Scholars' Rebuttals on the Wahabbis' Corporalism

<"xml encoding="UTF-8?>

AL-HAFIZ IBN HAJAR

Ibn Hajar's Fetihul Bari Fi Sharhi Sahihil Bukhari, part 3 page 23:

Adopters of trend of God's having a locality cited the Prophet's saying, "Our Lord descends to the lowest heavens," as their evidence. Majority of scholars denied so, since it leads to the Lord's demarcation. Allah be exalted against so. Various opinions were cited in respect of meaning of the Lord's descending. Anthropomorphists rested upon its extrinsic material meaning. Allah be exalted against their misallegation. Kharijites and Mutazilites denied the whole matter; authenticity of such hadiths. This is indeed an exaggeration. While they have been finding suitable interpretation for Quranic texts respecting such a subject, they, either ignorantly or inflexibly, denied hadiths involving the topic.

The worthy ancestors passed such texts as they are, believing in them generally and promoting Allah, the Exalted, against conditions and anthropomorphism. Like many others, Al-Beihaqi relate this viewpoint to the four masters, the two Sufians, the two Hemmads, Al-Awzai, Al-Leith and others. Others interpreted meaning of the hadith into a proper form common in Arabic. Others opted for an interpretation too exaggerative to evade distortion. Others discerned what is interpreted in a form near to Arabic, from what is rarely used. Hence, some was interpreted and the rest was commended. This is Malik's trend. Ibn Daqiq Al-Abd followed this trend lately.

Al-Beihaqi: The most secure trend is that of believing without seeking conditions, and suspending the intended meanings saving those communicated by authentic narrators. They agreed upon nonobligation of resting upon the identified interpretation. Only then, commendation to Allah becomes safer… Ibnul Arabi: It is said that the heretics refute such texts while the worthy ancestors passed them as they are. A third group ruled of finding interpretation for them. The latter, however, is the most suitable for me.

God's sayings are referred to His deeds, not Essence. It is also an indication to the angel who descends with His orders and instructions. Like corporealities, descending can be through mental meanings. Providing the material meaning is adopted, it will be alluded to the angel conveyed. Supposing the mental is adopted, that is called a descending to a lower rank. It is also an accurate style of Arabic.

Ibnul Arabi intends to say that there are two sorts of interpretation. First, the extrinsic meaning

that is descending of God's affair or angels. Second, metaphoric meaning that is the Lord's kindness to His supplicators and responding them.

Abu Bakr Bin Fawrak records some scholars utter the text in a way inciting that the angels, not the Lord, are concerned. As an evidence on the forecited reciting, is An Nisai's narrative ascribed to Al-Aghar, Abu Hureira and Abu Sa'eed. The hadith, then, should be in this form, "Allah respites till midnight. After that, He orders a declarant to announce if there is a supplicator so that he will be responded…" Othman Bin Abil Aas relates it in the following form, "Is there a supplicator so that he will be responded?"

Al-Qurtubi: Only in this way, this problem should be solved. It is also not defeated by Refa'a Al-Juheni's narrative, "Allah descends to the lowest heavens and declares that His servants should not ask but Him.", since this does not deny that interpretation.

Al-Beidhawi: As long as it is certified, by decisive proofs, that Allah is promoted against having corporeity or being restricted in a definite space, it is impracticable for Him to descend which hints at moveableness to a lower point. Illumination of His mercy is intended. In other words, He shifts from attribute of glorification, which requires ire and reprisal, into attribute of benevolence, which requires lenience and compassion.

AL HAFIZ IBNUL JAWZI

A 300 page book allocated to this topic was written by Ibnul Jawzi, named Defu Shubehit Tashbeeh Bi Ekuffit Tanzeeh, Obviating heresies of anthropomorphism by hands of promotion . Sheik Hassan As Saqaf revised this book which was published by Darul Imam An Nawawi Publication, Oman.

As Saqaf's two essays named Traditional statements of scholars in explication of falsity of the hadith of 'I have seen my Lord' in the most handsome look and The sufficient evidential explication of falsity of imputing Kitabur Ruyeh to Ad Darqutni, are appended to the third edition, published in 1413.

Describing the Hanbalite corporalists, Ibnul Jawzi states on page 99: … By their books, they offended against their sect. They slipped to level of ordinary people when they rested upon extrinsic meanings of aspect of the divine attributes texts…

Within the words of Sheik Mohammed Abi Zuhra, cited later on, Ibnul Jawzi's words shall be provided. Ibnul Jawzi rebutes corporalists' exegeses of the allegorical Verses. He criticizes sixty false and mistranslated texts. They are bases on which Wahabists and their forefathers constructed their sect.

AS SIBKI AND AL-HALABI

As Sibki's Tabaqatus Shafiiya, part 9 page 34:

Ahmed Bin Yahya Bin Ismail; Sheik Shihabuddin Al-Jelabi Al-Halabi…He was deceased in 337… I could obtain one of his books consecrated to rebutting Ibn Teimiya's claiming Allah's occupying a locale. The book comprises about fifty pages. The following is quoted from page 40 1 of that book:

Ashafii, when asked about God's attributes, says, "It is haram forbidden for intellects to present Allah, the Exalted. It is haram for illusions to limit Him. It is haram for conjectures to decide Him. It is haram for selves to think about Him. It is haram for minds to deepen in Him. It is haram for senses to cognize Him. Only what He Has ascribed to Himself, in the words of the Prophet (peace be upon him), is excluded." …

The following is Ahlus Sunna's opinion in this subject:

Allah is anterior and eternal. Nothing is alike Him and He is not equivalent to anything. He enjoys neither locality nor space. He is not influenced by a time or an age. It is impracticable to ask or say 'where' about Him. He is seeable not by means of meeting or any ordinary means. He was when there was no space. He made the cosmos and arranged the time. Now, He is as He was. Page 43:

Monotheists agreed upon denial of the Lord's occupying a locality. A faction, like Ibn Teimiya, is excluded. Page 53 4:

Hadith of amulet, Ibn Teimiya cites as an evidence on Allah's existing in a definite point, seems to be excerpted from texts of the Torah or the Bible. It is, "Our Lord, Allah, sanctified be Thy Name. Thy affair in the heavens is like Thy affair on the earth. Thy bestowal is in the heavens." From the hadith, "… The Throne is above all of that, and Allah is above all of that.", Ibn Teimiya, the dissident, understands that Allah is materially above the Throne.

Page 83:

… Promoting Allah against having a locality is evidenced by reports and traditions and sayings of scholars… Nullity of Ibn Teimiya's deceitful ideas. This nullity is proved by Quranic and prophetic texts… As-Sibki's Tabaqatus-Shafiiya, part 9 page 36:

Heretics misallege that they are following course of the worthy ancestors, which is monotheism… How is it reasonable to believe that the worthy ancestors adopted faiths of anthropomorphism, and keep still before emergence of origins of heresy? God says, (And do (.not mix up the truth with the falsehood

AZ-ZAHAWI; AN IRAQI SCHOLAR

Az-Zahawi's Al-Fajrus Sadiq, page 28:

Corporalism of Wahabists:

Wahabists decide atheism of those who visitate the Prophet's tomb, and judge seeking his intercession to Allah, the Exalted, as citing associates in Allah's godhood. They also rule obligation of promoting God against such deeds. In the same time, they were highly confused in promoting God against unfitting matters. It is they who emphasized on considering Allah's settling a physical firmness, settlement and elevation on the Throne.

It is they who ascribed material face and hands to the Lord, and divided His touchable missions by holding the heavens to a finger, the earth to another, trees to a third and royalty to a fourth. In a like fashion, they made him occupy locality. They claimed the Lord's being above the heavens, constant on the Throne, and can be physically pointed to, by material fingers, and can descend and ascend to and from the lowest heavens. Their poet composes:

If asserting His settling on His Throne is corporalism, I am, then, a corporalist.
If proving His attributes is anthropomorphism, I am keeping on anthropomorphism.
If denying His settling and attributes and speaking is promoting Him exaltedly.
I promote our Lord against that promotion, by His support. He is higher and more proficient.

From Addinul Khalis, the following statements involving the topic are quoted:

"If it is intended that corporealities are compound of material and form, or of atoms, Allah, the Exalted, is definitely promoted against so. It is correct to negate possible things from Him, too. A created corporeality is not compound of such things."

This statement is filled up with confusion. The writer denies existence of necessary or possible corporealities according to the form he refers to. It seems he intends at negating corporeality that is a principal in his belief in Allah, the Exalted. In order to avoid being accused of anthropomorphizing the Creator, the writer negates corporeality from creatures. Indisputably, if a corporeality is not compound of material and form, it is most surely compound of atoms. Stupidity, however, is boundless.

It is not strange that such an individual achieves such a record in hideous confusion. He should have mentioned things from which corporealities are compound. I do not see him too tedious to state that corporealities are composite from infinite things. The total scholars deny such a claim. Modern sciences and decisive evidences proved nullity of such an ill claim. He, then, added, "If corporealities that are described, capable of seeing, speaking, addressing, hearing, observing, pleasing and being irate, these are proved for the Lord, the Exalted. Such attributes are ascribed to Him. We do not negate so even if you dedicate such attributes to corporealities…"

As much as we know, we cannot name anyone defining corporeality as the thing speaking, addressing, hearing, seeing, pleasing and being irate. These are specifications of lively sane

beings. We admit that corporealities can see through eyes, but ascribing corporeality to Allah, the Exalted, in this very sense is degrading Him to levels of His creatures in a way denying His godhood.

Allah's being a corporeality, in this sense, is a defect against which Allah is, obligatorily, highly promoted. Intellectually, Allah's being a corporeality is denied since scientists of optics proved that vision occurs when light rays fall on surface of the visible object, and becomes thrown back to the eye. Accordingly, visible things necessarily have surfaces. This requires partitioning of that surfaced thing.

The idea, as a whole, nullifies godhead of Allah, since corporeality, in this sense, is identical to that the writer has previously negated from Allah, the Exalted, and possible beings. Reportedly, denial of Allah's being a corporeality is proved by God's saying, (Visions comprehend Him not, and He comprehends all visions;). This Verse is not contradictory to the other, (Some faces on that day shall be bright.

Looking at [waiting for] their Lord.) Condition of Seeing God, the Exalted, on Resurrection Day is unfamiliar. This is the most acceptable faith. It is possible that vision, on Resurrection Day, shall be by a sort of revealing and divine manifestation, that is in no need for an organ of vision. God's selecting the word 'faces' instead of 'eyes' proves that that vision shall be away from processes of material organs of visions. Likewise, the word 'bright' expresses attaining perfect blissfulness for that divine revealing.

The writer adds, "If corporealities that are materially pointed to, are intended, the most cognizant creature did actually refer to Allah by raising his finger upward, towards the heavens…"

Intellectual intuition rules that every entity materially indicated, should be occupying a definite locality and space, and should be seeable. All these are impracticable for Allah, the Exalted. Providing Allah was in a definite space or locality, anteriority of that space or locality should be necessarily decided. Evidences on Allah's being the only Anterior, have been decisively cited.

He would have been lacking the space He occupies had He been in a definite point. This contradicts necessity of God's Being. Likewise, had He been in a certain space, He would have been there either for a considerable period or permanently. Regarding the earlier, it is null since times are equal to each other and ascribing Him to definite times should be also equal. Dedicating definite times to Him, then, should be a sort of giving a casting vote to improbabilities. This is in case nonexistence of an extrinsic dedicating matter is concerned. If there is an extrinsic dedicating matter, the Lord's occupying a certain space should be requiring an accessory matter. Regarding the latter, if nullity of God's being occupying the entire times, in

the same time, is not proved, it requires involvement of matters occupying spaces in points engaged by corporealities. Naturally, this is impossible.

Moreover, it was permissible to point at the Lord materially, it should be possible to point to him from every point on the earth. As the earth is globular, it would be necessary that Allah, the Exalted, was encircling it totally. Lest, it is improper to point to Him with material indicators and , consequentially, He should not be settling on His Throne, as Wahabists claim.

If His Throne encompassed the seven heavens, it would be imperative for Him to decrease His corporeality when He descends to the lowest heavens and increase it during ascending. If so, He should be variable. Allah be highly promoted against sayings of the ignorant. Reported sayings adhered by Wahabists as evidences on their claims of validity of the material pointing to the Lord, are conjectural phenomena that are not contradicting ascertained matters. Such sayings should be interpreted in two ways. First, general interpretation, and commending details to Allah. This opinion is adopted by majority of the worthy ancestors. Second, opting for detailed interpretation. Majority of scholars adopted this trend.

Reports appertained to pointing to the heavens as an indication to the Lord, are tokens of His creating the heavens, or the heavens, that contain such tremendous worlds that our earth is but one of their tiny fragments, are one of appearances of His divine competence. Ascending to the Lord can be interpreted into seeking a place allocated for worshipping Him. At any rate, there are several sorts of interpretation.

Az Zahawi's Al-Fajrus Sadiq, page 31:

Wahabism and discarding intelligence:

Because intellectuality and sound reasoning contradict their faiths completely, Wahabists had to cast mentality off and adhere to extrinsic aspects of reports, even if impracticability, tyranny and deviation are the effects. Due to such an adherence to extrinsic aspects of Verses, they believe that Allah was physically settling on His Throne and lying over it. They also believed that He could have a face and two hands and could perform material descending to the lowest heavens and returning to His place. They believed that He could be pointed to. Allah be highly exalted against sayings of the wrong.

Wahabists, who decided visitators of the Prophet's tomb as pagans, are pagans indeed. They worship a god having a corporeality of an animal, sitting on a material throne, descending to a lower grade, ascending and having physical face, hand, leg and fingers. The Right God is promoted against physical matters.

If they are disputed that intellectual proofs verify that ascribing physical matters to the Lord does indeed contradict His godhead, they will answer that such disgraced mentality cannot

occupy any space in field of divinity which is in a rank exceeding mentality of mankind. Hence, they form no difference from trinitarianists who claim recognizing trinity is a matter exceeding mentalities of mankind so largely that it is illicit to think about.

It is indisputably rational that reports should be interpreted when contradicting mentality, since it is impossible to prove both of them because the inadmissible concurrence of antonymous matters will befall. In the same way, it is impossible to deny both of them because nullity of both antinomous matters will befall. Hence, there is one way only, which is admitting one and denying the other. Shunning mentality and opting for reports is null, since it is unreasoning to depend on secondary matters for invalidating principals.

Explicating this matter, we are to say that reported tidings should be certified by mental devises. Validity of reporting affairs such as existence of an absolute creator and recognition of divine prophecy and the like, can be credited exclusively by mentality, which is principal and reliable evidence on reported things. Supporting reported matters are preceded to mental, both will be invalidated since when principals are null, branches are null sequentially. Validity of reporting is a branch of mental judgment which is deniable and voidable. Hence, preferring reported matters to mental results is nullity of the two. Inconsistency, which leads to nullity, is the effect of correcting a branch by invalidating the principal. Pursuant to the previous, it is necessary to prefer mental proofs to reported.

Relying upon the above, obligation of finding suitable interpretation to texts the extrinsic meaning of their aspects contradicts intellectuality, is clearly evident. Such texts should be interpreted in two ways. First, general interpretation, and commending details to Allah. This is the opinion adopted by majority of the worthy ancestors. Second, opting for detailed interpretation. Majority of scholars adopted this trend. God's settling on the Throne stands for predominance on cosmos. The Arabic tongue confirms such an interpretation.

Likewise, God's coming, mentioned in the Verse, (And your Lord comes and the angels in ranks. 89:22), stands for approaching of God's affair. Regarding His saying, (To Him do ascend the good words), this means that Allah admits the good wording. Words, however, are incapable of ascending by themselves. Coming mentioned in God's saying, (They do not wait aught but that Allah should come to them in the shadows of the clouds along with the angels. 2:210), implies coming of His anguish. God's saying, (Then he drew near, then he bowed, so he was the measure of two bows or closer still), indicates that the Apostle becomes near to his Lord owing to his extraordinary compliance with Him. The measure indicated is a sort of depicting the mental things by visions of materiality. The Prophet's statement, "Allah, the Exalted, descends to the lowest heavens every night,…" refers to descending of His mercy.

Night, however, is the time usually consecrated to loneliness, adoration and worshipping. Alike .interpretations are cited cited for the like texts

ZUHRA IN TARIKHUL METHAHIBIL ISLAMIYA

Mohammed Abu Zuhra's Tarikhul Methahibil Islamiya, part 1 page 225:

Salafites modern radicalists are those who ascribed ensuing the worthy ancestors' trends to themselves. Later on, we shall discuss some of their beliefs. They came forth in the fourth Hijri century. They were Hanbalites. They claimed their beliefs are accredited to Ahmed Bin Hanbal who had enlivened and fought for the sake of the worthy ancestors' beliefs. In the seventh Hijri century, they re came forth. Sheikul Islam Ibn Teimiya was extremous in advocating those beliefs. As a matter of fact, he added new matters, originated due to ideologies of his time, to the sect. In the twelfth Hijri century, Mohammed Bin Abdil Wahab enlivened these beliefs in the Arab Peninsula. Wahabists, as well as some Muslims, have been fanatically soliciting to these beliefs. Hence, it is necessary to provide these beliefs.

Those Hanbalites discussed affairs of monotheism and connected it to shrines of the pious. They also controverted Quranic texts appertained to interpretation and anthropomorphism. This was first originated in the fourth Hijri century, and ascribed to Ahmed Bin Hanbal. However, some virtuous Hanbalite scholars argued their ascribing the beliefs to Ahmed Bin Hanbal.

Fatal combats against Asharites were occasionally broken out by those Salafites. Litigious dispute about whose party had been being the real followers of the worthy ancestors, was always arisen… The following is a scrutinizing critique to beliefs of the Salafites who ascribed this name to themselves. However, we are to discuss whether there is a relation between name and reality of its bearers.

Mohammed Abu Zuhra's Tarikhul Methahibil Islamiya, part 1 page 232:

They recognize attributes and affair of God, the Praised, mentioned by Quranic or prophetic texts. They recognize God's liking, ire, rage, satisfaction, calling, wording and descending to people in shadows of clouds. They also recognize the Lord's settling on the Throne, having a face and a hand, without any interpretation or non extrinsic exegeses. Without attempting to finding a suitable interpretation or condition, Ibn Teimiya saw that the worthy ancestors recognize God's having a hand and a face, and enjoying descending and ascending and the like affairs inferred from the extrinsic meanings of aspects of Quranic texts. He claimed that had been aiming at referring to the literal, not metaphorical, phenomena.

He, nevertheless, claimed being neither corporalist, nor Tatilite. He states, "Sect of the worthy ancestors is between Tatilism depriving the Lord of the entire attributes for attaining denying

His Existence and anthropomorphism. They do neither compare the Lord's attributes to these of His creatures, nor compare His Essence to His creatures' entities.

In the same time, they do not negate attributes and affairs the Lord has used for Himself or the Prophet has used through describing his Lord. They claim they opt for so in order that they would not deprive the Lord of His divine names and excellent attributes, alter words from their proper places and blaspheme God's Names and Verses. As a matter of face, Tatilites and anthropomorphists are joining Tatilism to anthropomorphism.

Asserting the faith that Allah descends and occupies the top space and may be beneath, without a definite condition, Ibn Teimiya, in his Al-Hamawiyatul Kubra Fi Majmu'etir Resailul Kubra, page 419, adds:

"There is no single letter, whether in Book of Allah, the Prophet's traditions, the worthy ancestors' statements, the Prophet's companions' words, the followers' sayings or words the scholars who coincided in time of caprices and dispute, contradicts these faiths whether in meaning or in aspect. No single one from the forecited categories has been claiming Allah's being not in the heavens, not on the Throne, not in everywhere, not for Him all spaces are equal, not being neither in nor out of this cosmos, not connected, not disconnected and not indicated by material signs."

On that account, Ibn Teimiya decides that course of the worthy ancestors is shunning interpretation and recognizing the literal extrinsic meanings of aspects of Quranic and prophetic texts referring to God's being descending and ascending, and having a face and a hand and feeling affectionate and irate. Is this, by God, course of the worthy ancestors?

As an answer, we should emphasize that in the fourth Hijri century, Hanbalites arouse the same claim. Scholars of that time argued them and proved that their beliefs would have been leading to anthropomorphism and corporalism. They could never deny so since even material indication, according to their faith, was applicable to Allah! The Hanbalite master jurisprudent and orator, Ibnul Jawzi, undertook the mission of opposing these beliefs and asserted that course of the worthy ancestors should in no way be taking in these false principals. He also denied accrediting that school to Ahmed.

He stated, "I could cognize some improper ideas rendered by some of our acquaintances regarding principals of Islam. They wrote a book in which they offended the sect. They were so lowly that they rested upon the material meanings of the divine attributes. As they perceived the text, 'Allah created Adam on his look.', they recognized Allah's having a definite look. They also accredited a face added to the Essence, a mouth, uvulas, dents, facial flash, hands, fingers, a palm, a little finger, a thumb, a chest, a thigh, legs and feet.

Finally, they claim they had not been acquainted whether He had a head or not!! They rested upon the extrinsic meanings of aspects of the divine attributes and names texts. Heretically, they ascribed such false things to the divine attributes. They could cite no single proof neither mentally nor reportedly.

They turned their faces against texts shunning the extrinsic meanings of aspects, and proving meanings inciting God's necessary attributes. They also disregarded cancellation of the extrinsic meanings leading to attributes of contingency. They transcended limits to the degree that they overstepped attributes of Essence, in addition to attributes of acts. When they proved these meanings' being attributes, they reject resting upon their interpretative linguistic meanings; such as 'hand' stands for grace and aptitude, 'coming' stands for forms of benevolence and compassion and 'leg' stands for incisiveness. On the contrary, they rested upon the familiar extrinsic meanings.

Extrinsic meanings imply the familiar descriptions of people. Extrinsic meanings of aspects are rested upon only when it is mentally possible. If not, metaphoric meanings should be adopted. While their words evidently refer to anthropomorphism, they shunned and scorned confessing of it. They claim their being Ahlus Sunna. A number of ordinary people ensued them. I did advise the heads and followers when I said, "O acquaintances! You are depending upon reports and traditions. While he was suffering lashes, Ahmed Bin Hanbal, the grand master, was shouting, 'How should I say what was not said?!' Hence, I warn you against ascribing false things to his sect. Then, you claim resting upon the extrinsic meaning of aspects of texts. This means that the word 'foot' alludes to that organ. Maintaining that Allah settles by His Essence, hints at accrediting materiality to Him, the Praised. You ought not to disdain the devise of recognizing principal; intellectuality. By our minds, we recognized Allah, the Exalted, and decided His anteriority. None would have censured you had you been sufficed by reading the texts and keeping peace! The unacceptable matter is your resting upon the extrinsic meaning of aspects of texts. You should not add new things to the sect of that Salafite follower of the worthy ancestors man." Ibnul Jawzi, however, provided abundant explication and proofs on nullity of their beliefs and argumentation.

The judge Abu Yali, the famous Hanbalite jurisprudent, died in 457, was one of the adopters of beliefs criticized and contradicted by Ibnul Jawzi. His opinions were the basic reason beyond the harsh criticism and reproach addressed at that Hanbalite judge. A Hanbalite jurisprudent said, "Abu Yali contaminated Hanbalism in such a way that waters of the entire oceans cannot clear away." An alike statement is expressed by Ibnuz Zaghawani, the Hanbalite, died in 527. A Hanbalite scholars says, "Abu Yali's statements of anthropomorphism are too bizarre to be

understood by the exceptional intelligent."

Owing to the general denial, especially that declared by the master Hanbalites, these faction hid themselves during the fourth and fifth Hijri century, till Ibn Teimiya relived it so daringly and importunately. It is important to mention that the claim of being followers of the worthy ancestors is problematic. Previously, Ibnul Jawzi's opinion respecting the subject has been forecited.

Linguistically, we should wonder whether expressions such as, (The hand of Allah is over their hands,) and (Everything is perishable except His face,), allude to material meanings, or they refer to other meanings fitting the Essence of Allah, the Exalted. It is quite true to interpret the hand of Allah into His might or grace, and His face into His Entity. Likewise, the Lord's descending to the lowest heaven can be interpreted into intimacy of His judgment and approach to His servants. Language is so extensive to subsume such interpretations.

Majority of theologists, jurisprudents and researchists opted for such interpretations. Indisputably, interpretation is favored to opting for the extrinsic literal meanings of aspects of texts, and neglecting their conditions. They claim that Allah has a hand, but they neglect its trimming. Finally, they recognize that it is different from hands of contingent beings.

Correspondingly, they declare there is an act of descending belonging to Allah, but they claim its being distinct from ours. Such claims are classified as committing to unknown substances purports and purposes of which are inconceivable. On the other hand, had such texts had been translated into familiar meanings admitted by language, we would have attained satisfactory results that lead to promoting the Lord against unbecoming affairs, and revealing any .unreachable matters

AL BISHRI AND AL QAZAI

Al-Qazai's Furqanul Quran Beinè Sifatil Khaliqi Wè Sifatil Akwan, page 72 (Printed in the margin of Al-Beihaqi's Al-Asma'u Wes Sifat): Unanimously, the worthy ancestors and descendants of this nation agreed on evading resting upon the extrinsic material meaning of aspects of the allegorical Verses. Reckoning such courses with forsaken nonsense and irreliable redundant speech, exegesists and hadithists, as well as the worthy ancestors and descendants of this nation, named adopters of such physical meanings as corporalists and Hashawites.

We close this chapter by citing the verdict of the actual 'Sheikul Islam' master of Islam , head of proficient scholars, mentor of mentors, Sheik Salim Al-Bishri (May God embrace him to His mercy and elevate his rank in the uppermost Paradise), regarding this topic.

The following problem and its answer is literally quoted from the master prompter and the

prosperous infallible teacher Ahmed Sheik Ali Badr's Shamsul Haqiqeti Wed Diraya Firreddi Ela Ehlid Dhelaleti Wel Ghiwaya. The question is addressed at Sheikul Islam Al-Bishri:

Q. What do you see about a scholar, reckoned with jurisprudents, who shows his belief in recognizing Allah's material elevation? Meanwhile, he claims following the worthy ancestors' course. Few people followed him while majority of scholars deny his claims. I could hear from him personally, that the reason beyond his acceding to this sect is that he had read a statement ascribed to Ibn Teimiya, in a book written by an Indian scholar, regarding substantiating the Creator's occupying a locality.

Moreover, this man believes in the in essence elevation of Allah, the Glorified. In other words, he believes that Allah is physically over the Throne, but in a way becoming Him. He also decides falsity of Abul Barakat Ad Dirdir's saying, " Allah be promoted against incarnation, occupancy, connection, disunion and ill mindedness." He also decides Sheik Al-Liqai's saying, "It is impractical to the Bearer of the divine attributes to be like this universe in having locality." Generally, he decides falsity of any scholar, disregarding his objective status, who may deny Allah's having a locality. In addition to the forecited book, this scholar exhibits Al-Alusi's Rouhul Me'ani (Exegesis of the Holy Quran), as his evidence.

Al-Alusi's exegesis of God's saying, (And He is the Supreme, above His servants. 6:18), is revealing such an indication into having a definite locality, but, as a matter of fact, the exegesist expresses inaccuracy of this exegesis. He also cited Quranic Verses; such as (And He is the Supreme, above His servants. 6:61), (They fear their Lord above them. 16:50), (To Him do ascend the good words) and their likes, as other evidences.

He also cites the deaf bondmaiden's indication towards the heavens as a sign to Allah, when the Prophet's asked her about the place of the Lord, as another evidence. He also refers to some books of Hijjetul Islam Al-Ghezzali (God please him) as evidences on accuracy of his sect. Truly, Mohammed Murteda, at clarifying Al-Ghezzali's Ihya'u Uloumiddin, hints at such points. He also mentions the hadith that the Prophet (peace be upon him) pointed to the heavens with his finger when he said, "O Allah! Be the witness.", in the Farewell pilgrimage. He also quotes the Karramites' saying, "Denial of Allah's being in one of the six directions is an assertion of His nonexistence". As your excellency realizes, discussions about the Lord's having locality is commonly familiar. Still, the decisive judgment in this topic is your excellency's wording. God save you and support you as long as you are backers of Ahlus Sunna sect.

A. To Sheikh Ahmed Ali Badr, the virtuous scholar and servant of honorable Islamic mastery in Bilsfoura:

On 22nd, of Moharram, 1325, I received your missive comprising questioning about the judgment should be issued on those who substantiate Allah's occupying a locality. Hence, we write the following answer. It is, however, sufficient for followers of the right and fair. God may reward you good on behalf of Muslims.

It is to notice, may God give you His support and lead you, as well as us, to paths of equity, that course of the saved party and unanimity of Sunnis is promoting Allah, the Exalted, against being likened to the contingent beings. They rule that the Lord is far away from specifications of contingency. Likewise, He is highly promoted against being occupying a locality and a space.

This is evidenced by conclusive proofs. God's being in a definite locality requires ruling of anteriority of that locality or space. Localities and spaces are part of this cosmos which is different from Allah, the Exalted. Ultimate credentials on contingency of all beings saving Allah, the Exalted, have been positively cited by both deniers and adopters of Allah's occupying a locality. Since entities of occupying substances is impossibly existed unless there is a space comprising, while it is possible for spaces to exist without occupying substances, because of permissibility of vacuums, this will require probability of necessary beings and necessity of probable beings. Both are void.

Supposing the Lord has a definite point to occupy, He, then, shall inevitably be an atom, since it is impracticable for Him to be an accident.

Supposing so, He shall be either divisible or indivisible. Both are void. Indivisible substances are the most diminutive. Allah is highly promoted against being a diminutive being. Divisible substances are compound corporealities. Complexity contradicts the intrinsic necessity. Compound substances are possible beings that lack influential cause. It is positively provable that Allah, the Exalted, is essential Aseity, Self sufficient and Requisite by all beings. Allah be praised (Nothing like the likeness of Him, and He is the Hearing, the Seeing.)

Allah has disgraced some people who were deceived and mislead by the Satan. They ensued their caprices and adhered to unavailing things. This occurred only when they substantiated Allah's occupying a locality. Allah be exaltedly promoted against such a thing. They agreed upon identifying that locality. They claimed Allah's being occupying an elevated point. Soon afterward, they disagreed.

Some believed that Allah is a corporeality touching the upper surface of the Throne. Jews and Karramites, whose atheism is indisputably decided, opted for so. Others substantiated the locality, but with promoting God against unbecoming matters. They ruled that God occupies the locality in a way different from corporealities' occupation. Those are also deviant and

lacking true faith. The legislator impermitted such a sort of accreditation to Allah. In effect, faith irreverence is uglier and more unacceptable than limb irreverence, especially for leaders and masters.

Besides many personal misbeliefs contradicting unanimity of Muslims and inadmitted by the current scholars who issued decisive scandalous verdicts that attained to deciding atheism, Ahmed Bin Abdil Halim Bin Abdis Selam Bin Teimiya Al-Harrani Ad Dimeshqi, the Hanbalite, one of scholars of the eighth Hijri century, adopted the misbelief of Allah's occupying a locality. This man suffered miscellaneous sorts of humiliation and ignominy for such ill beliefs. Some of his partisans, however, aimed at supporting and defending him by releasing him from the accusals addressed. He accredited some statements to his master, clarifying their purports and people's misunderstanding him. He also cited evident statements, said by his master, for refuting that accusal. He tried to prove that the man, for his honorable esteem and mastery, had not broken unanimity of Muslims.

Impotent illusory details, scholars adequately nullified, have been provided as evidences on the misbelief of Allah's occupying a locality. They adhered to extrinsic meanings of aspects of Quranic and prophetic texts; such as God's saying, (The Beneficent settled on the Throne), (To Him do ascend the good words;), (To Him ascend the angels and the Spirit; 70:4), (Are you secure of [that] in the heavens that He should not make the earth…), (He is the Supreme over His servants), the Prophet's saying, "Our Lord descends to the lowest heavens" and the deaf bondmaiden's indication towards the heavens as a sign to Allah, when the Prophet's asked her about the place of the Lord. The Prophet certified her being a believing individual.

As an answer of such texts, we may say that conjectural extrinsic meanings of aspects do not injure the persuasive decisive evidences referring to denial of Allah's occupying a definite space or locality. Such texts should be interpreted and made becoming true meanings certified by indications and doctrinal texts. Interpretation may be of two sorts. First, general interpretation without identifying the intended meaning. This is the worthy ancestors' course. Second, detailed interpretation by identifying the purports. This is the worthy descendants' course.

The latter interpreted 'settling' into prevalence, depending upon an example from Arabic poetry. They interpret 'ascending of the good wording' into the Lord's satisfaction and pleasingness. The rely upon impracticability of material ascending of words. They interpret 'that in the heavens' into God's affair, predominance or an angel undertaking the charge of irritating. Likewise, they interpret 'ascending of the angels and the Spirit' into their arising to a definite rank in which they seek favor of the Lord. God's being above His servants, is an indication to

His supremacy and power, since the supreme and powerful is in a rank higher than the overcome. By the same token, God's descending to the lowest heavens alludes to descending of His mercy and kindness.

It also indicates that Allah does not deal with His servants out of His elevation, might and supremacy. The Prophet's asking about the Lord with 'where' is a way of descrying whether that bond maiden had believed in the Lord's having a certain point, like the pagans, or not. As she pointed at the heavens, the Prophet understood that she had intended to refer to the Creator of the heavens. Relying upon decisive convictional evidences and inclining the conjectural, scholars could find suitable interpretative construction for the entire Quranic and prophetic texts regarding the topic involved.

It is so strange for a Muslim to shun the unanimous sayings of Muslims and their masters, and consent to deviation and heresy of the dissidents. Has such an individual not heard God's saying, (And whoever acts hostilely to the Apostle after that guidance has become manifest to him, and follows other than the way of the believers, We will turn him to that to which he has himself turned and make him enter hell; and it is an evil resort. 4:115) I advise such individuals, who have been stained with such filthy things, to repent to Allah, the Exalted, and avoid ensuing steps of the Satan who enjoins obscenity and evil. I also warn them against being so obstinate that they would transgress in insisting on erroneous beliefs. The best correctness is returning to correctness. Indulging to excess in wrong is resulting in the most severest sort of torture. (Whomsoever Allah guides, he is the rightly guided one, and whomsoever he causes to err, you shall not find for him any friend to lead aright. 18:17) We do implore our Lord to guide us all to the right path. On Him we do hold fast, and He is the best reliable. God's peace and blessings be upon Mohammed, our master, and his companions, entirely, and their virtuous followers to Day of Judgment.

The needy to God's mercy;

Salim Al-Bishri,

servant of scholarship and Malikite mastery in Al-Azhar.

Al-Qazai comments:

Sheik Al-Bishri's saying, "for his honorable esteem and mastery", reveals his good impression toward plea provided by that disciple.

It is indisputable, for deep viewers in books of Ibn Teimiya and Ibnul Qeyim, to ascertain that they believe in corporalism, anthropomorphism and Allah's occupancy. Those two men release themselves from clinging to the terms and claim adopting for promoting the Lord against unfitting affairs.

At any rate, they utter the word of promotion while they are so remote from its meanings. The current scholars of that man Ibn Teimiya are the most familiar of his personality. The pious master of Islam, Ali Bin Abdil Kafı, who coincided in time of Ibn Teimiya, wrote various books in refutation of Ibn Teimiya's misbeliefs. In his Ad Durretul Mudhiya Firraddi Elebni Teimiya, this pious master refuted ideas of that heretic deviant man who decides invalidity of suspended divorcement on oath, and reckons it with violation to unanimity of Muslims and forging lies against the Prophet's companions and their followers.

The master scholar says, "Ibn Teimiya breached principals of Islamic doctrine, and repealed pillars of Islam while he was hidden under curtains of followership of the holy Book and the prophetic traditions, and proclaiming of soliciting the right and leading to the Paradise. He dissented from followership to heresy, and gainsaid the Muslims' unanimity. He advocated affairs of corporalism and complexity in the divine Essence.

He ruled that lacking parts is not impossible. He also claimed incarnation of contingency in the Essence of Allah, the Exalted. He decided that the Quran is contingent that Allah spoke through it after it had been nothing, and that it might utter or keep peace. He also determined contingency of the Lord's Essence according to the creatures.

He surpassed exceedingly when he ruled of anteriority of this cosmos. This required the claim of eternality of creatures. He affirmed that the anterior attribute had been contingent, and the contingent creature had been anterior. No single follower of any nation or creed had ever combined these two beliefs. Hence, he was out of the seventy three parties of this nation. Hence, he depended upon no single nation or creed. All the previous can be seen as nothing if measured to the ill matters he attached to branches of the religion."

It is a precious essay in which Sheik Ali Bin Abdil Kafı refuted Ibn Teimiya's misbeliefs and exhibited the right creeds. The essay, however, was printed in Damascus.

Moreover, In his Tekmiletur Raddi Ela Nuniyatibnil Qeyim, Al-Kawthari provides adequate exhibition on this man and his faction. Allah may protect Muslims and us from following caprices.

Al-Qazai's Furqanul Quran Beinè Sifatil Khaliqi Wè Sifatil Akwan, page 17:

This faction was highly fond of forging false affairs and imputing them to the supreme scholars of this nation. Since first emergence till now, followers of this faction have been agitating and falsifying nearly in every century. On the other side, there have been troops of Ahlus Sunna defending and exposing the right in private and general sessions of dispute and argumentation, as well as writings that used the illumination of logic reasons for removing darkness of such heretic confusedness.

For seekers of guidance, these writings are reckoned as unexhausted fortune and interminable treasures. One of such ceaseless inheritance is the book of Abu Bakr Ahmed Bin Hussein Bin Ali Al-Beihaqi, the trustful supreme hadithist and jurisprudent who died in 458. In his time,unbecoming discussions about the divine names and attributes were far reaching; therefore, he wrote his book Al-Asma'u Wes Sifat. Tajuddin As Sibki states, "I have never seen a written work equivalent to Al-Beihaqi's.

" This is quite true since the writer gathers every single text upon which the heretic anthropomorphists and Hashawites rested. He features perplexity of each text and removes every problematic affair by referring to the allegorical object and attaching the fitting Quranic Verses. In addition, he records sayings of scholars preceded him.

God may reward him the best on behalf of the religion and nation of Mohammed (peace be upon him). It seems that Al-Beihaqi records this book as removing away the dishonor Ibn Khuzeima did pertain to hadithists. This man wrote a book named At Tawhid in which he combined and misrepresented the allegorical texts in a way unfitting believing in Allah, the Exalted, and sayings of the worthy ancestors and descendants. Fakhruddin Ar Razi threw at him a fatal shot.

Through providing the exegesis of God's saying, (Nothing like the likeness of His;), Ar Razi comments, "In his At Tawhid, Mohammed Bin Isaaq Bin Khuzeima records our acquaintances' bringing this Verse as their evidence. Ibn Khuzeima's book is, in fact, a book of atheism. I am to comment on his wording since he was an unsound speaker and ill minded man." Immediately, Ar Razi affixes Ibn Khuzeima's wording.

Since it is such an ill wording that it is unseemly for a sane believer, who recognizes his Lord, to utter, we shun recording it here so that a feeble would not be influenced. Ar Razi, then, comments, "This poor ignorant adopted such fables since he lacked knowledge of analogy. Scholars of monotheism talked adequately about real monotheism. Because of his being remote from recognizing realities, that man ensued words of ordinary people and took pride in his wording. We do seek the Lord's granting us with the acceptable end result."

Readers of Ibn Khuzeima's At Tawhid find excuses for Ar Razi's sayings. We have already stated that mastery in hadithology does not necessarily lead to mastery in other fields of religious sciences. Hence, scholars should be taken in only in their field of specialization. Gainsaying this rule results in occurrence of flaws in principals and branches of religion. As much as I am concerned, I do advise seekers of safety to hold fast to books of Abu Mansur Al-Materidi and Abul Hassan Al-Ashari in affairs respecting principals and creeds of Islam, since these two books demonstrate the path to which Book of Allah and the Prophet's tradition lead,

without inclination, exaggeration or blemish.

In Ar Razi's book of exegesis of the holy Quran, part 27 pages 150 3, third edition, Ihya At Turath Al-Arabi publication, a detailed exposition of Ar Razi's refuttal on Ibn Khuzeima An Nisapuri's claims in his At Tawhid, is rendered. Like defects regarding God's seeableness, already mentioned in the first chapter of this survey, Ar Razi exhibits Ibn Khuzeima's defects regarding definitions of semblance and analogy aimed at proving God's corporeity.

Ar-Razi pierced in such a way equivalent to Ibn Khuzeima's ugly failing. He paraphrased the actual definition of analogy of corporealities and proved God's being not analogous to such corporealities. In the next chapter, Ar Razi's thesis in negating corporalism shall be rendered. It is worthy mentioning here that supreme scholars of Wahabism guide Muslims to Ibn Khuzeima's At-Tawhid, because of its comprising ideas of corporalism. Al-Qazai's Furqanul Quran Beinè Sifatil Khaliqi Wè Sifatil Akwan, page 61:

It is necessarily provable that Allah is promoted against being compound or divisible or enjoying any quality of materiality and corporeality. This is averred by Verses of the holy Quran and addressed at hearing people and at those who give ear while they are witnesses. Ahlus Sunna, who were unlike whimsical people and Jews and Christians who have been affected by unsoundness of anthropomorphism and corporalism, did thoroughly adopt this course.

It is a funny thing to see Ahmed Bin Abdil Halim Ibn Teimiya, the supporter and master of corporalists, Karramites and ignorant hadithists who misunderstand what they retain, consider Imamul Haramein and Hujjetul Islam Al-Ghezzali, as more heretic than Jews and Christians, because of their opting for promoting God against unfitting affairs.

This is mentioned in his Al-Muwafaqa, printed in the margin of Minhajus Sunna. At any rate, principal of promoting God against corporeity and the like material affairs, is not adopted exclusively by these two masters. As a matter of fact, it is the principal adopted by majority of Muslim scholars,

since the Prophet's companions time, up to the current, till Resurrection Day. The Prophet (peace be upon him) states, in an authentic hadith, "A party of this nation is still keeping the right, uninfluenced by dissidents or opposers, till the coming of God's affair." This party forms the greatest majority of the nation. This fact is averred by some ways of narrating the previous hadith. Further discussion of danger pursuance of this man, his written works and his faction, as well as opinions of master scholars regarding his misbeliefs, shall be rendered later on.

Parable exaltation is a common metaphorical style in Arabic:

Expressive exaltation is widespread in the holy Quran and common in Arabic. It is ordinarily used for accrediting suitable qualities to the Creator and His creatures. The following Quranic

texts are examples. (And be not infirm, and be not grieving, and you shall have the upper hand. 3:139), (Saying; exalt not yourselves upon me. 27:31), (For surely if they prevail [above] you; 18:20), (And that do not exalt yourselves against Allah; 44:19), (Surely, Pharaoh exalted himself in the land. 28:4), (And that they might destroy whatever they gained in ascendancy; 17:7) and (Fear not, you are the uppermost. 20:68). When the polytheists tasted temporary victory upon Muslims, one of them shouted, "Exalt Hubal a pagan ." The Prophet ordered Muslims to reply, "Allah is more Exalted and glorified." Arabic poetry comprises such expressions.

At any rate, a volume may not contain the entire expressions of metaphorical exaltation used in God's Book and Arabic texts. It is quite understandable that there is a difference between exaltation of a place and exaltation of power. Spatial exaltation is a corporal accidental perfection which is definitely different from the origin essential perfection. Allah be exalted against theses of the a field.

Through rendering exegesis of God's saying, (Everything is perishable except His face), Abu Jafar At Tabari, according the ancestors, demonstrates that 'face' stands for the entity. Al-Bukhari, through rendering exegesis of the same Verse, rules that 'face' stands for God's property or deeds intended exclusively for His sake. Hence, Al-Bukhari, whose being the best of the worthy ancestors is never suspected, asserts that 'face' stands for God's property. He also interprets God's holding creatures by their forelock, mentioned in the Verse, (There is no living creature but He holds it by its forelock. 11:56), into the Lord's property and prevalence. God says, (And Allah is Ample, Knowing). It is familiarly known that 'ample' stands for material extension. However, no single scholar opted this meaning.

At Tabari states, "From God's saying, (Allah is the light of the heavens and the earth; 24:35). No single individual from the worthy ancestors did refer to that light reflecting on walls and widespreading in air, as the intended in the Verse. Master scholars and exegesists are far away from taking in such an extrinsic odd meaning."

According to the authentic documentation of At Tabari, Ibn Abbas explains the light in the forecited Verse as guidance. Anas Bin Malik opts for the same exegesis. Mujahid, however, interprets the light into superintendence. At Tabari selects the earlier exegesis and shuns the other. He also interprets the Lord's encircling things into awareness, willingness and prevalence. None renders the material meaning of encircling. Allah be exalted against qualities of corporealities and specifications of contingency.

Sources of the worthy ancestors' sayings reveal the meanings becoming Allah, the Exalted, identifiably. Unidentification is communicated by illiberal researchers. Al-Bukhari's book of

hadith and Ibn Jarir At Tabari's book of exegesis of the holy Quran do assert what we have been suggesting. We have only shown examples for concluding our claims. Al-Beihaqi's Al-Asma'u Wes Sifat is adequately enough in discussing this topic.

Scholars rendered abundant explanation of the allegorical texts. We have already provided Abu Bakr Bin Al-Arabi's narration regarding Malik's interpreting the Lord's descending, mentioned in the Prophet's saying, "Allah descends to the lowest heavens;", into descending of His mercy, not moveableness. At any rate, Malik might have not been acquainted of the other prophetic saying explaining the previous. He might have suspected the hadith documentation; therefore, he evaded citing it as an evidence. The Hadith, however, is, "Allah respites till midnight. After that, he orders a declarant of expounding whether there is…"

Thus, it is explicative that God's descending is metaphorical expression. It is not unusual to use metaphor in documentation, not in the party. Meaning of God's saying, (When we have recited it), indicates to Gabriel's reciting it out of the Lord's order. Al-Bukhari, in the hadith related to Ibn Abbas, removes perplexity of such a topic. Pursuant to an authentic narration, Ibn Abbas opted for exaltation, not material sitting, as the exegesis of God's saying, (The Beneficent settled on the Throne.)

Moreover, we have previously demonstrated sayings of At Tabari and At Thehbi, referring to unanimity of scholars on denying conditions of Allah's settling. We have also explained this point so evidently that any confusion should be eliminated.

Master scholars preceded us in this field. They wrote a good deal of valuable, concised and elaborate, books appertained to the allegorical texts. Thus, readers should fill in their hearts with creed of promoting Allah, the Exalted, against corporeity and material phenomena. he like .texts

AL KAWTHARI REFUTES CORPORALISTS AND THEIR FALSE ACCREDITATION TO MASTERS OF THE ISLAMIC SECTS

In the introductory of Al-Beihaqi's Al-Asma'u Wes Sifat, Al-Kawthari, the reviser, writes down: Al-Beihaqi wrote a book in which he freed Ahmed, the master, from matters of anthropomorphism and corporalism ascribed to him falsely. This book refutes words falsely accredited to Ahmed by some of his followers.

Abul Fadhl At Tamimi, head of Hanbalites in Baghdad, stated that Ahmed contradicted those who accredited corporeality to the Lord. He said, "Names are inferred from the doctrine and language. Linguists assign 'corporeity' to beings having length, width, density, structure, picture and complexity. Allah, the Praised, is out of all these things. Hence, it is illicit to assign corporeity to Him since He is out of being a corporeality. The Doctrine, also, did not mention

such a thing."

Al-Beihaqi states, "Al-Hakim: Abu Amr Bin As Semmak: Hanbal Bin Isaaq: Ahmed, my uncles, said, 'On that day, day of argumentation in the presence of the caliph, they contended that suras of Baqara and Tebarak will materially come on Resurrection Day, as the Prophet had told. I say that this stands for reward of these suras. God's competence is intended by God's saying, (Your Lord will come.) Quran is a set of examples and admonition.' Documentation of this narrative is not doubtful. At any rate, it proves that Ahmed had not believed in material coming and descending, mentioned in Quranic and prophetic texts. He presumed that such matters were expressions of advent of God's marvels and competence. They claimed that it would be unfit for the Quran to practice material coming and going if it was one of the Lord's attributes of Essence. Abu Abdillah answers that it is the reward which will appear on that day. Hence, appearance of the reward was expressed by using coming and going. Saving the most intelligent masters, who promote the Lord against unfitting affairs, none would be guided to such an answer."

Al-Beihaqi's Al-Asma'u Wes Sifat is an unparalleled book. The writer does not criticize those who claim Allah's being in the heavens or on the Throne, resting upon texts supporting this meaning, but he deprives the Lord's being in the heavens or on the Throne, of all meanings of materiality, unlike anthropomorphists. This is proved by his wording while he discusses the Lord's settling on the Throne. We provided a considerable commentation there. He adjudges believers in Allah's being materially in the heavens, as deviant. Meanwhile, he permits this saying,

linguistically, if it is alluded to the Lord's being so exalted and elevated, without referring to a definite point or locality. Doctrinally, there are some legal phenomena permitting such a saying. Since some hadiths, such as that of Abu Zurein and the ibex, reveal, to some extent, unacceptable remarks, it is precautious not to speak of so even if promoting the Lord against unbecoming affairs is declared. Moreover, it is obligatory not to publicize such hadiths at all, for sake of blocking doors into anthropomorphism so firmly. As a matter of fact, there is no single authentic hadith regarding this topic plainly.

Hadith of the deaf bondmaiden comprises a bewilderment so consequential that it is unbefitting to rest upon in topic of beliefs. Acceders to God's saying, (Are you secure that Who is in the heavens…), as their argumentative evidence, are totally wrong. Later on, this will be proved. Statements of Al-Beihaqi and his corollaries respecting permitting claiming Allah's being in the heavens as a signification of His exaltation and glorification,

do not flow in the good of those assigning material exaltation and space to the Lord. In

miscellaneous places of this book, Al-Beihaqi assures this fact. It is quite wrong to reckon such statements of Al-Beihaqi and his corollaries with evidences on substantiating the Lord's physical exaltation. Within narrators of relations respecting the divine attributes, ascribed to Abu Haneefa, is Nueim Bin Hemmad and his maternal grandfather. Abdullah Bin Nafi Al-Assem, the doubtful narrator, is within the series of narratives ascribed to Malik, regarding this topic.

Likewise, Abul Hassan Al-Hekari, Ibn Kadesh and Al-Ashari are within series of narratives related to Ashafii, regarding the same topic involved. Those three men are notorious doubtful narrators. Some, however, were deceived by such reports. Depending upon the previous, it is unacceptable to ascribe the faith of Allah's being in the heavens, to the three masters of the .sects

SAYID AL AMIN'S KESHFULIRTIYAB FI ITTIBA IBNI ABDIL WAHAB

In His Keshfulirtiyab Fi Ittiba Ibni Abdil Wahab, page 94, Sayid Al-Amin records: Quran and the Prophet's traditions are in Arabic. Like ordinary Arabic texts, they comprise factuality and metaphor. Factuality is the actual use of an expression; such as saying, "I saw a lion in the jungle." Lion, here, stands for that strong animal. Metaphor, on the other hand, is the use of an expression for exposing a condition between the expression and the meaning intended. As an example on this, we cite the sentence, "I saw a lion in the meeting." Lion, here, may stand for a brave individual. The acceptable condition linking the two is courage.

Like Quranic and prophetic texts, Arabic texts used metaphor so generally. The following are Quranic metaphorical texts:

(The hand of Allah is above their hands.)

(And make the ark before Our eyes.)

(That you might be brought up before My eyes.)

(You are surely before Our eyes.)

(And could you see when they are made to stand before their Lord.)

(Woe is me, for what I have squandered in the side of Allah.)

(Everything is perishable except His face.)

(Whither you turn, thither is Allah's face.)

(And there will endure only the face of your Lord.)

(The Beneficent settled on the Throne.)

(They fear their Lord above them.) (So he was the measure of two bows or closer still.) (Only whom your Lord will have mercy on.)

(Only whom Allah will have mercy on.)

(And Allah will send His wrath on him.)

(Allah shall pay them back their mockery.)

(And does come your Lord.)

Presumption of metaphor of the previous Quranic texts, is impossibility of intending the factual meanings that result in God's corporeity, occupying a definite space, existing in a definite point and being encountering contingent affairs.

Metaphorical expressions should be having a presumption. Back to the earlier example, wild animals do not attend meetings usually. Occasionally, the presumption is circumstantial, that is indicated through the circumstance, not expressional, that is indicated through representation of wording; therefore, some cannot comprehend it correctly. Metaphor, sometimes, is used so commonly that it does not need a presumption. It is also named reported metaphor when it attains rank of factuality.

Keshfulirtiyab Fi Ittiba Ibni Abdil Wahab, page 119:

Wahabists claimed their being the only monotheists, while other Muslims are entirely polytheists. In fact, Ibn Teimiya, Mohammed Bin Abdil Wahab and their followers abused, desecrated and raped monotheism. They ascribed unbecoming affairs to Allah, the Exalted. Allah be highly exalted and glorified against sayings of the wrong.

They materialized Allah's having the physical upper locality, settling on the Throne which is above the heavens and the earth, descending to the lowest heavens, coming, going and alike material matters. Without any interpretation, they also claimed His having a face, two hands, fingers, palm and eyes. This is indeed a clear corporalism. They rested upon the extrinsic meanings of aspect of the divine attributes and names texts; therefore, they proved Allah's affection, mercy, pleasingness, wrath and the like. They alleged that Allah articulates physically. Thus, they decided God as a contingent being.

Ibn Teimiya asserted the Lord's occupying a locality, having corporeality, material settling on the Throne and physical articulation. He was the foremost in this misbelief. He wrote dependent essays in this regard. His Al-Aqidetul Hamawiya and Al-Wasitiya and many other essays are good examples. His two students; Ibnul Qeyim Al-Jawziya and Ibn Abdil Hadi, as well as their partisans, ensued him. Jurisprudents and master scholars of his time judged him as deviant and atheist. They asked the ruler to kill or detain him. Hence, he was banished to Egypt where he was argued commonly. He was sentenced to imprisonment. In the prison, he died after he had breached his word of repentance.

For recognizing the actual value of Ibn Teimiya, the following are sayings of the master scholar regarding his personality and beliefs. Ahmed Bin Hajar Al-Heithami Al-Mekki, the Shafiite,

writes in his Al-Jawharul Munaddham Fi Ziyaretin Nabiyyil Mukarram: Ibn Teimiya transgressed the divine presence and violated fence of the divine excellence when he provided claims of Allah's having a locality and a corporeality before the public.

In His Ad Durrarul Kamina, Ibn Hajar records:

People stated various opinions about Ibn Teimiya. Some assigned claims of corporalism to him. This was because of his writings in his Al-AqidetulHamawiya and Al-Wasitiya, when he claimed Allah's having material hands, feet, leg and face. He also claimed that He is settling on the Throne physically. As he was argued that these beliefs lead to corporalism, he answered, "I do not submit to the matter that having a locality or divisibility are specifications of corporealities." This means that he had indeed claimed the Lord's having a definite space. In Ashraful Wasail Ila Fehmi Shemail, the writer records that Ibnul Qeyim and his master, Ibn Teimiya, pronounced a funny thing when they claimed that the reason beyond recommendation of sending edges of the turban on the shoulders, was the Lord had fixed His hands between shoulder of the Prophet while he was looking at him! Therefore, the Prophet honored that position. "We have not found a single report supporting this claim." Al-Iraqi asserted. However, such claims are listed under misbeliefs and deviation of these two individuals. They adopted and spared no efforts in finding evidences on corporalism and anthropomorphism. In addition, they aimed at debasing Ahlus Sunna for their denying this misbelief. Greatly exalted be Allah against sayings of the wrong and atheists. Moreover, they oversaid in this topic such catastrophic statements that ears cannot bear, and forgery, belying and fraudulence are easily decided. Deformed be their sayings and them. Ahmed, master of Hanbalism, and his reverent acquaintances are freed from such a hideous stain. For majority, it is decided as atheism.

In Hellul Ma'aqid, Al-Mawlawi Abdul Halim Al-Hindi records, "Taqiyuddin Ibn Teimiya was Hanbalite. But he transcended limits and attempted at substantiating matters contradicting the Lord's glorification and excellence. Besides many others, he claimed Allah's occupying a locality and a corporeality. The judge sentenced him to imprisonment in 705. In Damascus, it was publicly declared that properties and souls of followers of Ibn Teimiya's misbeliefs are lawfully disregarded. This was recorded in Abu Mohammed Abdullah Al-Yafii's Miratul Jinan. After he has shown repentance and declared of being Asharite, Ibn Teimiya was released in 707. Immediately, he breached his repentance and showed his heretic affairs anew. Thus, he was detained in more severe circumstances. He could escape and resettle in Syria. Historical records wrote down his circumstances, conditions and sayings. Sheik Ibn Hajar, in the first volume of his Ad Durarul Kamina, recorded his manners and events.

The same thing was written by At Thehbi, in his book of history, as well as many others. In brief words, Ibn Teimiya claimed Allah's being a corporeality and lacking a space. He relied upon the fact that every corporeality needs a space. Resting upon God's saying, (The Beneficent settled on the Throne.), Ibn Teimiya claimed the Lord's occupying the Throne. Accordingly, he had to state anteriority, eternality and ceaseless renovation. The Lord's final possibility is eternal, while the limited are contingent.

Abul Fida, in his book of history; events of 705, records:

On that year, Taqiyuddin Ahmed Bin Teimiya was summoned to Egypt where he was publicly argued. Owing to his belief of corporalism, he was detained. Within the royal judgment against Ibn Teimiya, the following statements are mentioned, "During this period, Ibn Teimiya, the miserable, used his quill and wording for delving into questions of the Quran and the divine attributes. He spoke in ill favored affairs, and asserted what was denied by masters of Islam. Unanimity of scholars contracted him, since he contravened savants and jurisprudents of his time and province. We have been informed that his people complied with him after he had betrayed them. We have been acquainted that they declared their misbeliefs of the Lord's having physical articulation and corporeality."

Mohammed Bin Abdil Wahab and his group did adhere to beliefs of Ibn Teimiya regarding corporalism, visitating tombs, intercession to Allah and the like. Without interpretation, son of Abdul Wahab exceeded his master in substantiating that Allah has a definite locality, which is above, and settles on the Throne that is above the heavens and the earth, and enjoys physical corporeality, material mercy, satisfaction, wrath, right and left hand, fingers and palm.

Partisans of Mohammed Bin Abdil Wahab claimed Allah's occupying an upper locality, settling on the Throne, having a face, hands and eyes, descending to the lower heavens, coming, nearness and the like; all with the material meanings wanting interpretative exegeses.

The following is written down in the fourth chapter of Al-Hadiyetus Sunniya, recorded by Mohammed Bin Abdul Latif, the grandson of Mohammed Bin Abdil Wahab. "Allah, the Exalted, is on His Throne as he said, (The Beneficent settled on the Throne;), and He has two hands wanting a certain condition,

as he said, (When I created with My hands;) and (His hands are open.) He also has eyes and face wanting a certain condition, as he said, (And there will endure the face of your Lord,)…"

They give credence to the Prophet's saying, "Allah descends to the lowest heavens…" and they believe that Allah shall come on Resurrection Day, as he said, (And there come your Lord and the angels.) By the same token, they believe that Allah comes near to His creatures as he desires. He said, (We are nearer to him than his life vein.)

In the fifth chapter of the previous book, the writer records, "We do believe that Allah settles on the Throne and exalts over His creatures. We believe that His Throne is above the heavens. Allah said, (The Beneficent settled on the Throne.) We believe in the expression and substantiate reality of settling, without suggesting a definite condition or picture. We adopt the saying of Malik Bin Anas, master of Darul Hijra (Al-Madina). When he was asked about condition of the Lord's settling, Malik answered, 'Settling is known and its way is unexplored, and believing in this is obligatory and questioning about it is heresy.'"

This saying results in one of two things; either corporalism or impossibility. Both, however, are impracticable. Occurring of material settling wanting a definite condition is impossible, on criteria of mentality. Occurrence of material settling with a definite condition results in opting for corporalism. Hence, it is requisite to opt for finding interpretative exegesis or resting upon metaphorical meaning. Presumption, however, should be intellectuality. This proves that the previous statement ascribed to Malik is rarely true. The good reputation of the man makes us suspect authenticity of assigning this statement to him.

Malik's statement, 'Settling in known', if the material meaning of settling is intended, is impracticable according to intellectuality, since Allah's corporeity is infeasible. It is also impossible to settle materially without being a corporeality. How is it practicable to decided asking about it as a heresy while giving credence to unknown matters is impossible?! If the meaning intended by Malik is believing in the settling proposed by the Lord without asking about its detailed conditions, its impracticability should be ruled for the same previous intellectual grounds. If he alludes to the metaphorical meanings only, where is the actuality of settling, then?!

Moreover, if those faction take Malik's words as their guidance and principals, what for did they shun his statements regarding directing towards the Prophet's tomb and seeking his intercession to Allah, then? Malik did instruct Al-Mansour, the caliph, to turn his face towards the Prophet's tomb and seek his intercession to the Lord.

Abdullah Bin Mohammed Bin Abdil Wahab, in the second chapter of Al-Hadiyetus Saniya, states, "Our claiming of the Lord's having a locality; which is the above, does in no means require our being corporalists, since consequences of a sect are not the sect itself." If the previous rule is true, it stands for the idea that adopting a certain faith does not necessarily require believing in its consequences.

But, when this faith is false, its consequences shall be false, too. Falsity of consequences leads to falsity of principals. Lest, inherence is totally null. If corporeity of Allah is false, accrediting locality of exaltation to Him shall be void and null, too. We have previously provided that Ibn

Teimiya, their master and guide, was decided as atheist, and sentenced to death penalty in absentia and imprisonment, because he claimed corporeity of the Lord. Mohammed Bin Abdil Wahab, founder of their faction, followed Ibn Teimiya in claiming Allah's having right and left hands, fingers and palm. Those are following these two so accurately and comprehensively that they would not be acquitted even if they declare freeing from corporalism.

AS SAQAF IN AS SAHIH FIL AQIDETIT TAHAWIYA

In As Sahih Fil Aqidetit Tahawiya, page 165, As Saqaf, the current reviser, states:

Singling out metaphor is a course adopted by the worthy ancestors. No single sane can doubt so. Ibn Teimiya, in his Al-Iman, page 85, records Ahmed's considering metaphor as a style used in some expressions. Al-Hafiz Az Zerkashi, in Al-Bahrul Muhit Fi Ilml Usoul, part 2 page 182, relates so to Ahmed. Ibn Teimiya and Ibnul Qeyim failed in their endeavors to deny metaphor. They contrasted themselves! While he decides metaphor as a sort of devil deeds, Ibnul Qeyim, in his Al-Fawaidul Mushawiqa, contrasts himself as he proves and cites many evidences on materialization of metaphor.

Sheik Al-Albani, the self contradictor, opposes Ibn Teimiya in this regard when he upholds metaphor in the introduction of Mukhtasarul Uluw, page 23 (the margin). On page 31 of our Al-Bisharatu Wel Ithaf, we have referred to this contradiction.

Because of compulsion and force, the present compiler of Adwa'ul Bayan was suffering in the country he had lived in, in his final days, he had to deny metaphorical expressions of the texts. Compulsion, however, has its own rulings! At any rate, denial of this scholar is not that strong evidence to which students and seekers of the truth via individuals, not seekers of individuals via the truth, should hold fast, especially when clear proofs have been provided. Allah, however, is the guide.

It is quite strange for Ibn Teimiya to claim, on page 85 of his Al-Iman, that neither Ahmed's followers, Malik, Ashafii nor did Abu Haneefa maintain that there are metaphorical expressions in the Quranic texts. He also claimed that division of factuality and metaphor had been originated in the fourth Hijri century, and that it might have emerged in the last of the second and the first of the third Hijri centuries!

Indeed, this is inconstancy in identifying history. It is aimed for nothing more than deviating the readers. Masters of sects, specially Ashafii who used another term, did refer to metaphor. Muammar Bin Al-Muthenna, whose birth was in 106, did compile a book named Mejazul Quran, Metaphor in the Quran .

As Sahih Fil Aqidetit Tahawiya, page 311:

Corporalists provided God's saying, (The Beneficent settled on the Throne), as their evidence

on God's being sitting on His Throne and being materially utmost. Evading stating belief of God's material settling and physical exaltation, some say that Allah is being above in the heavens. Indisputably, this is a clear blunder. Allah is gloriously promoted against having a space. In Arabic, the expression 'He is in the heavens.', is used for glorifying. The following are detailed exposition about meanings of this Verse and its likes,quoted from Ibnul Jawzi's Dafu Shubehit Tashbih, page 121, in addition to our comments:

The word, 'Throne' mentioned in God's saying, (He settled on the Throne), stands for the royal bench. It is commonly used in Arabic before and after Islam. It is also used occasionally in the holy Quran. The item 'settle' has various meanings. It may hint at equity, perfection, direction or prevalence.

As Sahih Fil Aqidetit Tahawiya, page 324:

Corporalists and anthropomorphisms claim that deniers of God's being in or out of the cosmos, are denying His Existence. This is a valueless mistake. They compare the Lord to corporealities. They believe that the Lord is a thing like other things and beings that occupy a point in spaces. Some imagine that He is compact corporeality, like mankind, or loose, like air, light or gas. In spite of their denouncement, they all imagine the Lord as a corporeality conceived by mentalities whether in or out of the cosmos. Our duty is clarifying this question, resting upon Quranic and prophetic texts.

Scholars, at suggesting that Allah is neither in nor out of this cosmos, intend that He, the Praised, cannot be given descriptions of this material cosmos. Hence, He is neither connected nor disconnected to this universe. Connection and disconnection are qualities of corporealities. Allah, the Exalted is as he describes Himself, (Nothing like His likeness). The point corporalists and anthropomorphists claim of being above the Throne and occupied by the Lord, the Praised the Exalted, should be positively a space. It would not have been possible to conceive had this point not been a space. By the same token, it would not have been described as occupied by the Lord, being above the Throne if it had not been a spatial point.

Finally, it would not have been possible for them to indicate to that elevated point for referring to the Lord, if it had not been a definite point. Correspondingly, they imagine that Allah is a corporeity comparable to material beings. They conceive that He is being above the Throne that He created along with the cosmos. Accordingly, they believe Allah had had a lower locality before He created this cosmos. He would certainly have upper, before, behind, left and right localities had He a lower one.

Complex of those corporalists and anthropomorphists is that they have not submitted totally to the doctrine. Hence, they could not recognize that Allah, the Exalted, is incomprehensible and

inconceivable, and that He is promoted against whatever may come to connotation and minds. Had they submitted to His extraordinary Existence and incomprehensibility, they would have been saved and joined to faith of promotion; the genuine faith of Islam.

As Sahih Fil Aqidetit Tahawiya, page 334:

The supreme reliable masters of Islamic scholarship and hadith pledged God's promotion against being in or out of this cosmos. They used the following expressions in various occasions. "He is neither in nor out of this cosmos." "He is neither connected nor disconnected to this cosmos." "He is neither combined nor separated from this cosmos." "He is neither touching nor quitting this cosmos." The entire expressions, however, lead to the same purport indeed. The following are sayings of those master scholars:

1. Al-Ghezzali, in Ihyau Uloumiddin, part 4 page 434:

Allah, the Exalted, is holily elevated against having a space, and blessedly promoted against having measures or localities. He is neither in nor out of this cosmos. By the same token, He is neither connected not disconnected to it. He bewildered some people's minds so perplexedly that they denied His Existence when they were unable enough to listen and recognize Him.

2 & 3. An Nawawi and Al-Mutawalli:

In his Rawdatut Talibin, page 1064, An Nawai records:

Al-Mutawalli says, "He is an atheist, that whoever believes in anteriority of the cosmos, contingent of the Creator, negation of constant unanimous attributes of the Anterior, connection or disconnection of the Lord."

An Nawawi, however, certifies this statement; therefore, this is considered as sayings of two supreme scholars. 4. Al-Beihaqi, in his Al-Asmau Wes Sifat, pages 410 1, as well as Shiebul Iman, renders this faith with thorough details. 5. Alizz Bin Abdus Selam, in his Al-Qawaid, page 201, asserts that within faiths that are rather difficult for the public to apprehend, is God's being neither in nor out of this cosmos, and neither connected nor disconnected to it. 6. Abul Muzaffar Alisferaini, in his At Tabsiru Fiddin, page 97, revised by Al-Kawthari, Publication of Al-Anwar 1359: … and to apprehend that moveableness and stillness… connection and disconnection are impracticable for Allah, the Exalted, since all require an edge and end.

7. Ibnul Jawzi, the Hanbalite, in his Dafu Shubehit Tashbih, page 103, Publication of Darun Nawawi: By the same token, it is illicit to claim that Allah is in or out of this cosmos, since being in or out are consequences of spatial beings. The previous was a good number of the master scholars who assert that it is impracticable to describe Allah, the Exalted, as being in or out of this cosmos.

As Sahih Fil Aqidetit Tahawiya, page 339:

The following is a literal quotation of his statements:

"The hadiths 'Allah comes with His face' and 'Allah is between your hands in prayers' do not contradict His being on His Throne, elevating His creatures. This fact is asserted by Quranic and prophetic texts, as well as traditions of the Prophet's companions and the worthy ancestors. Still, Allah is being far ranging and comprehending the whole cosmos. He has told that His servants encounter His face whenever they turn their faces. Naturally, exalted things encounter whatever is below from every side. Hence, Allah, the Comprehensive of everything, should be fitting this affair more intensely. More details can be provided in books of Sheikul Islam, Ibn Teimiya, specially Al-Hamawiya and Al-Wasitiya, pages 203 13, that are revised by Zeid Bin Abdil Aziz Bin Feyad."

As if they are divine texts, Al-Albani, in the introductory of Mukhtasarul Uluw, page 71, attests and cites Ibn Teimiya's statements recorded in his At Tadmuriya, as his evidence. "If localities are created beings, Allah, then, is not included with His creatures. If localities are what is aloft the cosmos, it is most surely that Allah is being aloft the cosmos. The same thing is said about those who substantiate that Allah is being in a certain locality. If they claim Allah's being aloft, they will be right. But if they claim His being included with His creatures, this will be wrong."

Thus, they claim existence of an area lying beyond the cosmos which is not included with the created beings. Hence, in that area, god of those faction exists!! As Sahih Fil Aqidetit Tahawiya, page 358:

Corporalists and anthropomorphists are two names of the same faction. They conceive God's being a definite corporeality. Most of them imagine the Lord's being in a form of a man sitting on a great seat (throne). Statements of those faction, appertained to questions of monotheism and faiths, recorded in their books are clear evidences on the previous allegation. One of the most evident witnesses is the book titled As Sunna, and ascribed to son of Ahmed, the master founder of Hanbalism. They do prevaricate when they claim their being believing in a faith other than the forecited.

Their books, wordings, speech, private orations and many other ostensible matters; these all are obvious indications on authenticity of our claims against them. For instance, although they reckon with the divine attributes, they aver the Lord's having limbs and organs such as a hand, fingers, face, leg, feet, eye, side and the like. They ascribe qualities of contingent material beings to the Lord; such as sitting, moving, edges and localities

Fetawi Al-Albani, page 520:

Q. As Saqaf has fabricated a new heresy when he claimed his ability to prove Allah's being aloft the heavens, like that bondmaiden. A. Escaping from attestation, such individuals utter such statements. In his books, the man affirms that declaring of Allah's being in the heavens is a sort of atheism. He also claims Allah's being neither in a certain place nor out of space. He also claims Allah's being neither in nor out of this cosmos. The man, then, follows trifles of Tatilites.

The bondmaiden mentioned in the question above is that who, before the Prophet, pointed to the heavens as an indication to Allah. The Prophet, however, accepted her indication. Wahabists cited this narrative as their evidence on God's occupying an aloft locality. As Saqaf refuted this exegesis. He only believed in authenticity of that bondmaiden's claim of God's being immaterially exalted. This is a true claim admitted by the entire Muslims other than corporalists. As he could not welcome this, Al-Albani accused As Saqaf, as well as every denier of God's materiality, of being Tatilite. The same judgment of Al-Albani's ancestors is repeated. They decided atheism of every individual contradicting their beliefs. At Thehbi's Tarikhul Islam, part 14 page 384:

Safwan Bin Salih: Marwan Bin Mohammed decides those who assert that Allah does not have an eye or a hand, as followers of Tatilism. For Wahabists, it is essential to admit the Lord's physical attributes; such as the foot, hand, eye, face and other organs, otherwise reckoning with Tatilites, who deny the divine attributes and names, is decided.

This is the ill thoroughly material utterance of these faction who, stubbornly or senselessly, confuse qualities of organs to attributes of denotation and these of deeds. Accordingly, corporalists and anthropomorphists became quite faithful believers, while deciders of God's being promoted against unfitting matters, who disavow ascribing material qualities to the Lord and form majority of Muslims, became Tatilites, apostates and disbelievers.

This is the very Jewish scrupulous materiality adopted by ulema of the two holy precincts, who intend, by means of spending fortunes and recruiting Indian and Syrian scholastic individuals, to make the Islamic world submit to it. This is in the twentieth century which witnessed collapse of the historical materialism.

THESES OF PHILOSOPHERS AND THEOLOGISTS REGARDING DENIAL OF GOD'S CORPOREITY AND LOCALITY

Keshful Murad Fi Sharhi Tajridulitiqad, page 154:

Text: For every corporeality, there is a natural space required when left, from the nearest way.

Explanation: Absolutely every corporeality wants a space to occupy. It is impracticable for any corporeality to be existing without space. Necessarily, that space is natural for the corporeality.

Supposing corporealities are deprived of contingent affairs, they shall be either occupying no locality at all, or occupying the entire space. The earlier is impracticable, and the latter is essentially void and null. Corporealities may occupy some locations that should be natural. Accordingly, every corporeality should return to its position. Usually, corporealities take the most straight paths when return.

Text: It shall be nonexistent when innumerable.

Explanation: There is only one natural space for each corporeality. If there were two or more places, one should be left during the corporeality's occupying the other. This left place would no longer be natural. This is the meaning of his saying that nonexistence of naturality should be ruled when there are numerous places for a single corporeality.

Keshful Murad Fi Sharhi Tajridulitiqad, page 317:

10. Allah, The Exalted, Is Not Compound.

Text: As well as composition, in all its forms…

Explanation: This implies that necessity of existence requires denial of composition. This is evidenced by the fact that every compound being lacks its parts, since it shall be nonexistent unless these parts compose its being. Besides, parts of a being vary each other. Things lacking others are possible. Correspondingly, Allah, the Necessary, is possible if He lacks parts. So, necessity of existence rules of denial of composition.

Composition may be either inherent or extrinsic. The first is that composed of genus and class while the second is that composed of material and form, such as corporealities or amounts. All these things are dispelled from Allah, the Necessary. The entire compound matters lack their parts, while the Lord has no genus, class or any other material parts.

13. Allah is not incarnating in other beings.

Text: …and incarnation…

Explanation: Necessity of Existence requires that Allah, the Exalted, does not incarnate in other beings. Majority of intellectual people agree upon this point.

Some of the Christians, who claim the Lord's incarnating in Messiah, and the Sufis, who believe in the Lord's incarnating in corporealities of some of their spiritualists, disagree. This faith is too ridiculous to be discussed, since the credible concept of incarnation means that a being, that is incapable of existing independently, finds a location in another on basis of fellowship. This meaning, however, is impracticable for Allah, the Exalted, since it necessitates possibility.

14. Denial of the Lord's combination Text: …and combination…

Explanation: Necessity of existence contradicts combination. Previously, we have explicated that necessity of existence requires oneness. In case the Necessary Existent combines with

another thing, it is most surely that thing should be possible. Thus, qualities of the possible existent will be born by the being combining it. As a result, the necessary existent will be transferring into a possible existent.

Furthermore, in case of combination, the two combined beings should be either independently existent; hence, the combination will be null, or both or one of them will be nonexistent; hence, the combination will be null, too, or the necessity will be null. Consequently, the necessary existent will be possible. This is contrast.

15. Denial of the Lord's occupying a locality.

Text: …and locality…

Explanation: This is one of the rulings required by the Necessary Existent. The entire corporalists disputed about this point. They believed in the Lord's occupying a definite locality. Followers of Abu Abdillah Bin Al-Karram were engaged in discrepancy in this regard. Mohammed Bin Heitham claims the Lord's being in an endless region atop the Throne. He also claims that the distance between the Lord and the Throne is infinite. Some claim the finitude of that distance. Others adopted corporalists' claim of the Lord's being over the Throne. All the previous beliefs are valueless, since every occupant is demonstrated and suffering contingent .manners. Contingent beings, however, are not necessary

AL FAKHR AR RAZI'S THESIS OF DENIAL OF ALLAH'S CORPOREALITY

Al-Metalibul Aliya, volume 2 part 2 page 25:

Chapter Three: Providing evidences on impracticability of Allah's being a corporeality In this regard, scholars have two opinions. Majority of Muslims compromised that Allah is promoted against having a corporeality and occupying a definite space. Others, corporalists, claimed His being defined by a certain space. However, the latter disagree upon certain points.

1. Regarding the Lord's having a definite look, there are two opinions. Some claimed the Lord's having the appearance of human beings, while others denied so. Muslim anthropomorphists claim the Lord's having an appearance of a young man. Jew anthropomorphists claim His having an appearance of an old man. Others claim His being a tremendous light.

Abu Mashar, the astronomer, asserts that because the preliminary people adopted faith of the Lord's being a corporeality, and being a tremendous light while the angels are less tremendous, they betook a pagan larger than the others so as to express the Great Lord. They also betook smaller pagans with different manners so as to express the angels. They engaged themselves in adoring these statues considering them as the Lord and the angels. This was the main reason beyond paganism. This proves that paganism is a branch of anthropomorphism.

2. Corporalists disagreed upon the idea whether the Lord is able of coming, going, moving and

stilling. A group of Karramites refuted so, while others affirmed. Majority of Hanbalites affirmed.

3. Adopters of Allah's being a light, deny His having organs and limbs; such as the head, the hand and the foot. Most of Hanbalites assert the Lord's having organs.

4. Unanimously, corporalists opted for the Lord's being in the highest space. This provides three probabilities. The Lord is either coping with the Throne, varying it in a limited dimension or varying it in a limitless dimension. Hence, corporalists were of three groups depending on the three previous probabilities.

5. Corporalists agree upon the Lord's having a limit from beneath. They, however, disagree about the other five sides. Some claim the Lord's being limited from the entire sides. Others claim the Lord's being limited only from beneath. Others claim the Lord's being limitless from the upward, and limitless from the other sides.

6. corporalists disagree whether the Lord occupies that definite space by Essence or for an idiosyncratic objective that necessitates His being in that space. This is similar to their contrariety on the idea whether Allah, the Exalted, is Knowing by His Essence, or by means of knowledge.

7. Corporalists disagree whether the Lord's knowledge, competence, will, hearing, seeing and articulation are equal manners of His corporeality, or each of these attributes occupies a definite part of His corporeality, exclusively dedicated to the attribute involved.

There are a number of proofs evidencing that Allah, the Exalted, is promoted against having corporeality and definite size. First proof: No necessary Aseity can be possible existent by essence. Every occupant is possible existent by essence; therefore, the necessary Aseity can never be occupant. The minor is logically acceptable. The major is provable since every occupant is component. Every composite is possible existence by essence. Hence, every occupant is possible existence by essence. For proving that every occupant is component, the following points are provided.

1. There must be a difference between the right and the left of every occupant. Hence, it must be component. This means that every occupant is component. Full rendition regarding this point is cited during providing evidences on denial of atoms.

2. Philosophers said, "Every corporeality is composed of prime matter and form."

3. Every occupant shares others in having a space, and varies them in having a clear space. The common feature of occupation enjoyed by every occupant is different from the distinctive feature consecrated to occupants exclusively. It is inevitable that every occupant should be composed of that common space and the distinctive feature. Hence, every occupant is

composed.

For clarifying that every composed being is possible, it is to say that every composed being lacks its definite space which is unlike it. Every composed being lacks other matters. Every being lacking others is possible existence be essence. This results in the fact that every composed being is possible existent by essence.

Second proof: The Lord resembles other occupants, in matters of quiddity, if He is occupant. This is impracticable since the first is impracticable. To explicate so, it is to say that if the Lord is an occupant, He will be equal to other occupants in feature of having space. This leads to one of two probabilities; either contrasting other corporealities in one of the fundamentals of quiddity, or not.

The first is logically invalid since if the Lord is equal to occupants, in feature of being spaced, and contrasts them in one of the fundamentals of quiddity, then the common feature of occupation is variant from the distinctive feature and, by the same token, the Lord's occupation is different from competency of contrasting; therefore, the second is valid.

Proving this, we say that the two previous features should be either attributes of each other, or not, or the distinctive feature is attributed while the common feature is the attribute. The first three probabilities are invalid. Hence, the fourth is only endurable. This leads to the fact that corporealities are analogous in ultimate quiddity. Nullity of the first probability is proved by the fact that providing it is true, each should be independent and idiosyncratic. This is untrue because of their being lacking others.

Likewise, nullity of the second probability is proved by the fact that should that have been true, the two features would not have been interrelated. This, however, is not a discussion of the coalescing essence. Nullity of the third probability is proved by the condition that if the distinctive feature was the essence, and the common feature was the attribute, then the distinctive feature should be either given the space exclusively, or not.

If the previous is adopted, it is, then, an occupying corporeality that is, essentially, the part of quiddity of a corporeality, should be a corporeality. This is logically impracticable. If the latter is adopted, it is, then, impossible for occupants to have space, since that being is not practicable to spaces. Occupants, as a matter of fact, necessarily occupy that space. It is intellectually impracticable for the necessarily occupying matters to occur to matters that are impossibly occupying spaces.

Thusly, the three previous probabilities are null and void. Only should the fourth endure. It is that the common feature, which is the process of occupation, is the essence, and the distinctive feature is the attribute. Proving that there is only one concept for the process of

occupation. This alludes to the fact that the entire occupants are similar in quitty and entity. This verifies our claim that the Lord should have been similar, in quitty and entity, to the other occupying beings had He been occupant. For the following reasons, we maintain impracticability of that exposition.

1. Inevitably, matters fully similar in quitty should be equal in necessities and results. Hence, corporealities, as a whole, should be either self sufficient from the Agent, or depending totally on the Agent. The earlier is null since we have previously proved contingency of the cosmos and its necessity to the Agent. Hence, the second is active. This leads to proving the fact that every occupant is in necessity to the Agent. Hence, the Creator of everything is not an occupant.

2. That corporeality's exclusive knowledge, competence and godhead should be either necessary or possible. The earlier is null and void. Supposing it is true, it is necessary for the entire corporealities to enjoy these attributes since it is provable that matters of the same category should enjoy the same necessities. The latter is also void since if it is true, it is occurred by a definite specialist actor. If that actor is a corporeality, the same wording should be resaid, otherwise, it will be the required.

3. Supposing corporealities are similar, they all should enjoy the same attributes. Hence, it is impracticable to regard some of them as anterior, while the others as contingent. If so, the anterior should be contingent, and the contingent should be anterior. This is logically infeasible.

4. Like other corporeality's, the Lord's corporeality should be suffering separation and amputation. Similarly, as other corporealities suffer extension, reduction, decay and corruption, the Lord's should be suffering so, too. Familiarly, this is infeasible and null.

5. Parts of that corporeality are supposed to be fully equal in quiddity. Since some of them occur in the lower part while others occur in the upper, then it is practical for those falling in the lower to occupy the place of those of the upper. Supposing so, position of each part must have been chosen by an expert actor. For the lord of this cosmos, this is impracticable. Although this proof is very effective, philosophers do not rest upon, since it supports the ideas of separability and cicatrization of the cosmos.

Third proof: The Lord is finite if He is occupant. Every finite is possible. Necessary Existent is not possible. Hence, the occupant is not necessary existent by essence. The idea that every finite is possible is proved by a number of evidences referring to finitude of dimensions. Likewise, by citing the fact that it is supposable to believe that every amount must have been increased or decreased, we can prove that every finite is possible. Besides, it is essential to acquaint affirmation of the possibility involved. This asserts possibility of every occupant. The

Necessary Existent is not possible. This arises the conclusion that no single occupant is necessary existent. By reversing so, it is to say that no single necessary existent is an occupant.

Fourth proof: The Lord is equal to other occupants if He is occupant. Thus, He is either having the same fundamentals of other occupants, or not. Regarding the earlier, the occupant should be a genus subclassified into species. Regarding the latter, the occupant should be a species subclassified into persons.

The earlier is null. Providing its validity, the necessary existent must be composed of species, which is the common feature of occupants, and the class, which is the distinctive feature. Every composed being is possible. This will arise the contrast that the necessary existent is the possible existent.

The latter is null, too. The common feature of occupation is shared by the entire persons. The distinctive feature is dedicated to each person independently. Hence, the distinctive feature is inordinate to the quantitative nature. In addition, that feature is necessitated by the consecratory characteristic. But we have previously decided its being common among persons. This is, then, contradiction.

If the feature is independent, then each person of the occupying corporeality will be identified by an independent reason; therefore, it will not be necessary existent by essence. This confirms that every corporeality is possibly existent by essence. Whatever is not possible necessary by essence should never be a corporeality.

Fifth proof: The Lord suffers separability and laceration if He is a corporeality. As the earlier is impossible, the latter is impossible, too. Supposing the Lord is constituent, each of His parts must be continually decomposable till it becomes simple. If so, then characteristics of the right side must not be different from these of the left, lest, He should be compound. Similarly, if equality of the two sides, in nature and quiddity, is proved, then it is positive that what is touched by a side must be touched by the other in the same manner. This implies that whatever touches the other part with one of its two faces, can validly touch with the other. This proves practicability of separation and laceration.

Impossibility of the Lord's being separable and decomposable is proved by the thesis that inseparability of the Lord cannot be preferred to His separability unless there is a favorable extraneous reason. This shows the Lord's lacking an extraneous reason. It is unrealizable for the necessary existent by essence to lack. Hence, the necessary existent by essence is not a corporeality.

Sixth proof: The Lord is a corporeality if He is occupier. No sane confirms the Lord's being as

minute as an atom. Corporealities are compound. Attributes of knowledge, competence and the like should either be a part of that corporeality, or the amount. Assuming the earlier is true, the Lord must be that part alone. This results in considering the Lord as minute as an atom. Considering the latter, these attributes should be either comprised by the entire parts, or distributing parts of the attributes on parts of the corporeality, or an independent part of each attribute occurs in each part of the corporeality. The earlier is null since it is impracticable for a single attribute to occupy more than a single position.

The second is impracticable since it is unworkable for knowledge, for instance, to be divisible. The latter is also impracticable since it requires that each part of the corporeality should bear the whole divine attributes. This leads to variety of lords.

It may be suggested that the previous proofs are dedicated to corporealities of humans that are divisible. Hence, each part should have an independent knowledge, competence and the like. This means a single man should be a number of knowledgeable and competent numbers. As an answer, we say that philosophers deny claims of wholeness. They ascribe qualities of knowledge, competence and the like to souls consecratorily. Otherwise, impossibility should be supposed. Al-Ashari adopted the claim that each part of human corporealities comprises definite knowledge, competence and the like. This is positively inaccurate. It is, however, not impossible.

Ascribing so to the Lord is definitely impossible. It leads to claiming variety of gods. Seventh proof: If the Lord is corporeality, He is either moveable or immovable. Both probabilities are impossible; therefore, the Lord is not an occupant.

If the lord of the cosmos is moveable, then there should be no blame to reckon the planets with gods. The sun, the moon and other planets can be gods unless they have three matters.

1. They are compound.
2. They are limited and bound.
3. They are moveable.

Supposing these three matters do not impede godhead, it will be trivial to criticize godhead of such planets. The same is said about the divine Throne and Chair. This is the very atheism and tergiversation and denial of the Creator. The claim that the Lord of the cosmos is a corporeality that is not submitted to transference and moveableness, is also null for a number of reasons. First, the Lord shall be seen as the handicapped that is disable to move, if He is immovable. This is, however, a blemish which is impracticable for Allah.

Second, like other corporealities, Allah should be capable of moving if He is a corporeality. Third, adopters of God's being composed of parts claim His ability of moving. They ascribe

processes of going and coming to Him. Once, they assert the Lord's reposing on the Throne while His feet are on the Chair. This is indeed stillness. Once, they relate that He descends to the heavens. This is the moveableness.

AL JIRJANI'S THESIS OF DENYING GOD'S OCCUPANCY

Al-Jirjani's Sharhul Mawaqif, part 8 page 19:

First concept: God, the Exalted, does not occupy a definite location and space. Anthropomorphists reject this concept when they, entirely, regard the atop point as the Lord's locality. However, they disagree upon secondary details. Abu Abdilah Mohammed Bin Karram resembles the Lord's being in a position, to the other corporealities' being in a position. He claims the Lord can be pointed and materially demonstrated. He says, "The Lord is touching the top of the Throne, and able of moving, transference and shifting into other locations." The Jews adopt this faith so exceedingly that they claim the Throne's creaking under the Lord. They also claim that a four finger distance from the two sides of the Throne is vacant while the Lord is sitting there. A number of anthropomorphists, such as Mudar, Kuhmus and Ahmed Al-Hujeimi, added that believers can hang the Lord in this world as well as in the Hereafter. Some claim the Lord's being adjoining, not matching, the Throne. Others claim finitude of the distance between the Lord and the Throne. Others claim infinity of the distance between the Lord and the Throne. Others assert that the Lord's occupying a definite position is unlike the corporealities' occupying positions. The disputation with the latter depends on the articulation, not the purports. Comprehensiveness of wording relies upon regulations defined by the Islamic doctrine.

For proving our concept, there is a number of points to be cited:

First: Anteriority of the space or the location occupied by the Lord, the Exalted, should be measured as same as the Lord's anteriority. Nevertheless, we have previously proved the Lord's uniqueness in anteriority. This is unanimously agreed upon by the entire parties.

Second: The occupying beings are in such an exigent need for their places that their existence is grounded on these position. Places, however, are not in need for occupiers since vacancy is realistic. The result is occupancy of the necessary existence, and necessity of the place. Both are indeed null and void.

Third: Should the Lord have occupied a definite locality, He would have been either occupying certain or the entire points. Both are null since points of a locality are equally the same. For theologists, place is the similar vacancy. Hence, relation of the Necessary Essence to these points should be equal. Then, dedicating certain points to the Lord should be reckoned with the baseless preference, unless there is an extraneous attributer. The necessary existent, in his

occupancy, will be necessitating another factor if there is an extraneous attributer.

Regarding the point of the Lord's occupying the entire points of a place, we provide that this requires interaction of occupants, since some of the points of that place should be occupied by another corporeality. Necessarily, interaction of occupants is impracticable. In addition, regarding the latter, this calls for the Lord's associating with dirt of the cosmos.

Fourth: Since The Lord is impossibly an accident, He will be a matter if He occupies a definite place. If the Lord is a matter, He will be either indivisible or divisible. Both probabilities are null. Nullity of indivisibility is proved by saying that indivisible matters are the most miniature. Allah be promoted against being miniature. Divisibility implies that the Lord should be a compound corporeality. Previously, it has been proved that external composition contradicts the essential necessity. Furthermore, it has been proved that corporealities are contingent.

Accordingly, the Necessary Existent must be contingent.

For nullifying the latter claim, some provide the following discussion. If the Necessary Existent is a corporeality, each part of Him will bear knowledge, competence and mortality different from these born by other parts, since it is necessarily impossible for the single accident to hold two positions. Hence, each part of the claimed corporeality of the Lord will independently have attributes of perfection. This leads to variety of gods.

At any rate, this discussion implies that each single mankind is a variety of knowledgeable, competent and mortal beings, since such qualities are available in a single human being.

Thence, this discussion is valueless.

Another discussion maybe rendered.

The Lord will is, in quiddity, to other occupants if He is an occupant. This necessitates anteriority or contingency of corporealities, since equal matters are concordant in affairs.

This discussion is based upon equality of corporealities or, to some extent, equality of occupants.

Another discussion is rendered.

The Lord resembles other corporealities in occupancy if He is an occupant. Hence, it is essential for the Lord to be unlike other corporealities which leads to His being composite.

Previously, we could prove imperfection of this discussion when we proved commonness and equality of accidents do not necessarily require composition.

Second concept: Allah, the Exalted, is not a corporeality. This concept is adopted by the right people. Some of the ignorant adhered to the faith that Allah is a corporeality. Afterwards, they are engaged in discrepancies. Karramites, some of them in fact, claim affirming the Lord's existence by alleging His being a corporeality. Others claim that the Lord is an idiosyncratic

corporeality. So, we differ with the two only in ascribing a corporeality to the Lord. Corporalists, such as Muqatil Bin Suleiman and the like, claim the Lord's being a realistic corporeality that is composed of flesh and blood! Others believe in the Lord's being a light twinkling like a silvern coin, and being seven arms length. Others surpass when they claim the Lord's having the same appearance of mankind. They assert His being youth, beardless and hair braided, or a gray haired old man. Allah be Exalted against sayings of the wrong. This is nullified by the fact that the Lord will be an occupant if He is a corporeality. Previously we have provided evidences on nullity of this claim. Besides, each corporeality should be compound and contingent. The Lord will enjoy qualities of corporealities if He is a corporeality. If He enjoys the entire qualities, then concurrence of opposites will befall. If He enjoys some, this implies the baseless preference unless there is an extraneous factor. That equality represents the Lord's Essence's relation to these qualities as a whole, or His Essence's prerequisite to other factors for enjoying such qualities. By the same token, if the Lord is a corporeality, He must be finite. Hence, He must have certain amount and form. The Lord's exclusive amount and form should be occurred by an attributer that is out of His Essence, in order that a baseless preference will not be required. This implies the Lord's necessity for other factors, so that he will gain that exclusive form and amount…