselves Salafis suggest, then the Arabs would have been able to discredit the Qur`an as a miracle, because there would be contradictions if everything in it is literal. They would have been able to argue with the Prophet ﷺ and the Muslims just as I am arguing with you now. They would have been able to say, "Hey Muḥammad, what kind of miracle is this? Is your God in the sky, or over the sky, or in the earth, or surrounding everything? Is He closer when I prostrate or is He closer than my jugular vein? Is He with me wherever I am, or only with the God-fearing?" However, the old Arabs understood the pure, eloquent Arabic, and how to interpret the different expressions; they knew that certain expressions are not taken by their literal meanings, as they did in their poetry and orations. For example, the Arabs would say: {اليلة الهلال}. Literally this means, "The crescent is tonight". However, they understood that there is an omitted mudaf, and that it really means, "(The appearance of) the crescent is tonight. If taken literally, it means that the crescent is the actual night. Likewise, they said: {الورد أيار}, which literally means, "The rose is May." It means the (APPEARANCE OF) the rose is in the month of May. Also, the poet said in praying for his beloved's home – and her name was "Mayy":

ألا يا اسلمي يا دار مَيِّ على البلى      ولا زال مُنْهَلًا بِجَرَعَائِكَ القَطْرُ

*"O house of Mayy, be sound from decrepitude, and may the rain never cease to drip upon your barren sands."*

If we understand Arabic as those who call themselves Salafis, this would be a supplication that the rain never stops falling on her family's land. However, it is only a supplication for prosperity and long life for her family.

So had the Qur`an and the Sunnah been explained as those who call themselves Salafis explain them, the Companions actually would not have had any real evidence; they would have only been able to say as those who call themselves Salafis say: "We believe in it without rationalizing it," which is the same thing the Christians say, and this is NOT the way of the Salaf.

### SECTION: ALLAH DOES NOT HAVE HANDS

**47. Q:** I'll have to look into these proofs you gave, but I still have a few questions. I am told that you deny Allāh's Attributes. What do you say about Allāh 's hands?

**A:** Firstly, it is untrue that I or the Muslims at large deny the Attributes of Allāh. Secondly, it is obligatory to believe that Allāh is Attributed with "Yad", but it is not appropriate to translate it as "hand", because "yad" has many meanings, and so does "hand", and not all of their meanings match, so they are not truly equivalent to each other. The same is the case for "wajh" vs. "face" and "ayn" vs. "eye". These Arabic words as Attributes of Allāh should not be translated, and the fact that I do not translate them does not mean that I deny them. If you mean that I must take them literally or else I have

denied them, then after what you have heard about the hadith of the slave girl, the `ayah of istiwa` and the hadith of nuzul, you should get the picture that these things have proper explanations.

**48. Q:** So what does "Yad" mean?

**A:** Again, you have the option of not delving into the meaning, and that is safest, and that is the general way of the Salaf. If you want to specify a meaning for it, then it depends on the context. For example, this `ayah: (Surat Al-Fath `ayah 10):

﴿يَدُ اللَّهِ فَوْقَ أَيْدِيهِمْ﴾

does not mean "the hand of Allah is over their hands", it means that their allegiance to the Prophet ﷺ is a commitment to Allah. It is not necessary to find a way to squeeze the word "hand" in the translation because of the word "yad". What is important is conveying the proper meaning. Also, the hadith (narrated by At-Tirmidhiyy and Al-Hakim):

﴿يَدُ اللَّهِ مَعَ الْجَمَاعَةِ﴾

does not mean "the hand of Allah is with the group", it means the SUPPORT of Allah is with Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama`ah".

Thus, there is no single way to translate it. It needs to be explained properly.

**49. Q:** But how do you explain that Allah created Adam with His two hands? Doesn't saying that they are "two hands" show that they are real, literal hands?

**A:** The `ayah in Surat Saad `ayah 75:

﴿قَالَ يَا إِبْلِيسُ مَا مَنَعَكَ أَنْ تَسْجُدَ لِمَا خَلَقْتُ بِإَيْدِي﴾

does not mean that Allah has two body parts.

**50. Q:** Did I say that Allah has body parts? Don't put words in my mouth!

**A:** You did not blatantly say "body parts", but you said everything else that means that. Avoiding the actual word does not mean that you aren't confirming it. Not saying the word is only the way to PLAY with the words. This is why the scholars said about the literalists that the secret of their matter is that they truly believe in likening Allah to the creations, but they use trickery.

**51. Q:** Well, everyone who knows even some basic Arabic knows that the dual form of the word means "TWO", not "one" or "three". Surely you don't claim that it means that Allah has "two powers", do you?

**A:** The dual form in Arabic does not always refer to "two", just as the plural doesn't always refer to "three or more", and just as the past tense form of a verb does not always refer to a past time, and the

feminine form of a word does not always mean that the named one is a literal female. It takes more than "some basic knowledge of Arabic" to explain the Qur`an.

**52. Q: Like what?**

**A:** An easy example is the dhikr of Hajj called the Talbiyah: "Labbayk Allāhumma labbayk" The word "labb" literally means "ta^ah (obedience)", but "labbayk" does not mean "Your (only) two obediences". It means, "I obey you time and again, O Allāh". Also, the `ayah in the beginning of Surat Al-Mulk (`ayah 4):

﴿ثُمَّ ارْجِعِ الْبَصَرَ كَرَّتَيْنِ﴾

does not mean, "Look (only) twice". It means, regardless of how much you look, you will never find imperfection in the creation of Allāh".

- As for the plural not referring to three or more, don't you see that Allāh refers to Himself as "Nahnu (We)", while He is one?
- As for the past tense verb not referring to the past, Allāh said about Judgement Day (Surat An-Nahl `ayah 1)

﴿آتَىٰ أَمْرَ اللَّهِ﴾

which literally means, "the Command of Allāh, meaning Judgement Day, came", but it has yet to come. So, it means, "It is on the verge of happening in the future".

- As for femininity in a male's name, take the example of "Talḥah". Don't you know it has the ta`marbutah which is originally used for femininity?

So would you say that Allāh is more than one, that Judgement Day already came, or that Talḥah is a woman, like you are insisting that Allāh has two hands because you found the dual form??

This is why some scholars said that the people who liken Allāh to the creations do not become scholars of the Arabic language. Their basic mistake is due to their inability to understand the language in the first place.

**53. Q: So how do you explain the `ayah about the creation of Adam?**

**A:** Ibn Hajar said in Fathul-Bari that some scholars said that this `ayah makes us understand the merit of Adam and that His creation had special honor. When the creations give something special heed, they handle it with two hands. So, when He revealed the word "yad" in the dual form about His creation of Adam, but it is known that He does not have limbs, it was understood by a figurative expression that Allāh gave Adam's creation special significance. Add to that that this expression was not used for other

than the creation of Adam, although Allāh created everything. Thus we know that the `ayah refers to Adam's special status with Allāh, not to two body parts.

**54. Q:** But doesn't Allāh also say that His two hands are spread wide?

**A:** The `ayah you refer to in Surat Al-Ma`idah `ayah 64:

﴿بَلْ يَدَاهُ مَبْسُوطَتَانِ﴾

means that Allāh is generous, not that He has two outstretched hands. The context shows that; if one saw the entire verse he would see that with a figurative expression: *Allāh's "hand" is tied*, the Jews were saying that Allāh is stingy or miserly. They didn't mean it literally. So with a figurative expression, Allāh contradicted their statement and confirmed that He is most generous, not that He literally has two outstretched hands. Again, it is not a condition to find a way to fit the word "hands" in the translation. Explain the proper meaning. And what further proves that this is the meaning is that He said there in the same verse:

﴿يُنْفِقُ كَيْفَ يَشَاءُ﴾

<<He gives as He wills.>>

This proves that it means that Allāh is Generous and not that He literally has two outstretched hands.

**55. Q:** But there's also a hadith that Allāh has two hands.

**A.** The Prophet's saying:

كَلَّمَا يَدَيْهِ يَمِينٌ

literally says that both of His hands are right hands. This in itself proves our point that it should not be taken literally, because two right hands is a deformity!

**56. Q:** You are rationalizing what cannot be rationalized. We must just accept it as it is.

**A:** Again, there is NO evidence from the Book or the Sunnah that discourages rational thinking. If you have something, please produce it.

As for 'Imam ^Aliyy saying, "Had the Religion been by opinion, then wiping the khuff would be from the bottom instead of the top ..." he said OPINION (ra`y), not RATIONAL THINKING, not to mention that this is not an `ayah or a hadith of the Prophet.

**57. Q:** OK, but I just feel like you are going through too much trouble to explain the meanings away. Why use the dual form if two is not intended?

**A:** Firstly, I already told you that we are not "emptying out the meanings" we are explaining these texts properly, and this is necessary so that there would not be any contradiction in the texts. Don't you know that Allāh said (Surat Ash-Shura, `ayah 11):

﴿لَيْسَ كَمِثْلِهِ شَيْءٌ﴾

<<Nothing is whatsoever like Him>>?

This means ABSOLUTELY He has NO SIMILAR in ANYWAY WHATSOEVER. So if you accept to explain the Qur`an and the Sunnah such that they are loaded with contradictions, then you will have to deal with that on Judgement Day. If anyone is "emptying meanings" it's the literalists who swept the other meanings under the carpet.

Secondly, I told you repeatedly that you do not have to specify ANY meaning for these texts, as long as you confirm "yad" as an attribute. What you cannot do is take it literally. So if you think that specifying meanings for these texts is too scary for you, just don't delve into their meanings, but if you choose to take it literally, you are doing what is worse: delving into the forbidden and destroying yourself!

Thirdly, Allāh inflicts His creations with whatever He willed. Isn't Allāh the one who commanded us not to worship anyone besides Him, yet He will send the Dajjal who claims to be God, that imposter who will do supernatural things like revive the dead and make the sky rain at his command? Similarly, Allāh told us that nothing is like Him, yet He revealed ambiguous verses that if misunderstood one will liken Him to the creations. He tests His slaves as He wills and exposes who has a tendency to obey and who has a tendency to disobey.

Fourthly, it depends on the goal of the statement. We see in Surat Yaaseen `ayah 71 that Allāh uses the plural form (aydee), and not the singular (yad) nor the dual (yadaan/yadayn):

﴿مِمَّا عَمِلَتْ أَيْدِينَا﴾

If taken verbatim it would say, "From what Allāh's (more than two but not more than ten) hands have done". So, do you say He has three or more hands? If so, then why previously say two? If not, then how do you explain this `ayah? If you explain it as "power" or anything else other than three or more hands, then you have done what you are telling me cannot be done; what you are calling "emptying out the meaning". Please note that the intent is not to be offensive, but to share knowledge and understanding. What is correct is that Allāh is attributed with Yad, Wajh and ^Ayn, not hand, face and eye.

**58. Q:** But isn't it obligatory to take them as they have come?



A. We have done that. They came as "yad", "wajh" and "^ayn". That's exactly as we say and what we pass on. "Taking it as it came" doesn't mean "give a strict literal interpretation and everything else is an all-out denial".

**59. Q: Why can't we just say that His face, eyes and hands are different from OURS?**

A: What does that mean? If it means, "just as a monkey face is different from a human face, Allāh's face is different from our faces" – as your people usually say – then this is actually likening Allāh to the creations!

**60. Q: How so?**

A: Because it means: "A fish face is different from a giraffe face, which is different from a fly face, which is different from a monkey face, which is not like a human face, etc., etc., etc., ... which is not like Allāh's face"! This is just a way to say that Allāh has a body part that is not EXACTLY like ours, but without calling it a body part! Likewise, a fish eye is not like a goat eye, which is not like a fly eye, which is not like a cat eye ... If it fits here to say, "... which is not like Allāh's eye, it just means that He has a body part that we are not familiar with exactly how it is. That would mean that He actually IS like the creation, but KIND OF different and not EXACTLY like us. Because although those different types of eyes and faces vary, they all have limits and boundaries and segments, so they are similar in some regards. Allāh is not like the creations, not partially nor totally.

But if saying, "His face, eye and hand is not like ours" means "not a shape, form or color, nor a piece or a part or an organ, not in a place or direction", then this meaning is correct, but then, why insist on a literal translation that confuses and leads people to imagine body parts for Allāh? Don't you care for people to believe properly, or you do not mind to give them a false impression?

**61. Q: So what does yad, wajh and ^ayn mean as Attributes of Allāh?**

A: Allāhu `A`lam! Why delve into the meaning without a need? What does face, eye and hand mean literally? We do not translate them or take them literally, and neither did the Salaf.

### SECTION: SCHOLARLY WARNING AGAINST IBN TAYMIYAH

**62. Q: OK, Khayr, I got you. I have one more topic I want to ask you about: It seems you have an issue with Ibn Taymiyah. Can you elaborate?**

A: Yes. But understand, firstly, that this is not a matter of attacking his character or slandering him; it is a matter of religious advice and sharing knowledge. I'm starting like this because I know that this is sensitive subject for many people, and they tend to shut down or get aggressively offended. If you think that you cannot handle what I will tell you, maybe we should stop here. But as long as this conversation can remain civil, then yes, I have issues with him. If you knew of someone who made catastrophic

mistakes time and time again, would you rely on him in your deen? If you would, then know that it is not the Sunnah of the Salaf to do that.

**63. Q:** No, let's remain civil. I'm curious to see what you have to say. But as far as someone making catastrophic mistakes, Ibn Taymiyah was a huge scholar. Who are you to count his mistakes?

**A:** Who I am is not really the issue. The issue is the religious evidence, not whether I have enough fame or popularity to clarify some of his mistakes. Imam ^Aliyy said that the truth is not known by the men, the men are known by the truth. I could be a "nobody" and be correct, just like he could be very famous and be incorrect. Don't you know the story of ^Umar, narrated by Al-Bayhaqiyy, when he was corrected by a woman, so he went back up on the pulpit and said, "A woman was correct and ^Umar was incorrect!"

**64. Q:** But we all make mistakes. Why are you picking on Ibn Taymiyah instead of overlooking his shortcomings and taking the good from him?

**A:** It seems that you would prefer to be oblivious to his mistakes, although that would mean that since you accept what he says and you trust him, those blunders could make their way to your heart, and you would accept them because you closed your eyes and ears. The scholars said that the one who does not know evil is bound to fall into it, like the blind man cannot detour around a hole.

**65. Q:** But if the mistake is his, and I don't know, then he will be responsible, not me.

**A:** This is a dangerous falsehood. I strongly advise you not to believe this, and to warn others from it. You are basically saying that the ignorant person is not accountable as long as he is ignorant. No, had this been true, then ignorance would be better than knowledge – as the scholars said. Think about it: If the thing that makes you deserve punishment is knowledge, and if what protects you from responsibility is ignorance, then why learn? It would be better to stay ignorant and be protected than to learn and become vulnerable. But there is no doubt that the knowledge and its people, to Allāh, are better than ignorance and its people. Allāh says:

﴿هَلْ يَسْتَوِي الَّذِينَ يَعْلَمُونَ وَالَّذِينَ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ﴾

<<Are those who know equal to those who do not know?>>

That's a rhetorical question, and the answer is obviously, "No". What is correct is that the knowledgeable and the ignorant are both accountable. The knowledgeable person is accountable to practice his knowledge, and the ignorant person is accountable to acquire the necessary knowledge by FINDING knowledgeable people, and then practice it.

Not to mention that this is contrary to the ḥadīth of Al-Bukhariyy that the Prophet ﷺ said:

فَسُئِلُوا فَأَفْتَوْا بِغَيْرِ عِلْمٍ فَضَلُّوا وَأَضَلُّوا

"... They are asked and they give answers without knowledge, so they go astray and lead others astray."

Here, the Prophet ﷺ did not exclude the one who took a wrong answer, although he did not know any better; he did not say, "They go astray, but they don't lead others astray because the mistake is not on the one who takes it."

And if you are really true to what you say, why do you warn from me and my brothers? Why not overlook our shortcomings and take the good from us, and if we were to slip you something wrong without your knowledge, you consider that we are responsible and not you? In fact, why protect yourself from anyone if you really believe that you will not be accountable for someone else's mistake that you take?

**66. Q:** How can we ignore your case when our scholars have warned against you and your group?

**A:** How can I ignore his case when the scholars of have warned against him and his group?

**67. Q:** What scholars?

**A:** There are over 90 scholars who either debated with him at his time, and/or authored works against him or documented the history of his follies:

- Imam As-Subkiyy wrote seven books refuting various claims of Ibn Taymiyah. He also wrote, "As-Sayfus-Saqeel (the Smooth Sword)", a book refuting the poem of Ibn Taymiyah's student, Ibnul-Qayyim Al-Jawziyyah, which is a long poem called "Nooniyyah" containing likening Allah to the creations.
- Adh-Dhahabiyy also scolded and rebuked him in a booklet after he praised him.

And that's only a drop in the bucket. And if you don't know who Imam As-Subkiyy is, then know that he is regarded as the highest scholar of his time, even higher than Ibn Taymiyah. Adh-Dhahabiyy said about him in a line of poetry:

شَيْوُخُ الْعَصْرِ أَحْفَظُهُمْ جَمِيعًا وَأَحْطَبُهُمْ وَأَقْضَاهُمْ عَلَيَّ

*The shaykhs of the era, the one with the most proficiency in hadith of all of them, and who has the most eloquent speeches, and the highest judge of them all is ^Aliyy (As-Subkiyy).*

Do you know who Adh-Dhahabiyy is and that he is an expert on the biographies of the scholars? Some of the other more famous names of those who refuted or warned against him are:

- Abu Hayyan Al-Andulusiyy
- Mulla ^Ali Al-Qari

- Ibn Hajar Al-Haytamiyy,
- Hafidh As-Sakhawiyy,
- Waliyyud-Deen Al-^Iraqiyy,
- Ibn Rajab,
- Ibn Baṭoṭah,
- Al-Kawthariyy, and
- The Ghumari brothers from Morocco, Aḥmad and ^Abdullah.

Ibn Taymiyah was left in prison to die after being arrested over and over, not because the scholars envied him as some may suggest to you, but for heresy.

**68. Q:** You can't use the imprisonment against him. Many scholars have been imprisoned unjustly, including 'Imam 'Aḥmad. What makes Ibn Taymiyah's imprisonment any different?

**A:** His charges, of course! Do you know what they are? Do you know the issues and the proofs involved? Do you know who sentenced him? Do you know that they said that there are things that Ibn Taymiyah invented that no one in the history of man ever said before, not even in another religion? If not, then how could you assume that he was imprisoned unjustly like 'Imam 'Aḥmad?

If you've noticed, whenever your people mention the imprisonment of 'Aḥmad, they tell the entire story – and I don't mean to imply that they understand all of the issues properly, but they mention in detail how he was jailed by the Mu^tazilah, not Ahlus-Sunnah, for refusing to say that the Qur`an is created, etc. However, when they talk about Ibn Taymiyah's imprisonment, the story is simply and generally that he was jailed unjustly like 'Imam 'Aḥmad. Rarely, if ever, do they mention the FOUR head judges who jailed him, because it certainly wasn't the Mu^tazilah or the kuffar. Nor do they mention how many times he "got booked" - as they say - and for what charges. Why is that? Look, if your people have anything documented against the judges who sentenced him like they have something documented against the caliph who jailed 'Aḥmad, tell them to produce it.

**69. Q:** OK. What do you claim to have on him?

**A:** I'll just list a few of the very many things for religious advice not slander:

Among the easiest to clarify, because even you and I agree about what is correct in this issue, is that he said that Hell will come to an end.

**70. Q:** This must be a lie on the Shaykh! He is the Shaykh of Islam! He would not say something like that!

**A:** Do not deny something because you do not know it. He certainly did say it, in a book called, "Ar-Raddu ^alaa Man Qaala bi-fanaa`il-Jannati wan-Naar (The Refutation of Whoever Says that Paradise

and Hell are Finite)", which, by the way, is a book that many people who call themselves Salafis do not make readily available (meaning that they hide it). He said on page 67<sup>1</sup>:

مَعَ أَنَّ الْقَائِلِينَ بِبَقَائِهَا لَيْسَ مَعَهُمْ كِتَابٌ وَلَا سُنَّةٌ وَلَا أَقْوَالُ الصَّحَابَةِ

*...Although those who say that it (Hell) is everlasting have no evidence from the Book, the Sunnah or the statements of the Companions.*

**71. Q:** Wait! It seems you misunderstood something. Look at the title: "The Refutation of Whoever Says that Paradise and Hell are Finite"! This means that he is defending the truth, that they are forever and everlasting.

**A:** No, the title has a trick in it. It seems from the title that he wants to defend the perpetuity of Paradise and Hell, by refuting those who say that they are both finite. However, if you read the contents of the book, you will see that what he REALLY meant is that ONLY Paradise is everlasting, not Hell also. He means by his title that he is NOT refuting those who specifically say that Hell is finite, because he agrees with that. He is refuting those who say that BOTH Paradise and Hell are finite. He is saying, in other words, that only Paradise is NOT finite. So he is refuting those who equate Paradise and Hell in perpetuity. However, whoever only reads the title will not understand what he meant. He claimed in this book that when Hellfire is extinguished, a plant called "Al-Jarjeer" will grow there.

**72. Q:** Well, I'll have to look into that, but anyway, if he did say that, the Prophet ﷺ said that if the scholar makes ijtihād and is incorrect, Allah will still reward him.

**A:** That hadīth does not apply here, for several reasons:.

1. This hadīth pertains to the mujtahids, and Ibn Taymiyah was not a mujtahid. He said about himself, that he was a Hambaliyy, which means he would be FOLLOWING a mujtahid – or at least supposed to be following one, which is ‘Imam ‘Aḥmad.
2. Ijtihād is performed for the rules, not for the basic beliefs. The everlastingness of Hell is a basic belief.
3. Ijtihād is performed when there is no explicit text clarifying the matter. The perpetuity of Hell has many explicit texts, and all Muslims know it, scholar and layman alike.

Plus, if you truly defend him by this hadīth, how did you distrust the scholars of the ‘Ash‘ariyy and Maturidiyy? Why didn't you say, "If they are mistaken, Allah will still reward them!" Instead, you believed that the ‘Ash‘ariyy and Maturidiyy were deviants that should not be trusted. Just like you do not apply this hadīth to them, you should not apply it to him, or else you are being unfair and inconsistent.

In fact, I know it hurts you to hear me say this, but he contradicted himself because he had previously documented in his book, Minhaajus-Sunnatin-Nabawiyah, that Paradise and Hell are both everlasting

and do not perish, and that this is by the consensus of the Muslims, and that no one opposed the Muslims in that except Jahm Ibn Ṣafwan, so the Muslims deemed him a kāfir. Later, he claimed that there is no evidence that Hell is everlasting, and that any consensus about that is unknown, and he wrote an entire book on it!

Also, Ibnul-Qayyim confirmed that this was Ibn Taymiyah's position in his book "Haadil-Arwaah", and he even agreed with him.

**73. Q: How do you know that he didn't retract it or repent?**

**A:** When a scholar retracts his blunder, he makes it known. Do you have record of any such retraction?

**74. Q: Is that all you have?**

**A:** Is that all?! Wow! Truly, that in itself is sufficient, but it is not all by far. You must admit, that it is not only a huge, huge blunder, but it is quite bizarre, isn't it? You would not have expected that he said such a thing, and many people who call themselves Salafis think that this is slander against him. No, there is much more:

He also said that types of things are eternal with Allāh. This means that he is saying that Allāh did not exist before all the types of things, rather, there was always something with Allāh. He said this in seven of his books. In Al-Muwaafaqah<sup>2</sup>, vol. 2, pg. 75, he said:

وأما أكثر أهل الحديث ومن وافقهم فإنهم لا يجعلون النوع حادثاً بل قديماً

*As for most of the people of hadith, and whoever agreed with them, they do not consider the types of things to be created, rather, eternal ...*

This contradicts Allāh who said (Surat Al-Furqan, `ayah 2 and Surah Al-`An`am, `ayah 101):

﴿وَحَلَقَ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ﴾

<<**He created everything**>>.

If He created everything, He must have existed before everything.

Do you know what the deen calls believing that something is eternal and uncreated besides Allāh? I'll let you say the word, so that you will not accuse me of unjustly "disparaging the scholars". If you do not know, I'll give you a hint by his quote from "Naqd Maraatibil-Ijmaa<sup>3</sup>" and you tell me if you figured out the word I'm talking about:

وأعجب من ذلك حكايته الإجماع على كفر من نازع أنه سبحانه لم يزل وحده ولا شيء غيره معه

*... And stranger than that is [Ibn Hazm's] conveyance of the consensus about the kufr of whoever disputes that He, the Glorified, never ceased to be alone in eternity and nothing was with Him!*

Let me clarify something for you: Here, Ibn Taymiyah is commenting on something that Ibn Hazm said. Ibn Hazm CORRECTLY said that the Muslims agree: **Whoever disagrees that Allah was alone in eternity is a kafir**. In this quote I just gave you, Ibn Taymiyah is disagreeing with that! He's saying that this is a very strange saying! Do you understand that He is saying that Allah was NOT alone in eternity?! Please realize the gravity and severity of this statement. This is a bigger blunder than what He said about Hell, and it contradicts that the Prophet ﷺ said (narrated by Al-Bukhariyy):

كَانَ اللَّهُ وَلَمْ يَكُنْ شَيْءٌ غَيْرُهُ

**Allah was, and there was nothing other than Him.**

**75. Q:** According to the first quote you gave, he said that most of the people of hadith said this. Like whom?

**A:** None of them! That question should be for him because the burden of proof is on the claimer! That is why he did not give a reference. Like I said, he said this in seven of his books, and in some of them he said it in several places, so it is not a lie on him, or a slip of his pen; it is his conviction. Sometimes he said it with expressions that are not so easy to understand if you are not familiar with that mode of discussion. The quotes I gave you are some of the easier ones.

**76. Q:** Well, look, I'll leave it at that for now. You gave me a lot to sift through!

**A:** The scholars said that he breached the Consensus in more than 60 cases, and we only looked at two. He was the first to say that travelling to visit the Prophet's grave is shirk – although the Prophet's Companion, Bilal Al-Habashiyy did that – and that Tawassul is shirk. If you have believed either of those, then know that you took an innovated creed that was not from the Salaf. He said if a man divorces his wife three times in one statement he only spent one divorce. He said in two of his books that Allah will sit Muhammad next to Him on Judgement Day.

If you need help finding those references – I mean any of them, the hadiths, the `ayahs, the quotes of Ibn Taymiyah, etc., I would be glad to help you. Also, if you want more information, let me know. You should especially make it your business to check this information if you know a little Arabic and can see the quotes for yourself. Even if you need the aid of a dictionary, put the effort. This is your deen, you will stand on Judgement Day alone. You will enter Paradise or Hell. If you find that what I told you is true, then take it, and do not be concerned about what others think about you. If they all disown you and boycott you while you are sure that you acquired the truth, then be disowned and boycotted. Surely, if you are accepted by Allah, then you are acceptable in reality, and no one's displeasure with you has merit. But if you are not accepted by Allah, then you are of low value and no one's pleasure or praise or acceptance of you after that has any credence, like the Prophet ﷺ said in the du`a` of qunut:

وَإِنَّهُ لَا يَذِلُّ مَنْ وَالَيْتَ وَلَا يَعِزُّ مَنْ عَادَيْتَ

**O Allah! Surely, whomever You have supported is not debased, and whomever You have taken  
as an enemy has no honor!**

I ask Allah to make our hearts sincere.

THE END OF THIS DOCUMENTATION



# الرد على من قال بفناء الجنة والنار وبيان الأقوال في ذلك

تأليف  
أبي العباس أحمد بن عبد الحلِيم بن تيمية  
المتوفى سنة ٧٢٨هـ - رحمه الله -

دراسة وتحقيق  
الدكتور محمد بن عبد الله السهمري  
الأستاذ المشارك  
بجامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية  
كلية أصول الدين  
قسم العقيدة والمذاهب والمعاصرة



وروى الطبري، عن يونس، نا ابن وهب، نا ابن زيد، في قوله: ﴿خالدين فيها إلا ما شاء ربك﴾ فقرأ حتى بلغ: ﴿عطاء غير مجدوذ﴾<sup>(١)</sup> فأخبرنا الذي شاء لأهل الجنة، فقال: ﴿عطاء غير مجدوذ﴾ ولم يخبرنا بالذي يشاء لأهل النار<sup>(٢)</sup>. وعن السدي: ﴿إلا ما شاء ربك﴾. إن هذه الآية يوم نزلت كانوا يطمعون في الخروج.

قوله: ﴿خالدين فيها أبداً﴾<sup>(٣)</sup>، وذكر البغوي عن عبد الرحمن بن زيد أنه قال: قد أخبرنا الله سبحانه وتعالى بالذي يشاء لأهل الجنة، فقال: ﴿عطاء غير مجدوذ﴾ ولم يخبرنا بالذي يشاء لأهل النار<sup>(٤)</sup>.

وقد روى علماء السنة والحديث في ذلك آثاراً عن الصحابة والتابعين مثل ما روى حرب الكرماني، وأبو بكر البيهقي، وأبو جعفر الطبري وغيرهم عن الصحابة في ذلك.

وفي المسند<sup>(٥)</sup> للطبراني: ذكر فيه «أنه ينبت فيها الجرجير»<sup>(٦)</sup>، وحيثنذ فيحتج على فنائها بالكتاب والسنة. وأقوال الصحابة - مع أن القائلين ببقائها ليس معهم كتاب، ولا سنة ولا أقوال الصحابة -.

منها: ما رواه حرب، والبيهقي، قال حرب الكرماني: «سألت إسحاق عن

(١) سورة هود الآيتان: ١٠٧، ١٠٨.

(٢) تفسير الطبري «جامع البيان» ١٣/١١٩.

(٣) ذكر الله تأييد الخلود في النار في مواضع منها: سورة النساء الآية: ١٦٩، سورة الأحزاب، الآية: ٦٥، وسورة الجن، الآية: ٢٣.

(٤) «معالم التنزيل» للبغوي ٢/٤٠٣.

(٥) مقابلة بهامش الأصل (وفي «المسند»، حديث) ومشار إلى أنه جاء هكذا في نسخة أخرى.

(٦) لم أقف على هذا الأثر في مظانه من كتب الطبراني، وقد أورده القرطبي في «التذكرة» (ص ٥٢٨)

وعزاه للخطيب البغدادي.

المملكة العربية السعودية  
وزارة التعليم العالي  
جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية



# ذُرُوعُ تَعَاَضِرِ الْعُقُودِ وَالنَّبْلِ لِي

لِابْنِ تَيْمِيَّةَ  
أَبِي الْعَبَّاسِ تَيْمِيَّةَ الدِّينِ أَحْمَدَ بْنَ عَبْدِ الْحَكِيمِ

تحقيق  
الدكتور محمد رشاد سالم

طبع على نفقة  
خادم الحرمين الشريفين الملك فهد بن عبد العزيز  
وفقه الله

الطبعة الثانية  
بمناسبة افتتاح المدينة الجامعية

الجزء الثاني

١٤١١هـ - ١٩٩١م

أشرفت على طباعته ونشره إدارة الثقافة والنشر بالجامعة

ثم بعض هؤلاء قد يجعلون نوع ذلك حادثا ، كما تقوله الكرامية<sup>(١)</sup> ،

وأما أكثر أهل الحديث ومن وافقهم فإنهم لا يجعلون النوع حادثا ، بل

قديما ، ويفرقون بين حدوث النوع وحدوث الفرد من أفرادها ، كما يفرق

جمهور العقلاء بين دوام النوع ودوام الواحد من أعيانه ؛ فإن نعيم أهل

الجنة يدوم نوعه ولا يدوم كل واحد واحد من الأعيان الفانية ، ومن

الأعيان الحادثة مالا يفنى بعد / حدوثه ، كأرواح الآدميين ، فإنها

مُبدعة ، كانت بعد أن لم تكن ، ومع هذا فهي باقية دائمة .

٨١/٢

والفلاسفة تجوز مثل ذلك في دوام النوع دون أشخاصه ، لكن

الدهرية منهم ظنوا أن حركات الأفلاك من هذا الباب ، وأنها قديمة

النوع ، فاعتقدوا قدمها ، وليس لهم على ذلك دليل أصلا ، وعامة ما

يحتجون به إبطال قول من لا يفرق بين حدوث النوع وحدوث

الشخص ، ويقولون<sup>(٢)</sup> : إنه يلزم من حدوث الأعيان حدوث نوعها ،

ويقولون<sup>(٣)</sup> : إن ذلك كله<sup>(٤)</sup> حدث من غير تجدد أمر حادث .

وهذا القول إذا بطل كان بطلانه أقوى في الحجة على

الدهرية في إفساد<sup>(٥)</sup> قولهم ، وفي صحة ما جاء به الكتاب والسنة ، كما

تقدم بيانه ، وإن لم يبطل بطل قولهم .

(١) بعد كلمة « الكرامية » توجد إشارة إلى الهامش في نسخة ( هـ ) حيث كتب ما يلي : « وابن

كرام كان متأخرا بعد محنة الإمام أحمد بن حنبل فكان ابن كرام بعد ابن كلاب بمدة . وكان أكثر أهل

القبلة قبل ابن كرام على مخالفة المعتزلة والكلابية . ودفن ابن كرام في حدود سنة ستين ومائتين . »

(٢) س ، ق ، هـ : ويقول .

(٣) هـ : ويقول .

(٤) كله : ساقطة من ( س ) ، ( هـ ) .

(٥) س : وفي .

(٦) هـ : فساد .

# مراتب الاجماع

في العبادات والمعاملات والاعتقادات

تأليف الحافظ أبي محمد علي بن أحمد بن سعيد

أبن حزم

...

و

نقد مراتب الاجماع

لابن تيبة

\*\*\*

عنيت بنشرها

مكتبة بيت المقدس

لصاحبها جتامة البين القديسي

سنة ١٣٥٧ وحقوق الطبع محفوظة

يقولون ان أفعال الميوان لم يخلقها الله<sup>(١)</sup> - أ كثر من أن يمكن ذكرهم من حين ظهرت القدرية في أواخر عصر الصحابة الى هذا التاريخ ، والمعتزلة كلهم قدرية وكثير من الشيعة بل عامة الشيعة المتأخرين وكثير من المرجئة والخوارج وطوائف من أهل الحديث والفقهاء نسبوا الى ذلك<sup>(٢)</sup> . منهم طائفة من رجال الصحاحين ولم يجمعوا على تكفير هؤلاء . بل هو نفسه قد ذكر في أول كتابه أنه لا يكفر هؤلاء . والمنصوص عن مالك والشافعي وأحمد في القدرية أنهم اذا جحدوا العلم كفروا واذا لم يجحدوه لم يكفروا . وأيضاً فقد ذكر في كتابه في الملل والنحل ان الصحابة وأئمة القتب لا يكفرون من أخطأ في مسألة في الاعتقاد<sup>(٣)</sup> ولا فتياً ، وان كان أراد بقوله أي المسلمون على هذا فهذا أبلغ ومدوم أن مثل هذا النقل للاجماع لم ينقله عن معرفته بأقوال الأئمة ، لكن لما علم أن القرآن أخبر بأن الله خالق كل شيء وأن هذا من أظهر الامور عند الأمة حكى الاجماع على هذا ثم اعتقد أن من خالف الاجماع كفر باجماع فصارت حكايته لهذا الاجماع مبنية على هاتين المقدمتين اللتين ثبت التزاع في كل منهما ، وأعجب من ذلك حكايته الاجماع على كفر من نازع أنه سبحانه لم يزل وحده ولا شيء غيره معه<sup>(٤)</sup> ، ثم خلق الاشياء كما شاء ، ومعلوم أن هذه العبارة العبد فلا يكون خلقاً إلا بمعنى آخر للخلق وهو التقدير قال الله تعالى ( فتبارك الله أحسن الخالقين ) و ( وإذ نخلق من الطين كهيئة الطير ) فلا يصح الشق الثاني من قول ابن تيمية إلا بهذا المعنى وهذا غير مكفر وان طال إلزامهم به حتى التزم الجبائي ومن بعده القول بالخلق بالمعنى الثاني وأما من صرح بالاول فلا نشك في كفره ولا قائل بخالق سواه تعالى بالمعنى الاول بين فرق المسلمين فيما نعلم . م (١) ولم نر من صرح بذلك منهم في كتاب من كتبهم ، وإلزام الشيء غير القول به . م

(٢) أي إلى نفي القدر بمعنى أنه لا قدر يحول دون اختيار العبد ، وهذا إذا أدى الى نفي العلم القديم يكون كفراً صراحاً ، لكن هؤلاء لا يجنحون الى مثل هذا فلا تكون بدعة القدر غير المؤدى الى نفي العلم القديم كفراً . وغريب من ابن تيمية نهوين بدعتهم مع رمية إلام بكل عظيمة . م

(٣) بشرط أن لا يؤدي الى انكار ما علم من الدين بالضرورة فان ذلك يكون كفراً بواحا . م

(٤) لا عجب في القول باجماع الأمة على كفر من أثبت خالقاً سواه تعالى