

Deoband aur Bareli ke Ikhtilaf wa Niza' pur:

Fayslah Kun Munazarah

The Decisive Debate:
On the Deobandi and Barelwi
Conflict

*A thorough refutation of false
allegations made against the scholars
of Deoband in Husam al-Haramayn*

Mawlana Muhammad Manzur Nu'mani
(1905-1997)

PART 2

Translated by
MUFTI ZAMEELUR RAHMAAN

PUBLISHED BY
MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.
PO BOX 3393
PORT ELIZABETH
SOUTH AFRICA

Deoband aur Bareli ke Ikhtilaf wa Niza' pur:

Fayslah Kun Munazarah

The Decisive Debate: On the Deobandi and Barelwi Conflict

*A thorough refutation of false allegations made against the
scholars of Deoband in Husam al-Haramayn*

PART 2

Mawlana Muhammad Manzur Nu'mani
(1905-1997)

Translated by

MUFTI ZAMEELUR RAHMAAN

**PUBLISHED BY
MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.
PO BOX 3393
PORT ELIZABETH
SOUTH AFRICA**

Contents

The Powerful Testimony of Mawlawi ‘Abd al-Sami‘ and Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib which Absolves Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayhi)	136
Reply to Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib’s Second Objection to <i>al-Baraahin al-Qati‘ah</i>	143
Reply to Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib’s Third Objection against <i>al-Baraahin al-Qati‘ah</i>	154
Reply to Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib’s Fourth Objection against <i>al-Baraahin al-Qati‘ah</i>	155
The Slander against Hakim al-Ummah Hazrat Thanawi (Rahmatullah alayh) : Degrading the Status of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and its Reply	163
The Passage of <i>Hifz al-Imaan</i> and its Clarification	171
An Explanation of the Distortion of Khan Sahib Barelwi of the Passage of <i>Hifz al-Imaan</i>	172
More Explanation of the Passage from <i>Hifz al-Iman</i>	174
Proof of the most Important Premises of <i>Hifz al-Imaan</i> from the Statements of Khan Sahib himself	177
An Illustration of the Statement from <i>Hifz al-Imaan</i>	183
Addendum: The Author of <i>Hifz al-Imaan</i> ’s Search for Truth and his laudable Declaration of Rewording the Passage of <i>Hifz al-Imaan</i>	189
Appendix A: Summary of Mawlana Qasim Nanotwi’s Exegesis of the Phrase “Seal of the Ambiya” in <i>Tahzir al-Naas</i>	192
The Multiple Meanings of Finality	202
Conclusion	203
Appendix C: Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Saharanpuri’s Explanation of the Controversy on <i>Imkaanul Kizb</i>	209
Appendix D: BY MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.	222
THE QUESTION OF IMKAAN-E-KITHB	222
Appendix E: BY MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.	230
THE QUESTION OF AALIMUL GHAIB	230

The Powerful Testimony of Mawlawi `Abd al-Sami` and Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib which Absolves Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayhi)

The decision of the accuser in my favour is better

As Zulaykha declared the innocence of the Moon of Canaan¹

From our previous discussion it was clear that the only 'crime' committed by the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* was that, based on the proofs which Mawlawi `Abd al-Sami` presented in *al-Anwar al-Sati'ah*, he accepted the expanse of one particular science, meaning, knowledge of the world, for Satan and the Angel of Death, and he said this expanse was not established by text for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), but:

Such a crime this is that those of your city commit it!

Shortly after this discussion, these are the words of *al-Anwar al-Sati'ah*:

The supporters of the gathering of Milaad do not claim that the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) is present in all pure and impure, religious and irreligious, gatherings. The

¹ Meaning, the Prophet Yusuf (peace be upon him).

presence of the Angel of Death and Iblis is found in even more places than him, (in places) of purity and impurity, disbelief and belief.

Look! Even Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib did not write with such audacity and impunity. He [i.e. Mawlana Khalil Ahmad] referred to only comprehensive specific knowledge of the world which was not documented in the texts for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This like-minded brother of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, namely, Mawlawi `Abd al-Sami` Sahib, clearly says that the presence of the Angel of Death and Satan is in more places than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The abovementioned sentence of *al-Anwar al-Sati'ah* was in its first edition which was printed together with *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*; and also in the edition which was revised by Mawlawi `Abd al-Sami and thereafter published. Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib wrote about 4 pages of commendation in which he lavishly praised Mawlawi `Abd al-Sami Sahib and his *al-Anwar al-Sati'ah*. Therefore, Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib's successors and followers should answer:

1) Is Mawlawi `Abd al-Sami` a disbeliever because of this passage or not?

2) And where does Khan Sahib himself stand because of writing a commendation on it?

May Allah Ta'ala give me and you the faculty of insight. Do you see the miracle of the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh)? Khan Sahib himself was caught up in the very accusation he hurled at him.

I will now close this discussion, and I think it is appropriate as a conclusion to the discussion that I quote the statement of the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* (Rahmatullah alayh) in *al-Tasdiqaat li Daf' al-Talbisaat* [also known as *al-Muhannad 'ala al-Mufannad*] in which he answered this Satanic slander.

When Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib took the yield of his labour and efforts, i.e. the fatwa of disbelief (kufr), to the two noble Harams, and he solicited endorsements from the noble Ulama there, who were unaware of the reality of the situation, by deceiving them, and this initiated a discussion even in the two noble Harams, some of the people of knowledge sent 26 questions pertaining to beliefs to the revered Ulama of Deoband and Saharanpur. The answers to these questions were given by Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib, the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*. The answers to all 26 questions were sent to the Ulama of Haramain

Shareefain, Levant, Damascus, Halab, Egypt etc. for endorsement and confirmation. These noble Ulama and senior Muftis endorsed it and declared it sound. These answers along with the endorsements were printed. Its first edition with translation was printed as *al-Tasdiqat li Daf' al-Talbisaat* (Endorsements to Repel Distortions). Then after that, many editions of it were published.

The nineteenth answer is related to this Satanic slander of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib. I shall quote the exact question and its answer. Readers will notice that my explanation in this discussion is in fact an elaboration of this brief reply which the author of *Baraahin* himself gave during his lifetime:

Question Nineteen

Do you believe that Iblis, the accursed, is more knowledgeable than the Chief of Creation, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and that he has more comprehensive knowledge than him in absolute terms? Have you written this in a book? And how do you judge one who believes this?

Answer:

A review of this issue preceded from us, that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the most knowledgeable of creation in general, of the sciences, the judgement, the secrets and other than that from the Kingdom of the Heavens, and we

believe with certainty that one who says that so-and-so person is more knowledgeable than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has disbelieved. Our elders have given the verdict of disbelief for one who says that Iblis, the accursed, is more knowledgeable than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). So how is it possible that this matter is in a certain book we authored?

However, the concealment of some insignificant particular things from Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) due to his inattention to it does not cause any defect in his (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) position as the most learned, since it is established that he is the most knowledgeable of creation in the noble sciences that are fitting to his lofty station. Similarly, cognizance of most of the menial (and mundane) issues, due to the intensity of Iblis's attention to them, does not cause glory and perfection of knowledge in him, since this is not the criterion of virtue. Therefore, it is not correct to say that Iblis is more knowledgeable than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) just as it is not correct to say about a child who knows some particulars that he is more knowledgeable than an erudite research scholar in the sciences merely on account of those particulars being hidden from him. We have recited unto you the story of Hud-hud with Sulayman (upon our Nabi and upon him be peace) and his statement, "I comprehend that which you do not comprehend." (Qur'an 27:22) The records of Hadith and the books of exegesis are replete with

abundant examples of this which are well-known amongst people².

The physicians are agreed that Plato and Galen and their likes are from the most knowledgeable of physicians about the qualities of diseases and their states, despite their knowledge that maggots are more knowledgeable about states of filth, their taste and their qualities. Hence, the lack of Plato's and Galen's knowledge of these despicable states does not detract from them being the most learned. No intelligent person and not even a moron will be satisfied with the view that maggots are more knowledgeable than Plato, although they have more extensive knowledge than Plato about the states of filth.

The innovators of our lands affirm for the blessed Soul of the Nabi (upon it a million greetings and peace) all the sciences of the base, lowly things and the lofty virtuous things, saying that since he (upon him be peace) was the best of all creation, it is necessary that he should possess all of those sciences, every particular and every universal. We rejected the establishment of this matter using this corrupt analogy without a proof-text from the authoritative texts. Do you not see that every believer is more virtuous and more honourable than Iblis so following this logic it would be necessary that every person from the individuals of this

² In the ninth introductory principle, I presented five verses with the statements of the exegetes and fifteen hadiths on this matter. (Mawlana Manzur Nu'mani)

ummah possesses the sciences of Iblis, and it would be necessary that Sulayman (upon our Nabi and upon him be peace) knew that which Hud-hud knew, and that Plato and Galen had all the knowledge of maggots? These concomitants are absurd in their entirety as is obvious.

This is a summary of what we said in *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* in order to sever the veins of the foolish deviants and break the necks of the forging deceivers. Hence, our discussion about it was only in regards to some of these temporal particulars, and for this reason we used the demonstrative noun to indicate that the objective in affirmation and negation was those particulars, and nothing besides them. However, the iniquitous ones distort the speech and do not fear the reckoning of the Knowing King. We are certain that those who say that so-and-so individual is more knowledgeable than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is a disbeliever, as more than one of our respected 'Ulama stated. And whoever concocts about us that which we did not say, upon him is the burden of proof, and he should fear the interrogation before the Recompensing King. Allah is witness over what we say.

For Allah's sake, be fair! After this reply of the author of *Baraahin* himself, is there any room left for this slander? No, by Allah! Judgement will be on the Day of Judgement.

Reply to Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib's Second Objection to *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*

The second substantial objection of Khan Sahib Barelwi against the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh), was that he accepted encompassing knowledge for Satan and labelled its affirmation for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) *shirk*, whereas anything which is *shirk* when affirmed for any single creature is also *shirk* when affirmed for another being. Hence, it is as though the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* accepts Satan as a partner of Allah Azza Wa Jal.

If the respected readers carefully considered this allegation, it would be realised that this objection is more erroneous and more unfounded than the first, and its reality is pure dishonesty, just as Khan Sahib's fatwas are far from honesty and integrity.

The actual truth is that in *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, the affirmation of intrinsic knowledge for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was regarded as *shirk*. (*Intrinsic Knowledge – Knowledge not derived from any external source – Knowledge which is inherent. This Knowledge is exclusive with Allah Azza Wa Jal.*). Based on the proofs which the like-minded brother of Khan Sahib, Mawlawi 'Abd al-Sami', presented in *al-Anwar al-Sati'a*, he (i.e. Hazrat

Maulana Khalil) accepted only granted knowledge for Satan. (*i.e. Such knowledge granted to him by Allah Ta'ala*). The affirmation of intrinsic knowledge necessitates *shirk* as proven from Khan Sahib's own statements, quoted in the first introductory principle.

In *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, such statements are found in different places from which it is clearly understood that only 'granted knowledge' is conceded for Satan, and *shirk* was determined for intrinsic knowledge, which Khan Sahib himself does not dispute. However, it is unfortunate that based on his "revivalist integrity," ignoring all these statements from *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, he wrote explicitly:

He believes in encompassing earthly knowledge for Iblis, and when the mention of Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace), comes, he says, "This is *shirk*." *Shirk* is only to affirm a partner for Allah Almighty, so when affirming something for any of creation is *shirk*, it will definitely be *shirk* for all creation, since it is not possible for anyone to be a partner of Allah Almighty.

I completely agree with this principle of Khan Sahib, that whatever is *shirk* to affirm for any creation will certainly be *shirk* when affirmed for any other being

in this world. However, although I completely agree with this principle of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, applying it to the author of *Baraahin* is the particular act of Khan Sahib which is called deception or distortion. Apart from the difference between intrinsic and granted knowledge, here, Khan Sahib openly slandered the author of *Baraahin* saying that he accepted “encompassing knowledge” for Satan, but this is a lie that is devoid of even a trace of truth³. But it is unfortunate that in the Raza Khani group (*i.e. the Barelwi Qabar Pujaari sect - Mujlisul Ulama*) no truthful and uprighteous person comes to mind who will accept this revolting act of his leader as even an unintentional error, let alone deliberate deception.

The reality is that the like-minded brother of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, viz. Mawlawi ‘Abd al-Sami` Sahib, in proving expansive knowledge for Satan in *al-Anwar al-Sati`ah*, wrote:

In *al-Durr al-Mukhtaar* in the section of Salaah it is written that Satan stays with the sons of Adam in

³ When the phrase “encompassing knowledge of the world” is mentioned in *al-Baraahin al-Qati`ah*, it is addressing the knowledge which is wrongly affirmed for the nabi (peace and blessings be upon him) based on the invalid analogy with Satan and the Angel of Death, not the knowledge that is conceded for the latter. The knowledge that is conceded for the latter is what is described in the work being refuted, *al-Anwar al-Sati`ah*, quoted in the next paragraph above. Hence, the deception in Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan’s comment, “He believes in encompassing earthly knowledge for Iblis,” which Mawlana Manzur Nu`mani is highlighting here.

the day and his children stays with the offspring of Aadam in the night. 'Allamah al-Shaami wrote in its commentary that Satan stays with all the children of Aadam except those whom Allah saves. After this he wrote: "Allah gave him this power just as He gave the Angel of Death a similar power."

Thus, whatever knowledge Mawlawi 'Abd al-Sami Sahib has confirmed for Satan by such evidence, it was certainly accepted by Mawlana Khalil Sahib. If this is what Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib understands as encompassing knowledge of the world, this then is the quality (*and worthlessness – Mujlisul Ulama*) of his academic ability which can be judged by the people of knowledge.

What is the relationship between Satan's (*and the myriads of his progeny's – Mujlisul Ulama*) continuous presence with people and encompassing knowledge of world? His presence with people does not necessitate the knowledge of every leaf and every atom. (*Such limitless knowledge is the attribute of only Allah Azza Wa Jal as is confirmed by the Qur'aan: 'And by Him are the Keys of the Ghaib. He knows what is in the land and in the ocean. Not a leaf drops (from a tree) but He is aware. There is not a seed in the darkness of the earth nor anything moist nor anything dry, but it is recorded in a Clear Book.'*)

Shaitaan's worldly comprehensive knowledge does not take within its ambit the knowledge of every material particle, for such knowledge is exclusive with Allah Azza Wa Jal. His 'comprehensive' knowledge is applicable to the tricks of his trade. – Mujlisul Ulama)

And if the mind of Khan Sahib accepts this (*i.e. continuous presence*) as encompassing knowledge, even then, the first to believe in it, rather, the first to call others to believe in it, is the like-minded brother of Khan Sahib, Mawlawi 'Abd al-Sami Sahib, and the first to exemplify the fatwa of *kufr* and *shirk* is him, because it was he who proved this extent of knowledge for Satan with 'proofs', while Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh) only said "we accept." Anyhow, here Khan Sahib slandered the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* falsely by baselessly claiming that he believed in encompassing knowledge of the world for Iblis.

The second deception (*of the Qabar Puraari*) was that in *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, based on those evidences which Mawlawi 'Abd al-Sami Sahib presented, only granted knowledge (*i.e. knowledge acquired from Allah Ta'ala*) was accepted for Satan (by Hazrat Mawlana Khalil) while he labelled intrinsic knowledge (*i.e. such eternal and limitless Knowledge which is exclusively the Attribute of Allah Azza Wa Jal*) for (Rasulullah Rasulallah (Sallallahu

alayhi wasallam), *shirk*. Khan Sahib had certainly seen this strong distinction made between intrinsic and granted knowledge. Now I will present evidence for both these matters, that granted knowledge was conceded [for Satan and the Angel of Death], and *shirk* was determined for intrinsic knowledge.

Proving the first matter

In this discussion of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, on the fortieth line of page 50, it says: "The extent of the knowledge given to Satan..." Then four lines after that, it says: "And Satan and the Angel of Death who were given this extent in knowledge..." There is clarity in these two sentences that the knowledge which was conceded for Satan was knowledge granted by Allah Ta'ala.

Proving the Second Matter

First it should be understood that the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, in this discussion, refutes the logic that, since Satan and the Angel of Death have acquired this expanse in knowledge, therefore, because of the superiority of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), more knowledge of the world than this is axiomatically inherent in him. It is this assumption that the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* called *shirk*.

In the first line of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* from where this discussion begins, it says:

The entire Ummah has the belief that affirming even one iota of knowledge more than the quantity of knowledge which Allah Azza Wa Jal favoured for and imparted to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and all creation, is *shirk*. This is derived from all books of the Shari`ah.

It is known from this text that the opinion of the author of *Baraahin* is that it is only *shirk* to affirm such knowledge for creation which has not been bestowed by Allah Azza Wa Jal. Such knowledge is termed "intrinsic knowledge." In the same discussion, shortly afterwards, he said:

The belief of the Ahl al-Sunnah is that no attribute of Allah Azza Wa Jal (*in its Intrinsic eternal state*) can be found in any created being. Whatever He bestows of His attributes to man, are mere shadows. Man's attributes are in entirety reliant on Allah Azza Wa Jal. A created attribute is not an intrinsic quality. Furthermore, there can not be even an atom's increase in whatever quantity of knowledge Allah Ta'ala has bestowed to anyone. The extent of knowledge which Satan and the Angel of Death have, cannot increase by virtue of their own ability. (*i.e. By independent acquisition.*)

Then he said:

The quantity of the knowledge of the hidden which was acquired by Hazrat Khidhr (Alayhis salaam), had been bestowed to him by Allah Azza Wa jal. Khidhr is not able to increase on it. Similarly, Hazrat Musa (Alayhis salaam) despite his superiority over Khidhr – Alayhis salaam), lacked it (i.e. the knowledge of the hidden which was bestowed to Khidhr – Alayhis salaam). Thus, Nabi Musa (Alayhis salaam) and Khidhr (Alayhis salaam) are equal in their inability to independently generate knowledge.

From this it should be clear that the understanding that a superior person, due to his superiority, can gain an increase in an attribute of perfection over an inferior person without the bestowal of Allah Azza Wa Jal, is incorrect. After proving this statement, the author of *Baraahin* says:

The upshot is: based on the states of Satan and the Angel of Death regarding their knowledge of the places of the world, as is understood from the evidences of Mawlawi 'Abd al-Sami' Sahib, to affirm encompassing knowledge of the world (i.e. intrinsic knowledge) for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) without absolute textual evidence, but on the basis of corrupt analogy, is *shirk*. The analogy posits that since Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the most superior being in creation, he possesses intrinsic knowledge.

This expanse for Satan and the Angel of Death (meaning, with Allah’s command having knowledge of many places of the world) is proven by text (meaning, those texts which Mawlawi ‘Abd al-Sami’ Sahib presented). However, for the expansive knowledge of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) – i.e. assumed intrinsic knowledge on the basis of corrupt analogy and pure opinion -- which decisive text (of the Qur’aan or Hadith) is there, on the basis of which all texts are rejected and *shirk* is established?

The end result is that the sections before and after the passage in question clearly show that the author of *Baraahin* is speaking only about intrinsic knowledge, and this is what he termed *shirk*.

Thus far, I proved my claim on the basis of implications of the context. Although these indications are not less than clear and explicit statements, I shall, nonetheless, now present a clearer statement from the author of *Baraahin* in which, he explains with complete clarity that his discussion pertains only to intrinsic knowledge (*which is Allah’s eternal, uncreated attribute*), and not to granted knowledge. In this very discussion, several sentences after the sentence quoted by Khan Sahib, Hazrat Mawlana Khalil states:

This discussion is about establishing such knowledge (*i.e. all-encompassing eternal knowledge*) for him intrinsically, as is the belief of the ignorant. If he believes that by Allah's Will Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is present, it will not be *shirk*, but without proof of Shari'ah, having this belief is incorrect. (*In other words, to believe that something is possible by the Will of Allah, is valid. But to affirm a specific state/attribute to any one without absolute proof of the Shariah, is erroneous and not permissible, despite the possibility. – Mujlisul Ulama*)

Now ponder! The author of *Baraahin* clearly explained that the ruling of *shirk* is only in the situation where any person affirms intrinsic knowledge for him (*i.e. for Rasulullah –Sallallahu alayhi wasallam*). In the first introductory principle, I quoted the references of *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah* and *Khalis al-I'tiqad* from the statements of Khan Sahib himself that whoever affirms any share of intrinsic knowledge, even if "less than, less than" an atom for any one besides Allah, he has committed *shirk*.

Thus, Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh) is not guilty of a 'crime' in which Khan Sahib does not have an equal share. And assuming this clear statement was not in *Baraahin* and these implications were not in the context which

compelled us to accept the intent as intrinsic knowledge, then too, it would never have been permissible in any way for Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib to read into this place the intent of comprehensive granted knowledge. In *Khalis al-I'tiqad*, on page 28, as a general principle, he wrote:

In the verses, hadiths and statements of `ulama which condemn the affirmation of knowledge of unseen for others, most certainly these two types (intrinsic or encompassing knowledge) are intended.

Thus in *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, the knowledge which is labelled *shirk* should be understood as intrinsic or completely encompassing knowledge. (*This is the logical conclusion*). But it is unfortunate that for the crave of *takfir*, he forgot his own written principles. It is true that:

Your love for something blinds and deafens.

Thus far, Khan Sahib's second objection has been answered, the upshot of which is that he criticised [*al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*] for describing as *shirk* the very knowledge that was affirmed for Satan whereas, the reality is contrary to this, as granted knowledge was conceded for Satan and *shirk* was applied to affirmation of intrinsic knowledge. The difference is quite evident.

Reply to Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib's Third Objection against *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*

The third objection of Khan Sahib Barelwi against the author of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*, Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh), was that:

He demands for the knowledge of Muhammad (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace) an absolute text, and he will not be satisfied with it until it is absolute (*qat'i*). However, when he comes to negating his (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace) knowledge, in this explanation on page 46, six lines before this disgraceful [statement of] disbelief, he himself adheres to a baseless hadith.

Regarding the classification of the narration (*which the Bid'ati labelled baseless*), I shall if Allah wills, explain it in the answer to the fourth objection. Here I only wish to answer Khan Sahib's academic fallacy that "he demands for affirmation (*of Rasulullah's knowledge*) an absolute text, but for negation (*of knowledge*) he presents one narration."

If only, before presenting this objection, Khan Sahib had first carefully considered the question: Did the author of *Baraahin*, present those hadiths as a claimant producing evidence, or as an objector and opponent? He should have also researched the

difference between these two functions in the principles of debate.

The reality is that the author of *Baraahin* (Rahmatullah alayh) demanded an absolute text for affirmation (*i.e. for the affirmation of intrinsic knowledge to Rasulullah – sallallahu alayhi wasallam*). For establishing belief, an absolute text is undoubtedly necessary. Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib himself accepts this in principle (see *Inba' al-Mustafa*).

However, in refutation of analogy (*qiyaas*), let alone hadiths, even another analogy can be produced (see *Munazarah Rashidiyyah* and its commentaries).

Reply to Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib's Fourth Objection against *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah*

The fourth objection was that the author of *Baraahin* was deceptive in quoting, and the narration which Hazrat Shaykh 'Abd al-Haqq Muhaddith Dihlawi (Rahmatullah alayh) refuted after quoting, was quoted [by Mawlana Khalil Ahmad] while attributing it to him, and there was no mention of the refutation. Thus, it is as though he selectively quoted "Don't approach Salah" [from the Qur'an] and omitted "while you are drunk."

I ask the spiritual descendants of Khan Sahib to forgive me, as I am forced to say here that since this act (*of deception*) is normal for him, he projects this onto others, but he should know that such tactics are only requisites of the people of falsehood (*especially those who worship graves*). The Seekers of Truth have no need for it. However, since this objection of Khan Sahib is not related to the subject of *takfir*, I shall be brief in my reply.

Firstly take note of the words used by the author of *Baraahin*. On page 51 on the seventh line he wrote:

And Shaykh 'Abd al-Haq narrates (the Hadith) that: "I do not even have knowledge of what is behind a wall."

Here the author of *Baraahin* did not give the name of any particular book of the Shaykh. So if this narration is mentioned in any book of the Shaykh without criticism and refutation then the reference of the author of *Baraahin* will be absolutely correct, and it will be understood that he quoted from there. Now take note of the last hadith of *al-Fasl al-Thaalith of Mishkat al-Masabih, Bab Sifat al-Salah*:

Narrated from Abu Hurayrah: He said: Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) prayed Zuhr with us, and in the last rows was a man who ruined [his] prayer. When he made *salaam*, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) called him and said: "

Do you not fear Allah? Do you not see how you pray? You think that something you do is hidden from me. By Allah! Indeed I see from behind me [in Salaah] as I see in front of me. (Ahmad narrated it)

Hazrat Shaykh 'Abd al-Haqq Dihlawi (Allah have mercy on him) while commenting on this hadith on page 392 of *Ashi'at al-Lam'at* wrote:

Know that Rasulullah's (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) vision from behind was a miraculous form (*kharq al-'adah*), by means of revelation or inspiration, and it was only an occasional feat. It was not permanent. This is supported by the hadith that when the blessed camel of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was lost, he did not know its whereabouts. So the hypocrites said: "Muhammad says that he receives news from the heavens, and he has no news of the whereabouts of his camel!" Then Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "By Allah! I know not but what my Rabb has taught me. Now, my Rabb has informed me that it is in a certain place, and its rein is tied to the branch of a tree." Also Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "I am a man. I do not know what is behind this wall," meaning, without being informed by the Allah Azza Wa Jal. (*Ashi'at al-Lam'at*, 1:392)

Here, the Shaykh quoted the narration and did not mention any criticism of it. Therefore, the reference

of Hazrat Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullaah alayh) is absolutely correct. In fact if considered carefully, from this statement of the Shaykh, it is known that the narration is worthy of consideration according to him because here the Shaykh presented it to support his claim, and it is inconceivable that the Shaykh would present a narration as proof for his claim if he believed that it to be completely baseless. Thus his quotation of this narration in the context of proof is clear evidence that it is reliable according to him.

The question remains that the Shaykh in one section of *Madarij al-Nubuwwah* said regarding this narration that "it is baseless." Although answering this question is not our responsibility, nevertheless, in order to remove confusion from the readers, I will comment briefly on it.

The reality is that even the well-known authority of Hadith, Hafiz Ibn al-Jawzi quoted this narration without its chain of transmission (*Sanad*) in some of his Kitaabs notwithstanding his meticulous appraisal of Ahaadith, expertise in this science, and deep insight. He exercised utmost caution in accepting and rejecting Hadith narrations. His citation of a narration without criticism is sufficient evidence for acceptance of the Hadith. Thus, the Shaykh (Rahmatullah alayh) accepted the narration to be reliable, and in the abovementioned passage

of *Ashi'at al-Lamat* presented it as support for his claim.

However, since no chain has been transmitted for this narration, he averred in *Madarij al-Nubuwwah*, that “it is baseless,” meaning, it has no chain. By this, the contradiction in the Shaykh’s speech is repelled. Indeed, it is a strange coincidence that even in the appraisal of Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalani regarding this very narration, there is an apparent contradiction. Thus, al-Qastallani in *al-Mawahib al-Ladunniyyah* quotes from al-Sakhawi’s (Rahmatullah alayh) *al-Maqasid al-Hasanah*:

Our teacher, Shaykh al-Islam, Ibn Hajar said regarding the hadith, “*I do not know what is behind this wall of mine*,” “It has no basis.” However, in *Talkhis Takhrij Ahadith al-Rafi'i* commenting on al-Rafi'i’s statement in *al-Khasa’is (on this Hadith)*, “*And he sees from behind his back as he sees from his front*”:

“It is in the two *Sahihs*, etc. from the Hadith of Anas and others. The hadiths transmitted in this regard are restricted to the condition of Salaah, and by this it can be reconciled with his (i.e. Rasulullah’s) statement: ‘*I do not know what is behind this wall of mine.*’” This indicates it is transmitted.

'Allamah al-Zurqaani, after quoting this passage of Hafiz al-Sakhawi (Rahmatullah alayh), said in *Sharh al-Mawahib*:

This statement, "It has no basis" is a contradiction. It is possible that by this is meant that the defect is not such which is worthy for consideration, as it was cited without chain. Therefore, it does not mean that that the narration is false.

Thus, the explanation that I gave for the apparent contradictions of the Shaykh (Rahmatullah alayh) is exactly how 'Allamah al-Zurqani explained it [the apparent contradiction] of Hafiz Ibn Hajar.

Whatever I have presented regarding the Shaykh's comment, viz. "it is baseless", was beyond my obligation. It was only my responsibility to find in a Kitaab of the Shaykh mention of this narration without criticism. This, I have shown. The narration is reliable according to him. I have eliminated the apparent contradiction between his two statements. So all praise and thanks is due to Allah!

Apart from what has been explained, there is no doubt that the narration is true in its meaning. Many authentic Ahaadith support its content. For example, in the two *Sahihs* and *Sunan al-Nasa'i*, it is narrated from Zaynab, the wife of Ibn Mas'ud (Radhiyallahu anhu), that she came to the door of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to ask a

question about Zakaat. When she reached there, another Ansaari wife was standing there with the same need. Then Hazrat Bilaal (Radhiyallahu anhu) came to them and she said to him: "Go to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and inform him that two women are at the door asking: 'Is their charity permissible on behalf of their husbands and the orphans in their care,' and don't inform him who we are." So Bilaal asked him, and Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said to him "Who are they?" he said: "A woman from the Ansaar and Zaynab." He said to him "Which Zaynab?" He said: "The wife of 'Abdullah [ibn Mas'ud]." He said: "For them are two rewards: the reward of [maintaining good] relations, and the reward of charity."

Thus, if Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was aware of all matters behind a wall, what was the need for him to ask Hazrat Bilaal (Radhiyallahu anhu) about the names of the women? He furthermore, enquired, "which Zaynab?" This is clear proof that he was not aware of everything behind a wall.

Furthermore, in the last days of his life in the state of illness, in order to see his congregation, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) went to the door of his blessed chamber, and opening the curtain, he saw those praying in congregation in the

Musjid. This is mentioned in the authentic Kutub. He repeatedly and specifically asked during the final days: "Are the people performing Salaat?" Yet between the Sacred Masjid and the holy chamber was only one wall. This is clear proof that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not know everything behind a wall. Thus, the narration in a hadith, "By Allah, I do not know what is behind this wall of mine", is not at all surprising. There is nothing repulsive about it? No one can deny the correctness of the meaning of this narration.

Furthermore, if all of this ignored, every unbiased person will accept that the author of *Baraahin* presented this narration in the context of negating intrinsic knowledge, because we have established from the statements of the author of *Baraahin* himself that his entire discussion pertains to intrinsic knowledge. Thus he understood this narration as a negation of intrinsic knowledge. In fact, we have established from the statements of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib that he, himself too does not profess intrinsic knowledge for anyone besides Allah. On the contrary, whoever affirms even one atom of intrinsic knowledge for any person besides Allah or even less than less than that, he is according to him a disbeliever and polytheist. Based on this, this narration is correct in its meaning according to Khan Sahib too, and he himself has

stated: "In the verses, hadiths and statements of 'ulama which condemn the affirmation of the knowledge of unseen for others, these two types (intrinsic or encompassing knowledge) are definitely intended." (*Khalis al-I'tiqad*, p. 28)

Thus, since Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Sahib (Rahmatullah alayh) understood this as negating intrinsic knowledge, what room for objection does Khan Sahib or his intellectual descendants have?

The inquiry in the statements of *al-Baraahin al-Qati'ah* is now complete. I have completed answering, with Allah's help, the four objections of Khan Sahib. I shall now commence the inquiry into *Husaam al-Haramayn* regarding the statements of *Hifz al-Imaan*.

The Slander against Hakim al-Ummah Hazrat Thanawi (Rahmatullah alayh) : Degrading the Status of Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and its Reply

With regards to Hakim al-Ummah Hazrat Mawlana Ashraf 'Ali Sahib Thanawi (Rahmatullah alayh), Mawlana Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib Bareilwi wrote on pages 20-1 of *Husaam al-Haramayn*:

From the seniors of these Satanic Wahhabis is another man from the scions of Gangohi called Ashraf 'Ali al-Thanawi. He compiled a small treatise

that does not reach four pages and stated clearly therein that the equivalent of the Messenger of Allah's (Allah bless him and grant him peace) knowledge of the unseen has been acquired by every child and every madman, rather every animal and every beast. These are his accursed words:

“If the assessment of the knowledge of unseen for the holy essence of the Nabi is valid as said by Zayd, it will be asked: What did he intend by this – is it a portion of the unseen or all of it? If he intended a portion, then what speciality is there in this for the Revered Rasool, for indeed the equivalent of this knowledge of unseen has been acquired by Zayd and 'Amr, rather every child and madman, rather all animals and beasts? And if he intended all whereby no part is excluded, its invalidity is established by narration and reason.”

I say: Look at the effects of the seal of Allah Almighty – how he equates [the knowledge of] the Messenger of Allah (Allah Almighty bless him and grant him peace) to [the knowledge of] such-and-such and such-and-such!

Here, I cannot give any answer to those ghastly and disgusting words which Khan Sahib has attributed to Hazrat Hakim al-Ummah. Its word-for-word retort can be given by those vulgar people who have also reached the status of “revivers” in the art of

vulgarity and abuse. I am completely free of and helpless in this craft. The Wise Qur'an states: "Tell My servants that they should speak that which is best. Surely, Satan creates discord among them. Indeed, Satan is an open enemy to mankind." (17:53) Elsewhere (in the Qur'aan) Allah Ta'ala addressed Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam): "Repel evil with that which is best." (23:96) Thus, according to this Qur'anic imperative, in reply to this abuse and vulgarity of Khan Sahib, I will only offer [this plea] to Allah Azza Wa Jal: O My Rabb! Khan Sahib has passed on from this world. Now save his successors from this evil practice which is a shame and humiliation in this world and deprivation and loss in the afterlife.

Only Allah guides to the path of righteousness. It seems that when writing *Husaam al-Haramayn*, Khan Sahib took an oath that he will not be truthful and honest in any act. Ponder: What is the actual statement of *Hifz al-Imaan* and its true meaning, and what is the accursed calumny of Khan Sahib's slander, viz., – that the extent of the knowledge of the unseen which is possessed by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is also possessed by every child and madman, nay every animal and every beast (Allah forbid!)? If before broadcasting his slander of disbelief, Khan Sahib had quoted the entire text of *Hifz al-Imaan* without mutilation,

readers would have known the truth, then there would not have been the need for this refutation.

Hifz al-Imaan is a short treatise by Hakim al-Ummah (Rahmatullah alayh)⁴ in which are three topics. The third topic is: “Is calling Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), ‘knower of the *ghayb*’ (*Aalimul Ghaib*) correct or not?” It is clear that the discussion of Mawlana was not regarding whether or not Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had knowledge of the *ghayb*, and if so, how much? Rather, here, Mawlana only wanted to establish that it cannot be said that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is “knower of the *ghayb*” (*Aalimul Ghayb*). There is a vast difference between the two issues.

An attribute which belongs to a being may not be utilized in an unrestricted manner for that being. In the Noble Qur’an, Allah is described as “the Creator of all things” (Qur’an 6:102, 13:16, 39:62, 40:62). It is the belief of all Muslims that everything in the world, small or big, great or insignificant, was created by Allah Ta’ala. However, despite this, our jurists have clearly stated that it is impermissible to call him “the Creator of monkeys and swine.” Likewise, in the Noble Qur’an, “farming” is

⁴ Mawlana Ashraf ‘Ali al-Thanaawi (d. 1943) was alive at the time of writing this piece and when it was first published in 1933 CE.

attributed to Him (Qur'an 56:64), yet it is incorrect to describe Him as a "farmer". Similarly, the Arabs use the term *rizq* (sustenance) in general for the provisions and positions which the commander endows to the men of his army. Thus in many books of Arabic language the sentence "the commander sustained the army" is written, although it is incorrect to refer to the commander as *raziq* or *razzaq* (sustainer). It is narrated by Hazrat 'A'ishah Siddiqah (Radhiyallahu anha) that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would mend his own shoes and milk his camels himself.

Despite this, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) may not be referred to as a cobbler or milkman. The reality is that in some instances despite the existence of an attribute in someone or some being, it may not be used in an unqualified manner for that person/being.

I hope that from this introduction my readers have understood that the question of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) possessing knowledge of *ghayb* or not is a separate discussion, apart from the issue of the permissibility or impermissibility of using the designation of *Aalimul Ghayb* ("The knower of the *ghayb*") for him. There is no necessary correlation between the two.

Now understand that the objective of Hazrat Mawlana (Rahmatullaah alayh) in *Hifz al-Imaan* was only to establish that it is impermissible to use the title of *Aalimul Ghaib* (Knower of the *Ghayb*) in an unrestricted, all-embracing manner for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and to prove that this designation (*Aalimul Ghayb*) may not be used for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in the way that the titles "the Seal of the Ambiya," "the Chief of the Messengers," "the Mercy to all Worlds" etc. etc. are used. In support of this claim, Mawlana presented two proofs.

The upshot of the first evidence is that in the general usage of the Shari`ah, the title of *Aalimul Ghayb* (Knower of the *Ghayb*) applies to only The Being who knows the matters of the *ghayb* intrinsically, without having acquired it via any medium. This is the exclusive distinction of Allah Azza Wa Jal. If any other being is called "knower of the *ghayb*," in this meaning, it will create the impression that the other being besides Allah Ta'ala also possesses knowledge of *ghayb* intrinsically, i.e. without having acquired it from any medium. This is s an explicit belief of *shirk*. Thus, to refer to anyone besides Allah Ta'ala as "Knower of the *Ghayb*" is incorrect as it confuses it with a belief of *shirk*.

This is why in the Qur'an and Hadith such dubious words which could create misunderstanding are forbidden. For example, the Qur'an Shareef prohibits addressing Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with the word, *ra'ina*⁵ (2:104), and the Hadith prohibits calling one's servants "my slaves" because these words are suggestive of a false meaning even if it is not the intention of the speaker. This is a summary of Hazrat Mawlana Thanawi's first evidence.

However, since Khan Sahib did not object to this proof of Mawlana Thanawi – in fact, in many places of his book *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah*, Khan Sahib states approximately the same contention in complete detail, there is no need for me to present any justification or support for it.

Now, I will turn my attention to the second evidence of Mawlana. Khan Sahib claimed, "He stated clearly therein that the equivalent of the knowledge of Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) regarding the unseen realities has been acquired by every child and every madman, in fact, by every animal."

⁵ In its original Arabic usage *ra'ina* means, "Observe us," but with a slightly different pronunciation it can be construed as an insult which some of the Jews exploited by "twisting their tongues" (Qur'an 4:46) to outwardly express the commonly understood meaning while intending insult and denigration. Consequently, the believers were forbidden from using it.

But before quoting the original passage of *Hifz al-Imaan*, in order to facilitate the understanding of the readers, I feel it will be appropriate to mention that in this second proof, Mawlana divided the matter into two options for the opponent. Then he proved the inaccuracy and falsity of both.

The upshot of the second proof of Mawlana is that a person, for example Zayd, uses the designation of *Aalimul Ghayb* (Knower of the *Ghayb*) for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) without qualifying the term. This entails one of two meanings. One: Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has partial knowledge of the *ghayb* or he has total and all-encompassing knowledge of the *ghayb*. The second meaning is obviously false because narrational (Naqli) and rational (Aqli) proofs negate all-encompassing, intrinsic *Ilm of the Ghayb* for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In fact, even Mawlana Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib himself concedes this.

The first meaning, i.e. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is *Aalimul Ghayb* because he is aware of some *ghayb*, is also erroneous and baseless. It is obvious that in this scenario it would entail that every person, rather even animals, can be called “knower of the *ghayb*” because some matters of the *ghayb* are possessed by all. Every animate being necessarily has some knowledge which is hidden

from others. On this basis it follows that everyone may be called “knower of the *ghayb*”, but this is rationally, scripturally and customarily, that is, in every way, erroneous. This is a summary of Mawlana’s entire argument. Now, I will present the original passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* with clarification [in parenthesis].

The Passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* and its Clarification

After explaining the first scenario, Mawlana writes:

If according to Zayd, it is valid to predicate the knowledge of *ghayb* to Rasulullah - Sallallahu alayhi wasallam - (i.e. meaning, calling Rasulullah - Sallallahu alayhi wasallam - the “Knower of the *Ghayb*” in the all-encompassing meaning), then he (i.e. this Zayd) will be asked: “Does this refer to some *ghayb* or total *ghayb*?”

Here, Hazrat Mawlana asked this person (i.e. Zayd) who called Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) the “Knower of the *Ghayb*” : “On what basis do you refer to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as “knower of the *ghayb*”? Is it because Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has some knowledge of *ghayb*? Or is it because he has total knowledge of *ghayb*?)

If some knowledge of *ghayb* is intended (meaning, because of some knowledge of *ghayb*, you called Rasulullah= Sallallahu alayhi wasallam - the "Knower of the *Ghayb*", and your principle is that whoever has some knowledge of *ghayb* you refer to him as "Knower of the *Ghayb*"), then what distinction is there in this (meaning of knowledge of merely some *ghayb* for Rasulullah -Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Such (partial) knowledge of the *ghayb* (because of which you believe it is necessary to call someone "knower of the *ghayb*,") is available to Zayd and 'Amr, rather every child and madman, rather even all animals and quadrupeds because every person has knowledge of some matter which is hidden from a second person. Thus, everyone should be called "knower of the *ghayb*" (based on your principle that because of mere knowledge of some *ghayb*, a person may be called "knower of the *ghayb*").

An Explanation of the Distortion of Khan Sahib Barelwi of the Passage of *Hifz al-Imaan*

This was the original passage of Hazrat Mawlana, and this was its clear and explicit intent which I have presented. However, Khan Sahib, in his commentary, gave it such a meaning that even Satan after listening to it will seek refuge. In this respect, a brief description of Khan Sahib's distortion is as follows:

1. The word *aysa* (such/like this) appears in the passage of *Hifz al-Imaan*, and its intent is some knowledge of *ghayb* in a specific. It does not refer to the blessed knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). However, Khan Sahib claimed that the intention is the blessed knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Hence he wrote: "He stated clearly therein that the equivalent of the Messenger of Allah's knowledge of the unseen has been acquired by every child and every madman, rather every animal and every beast."

2. The original passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* was as follows: "Such knowledge of the *ghayb* is available to Zayd and 'Amr, rather every child and madman, rather even all animals and quadrupeds; because every person has knowledge of certain issues which are hidden from others." Khan Sahib totally omitted this underlined sentence in the middle of his quote because it is clearly understood from it that the knowledge that is conceded for Zayd, 'Amr etc. is some knowledge of *ghayb* in a specific sense, not (Allah forbid!) the blessed knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

3. After the abovementioned passage of *Hifz al-Imaan*, the conclusion of the *ilzami* argument⁶ is

⁶ Meaning, an argument in the form of presenting an absurdity as the necessary consequence of an opponent's claim in order to refute the claim itself.

worded as: “then all should be called ‘knower of the *ghayb*’.” Khan Sahib also omitted this, because from this sentence it is completely clear that the discussion of the author of *Hifz al-Iman* was not about the extent of the knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Rather, his discussion was only about the unqualified usage of the title of “knower of the *ghayb*.” After having realised this, the reality of the entire scheme of Khan Sahib is laid bare.

Anyhow, in order to declare the author of *Hifz al-Imaan* a disbeliever, Khan Sahib committed this deception, and those sentences from which the meaning of the passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* can easily be understood were completely omitted in the middle, and he only quoted the first and last part of the passage. Shrewdly, in the Arabic translation of the passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* which he presented to the Ulama of the two Harams, he gave no indication from which those revered Ulama could have understood that in the middle of this passage some sentences were missing. Our readers can see this handiwork in the Arabic passage of Khan Sahib’s *Husaam al-Haramayn*, which I quoted from at the beginning of this discussion with its exact wording.

More Explanation of the Passage from *Hifz al-Iman*

Although the dishonesty of Khan Sahib and the condition of his fatwa will be understood by the readers from this explanation, to explain further, I wish to shed more light on its particular parts.

The upshot of the second evidence of Hazrat Hakim al-Ummah was this:

There are two scenarios in which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) can be called "Knower of the *Ghayb*." One is that, because of full *ghayb*, he is called "Knower of the *Ghayb*." The second is that, because of some *ghayb*, [he is called so]. The first option is false because the absence of his knowledge of all *ghayb* is established by narrational and rational proofs. And the second option is false because some knowledge of *ghayb* is possessed even by insignificant things in this world. Based on this principle, everyone should be called "knower of the *ghayb*", but this is baseless in every way.

If the parts of this proof are broken down, it will be realised that its basic premises are as follows:

1. So long as a principle does not subsist in a certain being, its morphological derivative [for example, the active participle] cannot be unqualifiedly used for it. For example, a person can be called "knower" when the attribute of knowledge is found in him; a person is called "ascetic" in whom the attribute of asceticism subsists; and a person is

called “writer” who has achieved the ability of writing; and other such examples.

2. With the cause, its effect must be found. It is not possible that the cause has no effect.

3. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not acquire knowledge of all *ghayb*.

4. Generally some awareness of the unseen is available to even those who are not Ambiya, and even to non-humans.

5. Every Zayd and 'Amr cannot be called “knower of the *ghayb*.”

6. The falsity of the consequence (*lazim*) necessitates the falsity of that which it is consequential upon (*malzum*), meaning, if the acceptance of something necessarily leads to an absurdity, it is itself absurd.

From these premises, the first two and the last two are rationally accepted principles, and obvious. No sane person in the world will dispute this. I shall establish the third and fourth premises from the clear statements of Khan Sahib.

The accuser is a thousand times weightier than your witness

Proof of the most Important Premises of *Hifz al-Imaan* from the Statements of Khan Sahib himself

The third premise of Hazrat Mawlana Thanawi was that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not acquire full knowledge of the *ghayb*. Now note its proofs from the statements of the Barelwi learned man:

Khan Sahib wrote on page 25 of *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah*:

For indeed we do not claim that he (Allah bless him and grant him peace) had encompassed all the things known to Allah (Glorified and Exalted is He), for indeed it is impossible for creation.

And in the same *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah*, he writes:

And we do not affirm through the bestowal of Allah Almighty also but a part. (*al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah*, p 28)

And this Khan Sahib writes on page 34 of *Tamhid e Iman*:

Even the knowledge of the Nabi (Allah bless him and grant him peace) does not encompass all things known to the Divine Being.

Furthermore, on page 34 of this *Tamhid* is written:

And encompassing knowledge of all things known to the Divine Being is also false and against most scholars. (*i.e. if attributed to others besides Allah Ta'ala*).

The import, nay the objective, of all these passages of Khan Sahib is that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not acquire knowledge of all *ghayb*. The acquisition of detailed knowledge of all the unseen is impossible for him, nay for all creatures, and believing in this is false. This is precisely the third premise in Mawlana Thanawi's evidence. With praise to Allah, from the explicit statements of Khan Sahib, this has become clear as daylight. So all praise is due to Allah.

The fourth premise of the evidence of Mawlana Thanawi under inspection was that generally awareness of some unseen matters is acquired by non-Ambiya and even non-humans too.

Take note of its proof from the statements of Khan Sahib Bareilwi also:

The aforementioned learned man wrote on page 13 of *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah*:

Indeed we believe in the Resurrection, and in the Garden and the Fire, and in Allah Almighty and the seven fundamentals of His (Exalted and Majestic is He) attributes, and all of this is *ghayb*. And we know

each in its own right, distinguished from other than it, so this necessitates the acquisition of general detailed knowledge of the unseen for every believer.

Moreover, this Khan Sahib says on page 24 of *Khalis al-I'tiqad*:

Allah Almighty said about the Muslims, “they believe in the unseen” (Qur’an 2:3). Belief is consent, and consent is knowledge. The thing which is fundamentally unknowable, how is its belief possible? Indeed [it says] in *al-Tafsir al-Kabir*: “There is no obstacle in saying, ‘We know of the *ghayb* that for which we have evidence.’”

It is known from these two passages of Khan Sahib that some knowledge of the *ghayb* is necessary for every believer.

Khan Sahib said regarding a prophecy of his father:

This was a prophecy made forty years ago. Allah Almighty grants His accepted slaves knowledge of *ghayb* because they are the bearers of the shoes of the slaves of the slaves of the Holy Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace). (*Malfuzat A'la Hazrat*)

In proving that in itself, *kashf* (inspiration) is nothing of perfection. It may occur to even non-Muslims, nay to even non-humans. Khan Sahib

quoted from one of his elders whom he explicitly called a “friend of Allah”, the story of a strange and wonderful donkey who had the ability of *kashf*:

I was going to Egypt. There was a huge gathering. I saw a man with a donkey whose eyes were tied with a stone. One person’s belongings would be placed in the possession of another person. Then the donkey would be asked about its location, and the donkey would circle the entire gathering, until it reached the person who had it, and in front of him he would bow. (*Malfuzat*, Part 4, p. 11)

After this, Khan Sahib said:

Thus, it is understood that the attribute which is possible for a non-human, it is not a perfection for a human being. (Part 4, p. 11)

It is known from this statement of Khan Sahib that according to him, this donkey also knew some hidden things. And this is the objective.

I have quoted one passage from Khan Sahib’s *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyyah* in which is clearly stated that Allah Ta’ala, His attributes, the Garden and the Fire, the Angels etc. etc. are all matters of the *ghayb*, and this is completely correct.

Based on this, even though Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself is not *ghayb*, his Risaalat is

undoubtedly a matter of the *ghayb*, because it is not a tangible and physical entity. There is a hidden relationship between Allah and the Rasool which is beyond the comprehension of our intellectual faculties. Based only on the integrity of the Rasool, is he accepted as the Messenger of Allah. Thus, whoever acquires knowledge of the existence of Allah Ta'ala, His Oneness or of the Risaalat of the Rasool, he has acquired some knowledge of the unseen. Khan Sahib concedes that everything in existence, even the leaves of trees and sands of the desert, are accountable for believing in Tawhid and Risaalat. They glorify Allah Azza Wa Jal and they testify to the Nubuwwat and Risaalat of the Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

For example, on Part 4, page 77, of Khan Sahib's *Malfuzat*, he writes:

Everything is accountable for believing in Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and for glorifying Allah Ta'ala.

Moreover, on page 78 of it is written:

A particular spirituality is connected to every plant and every inanimate object, whether that is called a "soul" or something else, and that thing is accountable for faith and glorification. It says in a hadith: "There is nothing but it knows that "I am

the Messenger of Allah, except the rebellious of the jinn and man.”

The following matters are established from these statements of Khan Sahib:

1. Every believer must know some matters of the *ghayb*
2. Even non-Muslims experience *kashf*
3. Even a stupid animal like a donkey has knowledge of some hidden matters
4. All things in existence, even plants and inanimate objects, know some things of *ghayb*

And this was the fourth premise in the proof of Mawlana Thanawi.

The result is that those premises on which Mawlana’s proof were based, four are accepted principles of reason and are conspicuously apparent, and two were dependent on proofs, which I have, with praise to Allah, proven from the clear expressions of Khan Sahib. Thus, our readers will understand that the entire basis on which Khan Sahib applied the ruling of *kufr* on Hazrat Mawlana is also shared and accepted by Khan Sahib, and if it necessitated *kufr*, then Khan Sahib has an equal share in that *kufr*.

Although there is no need to present anything else regarding the statement of *Hifz al-Imaan*, but for further clarification, I shall present an illustration.

An Illustration of the Statement from *Hifz al-Imaan*

Assume that some disciple or devotee of Khan Sahib refers to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as the "Knower of the *Ghayb*" and believes it to be permissible. To him I ask: "Do you refer to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as the 'Knower of the *Ghayb*' because of all-encompassing *ghayb* or partial *ghayb*? If encompassing *ghayb*, then that is, according to Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib, absurd rationally, and false scripturally, rather, impossible. On the other hand, if you refer to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as the 'Knower of the *Ghayb*' because of some *ghayb*, and it is your principle that whoever has knowledge of some *ghayb*, you will call him the 'Knower of the *Ghayb*,' then Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) will have no distinction in this because some matters of *ghayb* are possessed by every believer, infact, by all of humanity, all things, even animals and inanimate objects. Therefore, based on your principle it is necessary that you call everything in the world 'knower of the *ghayb*.' Now, if you say that you call everything 'knower of the *ghayb*,' then what superiority and excellence have been

conferred upon Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) by also calling him 'knower of the *ghayb*' ? According to your logic and view everyone (*and everything*) is a 'knower of the *ghayb*'?"

Respected readers, note: Will any sane person understand from my argument that I have, Allah forbid!, equated the knowledge of other beings and creatures to the knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)?

Take note of another more general illustration:

The king of a country is extremely generous. He operates a public kitchen, and he feeds thousands of needy and poor people in the morning and evening. Now, some idiot, for example Zayd, calls that king *raziq* (sustainer). A second person, 'Amr, asks him: "Brother, why do you refer to the king as *raziq*? Is it because he gives sustenance to all creation? Or is it because he feeds some people? The first is obviously false, so only the second option remains, which is that the king is called *raziq* because he feeds some people. However, giving him the title in this second meaning there is, no distinction for him because even a poor man and a menial labourer fill the bellies of their children. Besides humans, even small birds feed their chicks, so according to your principle, everyone and every creature may be called *raziq*."

It should be asked, did 'Amr mean by this statement that the generous and beneficent king and every poor and menial labourer are equal in their generosity? It is obvious that this understanding is a manifestation of the idiocy of the one who understood it. Thus, whatever was said in *Hifz al-Imaan* is nothing more than this.

I shall now cite a statement from *Sharh al-Mawaqif* of the accepted Scholar of Ahl al-Sunna, Imam 'Allamah Sayyid Sharif (rahmatullah alayh), which is identical to the statement of *Hifz al-Imaan*, so that after reading this no Sunni Muslim will dare to open his mouth against *Hifz al-Imaan*, because whatever is in *Hifz al-Imaan*, is approximately a translation of this passage from *Sharh al-Mawaqif*. The 'Allamah wrote [underlined is the original text of al-Iji and the remainder is from the commentary, *Sharh al-Mawaqif*]:

As for the philosophers, they say: He i.e. the Nabi **is the one in whom three special features combine**, by which he is distinguished from others. **The first of them**, i.e. the first of the matters that are exclusive to him, **is that he is cognizant of the *ghayb***, the present, the past and the future.

After this, in a few lines, he proves on behalf of the philosophers that this matter is not farfetched for the Ambiya (upon them peace). Then he says on behalf of the philosophers:

And why would this cognizance [of the *ghayb*] in respect to the Nabi be considered farfetched, **when** that is **found in those you say his preoccupations are exercise** with [various] types of [spiritual] struggles, **or illness**, averting the soul from preoccupation with the body and using sensory organs, **or sleep**, disconnecting thereby his external senses; since these [individuals] are cognizant of the *ghayb* and give information about it as attested to by transmission and experience whereby no doubt about it remains for those who are just?

This was a description of the position of the philosophers and their proofs. After this, the author (Allah have mercy on him) gives an answer on behalf of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah, and says:

We say: What you mentioned is **rejected** for [various] reasons: **because cognizance of all *ghayb* is not necessary for the Nabi by agreement** between us and you, and for this [reason] the Chief of the Prophets said, "Had I knowledge of the *ghayb*, I should have abundance of wealth, and adversity would not touch me" (Qur'an 7:188); **and a part**, i.e. cognizance of part [of the *ghayb*], **is not specific to him**, i.e. to the

prophet, **as you have agreed**, since you allowed it for the exercisers, the ill and the sleepers, so the Nabi is not distinguished thereby from others.

Fair readers should take note, what is the difference between this passage of *Sharh al-Mawaqif* and the passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* under inquiry?

I hope that after this explanation of the passage from *Hifz al-Imaan*, no doubt of the opponents remains. To complete the proof for this, I will briefly quote the answer which Hazrat Mawlana Thanawi wrote in his reply to this slander.

When this fatwa, *Husaam al-Haramayn*, of Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib was published, and it caused a great stir, the respected Mawlana Sayyid Murtaza Hasan Sahib wrote a letter to Mawlana Thanawi:

“Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib Bareilwi wrote with respect to you that you (Allah forbid!) stated explicitly in *Hifz al-Imaan* that the equivalent of the knowledge the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) possesses from the matters of the *ghayb* is possessed by every child and every madman and every animal. Did you write this anywhere in *Hifz al-Imaan*, and is this your belief? And if this is not your belief, what is your position towards someone who holds this revolting belief?”
(Summarised from *Bast al-Banaan*)

Hazrat Mawlana Thanawi gave the answer:

“I did not write this disgusting content in any book. Let alone writing it, this thought never crossed my heart. Nor is it the necessary conclusion of any speech of mine, as I will explain later. Since I understand this content to be revolting, how can it be my intent? The person who believes this, or without belief utters it explicitly or implicitly, I believe him to be outside the fold of Islam because he has denied decisive texts and denigrated Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).”

Thereafter, in that book, *Bast al-Banaan*, Hazrat Mawlana Thanawi gave a detailed reply to this accusation of Khan Sahib and explained the meaning of the passage from *Hifz al-Imaan* under discussion. However, now there is no need to quote it because all that I wrote to explain this passage above is in effect an elaboration of this answer of Hazrat Mawlana.

Respected readers carefully note how far the Barelwi learned man was from truth and integrity in this fatwa.

And Allah is the One Who guides to the path of rightness.

Addendum:

The Author of *Hifz al-Imaan's* Search for Truth and his laudable Declaration of Rewording the Passage of *Hifz al-Imaan*

Respected readers! The debate-style reply to the fatwa of disbelief which Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib issued in *Husaam al-Haramayn* by attributing a heretical content to *Hifz al-Imaan* has terminated, and the readers will understand that its reality is nothing besides slander and fabrication, and the author of *Hifz al-Imaan* is completely innocent of this impure and heretical belief ascribed falsely to him.

A sincere person drew the attention of Hazrat Mawlana Ashraf 'Ali Sahib Thanawi (Rahmatullah alayh) by suggesting that: "although the passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* in reality is completely sound and free of doubt, if the words with which the ungodly and obstinate people deceive the fickle simple-minded commoners were rephrased, these commoners who are susceptible to *fitnah* would not succumb to the deception, so for the sake of the fickle lay-people this would be best."

Hazrat Thanawi made dua for the one who gave him this advice and wholeheartedly accepted the advice and changed the passage in the following way:

In the old passage, the sentence which began as “such knowledge of the *ghayb*” was substituted for the sentence: “mere knowledge of some unseen matters has been attained by non-Ambiya.” This incident occurred in Safar of 1342 H (September 1923 CE). Thus, approximately 32 years ago this revision had taken place in the passage of *Hifz al-Imaan*. After this, *Hifz al-Imaan* has continued to be printed with this revision. Rather, the entire circumstance behind this revision and its announcement on behalf of the revered author (Allah have mercy on him) was printed as an addendum to *Hifz al-Imaan* called *Taghyir al-Unwaan*.

Thereafter, in Jumada al-Ukhra of 1354 H, it happened that because of the advice of a certain individual, the worthless writer of these lines (Muhammad Manzur Nu`mani) himself proposed in the presence of Hazrat Hakim al-Ummah (Allah have mercy on him), that the intent of the words “apply the ruling of the knowledge of *ghayb*” at the very beginning of the passage from *Hifz al-Iman* which the obstinate ones object to, is, without doubt, the unqualified usage of “knower of the *ghayb*,” which is obvious from the preceding and succeeding parts of this passage, and in *Bast al-Banaan* and *Taghyir al-Unwaan*, Hazrat stated explicitly this. Therefore, if in the original passage

“ruling” is changed to “unqualified usage” the matter will become even more clear and will leave no room for doubt. Hazrat, without any hesitation, accepted this and changed the sentence as follows: “Furthermore, if unqualifiedly using ‘knower of the *ghayb*’ for the holy essence is sound according to the statement of Zayd...” And he instructed this worthless one to announce this revision on his behalf. Thus, in Rajab of 1354 H, in [the journal] *al-Furqaan*, this announcement was made.

Anyhow, after those two revisions, the passage of *Hifz al-Imaan* reads as follows:

“Furthermore, if unqualifiedly using “knower of the *ghayb*” for the holy essence is sound according to the statement of Zayd, he will be asked about this matter, that, is the intent of this *ghayb* some *ghayb* or all *ghayb*? If some unseen sciences is intended, what distinction is there for the Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in this? Mere knowledge of some unseen matters has been attained by non-Ambiya, so everyone should be called “knower of the *ghayb*.”

The result is that our elders declared their innocence and abhorrence for the heretical beliefs which Mawlawi Ahmad Raza Khan Sahib attributed to them, and audaciously declaring them disbelievers. In addition, our elders explained the true and real meaning of those passages. They

further proved that there is nothing in their statements that is against the teachings and beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

In order to protect fickle simple-minded laymen from misunderstanding, if any person sincerely advised them to rephrase their statements, then without deliberation and without any ill feeling, they accepted the advice. No doubt this is clear evidence of their sincere quest of the truth and their selflessness. How unfortunate! How unjust and wretched are those people who call these noble slaves of Allah disbelievers!

Muhammad Manzur Nu`mani (Allah pardon him)
21, Dhu al-Hijjah, 1373 Hijri

**Appendix A: Summary of Mawlana Qasim
Nanotwi's Exegesis of the Phrase "Seal of the
Ambiya" in *Tahzir al-Naas***

Tahzirun Naas is a treatise in the form of a legal response (fatwa) from Mawlana Qasim Nanotwi to a question posed regarding the narration of 'Abdullah Ibn 'Abbas (Radhiyallahu anhu) confirming the existence of Ambiya like the Ambiya on this earth, on six other 'earths' (planets). Is this narration authentic? How does acceptance of the narration impact on Rasulullah's (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) status as the last and final Nabi? (*Tahzir al-Naas min Inkaar Athar ibn 'Abbas*, Mawlana Qasim

Nanotwi, Idarat al-'Aziz Publishers, 2001, p. 40)

He begins with a lengthy explanation of the term "Seal of the Ambiya" mentioned in the Qur'aan, which he states if fully understood, will assist in answering the question. Then he presents an exegetical dilemma on the interpretation of this phrase in the context of the Qur'aanic verse. In the understanding of the common people, this simply means the last of a series of Ambiya.

However, appearing before or after in the chronological sense, does not of itself confer excellence, for example, Nabi Ibrahim (Alayhis salaam) is superior to many Ambiya who came after him. (ibid. p. 41) The term "Seal of the Ambiya" must be a term of merit and praise for two reasons: First, those things which are not of relevance in relation to his Nubuwwat, e.g. physical form, colour, lineage, etc. are not given as titles to him in the Qur'aan, so its mention without merit would be imagined as an "excess" in His (Allah's) Speech, as there would be no difference whether it is mentioned or not.

Second, with respect to the people of perfection, like Ambiya and Auliya, titles used for them are for the purpose of lauding them with praise and merit, as is clear from historical writings. Thus the assumption that such titles are without any intent

of praise may lead to denigration of the greatness of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). (ibid. p. 42)

An objection to this reasoning is that the term “Seal of the Ambiya” in this meaning (i.e. without intent of praise) is not devoid of purpose and benefit, as Islam, being the final religion, must negate the legitimacy of any false future claimants to Nubuwwat who will be the cause of the misguidance of many. Hence, with this meaning of “the Seal of the Ambiya,” this door of misguidance is closed. (ibid. p. 42)

The (term of) Conjunction (*istidraak*) in the Qur’an 33:40 implies that the term “Seal of the Ambiya” affirms Spiritual Fatherhood (as well)

Mawlana Nanotwi explains that, even then, (i.e. if the only meaning of the term) “Seal of the Ambiya” is “last Nabi chronologically speaking” then this meaning is not free of difficulties. This is because the verse reads: “Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but the Messenger of Allah and the Seal of the Ambiya.” (33:40). The word “but” (*laakin*) is a conjunction (*'atf*) used for *istidraak* (rectification), that is, to correct (or eliminate) a doubt (*shubh*) or false assumption that may have been created from the previous sentence. Hence, the sentence that he is “the Messenger of

Allah and the Seal of the Ambiya,” corrects a possible misconception that may arise from the sentence, “Muhammad is not the father of any of your men.” (ibid. p. 42)

While the verse clearly negates biological and physical (*jismani*) fatherhood, the doubt may arise that he does not deserve the respect a father deserves, or that he does not hold the position of a spiritual (*ma'nawi*) father to anyone. This erroneous assumption is corrected by the sentence, “but the Messenger of Allah and the Seal of Ambiya.” Thus, by this latter sentence, the doubt that he is not the “father” in any sense of the word is eliminated. Spiritual fatherhood of this Ummah is implicit in the phrase “the Messenger of Allah,” and that he is the spiritual fatherhood of all previous Ambiya, and by implication of their peoples, is established by the phrase “the Seal of the Ambiya.” (ibid. p. 57)

The term “Messenger” implies he is the spiritual father of the Ummah. Mawlana Nanotwi explains this at length in conjunction with the verse of the Qur’an which states, “The Rasool is closer to the believers than themselves.” (33:6) Because our belief is a consequence of his revelation from Allah. Mawlana Nanotwi writes extensively on this point based on linguistic, theological and philological analyses. (ibid. pp. 58-64)

Essential Sealship and its Proofs

In his elaboration, Mawlana Nanotwi explains that the status of the Nubuwwat of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is absolutely independent in that it was not an acquisition from any other Nabi, but was a direct bestowal to him by Allah Ta'ala, while the Nubuwwat of all others is derived from his Nubuwwat. Therefore, their Nubuwwat and all the excellences of their respective Nubuwwat terminated upon his Nubuwwat. Thus, even in this sense he is the "Seal of the Ambiya." (ibid. p. 43)

Mawlana Nanotwi elaborately substantiates this in three ways:

First, verse 3:81 of the Qur'aan: "[Remember] when We took the covenant of the Ambiya: Indeed, that which I have given to you of the Book and Wisdom, then (when) a Messenger [i.e. Muhammad – Sallallahu alayhi wasallam] confirming what is with you comes to you, believe in him and aid him." This verse proves that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the "Nabi of the Ambiya" (*Nabi al-Anbiya*), hence all the Ambiya are commanded to believe in him and to aid him if he were to appear in their time. Thus, Mawlana Nanotwi concludes that their Nubuwwat is subject to his absolute Nubuwwat. This is also indicated by the hadith

which states: "If Musa (Alayhis salaam) was living, he would have had no option but to follow me." This is also indicated by the fact that when Nabi 'Isa (Alaihis salaam) returns to earth, he will be a follower of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In this way, the Nubuwwat of all other Ambiya ends at the Nubuwwat of the Seal of the Ambiya (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). His Nubuwwat is not an effusion (*faydh*) of or an acquisition by the medium (*bi wasitah*) of any other Nubuwwat. On the other hand, the Nubuwwat of all the other Ambiya is an effusion of his Nubuwwat. Hence, all the excellences of the Ambiya are accumulated in his Nubuwwat and Seal. The hadith, "I was the Seal of the Ambiya by Allah while Aadam was an admixture of clay," can be understood in this way, that his Nubuwwat was the initial springboard of Nubuwwat from which the other Ambiya acquired their Nubuwwat. (ibid. p. 44)

Second, there are two types of excellences: knowledge and deeds. Four categories of people are praised in the Qur'an: The Ambiya, the Auliya (*siddiqeen*), the Shuhada (martyrs) and the Saliheen (the pious). (4:69). The first two have excellences in knowledge and the second two in deeds. The Ambiya are the sources of perfection in knowledge and the Auliya are the repositories for

this. The Shuhada are the source of perfection in deeds and the pious are the repositories for this. The word *nabi* is derived from *naba'a* which means to inform, and *siddeeq* is derived from *saddaqa* which means to assent, so the Ambiya are the fountainheads of knowledge and the Auliya are its repositories i.e. those who assent to that knowledge. This is also corroborated by the hadith, "Whatever Allah infused into my breast, I infused into the breast of Abu Bakr," who is known as "the greatest *Siddeeq*."

Here, Mawlana Nanotwi also makes the point that because Nubuwwat is perfection in knowledge and not deeds, apparently (*bi-zaahir*) a follower's deeds may become equal to or exceed the deeds of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). (ibid. pp. 44-48) The reason he mentions "apparently" or "outwardly" is because this is in terms of the "quantity" and not the quality of deeds. His knowledge is both quantitatively and qualitatively superior. Although this statement was misused by the detractors of Mawlana Nanotwi to malign him, the very same point was articulated by Imam al-Razi under verse 2:34 of the Qur'an, in which he says, "We do indeed find in the Ummah those who have a longer life and strive more rigorously than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)." This statement of fact, that sometimes outwardly a

follower performs more good deeds than Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was used by al-Razi as a premise in his argument just as it was by Mawlana Nanotwi.

Mawlana Nanotwi also explains in some detail how martyrdom and piety are perfections in deeds and not knowledge. (pp. 48-49)

The knowledge of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was complete and perfect, while the knowledge of the other Ambiya was not as complete and perfect as his. Hence, he said, "I was taught (*'ullimtu*)," or "I was given (*utitu*) the knowledge of the first and the last," i.e. my knowledge encompasses the spiritual knowledge of all peoples. This is because he is the true knower (*'alim haqiqi*) while the knowledge of all other knowers is derived from him. In the same way our knowledge from our sensual faculties combine in our rational soul (*nafs natiqah*). The senses do not themselves "perceive," knowledge of the divine and transcendental realities which combine in Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and originate in him, while for everyone else before and after him, it is derived from him. Verse 3:81 of the Qur'an describes Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as "confirming all that which is with you [i.e. the Ambiya],". Here the word *ma* (that) is general

(*'aam*), hence it includes all the knowledge in the Scriptures of the Ambiya who were sent previously. Hence, his absolute knowledge – absolute in the sense that it is not derived from any other person, but was bestowed to him directly by Allah. Absolute knowledge is a necessary corollary of his absolute Nubuwwat since Nubuwwat is perfection in knowledge.

Another proof which Mawlana Nanotwi presents for this perfection in knowledge is his greatest miracle, the Qur'aan, which is a Book of knowledge and "an explanation of all things" (Qur'an 16:89). (ibid. pp. 44-50)

Third, the hadith, "I was a Nabi while Aadam was between body and spirit" proves that his Nubuwwat was established at a time before the creation of Aadam (Alayhis salaam), and that his Nubuwwat supersedes the Nubuwwat of all the Ambiya. (ibid. p. 50)

On the basis of these evidences Mawlana Nanotwi concludes that the Nubuwwat of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is absolute, i.e. it is not derived from any other Nabi, while that of other Ambiya is of a secondary nature having been derived from his Nubuwwat. In this manner the term, "the Seal of the Ambiya stated in the Verse" implies that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)

is the spiritual father of the Ambiya. This meaning is the logical extrapolation of the conjunctive term *laakin (istidraak)* in the verse.

Chronological Seal of the Ambiya (*Khatm Nubuwwat Zamani*) is a Necessary Consequence of the Intrinsic Seal (*Khatm Nubuwwat Zaati*)

Mawlana Nanotwi explains that the Intrinsic Seal as described above also necessarily implies that he is the last of all the Ambiya chronologically. This is because a hypothetical new nabi will either bring a new shariat, or he will not. In both cases, the Intrinsic Seal of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) prevents this from happening.

In the assumption, if the hypothetical nabi who was commissioned after the Seal of the Ambiya came with a different law, this would mean a nabi of lower status abrogated the law of a Nabi of superior status, and this is contrary to the rule established in verse 2:106 of the Qur'aan which states: "We do not abrogate any revelation, or cause it to be forgotten, except we bring better than it or the like of it." (ibid. p. 52)

And if he were to bring the same law, this nubuwwat would hold no meaning as Nubuwwat is a perfection in knowledge and all knowledge has culminated in Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and his perfect knowledge in the Book that is an “explanation of all things” will forever be preserved (Qur’an 15:9) as opposed to the Ambiya of lesser status – the Ambiya of Bani Israaeel. The knowledge given to them was corrupted by their followers. Therefore, no new nabi can appear after the Seal of the Ambiya, with or without a new law. Hence, chronological finality (*ta’akkhur zamaani*) is a necessary consequence of Absolute finality. (ibid. pp. 52-53)

The Multiple Meanings of Finality

Coming first or last (*taqaddum/ta’akhkhar*) is a generic (*jinsi*) attribute which manifests in three different ways: chronological (*zamaani*), spatial (*makaani*) and positional (*rutbi*). Seal (*khaatam*) implies finality. It also bears these three possible meanings. If however only one of the three meanings is meant in the statement “Seal of the Ambiya”, i.e. it is either *khaatam zamaan al-nabiyyin* (seal as applicable to the chronological order of the Ambiya), or *khaatam rutbat al-nabiyyin* (seal pertaining to the status of the Ambiya) or *khaatam makaan al-nabiyyin* (seal of the place of the Ambiya). However, in such generic

words, if all meanings can be adopted, then that is the preferred option. Hence, the preferred view according to Mawlana Nanotwi is that the evident indication (*dalala mutabiqi*) of the term “the Seal of the Ambiya” is finality in terms of time, place and position. (ibid.p. 53-55)

This is akin to the verse, “Wine, gambling, altars and divining arrows, are only filth (*rijs*),” (5:90) where “filth” is a general (*'aam*) word including physical and spiritual filth since wine is a physical/material filth and the others are spiritual filth. In the same way “filth” is inclusive of a number of sub-categories with differing qualities included under its general meaning, “Seal” is inclusive of a number of sub-categories under its general meaning. Finality in merit was explained as Absolute Sealship. Chronological finality means his era came after all the Ambiya. And, spatial finality entails Nubuwwat manifesting on the highest of all earths, which is explained in Ahaadith which reveal that the earth we inhabit is the uppermost of all earths. The other six earths also have Ambiya as confirmed in the narration of Ibn ‘Abbas (Radhiyallahu anhu) in the question.

Conclusion

The benefit of this interpretation, Mawlana Nanotwi insists, is that it eliminates the ambiguity (*istidraak*)

present in the verse. It explains what Seal means in the best possible way, while not compromising on the chronological finality of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He writes: "Now you can see that if this view is accepted, the conjunction between the two sentences, will become clear, and the meaning of the Seal is established in the best possible way. At the same time Chronological Seal is also not lost." (ibid. p. 57)

Appendix B:

Al-Hakim al-Tirmidhi's Explanation of the Designation, "Seal of the Ambiya" in *Kitaab Khaatm al-Awliya'*

Abu 'Abdullah Muhammad ibn 'Ali ibn al-Hasan al-Hakim al-Tirmidhi (230 – 320 H), a great Scholar of Hadith and Usul, author of the well-known work *Nawaadir al-Usul*, and from the great masters of Tasawwuf, wrote in his work *Kitaab Khaatm al-Awliya'*:

A speaker said to him [al-Hakim al-Tirmidhi]: What is the Seal of Nubuwwat?

He replied: The Proof of Allah over His creation, in realisation of His (Exalted is He) statement: "and give good news to those who believe that they have a 'Pedestal of Truth' with their Rabb." (10:2)

So Allah certified for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) true servitude. Thus when the Judge appears in His majesty and greatness, on that plane, and He says: "O My bondsmen! I created you only for My obeisance (i.e. to worship Me)! Therefore, worship Me (in total submission)!" There will be no sense or movement left for anyone due to the awe and grandeur of that position, except Muhammad (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). For by that Pedestal of truth that he has, he proceeds ahead of all the ranks of Ambiya and Rusul (Messengers) because he was (enabled to offer) the highest stage of obeisance to Allah Azza Wa Jal. So Allah will accept it [i.e. obeisance] from him and elevate him to the Praised Platform (*al-maqam al-mahmud*) near the *Divine Kursi*. Thereupon, the veil over that Seal will be removed, and *Noor* will encompass him. The rays of that Seal will shine over him. From his heart to his tongue will spring such praise which none from His creation had hitherto heard. Thus, all the Ambiya will know that Muhammad (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was the most knowledgeable of them regarding Allah Azza Wa Jal. He will be the first converser and the first intercessor, so he will be given the Standard of Praise and Keys of Generosity. The Standard of Praise is for the bulk of the believers while the Keys of Generosity for the Ambiya. The Seal of Nubuwwat has a profound condition and station, more profound than you can bear, so I hope that this much is sufficient for you of its knowledge."

So Muhammad (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)

becomes the intercessor for the Ambiya, the Auliya and for others besides them. Do you not see his (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) speech regarding the station of the Praised Platform: "Even Ibrahim the *Khaleel* (Friend) of the Allah, The Merciful, will need me on that day"? That was narrated to me by Jarud from al-Nadr ibn Shumayl from Hisham al-Dastawa'i from Hammad who traced it to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Do you not see that Allah Azza Wa Jal mentioned good news to the believers in many verses but did not mention it except with a condition: "and give good news to those who believe and do righteous deeds" (2:25) and he mentioned it here without a condition [i.e. without the condition of "righteous works"]: "and give good news to those who believe that they have a Pedestal of Truth with their Rabb," informing them that the salvation of all on that day is through this Pedestal of Truth [i.e. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)]?

As for the proof, it is as though He says to the Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam): "O Assembly of Ambiya! This is Muhammad. He came at the end of time, weak in body, weak in might, weak in livelihood, short in life. He produced what you have seen of true obeisance and copious knowledge. And you in your speech, your lives and your bodies did not produce what he produced." Thereupon, the veil over the Seal will be removed, and all talk will end, and it will become a proof over all creation; because the object which is sealed is guarded. And thus is Allah's (Exalted is He) administration over us in this

world: when a thing is found with its seal, doubt is removed and argumentation ends amongst people.

So Allah gathered the particles of Nubuwwat for Muhammad (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and He perfected them and sealed them with His seal. So neither his self (*nafs*) nor his enemy can find a path to enter the place of his Nubuwwat due to that Seal. Do you not see the hadith of al-Hasan al-Basri (Rahmatullah alayh) from Anas ibn Malik (Radhiyallahu anhu)? In the hadith of intercession by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) that he said: "When they come to Adam they will ask him to intercede for them by their Rabb. Adam will say to them: 'What is your opinion, if your goods were collected in your absence and then sealed [i.e. tied away], will the goods only be approached from the seal? So go to Muhammad for he is the Seal of the Ambiya.'" Its meaning according to us is that Nubuwwat in its entirety has culminated in Muhammad (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). His heart was made a vessel for the perfection of Nubuwwat and then it was sealed.

Allah did not leave the proof concealed in the inside of his heart for He made it manifest. Between his shoulders that Seal was conspicuous like the egg of a pigeon. This is for him a great station the story of which is long.

Indeed the one who is blind to this information, he thinks that the interpretation of "the Seal of the Ambiya" is only that he is the last of them in being

sent. But what virtue is there in this? And what perfection in knowledge is there in this? This is the interpretation of ignorant people.

Most recite *khaatam* (seal) with *fath* on the *ta'*. As for those from the Salaf who recited with *kasr* on the *ta'* [i.e. as *khaatim*], its interpretation is that he is a *khaatim* (sealer) in the sense of the active participle. That is, he sealed Nubuwwat by the Seal which he was given. Confirming this reality is what was narrated in the hadith of the Ascension (*Mi'raj*) from the hadith of Abu Ja'far al-Razi from al-Rabi' ibn Abi al-'Aliyah from what he mentioned regarding the meeting of the Ambiya in the Aqsa Musjid: "So every Nabi (Alayh Salaam) mentioned the favour of Allah upon him, and it was from the speech of Allah's Messenger (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) that he said: 'He made me the Sealer and the Opener.' So Ibrahim (Alayhis salaam) said: 'By this, Muhammad is superior to all of you.'"

(*Kitaab Khaatm al-Awliya'*, Edited by Othman I. Yahya, Imperial Catholique, Beirut, pp. 338-342)

Appendix C: Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Saharanpuri's Explanation of the Controversy on *Imkaanul Kizb*

In the treatise *al-Tasdiqaat li Daf' al-Talbisaat*, also known as *al-Muhannad 'ala al-Mufannad*, Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Saharanpuri answered three related questions on the issue of the possibility of a lie in Allah's speech (Exalted is He) and Mawlana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi's position on the matter. Since these answers shed further light on the matter, a translation of these answers is reproduced here.

Question Twenty Three:

Did the eminent *shaykh*, the scholar of his time, Mawlana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, say that the Creator (Exalted is He) has actually lied, and that the one who says this has not erred, or is this amongst the slanders against him? Assuming the latter, how do you respond to what al-Barelwi mentioned that he has with him a photocopy of the deceased *shaykh's* fatwa stating this?

Answer:

That which they attributed to the eminent and incomparable *shaykh*, the scholar of his time, the peerless of his age, Mawlana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, that he said that the Creator (Exalted is His Eminence) actually lied and that the one who says this has not erred, is a slander against him

(Rahmatullah alayh). It is from the lies concocted by the deceptive and lying devils (Allah confound them! How they are perverted!). He is innocent of such heresy and disbelief. The fatwa of the *shaykh* (Rahmatullah alayh) that was printed and published in volume one of his *Fatawa Rashidiyyah* (p. 119) falsifies their [claim]. It is in Arabic and was verified and stamped with the seals of the `ulama of Makkah al-Mukarramah. A copy of this question and answer follows:

In Allah’s Name, the Ever Merciful, the Beneficent. We praise Him and send blessing on His noble Messenger. What is your view on Allah being described with the attribute of falsehood? And what is the ruling on the one who believes He lies? Provide us with an answer, and be rewarded.

Answer:

Allah (Exalted is He) is certainly free from having the attribute of falsehood, and no element of falsehood is found in His Speech, as Allah says, “Who is more truthful than Allah in speech?” (4:122) Whoever believes or professes that Allah lies, he is certainly an accursed disbeliever, and has opposed the Kitaab, the Sunnah and the consensus of the Ummah.

Yes, the belief of the people of faith is that which Allah foretold in the Qur’an, that Pharaoh, Haaman and Abu Lahab are from the inhabitants of Hell, it is an absolute decision that He will not act contrary to, but Allah (Exalted is He) is able to admit them into

Paradise and is not incapable of this, but He will not do so by His choice.

Allah Azza Wa Jal said, "And if We had so willed, We could have given every soul its guidance, but the word from Me concerning evil-doers took effect: that I will fill the Fire with jinn and mankind together." (Qur'aan 32:12) It is evident from this verse that had Allah wished, He would have made all people believers but He does not contradict what He says, and this is all by choice, not coercion. He is a Doer by choice, acting as He wills.

This is the belief of all the 'Ulama of this Ummah, as al-Baydawi said under the explanation of His statement (Exalted is He), "If you forgive them..." (Qur'an 5:118) that "the absence of forgiveness for *shirk* is a consequence of His threat, but it is not intrinsically impossible." Allah knows best the truth.

The humble Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (may he be pardoned) wrote this.

A review of the endorsements of the '*Ulama* of Al-Makkah al-Mukarramah, Allah increase its honour:

"All praise to the One Who is deserving of it, and from Him extends all help and guidance. That which 'Allamah Rashid Ahmad said in reply as cited [above] is the truth from which there is no escape. Allah send blessings and peace on the Seal of the Ambiya, his family and his companions."

The servant of the Shari'ah, seeking grace, Muhammad Salih ibn al-Marhum Siddiq Kamal al-

Hanafi (Allah support them), the present Mufti of Makkah al-Mukarramah, ordered his signature.

The one hopeful of perfect attainment from His Rabb, Muhammad Sa'id ibn Muhammad Babusayl at Makkah (Allah forgive him and his parents, and his teachers and all the Muslims) signed it.

Seeking pardon from the Giver of Bestowals, Muhammad 'Abid ibn al-Marhum Shaykh Husayn, Mufti of the Malikis at the protected land of Allah, [signed it].

"[After] sending blessings and peace, that which 'Allamah Rashid Ahmad gave in answer is sufficient and upon it is reliance, rather it is the truth from which there is no escape."

Written by the humble one, Khulf ibn Ibrahim, a servant of *Ifta* for Hanbalis, at the honoured City of Makkah.

The response to what al-Barelwi said that he has in his possession a copy of the fatwa of the deceased *shaykh* in photocopy form containing what he mentioned, it is from his fabrications which he invented and kept with himself to slander the *shaykh* (May Allah sanctify his soul). Such lies and slanders are insignificant for him, for he is the teacher of teachers in this and all of them [i.e. liars] are children in comparison to him in his time. Indeed he is a distorting manipulator and a scheming imposter, often forging signatures. He is not less than the Masih al-Qadiyani, since the latter claims Nubuwwat manifestly and openly, and the

former conceals [claims of] revivalism, and anathematises (*yukaffiru*) the 'Ulama of the ummah, just as the Wahhabis, the followers of Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab, anathematise the Ummah (May Allah Most High disgrace him as He disgraces them).

Question Twenty Four:

Do you believe in the possibility of the occurrence of falsehood in a speech from the Speech of the Master (Great and Glorious is His Majesty). If not, what then is your opinion?

Answer:

We and our elders (Allah Most High have mercy on them) declare and are convinced that all speech that issued from the Creator (Great and Glorious is He) or will issue from Him is absolutely truthful, and it is certain that it concurs with reality. Undoubtedly, there is no trace of falsehood in any part of His (Exalted is He) Speech, nor any doubt about [the absence of] contravening reality [in His Speech]. Whoever believes contrary to this or conceives of a lie in any part of His Speech, is a disbeliever, apostate and heretic, and does not have even a trace of faith.

Question Twenty Five:

Have you ascribed the view of "*imkaanul kizb*" (the possibility of lying) to some of the Ash'aris? If so, what is meant by this? And do you have textual

proof for this view from the reliable scholars? Explain the matter to us.

Answer:

This began as a dispute between us and the Indian logicians and innovators about the capacity of the Maker (Glorious is He) to act contrary to what He promised, informed, intended, and so on. They said that acting contrary to these things is absent from Allah's Eternal Power (*qudrah qadimah*), rationally impossible (*mustahil aqlan*), impossible to exist within His capacity, and it is necessary for Him [to act] in accordance with His promise, report, intent and knowledge. We said: such things are certainly capacitated, but their occurrence (*wuqu'*) is not possible, according to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah from the Ash'aris and Maturidis, textually and logically according to the Maturidis, and only textually according to the Ash'aris.

They objected that if the occurrence of these things were possible, it would entail the possibility of falsehood and this is certainly not in His capacity and is intrinsically impossible (*mustahil dhatan*). We responded using a variety of answers from the theologians, of which was: even if the concomitance of the possibility of falsehood in acting contrary to the promise, reports and so on, in His capacity is accepted, it too is not intrinsically impossible, rather, like oppression and impudence, it is intrinsically and rationally possible, but it is

textually and logically impossible, or just textually, as more than one of the Imams have espoused. When they saw these responses they caused corruption in the land and attributed to us [the position of] allowing imperfections (*naqs*) in relation to His Holiness (Blessed and Exalted is He), and they spread this accusation amongst the foolish and the ignorant to create enmity in the common people and to seek enjoyment and popularity amongst men. They reached the pathways of the heavens in fabrication when they forged an imagination expressing the actuality (*fi'liyyah*) of falsehood without fearing the Knowing King. When Indians became aware of their scheming, they (i.e. the Bid'atis) sought help from the noble 'Ulama of the two Sanctuaries because they know they are unaware of their evils and the reality of the views of our 'Ulama.

Their likeness is but the likeness of the Mu'tazilah as compared with the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah, since they [i.e. the Mu'tazilah] excluded rewarding the sinner (*ithabat al-'asi*) and punishing the obedient (*'iqab al-muti'*) by the Eternal Power and made justice (*'adl*) necessary (*i.e. obligatory – such an obligation from which He has no power to depart – Mujlisul Ulama*) for Allah's essence (Zaat). They called themselves "the advocates of justice and transcendence" and they attributed injustice, unconscientiousness and ugliness to the 'Ulama of Ahl al-Sunna wa al-Jama'ah. So, just as the predecessors of Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah did not mind their ignorance and did not permit

incapacity in relation to Him (Azza Wa jal) in the aforementioned injustice, and broadened the Eternal Power while also removing imperfections from His Noble Absolute Self and perfecting the transcendence and sanctity of His Lofty Holiness, saying that, “Your understanding of the possibility of the capacity to punish the obedient and reward the sinner as an imperfection, is but the consequence of [following] the wretched philosophers”. In the same way, we say to them, “Your understanding of the ability to act contrary to the promise, report and truth and the likes of them, as an imperfection, although their issuance (*sudur*) from Him (Exalted is He) is impossible, only textually, or rationally and textually, is but the misfortune of philosophy and logic and your incorrigible ignorance.”

They do what they do because of the absolute transcendence [of Allah], but they are unable to perfect the Power and broaden it. As for our predecessors, the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama’ah, they combined between the two matters, of widening the Power and perfecting transcendence for the Eternal Being (Azza Wa Jal).

This is what we mentioned in *al-Baraahin al-Qati’ah* in summary-form, and here are some of the proof-texts in support of it from the authoritative books of the Math-hab:

(1) It says in *Sharh al-Mawaqif*:

“All the Mu’tazilites and Kharijites make punishing the one who incurs a major sin necessary when he dies without repentance, (*i.e. Allah Ta’ala lacks the*

power to forgive them – Nauthu billaah!) They do not allow Allah to pardon him for two reasons:

“First, He (Exalted is He) made it a promise to punish major sins and informed us of this i.e. punishment for major sins, hence if He does not punish for a major sin and pardons, it would entail renegeing on His threat and imply falsehood in His speech, and this is impossible.

The answer for this is: the conclusion of this argument is that punishment is a future event. Thus, it is not an intrinsic issue whose existence is (intrinsically) necessary. This is the issue on which is our discussion. Since punishment is not an intrinsic/inherent issue, its non-occurrence does not entail renegeing and falsehood? Punishment is from the possibilities which are included in His (Exalted is He) Power?” End [quote from *Sharh al-Mawaqif*]

(2) In *Sharh al-Maqasid* by ‘Allamah al-Taftazani (Rahmatullah alayh) at the end of the discussion on Power (Quadrat of Allah Ta’ala), he says:

“The deniers of the inclusiveness of His Power are many groups; of them are al-Nazzam and his [Mu'tazilite] followers who say that He does not have power over ignorance, falsehood and oppression and all ugly acts (*qaba'ih*), for if their creation were in His capacity, their issuance (*sudur*) from Him would be possible, and this concomitant (*lazim*) is false because it results in impudence (*safah*) if He knows the ugliness of this and its dispensability, and in ignorance if He is not knowing.

The response is: we do not concede the ugliness of a thing in relation to Him, how [can we accept this] when He is in complete control of His kingdom? And if it [i.e. ugliness in relation to Him] is conceded, Power over it does not negate the impossibility of its issuance from Him, by consideration of the presence of disposal and the absence of need, even if it is possible (*mumkinan*).” End [quote from *Sharh al-Maqasid*], in summary-form.

(3) It says in *al-Musayarah* and its commentary *Al-Musamarah* by ‘Allamah al-Muhaqqiq Kamal ibn al-Humaam al-Hanafi and his student Ibn Abi l-Sharif al-Maqdisi al-Shafi’i (Rahmatullah alayhima):

“Then he i.e. the author of *al-‘Umdah* said, ‘Allah Azza Wa Jal is not attributed with Power over oppression, impudence and falsehood because the impossible is not included in [His] Power (Qudrat), i.e. it is improper for it (His Power) to be related to these issues (of injustice and deficiency). According to the Mu’tazilah, He (Exalted is He) is able over all that but does act accordingly.’ End of quote from *al-‘Umdah*.

“It appears as though he altered that which he transmitted from the Mu’tazilah, since there is no doubt that the absence of power over what was mentioned, is the position of the Mu’tazilah. As for its presence, i.e. power over what was mentioned, and abstention therefrom by volitional choice, is the stance of the Math-hab, i.e. it is, in fact, the Math-hab of the Ash’aris. It is not the view of the

school of the Mu'tazilah. It is obvious that this more befitting position (of the Ash'aris) is also included in divine transcendence, since there is no doubt that abstention therefrom i.e. from oppression, impudence and falsehood, is an issue pertaining to divine transcendence, which does not befit the majesty of Allah Azza Wa Jal.

"Hence, the intellect understands which of the two views is more loftier and distinguished from indecencies: is it power over it, i.e. over oppression, impudence and falsehood what was mentioned from the three matters, along with impossibility by volitional choice, or its impossibility due to Him lacking power over it? Reliance on the former position is incumbent, and this is the view of the Ash'ari School." End [quote from *al-Musamarah*].

(4) In *Hawashi al-Kalnbwi 'ala Sharh al-'Aqa'id al-Adudiyyah* by al-Muhaqqiq al-Dawwani (Rahmatullah alayh) it is mentioned:

"In sum, lying being ugly in the Divine Speech (*al-kalam al-lafzi*), in the sense that it is an attribute of deficiency, is prohibited according to the Ash'aris. That is why al-Sharif al-Muhaqqiq (al-Jurjani) said it is from the totality of the possibilities (*mumkinat*), and its non-occurrence in His speech is by consensus of the ulama and the Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam). This does not negate its intrinsic possibility like all decisive knowledge of normal occurrences (*al-'ulum al-'adiya*) and it does not negate what Imam al-Razi said," in this regard.

(5) In *Tahrir al-Usul* by the author of *Fath al-Qadir*, Imam Ibn al-Humaam, and its commentary by Ibn Amir al-Hajj (Rahmatullah alayhima) they said:

“Therefore – i.e. since whatever is conceived as a deficiency is impossible for Him – the decisiveness of the impossibility of attributing Him – i.e. Allah Azza Wa Jal – with lying and the like of it (Glory to Him! High is He above it!) becomes apparent. Also, if the attribution of ugliness to His actions was possible, confidence in the integrity of His promise, the integrity of His speech besides it – i.e. [besides] His (Exalted is He) promise – and the integrity of His Ambiya would disappear – i.e. in principle, His integrity would be uncertain.

“According to the Ash’aris, He (Exalted is He) is certainly not attributed with ugly acts, but they are not rationally impossible, like all of creation. This is just like all the sciences in which one of two opposites being the reality is certain, but the other is not impossible, if it were assumed that it is the reality; just like the certainty of Mecca and Baghdad – i.e. their existence – since their non-existence is not rationally impossible. Therefore – i.e. when the matter is such – confidence [in the integrity of His Word] disappearing is not necessitated because the rational possibility does not necessitate the absence of a firm resolution of its (practical) non-existence.

“The dispute regarding the rational impossibility and possibility applies to all deficiencies – does Allah have power over it or not? He will certainly not give practical effect to it despite the Qudrat. The

absolutely decisive condition is that the deficiency will not be performed”.

Similar views to what we have cited from the School of the Ash’aris were mentioned by al-Qadi al-’Adud in *Sharh Mukhtasar al-Usul* and the commentators on it. Similar statements are found in *Sharh al-Mawaqif* and the marginalia of *al-Mawaqif* by al-Chalabi, and others. Similarly, ‘Allamah al-Qushji in *Sharh al-Tajrid*, al-Qunawi and others stated this. We avoided quoting their texts fearing prolixity and tedium. Allah has the power of guidance and direction.

(*Al-Muhannad ‘ala l-Mufannad ya’ni ‘Aqa’id ‘Ulama Ahl al-Sunnah Deoband*, Mawlana Khalil Ahmad Saharanpuri, Idarat Islamiyyat, 1984, pp. 70-84)

**Appendix D:
BY MUJLISUL
ULAMA OF S.A.**

Much of the foregoing elaboration will be incomprehensible to laymen due to its academic nature. Firstly the questions in dispute are subtle. Secondly, the arguments and evidences are largely based on the principles of logic. Thirdly technical terms have been literally translated. This combination creates a scenario of *obscurum per obscurius*, i.e. explaining the obscure with what is more obscure. We shall, therefore present a simple explanation for better comprehension.

THE QUESTION OF IMKAAN-E-KITHB

Literally, *Imkaan-e-Kithb* means the *possibility of speaking a lie*. The Qabar Pujaaris grabbed the literal meaning and with it slandered the Ulama of Deoband, accusing them of believing and stating that 'Allah Ta'ala speaks lies' - Nauthubillah!

The term *imkaan* in the context has a technical meaning which means *rational possibility*, not practical possibility. A rational possibility is valid and intellectually possible without it necessarily being in practical existence. For example, it is possible to imagine in the mind a donkey with a hundred heads although such an animal does not exist. The existence in the intellect is termed *rational possibility (Imkaan-e-Aqli)* which is the meaning of *imkaan* in the context.

On the other hand *rational impossibility* (*Mahaal-e-Aqli*) refers to an entity which is rationally impossible, hence it will also be practically impossible. For example, it cannot be rationally conceived that one plus one equal three, or something can be black and white in the same substratum at the very same time, or it can be day and night at the very same time.

While the issue in dispute pertains to the domain of *rational possibility* in the technical meaning, the grave-worshippers accused the Ulama of Deoband with the slander of believing in the practical possibility or the real possibility of Allah Azza Wa Jal acting in contradiction to His Promises, e.g. forgiving Shaitaan, Fir'oun and the like, and granting them admission to Jannat.

The subtlety of the issue has confused the ordinary folk who fell into the snare of slander woven by the Qabar Pujaari molvis. However, Ulama and intelligent Muslims understand that at no stage did the Ulama of Deoband put forth the kufr of practical attribution of falsehood to Allah Azza Wa Jal.

The simple issue is only this: Does Allah Ta'ala have the power (Quadrat) to forgive the incorrigible kuffaar such as Shaitaan, Fir'oun, Haamaan, etc.? It is the belief of the heretical philosophers (those who had sprung up among Muslims) and of the Mu'tazili heretical sect that Allah Ta'ala lacks the power to forgive these kuffaar. In other words even

if he wanted to send them to Jannat, He is bereft of the power to do so – Nauthubillah.

The contention of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah since the inception of Islam, has always been that Allah Ta'ala does possess the Qudrat although He will not act in conflict with His eternal Promise. The Qabar Pujaaris incline to the Mu'tazili viewpoint. Instead of honestly stating their case, they resort to slandering the Ulama of the Ahlus Sunnah Wa'l Jama'ah. The Kutub of the Ulama of the Ahlus Sunnah state exactly the same view propounded by the Ulama of Deoband on this question. Thus, Hadhrat Maulana Gangohi (Rahmatullah alayh) and the Ulama of Deoband in general, did not proffer any new concept. They simply narrated the official and authoritative view of the Ahlus Sunnah and expounded it for better comprehension.

It is inconceivable to an intellect functioning in the state of equilibrium to accept that Allah Ta'ala lacks the power to pardon Shaitaan. No one had ever claimed that Allah Ta'ala will forgive Shaitaan and admit him to Jannat. But, if Allah Azza Wa Jal chooses to bestow *hidaayat* to Shaitaan, what power in creation can prevent Him from this simple act? The Qur'aan Majeed is replete with the declaration: "*He guides whomever He wills, and He misguides whomever He wills.*" In the Qur'aan Majeed Allah Azza Wa Jal states:

"Thus, We have made for every Nabi enemies from

*from mankind and the shayaateen. They inspire one another with adorned statements of deception. **And, if your Rabbwills, they would not be able to do so.** Therefore leave them and that (evil) which they fabricate.” (Al-An’aam, aayat 112)*

If Allah Ta’ala so desires that these human and jinn devils acquire *hidaayat*, nothing can prevent it. Thus, the aayat establishes with certitude the rational possibility of the shayaateen acquiring *hidaayat* (*guidance*). Comprehending this simple reality is within the intellectual parameters of even rustic and illiterate folk. There is nothing rationally possible which is impossible for Allah Azza Wa Jal. He repeatedly declares in His Qur’aan-e-Hakeem:

“Verily, Allah has power over all things.”

Now from whence do these moron grave-worshippers hail to curb and truncate the infinite, eternal *Qudrat* of Allah Azza Wa Jal?

Further confirming the unrestricted *Qudrat* of Allah Azza Wa Jal, the Qur’aan Majeed states:

“(O Muhammad!) Recite to them the episode of the one to whom We gave Our Aayaat. Then he abandoned it. Thus, Shaitaan pursued him (to enlist and entangle him in evil). Then he became of those who had gone astray.

If We had willed, We could have elevated him with those Verses, But he (the vile one) clung to the

earth and followed his base desires. Thus, his example is like that of a dog.”
(Al-A’raaf, Verses 175 & 176)

The episode mentioned in these Verses pertains to a very pious Buzrug (Saint) of bygone times, prior to the advent of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He fell into the trap of shaitaan and abandoned the Haqq and went astray into kufr and evil. Regarding him, Allah Ta’ala says: “*If We had desired*”, he would not have gone astray, and he would have been among those of elevated ranks. This establishes the fact that although this person, like Shaitaan, Fir’oun, etc. have been decreed for everlasting doom, Allah Ta’ala has the power to act to the contrary and forgive them. This is the meaning of *Imkaan-e-Kithb – the rational possibility of an issue which will not attain practicality by Allah’s choice.*

Another pertinent question coming within the purview of this self-same issue, is the possibility of Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) being punished by Allah Ta’ala. What is the *tafseer* of this possibility, and what type of possibility is it? Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself elucidated this issue to preclude the assertions of the grave-worshippers bogged in *jahl-e-murakkab (compound ignorance)*. The Qur’aan-e-Hakeem states:

“It is not proper for a Nabi to take prisoners until he spills blood

In the land. Do you desire the material things of this world whilst Allah desires (for you) the Akhirat. Allah is The Mighty, The Wise.

*If it had not been for a decree preordained, then most certainly, a great punishment would have afflicted you on account of what you had taken.”
(Al-Anfaal, Verses 67 & 68)*

On the occasion of the Battle of Badr, 70 prisoners were taken. What had to be done with these prisoners? There were two opinions: One – to ransom them, and two- to put them to death. The former advice was proffered by Hadhrat Abu Bakr (Radhiyallahu anhu) and other Sahaabah, while Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) was of the latter view.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), being *Rahmatullahi lil Aalameen (A Mercy to the worlds)*, opted for the advice of Hadhrat Abu Bakr (Radhiyallahu anhu), and the prisoners were ransomed and set free. It was on this occasion that these two Verses were revealed with the severe reprimand for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The day after this incident, when Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) went to visit Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), he was shocked to see Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and Hadhrat Abu Bakr (Radhiyallahu anhu) bitterly

weeping. Overcome with emotion, Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) said:

"O Rasulallah! Why are you and your Companion weeping so much? If I am informed of the reason, I too shall weep, and if I am unable to weep, I shall simulate a weeping person so as to be like you."

Rasulullah (sallallaahu alayhi wasallam) responded: *"I am weeping because I perceived the arrival of the punishment of Allah as close as the nearest side of the tree because I had accepted the opinion of those who had suggested the ransom."* (Ma-aalimaat Tanzeel)

In another Aayat, Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is commanded by Allah Ta'ala to say:

"Say (O Muhammad!): 'Verily I fear the punishment of the Great Day if I disobey my Rabb.'" (Aayat 7, An'aam)

Now the Qabar Pujaaris may proclaim us to be 'kaafir' on the basis of the slander that we believe that Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) will be punished by Allah Ta'ala. This episode comes within the scope of the meaning of *Imkaan-e-Kithb*.

While there are numerous such examples in the Qur'aan Majeed of Allah's unrestricted, eternal Power, we shall cite one more for people of intelligence. Allah Ta'ala states:

*"If your Rabb had willed then most certainly all on earth, all of them would have believed."
(Yoonus, Aayat 99)*

Only unfortunate and miserable ones can claim that Allah Ta'ala lacks the power to forgive, guide and admit to Jannat Shaitaan, Fir'oun, Haamaan, Qaaroon, Namrood, etc., etc. This fact is a rational possibility. However, by His volitional Will, Allah Ta'ala will not forgive them. Abstention from forgiveness is not the effect of inability or lack of power. It is indeed kufr to believe that Allah Ta'ala lacks the *Quadrat* to do as He pleases.

Further confirming the unfettered *Quadrat of Allah Ta'ala to do as He pleases, the Qur'aan Majeed states:*

*"So that Allah may reward the Saadiqeen (the Truthful ones) for their truth, and punish the Munaafiqeen (the hypocrites) **if He wills or forgives them.** Verily Allah is Most Forgiving, Most Merciful."
(Ahzaab, Aayat 24)*

This in a nutshell is the stupid and evil controversy which the Qabar Pujaaris have churned up on the issue of *Imkaan-e-Kithb*.

**Appendix E:
BY MUJLISUL
ULAMA OF S.A.**

THE QUESTION OF AALIMUL GHAIB

On this issue too, the Qabar Pujaaris have kicked up considerable dust with their slandering. *Ghaib* in the context of the Qur'aan refers to unseen/unknown knowledge and issues, the awareness of which is possible only by revelation/inspiration from Allah Azza Wa Jal. Jannat, Jahannam, the Malaaiqah, LooH Mahfuz, the torments of the Grave and innumerable other matters are from the *Ghaib*.

The stance of the Ulama-e-Haqq of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah is that only Allah Azza Wa Jal is *Aalimul Ghaib* (*the Knower of the Ghaib*). No created being is intrinsically *Aalimul Ghaib*. Whatever knowledge of the *Ghaib* the Ambiya had was a bestowal of Allah Azza Wa Jal. Their knowledge of the *Ghaib* was not independent of Allah Ta'ala.

In refutation of the Qabar Pujaari's belief that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is *Aalimul Ghaib*, the question was posed: Is Nabi (Salallahu alayhi wasallam) the knower of **all** *Ghaib ad infinitum*, or of a portion of the *Ghaib* i.e. of some issues of the realm of *Ghaib*.

Rationally and narrationally the first possibility is precluded. It is not at all possible because no one

besides Allah Azza Wa Jal has all-embracing, infinite Knowledge of the *Ghaib*. The self-evident reality of this fact obviates the need to cite some examples of this fact from the million examples in the Qur'aan and Ahaadith to prove that only Allah Azza Wa Jal is the Sole Repository of all-embracing and total Knowledge of the *Ghaib*.

If it is said that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had a portion of the knowledge of the *Ghaib*, then this option too is baseless because the knowledge revealed to him ceases to be *Ghaib* after its revelation and publication, hence all the members of the Ummah are aware of Jannat, Jahannam, Siraat, Barzakh, etc., etc. Hence, each and every person in the Ummah be he a faajir and a faasiq will also be described as *Aalimul Ghaib*. But this is manifestly baatil (baseless and false).

Secondly, this knowledge of the *Ghaib* possessed by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is not independent of Allah Azza Wa Jal. It is knowledge imparted to the Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam) by Allah Azza Wa Jal. It is therefore, manifestly incorrect and improper to ascribe the title, *Aalimul Ghaib* to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Thirdly, awarding this title to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) without any Shar'i *daleel* is baseless and an excess committed in the Deen.

Fourthly, the *Aqeedah (Belief)* of the masses is corrupted and brings them within the fold of *shirk*.

It, i.e. conferring this title to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), is *shirk* because an attribute which is exclusive with Allah Ta'ala is being awarded to a created being. The ignorant and unwary masses will believe from this title that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the Knower of the *Ghaib* in its intrinsic, unrestricted, infinite meaning.

Finally and firmly clinching this argument in negation of the claims of the Grave-Worshippers, the Qur'aan Majeed states:

*"Say (to them): 'I do not say to you that by me are the Treasures of Allah **nor (do I say that) I know the ghaib**, Nor do I say to you that I am an Angel. I follow merely what is being revealed to me."
(Al-An'aam, Aayat 50)*

*"By Him are the keys of the **Ghaib. No one knows of it, except He.**" (Al-An'aam, Aayat 59)*

*"**He (Allah) is Aalimul Ghaib** wash-Shahaadah, and He is The Knower, The One Who is Aware."
(Al-An'Aam, Aayat 73)*

*"Say (O Muhammad!): 'I am not able of either benefit or harm for myself. **If I was aware of the Ghaib**, then I would have ensured abundance of goodness (for myself), and hardship would not have afflicted me. I am merely a warner and a bringer of glad tidings for a people who believe."
(Al-A'raaf, Aayat 188)*

"(O Muhammad!) Say: **'Verily the Ghaib belongs to only Allah,** therefore wait (for His punishment).'" (Yoonus, Aayat 20)

"These are from the **episodes of the Ghaib which We reveal to you (O Muhammad!).** You were **formerly not aware of it,** neither you nor your nation." (Hood, Aayat 49)

"(O Muhammad!) Say: **'None in the heavens and the earth is aware of the Ghaib except Allah...'**"

"Verily, Allah is **Aalimul Ghaib of the heavens and the earth,** Verily, He aware what is within the breasts (of people)." (Faatir, Aayat 38)

"He (Allah) is Aalimul Ghaib. He does not inform anyone of His Ghaib except for the Rasool with whom He is pleased..."

(Al-Jinn, Aayat 27)

"Haqq has come and baatil has perished, for verily baatil (by its very) nature perishes." (Qur'aan)

There is no need to further pursue this manifestly obvious stupid controversy created by the Qabar Pujaaris.