



## The Jahmee Inquisition...

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

Brought to you by SalafiPublications.Com

### Chapter Four: Concerning the Difference Between The Ta'weel of Information (Khabar) and the Ta'weel of Request (Talb).<sup>1</sup>

Since speech is of two types: khabar (information) and talb (request [i.e. a command or a prohibition]), then the intent behind information is tasdeeq (i.e. for it to be accepted and believed), and [the intent behind] a request (i.e. a command or prohibition) is its fulfilment - [so when this is so], the intent behind the ta'weel of information is to accept and believe in that which is the subject of the information (mukhbar, i.e. that which has been informed about), and the intent behind the ta'weel of a request is to fulfil it, abide by it.

And every ta'weel which leads to the negation, divestment (ta'teel) of that which has been informed about (mukhbar), or which leads to opposition to the request (i.e. what has been commanded or prohibited), then it is a false ta'weel.

The intent here is to differentiate between ta'weel of the command and prohibition [on the one hand] and ta'weel of information. As for the first, then knowing it is obligatory upon every mukallaf (one who is bound by the Sharee'ah, i.e. sane, reached puberty), since it is not possible for him to fulfil it, except after knowing its ta'weel [i.e. what is actually intended and desired by it of action].

Sufyaan Ibn Uyainah said, "The Sunnah is the Ta'weel of the command and prohibition" [at-Tadmuriyyah of Shaykh ul-Islaam, p.60], and there is no difference between the Ummah that those who are firmly rooted in knowledge (ar-raasikheena fil-ilm) actually know this ta'weel. And those who are more firmly rooted in knowledge, are the ones who are most knowledgeable of it (i.e. the ta'weel of the commands and prohibitions).

<sup>1</sup> "As-Sawaa'iq al-Mursalah" (1/204-210). And when reading this chapter, always recall what is actually meant by "ta'weel" – that it is the correct and sound ta'weel that was explained earlier and by which the actual reality, outcome, fulfilment, or occurrence is intended, or its tafseer and bayaan.

And if the knowledge of this ta'weel was not possible to be known by man, and only Allaah knew it, then acting in accordance to its texts would be impossible. And how can this be, when acting by it is obligatory. Hence, it is necessarily so that there is in the Ummah those who know the ta'weel (i.e. of the command and prohibition), otherwise, all of the Ummah will be neglecting that which it has been commanded with.

And sometimes the meaning of text might be clear and manifest, and hence the Ummah does not differ concerning its ta'weel. And if difference occurs concerning the judgement in this matter, due to it being hidden from the one whom it has not reached, or due to some preventative barrier that he considers to allow (his non-acceptance of the ruling), or due to his forgetfulness, then in the likes of these matters, the opposer (to that which is clear and manifest) is pardoned, when his intent was to follow the truth, so Allaah will reward him for his intent.

And as for the one whom the text has reached, and he recalls it, and then there is nothing in the way of (accepting it), then it is not possible for him to oppose it, and nor will he be pardoned, in the sight of Allaah, for abandoning it for the saying of someone else, whoever that may be.

And sometimes the indication of the word might not be clear, and hence the actual intent behind it might be mixed up and confused with something else. Hence, there is a battle of contention between the people of ijtihaad (jurisprudence) concerning its ta'weel and due to the ambiguity, dispute has arisen. Hence, one person understands a particular meaning from it, and hence he explains it with that meaning, and then another person understands it with another meaning, and hence explains it according to that.

Yet both understandings could actually be correct, with the verse indicating this meaning and that meaning together. And the one who is firmly grounded in knowledge is the one who explains it with both meanings, and the one who affirms only one meaning and negates the other, he is less firmly grounded (in knowledge).

And it can also be the case that only one of the two meanings is intended, especially when they oppose each other. Hence, the one who is firmly grounded in knowledge is the one who arrives at this correct meaning. Hence, the ta'weel in this type is something that is commanded, and for which a person is rewarded, either with a single reward or two rewards.

And the Companions disputed concerning the ta'weel (i.e. explanation) of His, the Most High's saying, "**...or he in whose hands is the marriage tie, agrees to forego and give her full appointed Mahr...**" (al-Baqarah 2:237), is this in reference to the father, or the husband?

And they disputed concerning the ta'weel of His saying, "**...or you have been in contact (laamastum) with women...**" (an-Nisaa 4:43), is this referring to intercourse, or mere touching with the hand, or kissing and the likes?

And they disputed concerning the ta'weel of His saying, "**...nor when you are in a state of Janâba, (i.e. in a state of sexual impurity and have not yet taken a bath) except when travelling on the road...**" (an-Nisaa 4:43), is this in reference to the traveller who prays after making tayammum for his state of Janâba, or is it concerning the one who passes through the places in which prayer is performed, such as the mosque, while he is in a state of sexual impurity?

And they also disputed concerning "the near relatives", those who deserve something from the one-fifth of the booty, are they the near relatives of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), or are they the near relatives of the Imaam?

And they disputed concerning the saying of the Most High, "**So, when the Qur'an is recited, listen to it, and be silent...**" (al-A'raaf 7:204), does this include the recitation in the obligatory prayers or not?

And they also disputed concerning the ta'weel of His saying, "**And those of you who die and leave wives behind them, they (the wives) shall wait (as regards their marriage) for four months and ten days...**" (al-Baqarah 2:234), does the wording include the pregnant woman or is it for the non-pregnant woman only?

And they disputed concerning His saying, "**Forbidden to you (for food) are al-Maytatah (the dead)...**" (al-Maa'idah 5:3), does whatever has died in the sea enter into this (prohibition) or not?

And they disputed concerning "kalaalah" (in the verses relating to inheritance).

And they disputed concerning the Most High's saying, "**...if the deceased left brothers or (sisters), the mother has a sixth...**" (an-Nisaa 4:11).

And the many other examples like that (in those matters concerning the ta'weel of which they differed).

However, they did not dispute concerning the ta'weel of the verses relating to the Attributes and nor the Narrations pertaining to them, not in a single place. Rather, their word was united, as was the word of the Taabi'een after them, upon affirmation (of these texts) and passing them (as they have come), with the understanding of their meanings, and affirmation of their realities. And this shows, that of the two types [of speech, khabar (information) and talb (request)], they are the greater of the two in clarity and explanation, and that the concern with their explanation is more important, since it is from the completion of the actualisation of the two testimonies of faith. And affirming them is from the requirements of Tawheed. Hence, Allaah and His Messenger explained them clearly and sufficiently, in which no doubt or difficulty has occurred. And nor any difficulty which has caused those who are firmly rooted in knowledge to fall into dispute. And nor has any confusion occurred [about them].

And the one whose chest Allaah expands, and whose heart He illuminates, will know that the indication of these words to their meanings, is more clear and evident than the indication of many of the verses related to akhaam (judgements) to the particular meanings (intended by them). And for this reason, there is none who can actually understand the meanings of the verses pertaining to ahkaam except specialist people.

But as for the verses related to the Names and Attributes, then both the general and the specific people share in understanding them. I mean here understanding the foundational, base meaning, not the understanding of their true nature and how they actually are.

In light of this, [we see] that His saying, “...**until the white thread appears to you distinct from the black thread...**” caused difficulty (in understanding) to some of the Companions, until He explained it to them with His saying, “...of Fajr...” (al-Baqarah 2:187). However, His saying, “**And when My slaves ask you (O Muhammad) concerning Me, then (answer them), I am indeed near (to them by My Knowledge). I respond to the invocations of the supplicant when he calls on Me (without any mediator or intercessor).**” (al-Baqarah 2:186), did not cause any difficulty to them, just like the other examples from the verses related to the Attributes [did not cause any difficulty].

And the verse related to “kalaalah” became difficult upon ‘Umar Ibn al-Khattaab, however the beginning of [Surah] al-Hadeed (57), or the end of al-Hashr (59), or the beginning of Taa Haa (20) and whatever is like them from the verses related to the Attributes did not become difficult for him.

Also, some of the verses relating to the akhaam are general, and their explanation is known from the Sunnah, such as His, the Most High's saying, **"...he must pay a Fidyah (ransom) of either observing Saum (fasts) or giving Sadaqah or offering sacrifice..."** (al-Baqarah 2:196), so this is general concerning the amount of fasting, or feeding. Then the Sunnah explains it in that the fasting is for three days, and that the feeding is the feeding of six poor people, and that the sacrifice is of one sheep.

Likewise, His saying, **"...then let them perform Tawaf around the Ancient House (the Ka'bah)..."** is general concerning the tawaf, then the Sunnah explained it to be seven times.

And the examples of this are very many, such as the verse relating to stealing (cutting off of the hand), and verse related to zakaah, and the verse related to Hajj. Yet, there is nothing that is general in any of the verse related to the Attributes or the ahaadeeth, which would need additional, external clarification. Rather, the explanation is actually contained in these texts, even if the Sunnah comes with additional explanation and detail. Hence, the verses related to the Attributes are not general, ([do not] carrying many meanings), and [nor is it the case that] the intent behind them cannot be understood except by the Sunnah – in opposition to the verses related to akhaam (since they are general, can carry many meanings, and do require the Sunnah for the intent behind them to be made clear).

If it is said that all of this is actually refuted by what is already known that the verses relating to commands and prohibitions, the lawful and the unlawful are all decisive (muhkamah) and that the verses related to the Attributes are ambiguous (mutashaabihah), then how can the ambiguous be more clear than the decisive?

It is said in reply: At-Tashaabuh and al-Ihkaam are of two types: A type of tashaabuh and ihkaam which covers the whole of the Book. And a type of tashaabuh and ihkaam that is specific to some parts of it as opposed to others.

As for the first then it is like the Most High's saying, **"Allâh has sent down the best statement, a Book (this Qur'ân), its parts resembling each other in goodness and truth, oft-repeated..."** (az-Zumar 39:23)... and also His saying, **"...(This is) a Book, the Verses whereof are perfected (in every sphere of knowledge, etc.)..."** (Hud 11:1), and also His saying, **"Yaa Seen. By the Qur'an, full of Wisdom"** (Yaa Seen 36: 1-2).

And the second is like his saying, **"It is He Who has sent down to you (Muhammad) the Book (this Qur'ân). In it are Verses that are entirely clear,**

**they are the foundations of the Book; and others not entirely clear...**" (Aali Imraan 3:7).

So if you mean the first type when you say that the verses of the Attributes have tashaabuh, then yes, these verses resemble each other, they do not contradict each other, but these verses resemble each other. The verses of ahkaam are similar [they too resemble each other, are like each other, and do not contradict each other].

And if you mean that the intent behind them is confused and mixed with something that is not actually intended, then this, even though it might occur only to some people, is a relative matter. Hence, it would be from the mutashaabih in relation to him, not others.

And there is no difference in this between the verses of the Ahkaam and the verses of the Attributes, since the actual intent behind them could – to some people as opposed to others – be mixed with that which something else.

And the people have contended a great deal about al-muhkam (the decisive) and al-mutashaabih (the unclear) a great deal, but it is not known from any one of the Companions, ever, that the verses of the Attributes are from the mutashaabihaat (unclear). Rather, that which has been narrated from them indicates the exact opposite of this, so how can the verses of the Attributes be unclear in their view, when they have not contended or disputed in anything from them? And yet the verses of the ahkaam are decisive, yet contention occurred between them concerning some of these verses? In reality, this is the saying of some of the later people.

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

1. In the last tribunal, evidence was presented to the Jahmee in the stand that what is meant by “ta’weel” is to arrive at the actual and desired intent of the speaker behind his words, and to inform of this intent – that this is what is actually meant by ta’weel. And that devising and originating new applications and meanings for words used by the speaker is not counted as “ta’weel”.

2. In today’s tribunal, we continue to augment the evidence against the Jahmite – this time by illustrating the nature of the difference between making ta’weel of information (khabar) and ta’weel of request (talb). Since, speech is only two types. One in which information is being presented and one in which a request is being made, either a command or a prohibition. And hence, ta’weel can apply to both of these types of speech. Thus, we need to understand the difference between the two.

3. The objective behind this is so that the Prosecution can establish numerous matters to support the case of the faithful believers, the Sunni Affirmers. And these include:

- a) To show in accordance with the previous evidence submitted concerning the meaning and nature of the correct, sound ta’weel, the ta’weel of talb (request) requires action – and thus, the ta’weel of the texts of ahkaam (rulings) means arriving at the knowledge of what they actually require from the believer, and then fulfilling that requirement. And that fulfilment, is itself the ta’weel.
- b) That in relation to the ta’weel of talb (request) people may or may not arrive at what is correct and what is actually intended in the texts – based upon the degree and level of their being rooted in knowledge. And that is the basis upon which differences have occurred between the people in relation to the ahkaam. And then many examples are given of the differences amongst the Companions concerning certain verses in the Qur’an that contain injunctions for inheritance, hajj, purification, fasting, divorce, food and other matters. And that only the specialist, with a great deal of knowledge of the sciences of fiqh can attain at what is correct.
- c) That in contrast, the Companions did not differ concerning the ta’weel of the verses of the Attributes – and that both the specialist people and the common folk understood what was intended by these texts and by the one who spoke with them – which is to affirm the qualities of perfection, and to inform of his Attributes and Actions. And thus we do not find any contention amongst them regarding this.

- d) Additionally, that the verses related to rulings can sometimes be general and are only explained by the Sunnah – such as how the thief is to be punished, how many times to perform tawaaf around the Ka'bah, how to pay for the ransom during hajj, and also the affairs of zakaah. So in the likes of these affairs the verses that mention them are only general and the detail is actually found in the Sunnah, which explains and clarifies it. But as for the verses of the Attributes then we find that there is no contention concerning them firstly, and secondly, there is nothing general about them, and nor do they carry many meanings, and they do not require the Sunnah for the intent to be understood by them – rather we find that if the Sunnah does speak of what has been spoken of in the verses – then it only comes with additional detail and explanation.
- e) And all of this reinforces what the Sunni Affirmers are upon of making tasdeeq of that which Allaah has informed of Himself concerning affirmation of the Attributes – which is actually “ta'weel” – i.e. to know and affirm what is intended by the speech which contains mere information, namely, that Allaah has affirmed Attributes for Himself, and we affirm them in a manner that befits His Majesty, affirming them exactly as they came, without distorting them, or negating them, or likening them to the creation, or enquiring into their true nature – even though we affirm they have a reality to them – we do not know the nature this reality.
- f) Additionally, it shows that the argument of the Jahmites should be applied more so to the verses of the rulings, since there is a greater likelihood, that people arrive at what is not actually intended by the text and thus fall into error – and this is known and established by the mere fact of the existence of great differences in many of the affairs of worship and what relates to them of rulings and injunctions. And that it should not apply to the verses of the Attributes, since no contention is known about them amongst the Companions and nor the Taabi'een – rather this contention came from the Innovators, the Jahmites, and other than them after the era of the Companions.

4. Despite the truth of the above matter, the Jahmite Defence attempts to argue that the verses that are muhkamah are those that relate to injunctions and the lawful and unlawful, and that the verses of the attributes are mutashaabihah. To this, the Prosecution explains what the Jahmite has feigned ignorance of which is that tashaabuh (resemblance) and ihkaam (precision) can either apply to the whole of the Book of Allaah, collectively, or it can be applied to specific parts of the book – and that this will determine what is meant. Thus, if it is meant



that the verses of the Attributes have tashaabuh, then this is correct from the angle in that in relation to the sum whole of the Book and all of the other verses of the Attributes, there is resemblance, and coherence, without any contradiction between them – as this is one of the meanings of tashaabuh, as occurs in the Qur'aan. But if what is meant by tashaabuh is that the intent behind these verses might not be clear and it is possible that a person might arrive at something that is not intended or is falsehood and the likes – then this only occurs to some people, not all, and additionally this is a relative matter, not an absolute one. Then the Prosecution indicates that though people have disputed concerning the issue of muhkam and mutashaabih, it is clear and established that contention amongst the Companions occurred in the verses related to the rulings, but not in the verses related to the Attributes.

5. So the conclusion is that verses of the Attributes are from the muhkam, the clear and decisive verses, whose intent is clear and known – and they are not from the mutashaabihaat – as alleged by Jahmite Negators.

6. A final point worthy of being mentioned is that from an angle the verses relating to the Attributes are from the muhkam and from an angle they are from the mutashaabihaat. As for the muhkam aspect, then it is because they indicate realities, with words that are ambiguous in meaning – and the indication of a word to its meaning is an established matter to all people. Hence, these meanings are affirmed. However, the exact reality indicated by the word – then even though this reality is true, established and real – by virtue of the word indicating it – how exactly it is, or what it is, is not known – and hence from this angle it is from the mutashaabih – so that which is unknown is the kaifiyyah, not the ma'naa (meaning) indicated by the word.