

# فضیلت ابن تیمیہ ورد

## طعنهای که جمعی بر او کنند

مکتوب نادر ز مولنا الإمام شاه ولی الله المحدث الدہلوی

قدس سرہ

تحقیق و ترجمہ:

دو نفر از طلبا زیر نگہداری شیخ الحدیث مولانا فضل الرحمن الأعظمی

کان اللہ لہ

مصلحت نیست کہ از پردہ برون افتد راز

ور نہ در مجلس زندان خبری نیست کہ نیست

: جواب مکتوب جامع الفضائل مخروم معین الدین تہنائی متضمن کشف شہادت و رفع ایراد ایشان در کلام شیخ تقی الدین احمد بن تیمیہ صلی و بیان فضائل و تنویر شان اور در زمرہ علمای اہل سنت و در مجمعہ کہ زبان طعن در حق وی دراز کنند و اظهار حسن عقیدہ خویش بنہیہ ارضی اللہ عنہ و عن سائر علمائے دین تحریر یافت

بسم اللہ الرحمن الرحیم الحمد للہ مفیض النعم و علم الحکم و صلی اللہ علی سیدنا محمد سید العرب العجم و علی آلہ صحبہ اصحاب عوالی الہم اما بعد  
فیقول الفقیر ولی اللہ بن عبد الرحیم عالمہما اللہ تعالیٰ بفضلہ الجسیم و ردت رقیمۃ کریمۃ من مخدوم مکرم لازال معینا للحق والدين في الفحص عن حال  
الشيخ تقی الدین احمد بن تیمیہ عاملہ للہ تعالیٰ بفضلہ وای شی ینبغی ان یعتقد فیہ فوجہ الأتمار بامرہ وان کنت بمعزل عن مثل ذلك الذي اعتقده انام  
حسب ان یعتقدہ جمیع المسلمین فی العلماء الاسلام حملة الكتاب والسنة والفقہ الذابین عن عقیدة اهل السنة والحديث انهم عدول بتعديل النبي صلی اللہ  
علیہ وسلم حيث قال یتحمل هذا الدين من کل طبقہ عدوله وان کان بعضهم تکلم بما لا یرتضي هذا المعتقد إذا کان قوله ذلك غير مردود بنص الكتاب  
والسنة والایجماع وکان قوله ذلك محتملا وکان مجال ومساح للخوض فیہ سواء کان قوله ذلك فی اصول الدين اوفي المباحث الفقہیة أو فی الحقائق الوحدانیة  
وعلی هذا الاصل اعتقدنا فی الشیخ الأجل محي الدين محمد بن علی بن العربي وفي الشیخ المجدد احمد بن عبد الاحد السهرندي انها من صفوة عبد اللہ  
ولم نلتفت الی ما قيل فیہما فکذلك ابن تیمیہ فانا قد تحققت من حالہ انه عالم بکتاب اللہ ومعانیہ اللغویة والشرعیة وحافظ سنة رسول اللہ صلی اللہ علیہ  
وسلم و آثار السلف عارف بمعانیہا اللغویة والشرعیة استاذ فی النحو واللغة محررا مذهب الخنابلة فروعه اصوله فائق فی الذکاء کان بلاغته فی الذب عن عقیدة  
اهل السنة لم یؤثر عنه فسق ولا بدعته اللهم الا هذه الامور التي ضیق علیہ لاجلہا وليس شیء منها الا ومعه دلیله من الكتاب والسنة و آثار السلف فمثل هذا  
الشیخ عزیز الوجود فی العالم من یطیق ان یلحق شأؤہ فی تحریرہ و تقریرہ والذین ضیقوا علیہ ما بلغوا معشار ما آتاه اللہ تعالیٰ وان کان تضییقہم ذلك ناشیا من  
اجتهاد ومشاجرة العلماء فی مثل ولک ماہی الا لمشاجرة الصحابة فیما بینہم والواجب فی ذلك کف اللسان الا بخیر وقد ذکر انہ قال ان اللہ تعالیٰ فوق العرش  
والتحقیق ان فی هذه المسئلة ثلث مقامات احدهاها البحث عما یصح اثبات للحق توفیقا عمالا لا یصح توفیقا والحق فی هذه المقام ان اللہ تعالیٰ اثبت لنفسه  
جهتہ فوق وان الاحادیث متظاہرة عای ذلك وقد نقل الترمذی ذلك عن الامام مالک و نظائره وثانیہا ان العقل هل یجوز کون مثل هذا الکلام حقیقته أو  
یوجب حملہ علی المجاز والحق فی هذا المقام ان العقل یوجب انہ لیس علی ظاہرہ فی نفس الامر و ثالثہا انہ هل یجب تاویلہ او یجوز وقفہ علی ظاہرہ من غیر  
تعین المراد والحق فیہ انہ لم یثبت فی حدیث صحیح او ضعیف انہ یجب تاویلہ ولا انہ لا یجوز استعمال مثل تلك العبارات من الامة اخبرني ابو طاهر عن ابیه  
انہ قال قال الحافظ ابن الحجر العسقلانی لم ینقل عن النبي صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم ولا عن الصحابة من طریق صحیح التصريح بوجوب تاویل شیء من ذلك یعنی  
التشابهات ولا المنع من ذکرہ ومن المحال ان یأمر اللہ نبيه بتلیغ ما انزل الیہ من ربه وینزل علیہ الیوم اکملت لکم دینکم ثم ترک هذا الباب فلا یمیز ما یجوز  
نسبته الیہ تعالیٰ مما لا یجوز مع حثہ علی التبلیغ الشاهد الغائب حتی نقلوا أقوالہ وأفعالہ وأحوالہ وما فعل بحضرته فدل علی أنهم اتفقوا علی الإيمان به علی  
الوجه الذي أراد اللہ تعالیٰ فیہا وأوجب تنزیہ من مشابہة المخلوقات بقوله لیس کمثلہ شیء فمن أوجب خلاف ذلك بعد ہم فقد خالف سبیلہم انتهى وهذا  
الذي حققناه هو مذهب الشیخ أبی الحسن الأشعري عند التحقیق أقرأنی أبو طاهر المدني رضی اللہ عنہ بخط أبیه ان الشیخ أما الحسن قال فی کتابہ إنی علی  
مذهب أحمد فی مسألة الصفات وأن اللہ فوق العرش وکلام ابن تیمیہ محمول علی المقام الاول والثالث وإذا رجعنا إلی الوجدان فلا شک ان اللہ تعالیٰ  
خصوصیتہ مع العرش لیست مع غیرہ من مخلوقاته ولا نجد عبارة فی ذلك فصح وأقرب من الإستواء علی العرش كما إنا لا نجد عبارة فی الکشاف المسموعات  
والمصبرات أفصح من السمع والبصر واللہ اعلم بحقائق الامور وقد ذکر عنہ انہ منع السفر لزيارة النبي صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم ولا یروی کلامہ ذلك بدلیل صریح  
صحیح فإنه لم یمنع الزيارة مطلقا بل منع السفر لزيارة بحديث لا تشد الرحال و یحدث لا تتخذوا قبری عبدا فاذا کان لقوله مساح اجتهادی لا ینبغی ان یشد  
وعلیہ ذلك التشدد وقد ذکر عنہ انہ انکر وجود القطب والغوث و الخضر والذی مدعیہ الشیعة انہ المهدی و حق له ذلك السنی ما دام علی شرط من اعتقاد  
لا یعتقد ذلك ومن أثبت من الصوفیة فانہ لم یثبت عن کتاب وسنة اللهم الا ما ثبت بالکتاب والسنة والایجماع والسکوت عما لا یثبت بها یجوز له ان  
لکشف و لیس من ادلة الشرع والذي افہم من کلامہ انہ یرید ان هذا قول مبتدع باطل اعتقاده من حيث الشرع لقوله صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم من احدث من امرنا

لم يدل عليها الشرع لانقياد ولا هذا ما ليس منه فهو رد ولو كان قطع بالانكار لم يستحق التكفير ولا التفسيق ايضا وهاهنا دقيقه وهي انه كم من مسئلة إثباتا ودل عليها العقل كقولنا يحصل من ضرب العشرة في العشرة المائة او الكشف والوجدان كقولنا المحبة الدقيقة ثابتة الكمل من عباد الله وهي ميل الوجود الخاص الى اصله المطلق من القيود كمثلي ميل كل عنصر الى مقره وهذه المسائل حقة في الحقيقة ولو اعتقد انسان انها من الشرع كان اعتقاده ذلك خطأ . ولو احلها محل الثابت بالشرع فانكر على من لم يقل بها او جادل اثباتها على منكريها كائنات الشرعيات كان خطأ ايضا وقد ذكر عنه انه انكر اعتقاد الشيعة في الامام المحجوب على زعمهم وحق له ان ينكر ذلك بل الأشاعة كلهم على هذا الانكار لا اعلم ان احدا قال به وقد ذكر عنه انه اساء الادب مع سيدنا على رضى الله تعالى وحاشاه من ذلك وقد طالعت كلامه فوجدت بعضه مسوقا في مناقضته كلام الشيعة في طعنهم على الخلفاء الثلاثة مذكور في آخر التجريد فقام هذا الشيخ يعدد عليهم امورا اعترفوا بها في سيدنا على هي مثلها كانه يقول ليست هذه الاسور نقصا كما تخيلتم فان مثلها ماثور عن سيدنا على وهو رضى الله تعالى عنه مرضى عندنا وعندكم وما هو جوابكم في سيدنا على هو جوابنا في الخلفاء الثلاثة وهذا من كمال علمه وقوة مناظرته ومن الاعتراف بفضل سيدنا على وعلى هذا الاصل يخرج قول معلوم ان الراى ان لم يكن مذمونا الخ وقوله فان الحسين رضى الله عنه لم يعظم انكار الامة بقتله كما عظم انكارهم يقتل عثمان وقوله فان فضل ابى بكر الخ معناه الرد على الشيعة في طعنهم على الصديق منع فذك وان ايداء لفاطمة رضى الله تعالى عنها وقد قال النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم يؤذنى ما آذاها وحاصله ان مثل هذه الأمور مستثنى من مطلق الايداء لانه بالشرع للشرع وكذلك قوله واما فعل توذيتى الخ حاشاه ان يشنع على علي وفاطمة رضى الله تعالى عنهما بل هو على سبيل المناقضة كانه قال تشنيعكم على ابى بكر هو مثل ما بالقرض من تشنيع احد على علي وفاطمة وجوابكم هو جوابنا بعينه وبعضه في مناقضته الشيعة في اثباتهم افضلته سيدنا علي على الخلفاء الثلاثة كما هو مذكور فى آخر التجريد ايضا فقام هذا الشيخ الأدب يثبت للخلفاء الثلاثة مثل ما أثبتوا سيدنا على او افضل منه وليس في التفضيل اساءة ادب فان التفضيل مذهب اهل السنة اجمع وحاشاهم ان يسيئوا معه رضى الله عنه واما تفسير آية الطهارة بالارادة التشريعية دون الإرادة التكوينية فصحيح ومثله قوله تعالى يريد الله بكم اليسر ولا يريد بكم العسر ويريد الله أن يتوب عليكم إلى غير ذلك من الآيات وبعد فانى اذكر الله عز وجل كل المسلم في هذه المسألة وأمثالها الله الله ان سب احد من المسلمين عالما مجتهدا في امثال هذه هذا ما تيسر في الحال من الجواب وما حملنى عليه الا النصح والله أعلم بحقيقته

(Persian) *A response-letter to the unity of virtues, Mu'in al-Dīn al-Thattāi. Its contents include the banishment of doubts in the speech of Shaykh Taqī al-Dīn Ahmad bin Taymiyya al-Hanbalī, and an exposition on his virtues and his ineffable appreciation amongst the Sunnī scholars; and a refutation who of those who seek to undermine his status, and a revealing of his proper theological beliefs. May Allah be pleased with him and all the Sunnī scholars. It is written as follows (tehrir yaft):*

In the name of Allah, the Munificent, the Gracious. Limitless praise to Allah, the emanator of virtues, and the inspirer of wisdom! And ceaseless salutations on the Prophet, the master of Arabs and non-Arabs; and upon his exalted family, his exalted Companions, those of lofty determination!

Thereafter says: Walī Allāh bin ‘Abd al-Rahīm al-Dihlawī, may Allah treat him and his father with His boundless grace.

The honorable letter has arrived from the one who is ever-assisting truth and Allah’s religion, seeking to uncover the moral condition of *Shaykh* Taqī al-Dīn Ahmad bin Taymiyya al-Hanbalī, may Allah treat him with excellence, and what beliefs should be held regarding Ibn Taymiyya. And although I am at a distance (i.e. hesitate to answer) I see it necessary to reply to the letter. That which I believe, and I hope all Muslims believe as well, about the scholars of Islam is that they are the bearers of the Quran and the Sunnah, defenders of Sunnī theology. The Hadīth (states) that they are morally proper by the moral endorsement of the Messenger (*alayhis salam*), where he affirmed: *From every generation and class, the righteous (‘adul) will carry this knowledge.* (And he must hold respect for them) even if (these scholars) say statements that he is not pleased with, as long as (those statements) are not repudiated by the Quran and prophetic practice and scholarly consensus.

And that such a scholar’s speech holds multiple interpretive possibilities (*muhtamal*), and there is juridical scope for intellectual discussion, regardless of the view is in theological, legal, or ontological matters. On the heels of this very theory, we hold our beliefs in the exalted *Shaykh* Ibn al-‘Arabī, and the revivalist *Shaykh* Ahmed al-Sirhindi—they are from the intimately chosen of the slaves of God. And we don’t care what people say (recklessly or negatively) about these two; so, too, with Ibn Taymiyya. We have researched his intellectual production and life and verified that he was a scholar of the scripture of Allah, including its semantic and legal meaning, and of the *sunnah* of the Messenger (limitless blessings on him), and the traditions of the early generations of Islam, skillful in their legal and linguistic implications; a master of Arabic grammar, and prolific in expounding the Hanbali school, including its substantive law and legal theory. He was unmatched in brilliance, and exceedingly eloquent in defending the beliefs of those who follow the *Sunnah*. There is no mention of sin nor innovation traded down the generations about him (*yu’tbar*)-- Allah!—except in some matters for which he was constrained (*dhiyyiqā*) for. And in (these few matters) he held an evidentiary proof from the Quran, Sunnah, and the traditions of the *Salaf*. The appearance/existence of such a learned man is exceedingly rare—and who can reach his academic production in writing or lectures? And those put a chokehold on him, they did not reach a *tenth* (*mi’shār*) of what Ibn Taymiyya had been gifted by Allah, *may He be exalted*—even if the constraint of theirs was grounded in a justified scholarly debate. And how is this any

different than the legal debates and differences between the *Sahaba*—what is required but to speak well (of the Sahaba) or hold our tongues?

It has been mentioned that Ibn Taymiyya said: “In truth, Allah, exalted be He, is above the throne.” (Waliullah continues): There are three intellectual positions here. The first is to establish for Allah (from divine sources) from those points which cannot be authenticated. And the truth in this matter is that Allah, exalted be He, has established for himself the direction of *above-ness*, and the prophetic reports are explicit on this. This has been reported from Imām Tirmidhī, narrating from Imām Mālik, and his contemporaries. Second, does the rational intellect permit a literal understanding of this understanding, or does it demand to construct a metaphorical meaning? And the truth in this matter is that the intellect demands it should be construed literally, in the core of the issue. The third is that is it necessary to interpret the verse (about Allah’s directionality) or can we remain silent on its literal words, without diving into its interpretation? The truth here is that no authentic or canonical prophetic report demands that interpretation is obligatory, nor that the use of such statements is inherently impermissible. Abu Tahir al-Kurdi (i.e., al- Gurānī) reported to me from his father (Ibrāhīm al-Gurānī) that Ibn Hajar al- ‘Asqālānī said: “No necessity of interpretation of the *Mutashabihāt* has been reported from the Messenger (salutations on him), nor that anyone is barred from interpreting these verses.” It is inconceivable that Allah would command the Messenger (salutations on him) to convey what has been revealed to him, and that Allah would say: *Today I have perfected for you for your religion*, and the Messenger having failed to explain this issue (lit. he abandoned the section), with the result that we are unable to distinguish from what we may attribute to Allah *ta’ālā* from that which we may not. And this is also despite the exalted Messenger exhorting “the present should convey to the absent” so that (those present) may transmit the Messenger’s statements, actions, and those acts performed in front of him. That nothing was mentioned proves that they (the Sahaba and the early generations) were united on the theological matters in a manner Allah decreed. Allah has demanded we maintain His transcendence, per His verse: *And there is nothing like Him*—so whoever does otherwise, he has contravened the path of the scholars.

And the aforementioned is also the position of Abū ‘l-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī [d. 324] from what I have researched. Abū Tahir al-Madanī (al- Gurānī) read to me from the script of his father (Ibrahim al-Kurdi al- Gurānī) that Imām Hassan al-Ash‘arī said: *I follow Imam Ahmed bin Hanbal as it concerns Allah’s attributes, and that Allah is above the throne*. And Ibn Taymiyya’s position can be interpreted in either the first or the third possibilities (that Waliullah mentioned above). When we rely on our true consciousness (*wijdān*—mystical intuition may also be employed here), then there is little doubt that Allah possesses a special relationship with His throne unlike with any other creation! And we do not find any statement more forceful and eloquent than *istinvā ‘ala al-‘arsh*, just as we do not find any expression in elaborating on seen and auditory matters than *sam’* and *basar*. And Allah knows more than all in all matters.

And Ibn Taymiyya has been accused of halting people from visiting the Messenger of Allah (salutations on him!). Yet, no evidence from his books or lectures proves that he made such a pronouncement. For Ibn Taymiyya did not ban visitations to the Messenger of Allah, in an absolute manner, but visitations that were premised *only* on visiting the Prophet, with the proof of the prophetic report: *Do not make burdensome travel except to three (Masjids)*, and the prophetic report: *Do not turn my grave into a festival*. If there is juridical scope for Ibn Taymiyya’s statement, it is not appropriate we should be harsh on him—whoever is harsh, the harshness is on him!

And Ibn Taymiyya has been accused of denying the existence of the *Ghawth*, the *Qubt*, and *Khidhr*, and the one the *Shi'ahs* claim to be the *Mahdi*. It is correct for the Sunnī to believe such as long as his belief is anchored in the Quran, the Sunnah, and scholarly consensus. And silence is permissible for those matters which hold no scriptural grounding, and (it is also permissible) that he also not believes in them. And whoever has established these matters from the Sufis, they have not done so from the Quran or the Sunnah, unless through divine inspiration (*kashf*)—and *kashf* is not a proof in the Sharia. And that which I understand from his speech that the above statements are from the speech of an innovator whose theological beliefs are corrupted, per the judgement of the Sharia, for the Messenger's statement (salutations on him!): *Whoever introduces a matter that is not a part of our religion it is forsaken*. And even if Ibn Taymiyya categorically denied the existence of such figures then even then we may not pass judgement of *kufr* or *fisq* on him! And here is a wonderfully subtle point: How many matters are there the Sharia does not allude to, for submission, nor affirms, but the intellect concludes those matters? Such as our speech that ten times ten equals a hundred—or by unveiling or intuition, such as the statement that perfect love is established for the complete slaves of Allah, and it is the inclination of a particular element to its unrestricted root, like the inclination of every genus towards its natural habitat. And these judgements and issues are truth. If someone were to understand these matters as a *part* of the Sharia, he would be in error. And if he were to place these (unestablished from the Sharia, but established from 'Aql) matters in the place of those evidenced by the Sharia, with the result that he scorns who do not hold these beliefs, or he seeks to uphold them against its deniers as actual content from divine law, he would be similarly at fault.

Ibn Taymiyya has also been accused of denying the Shī'ī belief regarding the hidden Imam, and he was perfectly within his right to do so, for all of the Ash'arī have done so—I do not know of a single one who affirmed the supposed existence (of the Shī'ī 12<sup>th</sup> Imam)!

Finally, Ibn Taymiyya is claimed to have disrespected *Sayyidunā* 'Alī, may Allah's pleasure cradle him, and Allah forbid that he ever engaged in such! I have researched his works, and found that some sentences were brought forth to challenge the Shī'īs defamation of the first three Caliphs, may Allah be pleased with them, as it is mentioned in *al-Tajrīd* (by Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī). So this Imam (Ibn Taymiyya) rose up and enumerated a range of qualities the Shī'īs concede to be found in *Sayyidunā* 'Alī, may Allah be pleased with him, as if to say these ostensible faults you consider to be present in the first three Caliphs are also embodied by *Sayyidunā* 'Alī (and they are not actually shortcomings). And *Sayyidunā* 'Alī is well-regarded by us (Sunnis), as they he is by you, so what your response is to my claims is also our response to the first three Caliphs. And this manner of argument is from his brilliance in knowledge and excellence in debate, and, further, the acknowledgement of *Sayyidunā* 'Alī's virtues.

Based on this theoretical outline, a well-known canon emerges that the opinion, if not, is reprehensible, etc. (the full quote is in *Minhaj al-Sunnah*, which says: “if an opinion is not heterodox, then there is no blame on the one who holds it,” 6:112).

And (the same case is applied to his saying): “The Ummah did not manifest the same wrath for the murder of *Sayyidunā* 'Uthmān, as they did for the murder of *Sayyidunā* Hussein.” And his saying, “Then he preferred *sayyidunā* Abu Bakr,” etc., means responding to the Shiites in their attack on al-Siddīq, who barred the allocation of Fadak; that it was a source of harm to Fātima, may Allah be pleased with her, while the Prophet, may Allah's prayers and sanctity be upon him, said, “He who harms Fātima harms

me.” The bottom line is that such matters an exception to absolute harm, because it (i.e., the denial of Fadak) is legislated by the Sharia. And likewise is the Messenger saying, “They harm me,” etc. Far be it from Ibn Taymiyya to slander Ali and Fatima, may Allah be pleased with them. Rather, Ibn Taymiyya wrote this by way of attacking the premise of the opponent’s argument, as if he said your libel of Abu Bakr is similar to slander against Ali and Fatima-- may Allah be pleased with them both!-- and your (i.e., to the Shiites) answer is our answer in its entirety.

And other statements of Ibn Taymiyya are partly in proving the inconsistency of the Shiites in their demonstration that *sayyidunā* Ali is preferred over the three caliphs, as mentioned in the final chapters of *al-Tajrid*. So Ibn Taymiyya emerged to prove virtues for the first three Caliphs what the Shiites proved for *Sayyidunā* ‘Alī, or even greater virtues. And there is no disrespect in preference, for this hierarchy is the position of the Sunnīs. And Allah forbid that they would ever labor to disrespect *sayyidunā* ‘Alī!

So, too, is the reasoning with the verse of purity—that it is part of the legal will of Allah and not the cosmic will of Allah (i.e., that the purity of the Ahl al-Bayt is a legal matter and not an ontological one in that they are *ma’sūm*): this reasoning is completely valid, as we learn from other Quranic verses: *Allah wills ease for you and not difficulty* and *Allah intends to forgive you*, including other topical verses. I exhort every Muslim to remember Allah in this discussion, and other inexorable issues. Allah Allah! May He forbid that any Muslim should disdain or insult an incredibly gifted jurist (as Ibn Taymiyya)! The above is what was possible as a response to your letter, and nothing urged me to write this except my own well-wishes for you. Allah knows more about its reality!