

# The Hanafī-Māturīdīs Are Followers of the Jahmiyyah and Mu‘tazilah in Şifāt (Attributes) and Are Not Followers of Abu Ḥanīfah and His Students, Let Alone Followers of the Salaf

Abu ‘Iyaad  
asharis.com ♦ maturidis.com



The first Ḥanafīs, the students of **Abū Ḥanīfah** (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) (d. 150H), were upon the ‘aqīdah of the Salaf which is founded upon acceptance of the āthār. They reprimanded kalām and its people—the Jahmiyyah and Mu‘tazilah—who had appeared with a new doctrine in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century hijrah based upon the language of Aristotle of **bodies** (ajsām), **substances** (jawāhir) and **accidents** (a‘rād). This is the ‘ilm al-kalām (speculative theology) that the Salaf condemned during the second and third centuries after hijrah.

When the people of kalām incorporated this language into a flawed proof for Allāh’s existence (known as **ḥudūth al-ajsām**, *the origination of bodies*), they observed a contradiction between this proof and between the texts of the attributes. Because they wrongly believed their flawed proof to be the only way to argue for Islām, they had to reconcile between this proof and the texts of the attributes.

So they opted to give their speculative kalām proof the higher status over revelation and this then led them to deny or distort the great symbols of the Islāmic ‘aqīdah which were clearly outlined in the texts. They said that the intellect provides definitive (qaṭ’iyy) knowledge and that the texts of revelation are only speculative, uncertain knowledge (dhanniyy). As a result, they said Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) is not above His creation, over His Throne, nor will He be seen on the Day of Judgement with the vision of the eyes, nor does He speak or have the attribute of speech. That the Arabic Qur’ān known to all the Muslims is created and that Allāh does not have any attributes, because if He did He would be composed (murakkab) like all other created entities or would be a body (jism) and so on. These terms were injected into discussions of the ‘aqīdah and used with their philosophical meanings to challenge what came in the Book and the Sunnah.

These innovated views arose due to the philosophical baggage which they incorporated into the foundations of their theology and whose origins lie in the metaphysics of

Aristotle and Plato. The Salaf recognised this and saw it as tremendous misguidance and they spoke against the people of kalām with very severe speech.

The followers of **Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī** (d. 333H) who ascribed to the fiqh of Abū Ḥanīfah took the foundations of their creed regarding the Ṣifāt (attributes) from the Jahmiyyah and Mu'tazilah. This led them to rejecting Allāh's 'uluww and His ṣifāt khabariyyah<sup>1</sup> on the basis of that innovated Aristotelian language of Tawḥīd which they inherited.

Then, the later ones among them **tried to ascribe this creed to Abu Ḥanīfah**, who was free and innocent of it. For he reprimanded this way and nothing of this type of language (ajsām, a'rād) can be found in his speech or that of his students in the derivation of matters of creed.

It is related that Nuḥ al-Jāmi' said: I said to **Abū Hanīfah**: What do you say about what the people have innovated of speech regarding *al-a'rād* (accidents) and *al-ajsām* (bodies)? He said, "(Nothing but) the sayings of the Philosophers. Upon you is (to follow) the narrations and

---

<sup>1</sup> Some of the attributes of Allāh can be known by reason such as His knowledge, power, life and so on but others are only known on the basis of texts, these have been referred to as ṣifāt khabariyyah and they include the attributes of hands (yadān), face (wajh), ascent,(istiwā') among others.

the path of the Salaf, and beware of every newly-invented matter, for it is an innovation.”<sup>2</sup>

**Abū Yūsuf** (d. 182H) (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ)—the companion of Abū Ḥanīfah (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ)—said: “Knowledge of disputation and kalām is ignorance and ignorance of disputation and kalām is knowledge.”<sup>3</sup>

There are many similar statements from the Imāms of the Salaf. In their condemnation, all of these Imāms intended the kalām involving speech about **jawāhir** (substances), **ajsām** (bodies) and **a’rād** (incidental attributes) used by the Ahl al-Kalām. These philosophical terms were employed in an argument to prove Allāh's existence, the plausibility of prophethood and the plausibility of resurrection to the Atheists and Philosophers with whom they were debating. However, in order to remain consistent with the kalām argument they were using, they were forced to reject Allāh’s names, attributes and actions to varying degrees because their flawed proof forced them to presume these texts to contain tajsīm and tashbīh.

A **universal principle** was laid down by them—and it is found in the writings of the Ash‘arīs and Māturīdīs—which states that when reason (‘aql) and revelation (naql) clash with each other, then reason takes precedence. Fakhr al-

---

<sup>2</sup> *Dhamm ul-Kalām wa Ahlihī* of Abu Ismā‘īl al-Harawī (4/213-214) and also *Dhamm al-Ta’wīl* of Ibn Qudāmah (1/32/33).

<sup>3</sup> *Dhamm ul-Kalām wa Ahlihī* of Abu Ismā‘īl al-Harawī (4/211)

Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606H) outlined this in one of his books and it is called **al-qānūn al-kullī** (the universal principle). And what they mean by this is that since reason [and they mean here the proof they devised on the basis of Aristotelian terminology] proves Allāh’s existence which is the basis of our faith and since this clashes with what is in the Qur’ān of names, attributes and actions for Allāh (which they called *a’rād*, accidents, and *hawādith*, events), they said we have to reconcile between reason and revelation and the only way to do that is to distort the texts to make them conform to reason. It is here where there so-called “ta’wīl”—a form of distortion of the texts—came about. They saw the texts of the attributes as dirty stains of tashbeeh and tajseem (anthropomorphism) in the revelation of Allāh that needed to be cleaned, washed and neutralised.

This is the foundation of the creed of the kalām schools till this day. By way of example, there occurs in *Jawharah al-Tawhīd* of Ibrāhīm al-Laqqānī<sup>4</sup> (d. 1041H) the line of poetry: “*And every text that gives the presumption of tashbīh, make a figurative interpretation of it, or consign its meaning (to Allāh) and adhere to tanzīh.*”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> He is Ibrāhīm bin Ḥasan bin ‘Alī al-Laqqānī al-Mālikī, and the book *Jawharah al-Tawhīd*, has been given considerable attention by the scholars of the Ash‘arīs, it is a major study textbook within the school.

<sup>5</sup> Refer to Ibrāhīm al-Bayjūrī’s *Hāshiyah on Jawharah al-Tawhīd* (Dār al-Salām, 1st edition, 2002) p. 156.

This approach is necessitated upon them because of the philosophical baggage they employed and inherited from the Jahmiyyah and Mu‘tazilah, which in turn came from the Hellenized Jews, Christians and Sabeans before them. These nations had already dabbled in this kalām theology centuries before Islām because they had also incorporated the philosophical baggage of the Greeks into their theology.

As a result of this necessity of reconciling between their kalām philosophy and the revealed texts, the people of kalām innovated numerous devices to help achieve this goal and from them were:

—**Distinguishing between mutawātir and āhād** in matters of ‘aqīdah which is not known to the Salaf. Through this they could reject a large body ḥadīth that pertain to the attributes.

—**The use of majāz and ḥaqīqah.** This enabled them to explain away those ḥadīths which were mutawātir and could not be dismissed outright. The Salaf never spoke with this principle at all and none of this be can found with the Companions, the Tābi‘īn or the four Imāms and nor with the masters of the Arabic language such as al-Khalīl, Sībawaih and others.

—**The claim of tashābuh,** that the texts of the attributes are from the mutashābihāt (ambiguous, unclear). If what is intended is **the reality** (ḥaqīqah, kaifiyyah) of the attributes, then this is true because these texts do not

inform us of the actual realities of the attributes. This knowledge is from the unknown to us. But if what is intended is the meaning (maʿnā), then this is not true. The Salaf did not consider these texts to be from the mutashābihāt from the angle of meaning.

—**The instrument of taʿwīl**, which is really distortion (taḥrīf) of the texts that did not please them and which clashed with their innovated theology built upon the philosophical language of ajsām and aʿrāḍ (bodies and accidents).

—**The instrument of tafwīḍ**, which is employed when it is very difficult to justify the taʿwīl of a text or when the text cannot be “washed” and “neutralized” by any of the previous mechanisms. Tafwīḍ is a catch-all, universal mechanism and it means to relegate knowledge of the text to Allāh, to assume total ignorance of its meaning.

Through these means they assaulted and distorted the revealed texts that clashed with their kalām foundations and undermined what is in the hearts of the people of belief in Allāh’s names, attributes and actions and what this belief brings about of love, fear, hope, reliance and other feelings of the heart which are from the greatest forms of worship. This kalām approach eventually lead—over centuries—to a great departure from the Tawḥīd of the Messengers, which is to single out Allāh with all forms and types of worship, to the Tawḥīd of the Language of Aristotelian Metaphysics

which is simply a series of negations: “Allāh is not a *jism* (body), not a *jawhar* (substance), not an *‘arad* (incidental attribute), not in a *makān* (place), not in a *jihah* (direction), ...” and so on from the philosophical drivel uttered by these people which is not found **on the tongue of any Messenger** and nor **in any revealed Book sent by Allāh**. Rather, its origins lie in the books of Aristotle who was a star-worshipping polytheist.

Hence, it was very appropriately stated by **Ibn Surayj al-Shāfi‘ī** (d. 306H) (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ), as is related from him: “The Tawhīd of the people of knowledge and the Jamā‘ah of the Muslims is, ‘I testify none is worthy of worship except Allāh (alone) and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh’. And the Tawhīd of the people of falsehood is disputing about *al-a‘rād* (incidental attributes) and *al-ajsām* (bodies) and the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) was sent with the rejection of that.”<sup>6</sup> This is the Tawhīd of Ahl al-Kalām.

This approach also led them to restrict Tawhīd only to the belief that there is no creator, provider or sustainer except Allāh alone, which is not the Tawhīd that the

---

<sup>6</sup> Abū Ismā‘īl al-Harawī with his isnād in *Dhamm ul-Kalām* (4/385-386) and Ibn Taymiyyah in *Bayān Talbīs al-Jahmiyyah*. And he means that the speech of the people of disbelief from the Philosophers and other than them regarding the creator was based upon the likes of these philosophical terms and discussions, and the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) came to guide people with the light of revelation and to reject false and ignorant speech regarding belief in Allāh and the unseen.



Messengers called to because this belief is already innate in the fiṭrah of all people. Rather, the Messengers called to singling out Allāh with all forms of worship, this being necessitated and demanded by the innate belief in His unique rubūbiyyah.

This is why the Imāms of the religion said that whoever seeks his religion (meaning his ‘aqīdah) through *kalām*, will go astray and enter heresy. Abu Bakr al-Marwazī reported: I heard **Abū ‘Abd Allāh [Imām Aḥmad]** saying: “Whoever takes to *kalām* will never prosper and whoever takes to *kalām* will not escape from *tajahhum* (adopting the *ūsūl* of the Jahmiyyah).”<sup>7</sup>

This innovated “*kalām*” theology was spuriously ascribed to Abū Ḥanīfah afterwards by the later Ḥanafīs. Thus, we distinguish between the original **Salafī Ḥanafīs** and those Jahmite Ḥanafīs who came afterwards. In fact, the same happened with the other fiqh schools too. Imām’s Mālik, Shāfi‘ī and Aḥmad (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) were all upon the ‘aqīdah of the Salaf. However, there appeared among the latecomers who ascribed to them in fiqh, individuals who fell into that innovated *kalām* theology and then tried to ascribe this theology to those Imāms, wrongly thinking that those Imāms were upon this *kalām* theology.

In the second and third centuries, there were only two ways: **The way of the Salaf** and the way of the Jahmiyyah and Mu‘tazilah who were the condemned and refuted “Ahl

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibn Baṭṭāh in *Kitāb al-Ibānah*, *Kitāb al-Īmān* (2/537).

al-Kalām”. There was no doctrinal “Ash‘arī” or “Māturīdī” in existence then. When the Ash‘arī and Māturīdī schools appeared—long after **Imām Aḥmad** (d. 241H) had already defeated and humiliated the Jahmiyyah, Mu‘tazilah—they inherited the very uṣūl of the Jahmiyyah and Mu‘tazilah in the topic of the Ṣifāt (attributes). This is very apparent in their books and is only denied by the ignorant or wilfully blind.

Note that this kalām theology had already affected the Jews and Christians before Islām. The Jewish rabbi, **Philo Judaeus of Alexandria** (d. 50 CE) and Christian leaders such as **Clement of Alexandria** (d. 215 CE) and **Augustine of Hippo** (d. 430 CE) all spoke of a deity that is identical to the deity of the Jahmiyyah, Mu‘tazilah, Ash‘ariyyah and Māturīdiyyah on the basis of the language of Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy—that of ajsām and a‘rāḍ (bodies and accidents). This can be found in their writings and it has also been well studied by non-Muslim academics. The reader is referred to **Asharis.Com** for a detailed discussion and corroboration of these undeniable facts of history which the average, common Ash‘arī or Māturīdī will be ignorant of and which the learned amongst them conceal from their common folk knowingly and deliberately if they themselves are aware of these matters in the first place.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Refer to the five part series: *Aristotle of Stageira, Philo of Alexandria, Augustine of Hippo, the Sabeans of Harraan, the*

These kalām schools simply disputed with each other about how to apply this kalām theology in a coherent and consistent manner, after agreeing upon its foundations. They differed with each other about the application of these foundations and consequently, as to what can or cannot be denied for Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) (of His names, attributes and actions) in order not to contradict the foundations of their inovated kalām theology.

Hence we have the **Jahmiyyah**, **Mu'tazilah**, **Rāfiḍī Hishāmiyyah**, **Kullābiyyah**, **Ḥanafī Karrāmiyyah**, **Sālimiyyah**, **Ash'ariyyah** and **Māturīdiyyah** kalām schools and the differences between them.<sup>9</sup> The later ones from the Mu'aṭṭilah tried to disguise this kalām theology as the way of the Salaf—and this is how the Ash'arīs and Māturīdīs deceive the Muslim nation today.

From the most apparent signs of their falsehood is that they all differ with each other in terms of what they accept or deny of the attributes, despite having the same foundations in their kalām. And this is keeping in mind their claim that the proof of intellect is decisive over the proof of revelation, which is speculative and uncertain to them.

---

*Mu'tazilites of Basrah and Baghdad and the Jahmite Ash'ari Heretics of Today Claiming Orthodoxy* which is available at the following address: <http://www.asharis.com/creed/?kagzi>

<sup>9</sup> Some of them are negators (Mu'aṭṭilah) and others are Mujassimah, Mushabbihah (such as the Ḥanafī Karrāmiyyah and Rāfiḍī Hishāmiyyah).

Also, they have no clear principle do distinguish between what they make ta'wīl of and what they do not make ta'wīl of. And here it is where their contradiction becomes clear.

As for Ahl al-Sunnah, the Righteous Salaf, they have a **uniform, consistent, coherent principle**. They affirm whatever Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) described Himself with or what His Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) described Him with whilst negating any likeness from him. This was evidently the way of the Salaf and they made no distinction between what came in the Qur'ān and what came in the ḥadīth, whether mutawātir or āḥād.

## THE CONSENSUS OF THE RIGHTEOUS SALAF BEFORE THE EXISTENCE OF ANY ASH'ARĪ OR MĀTURĪDĪ ON THIS EARTH

As for the consensus of Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah in affirming the ṣifāt khabariyyah, it is reported by al-Tirmidhī (d. 278H)—at a time when there was no doctrinal Ash'arī or Māturīdī in existence—showing that their claim of the truth being conveyed to the ummah only through the Ash'arīs and Māturīdīs is **totally spurious** and nothing but baseless, futile propaganda. **Imām al-Tirmidhī** (رَحْمَةُ اللهِ) said:

وقد قال غير واحد من أهل العلم في هذا الحديث وما يشبه هذا من الروايات من الصفات ونزول الرب تبارك وتعالى كل ليلة إلى السماء الدنيا

قالوا: قد تثبت الروايات في هذا ويؤمن بها ولا يتوهم ولا يقال: كيف؟ هكذا روي عن مالك و سفيان بن عيينة و عبد الله بن المبارك أنهم قالوا: في هذه الأحاديث أمرها بلا كيف وهكذا قول أهل العلم من أهل السنة والجماعة وأما الجَهْمِيَّة فأنكرت هذه الروايات وقالوا هذا تشبيه وقد ذكر الله عز و جل في غير موضع من كتابه اليد والسمع والبصر فتأولت الجَهْمِيَّة هذه الآيات ففسروها على غير ما فسر أهل العلم وقالوا: إن الله لم يخلق آدم بيده وقالوا: إن معنى اليد ههنا القوة وقال إسحق بن إبراهيم: إنما يكون التشبيه إذا قال: يد كيد أو مثل يد أو سمع كسمع أو مثل سمع فإذا قال سمع كسمع أو مثل سمع فهذا التشبيه وأما إذا قال كما قال الله تعالى يد وسمع وبصر ولا يقول: كيف؟ ولا يقول: مثل سمع ولا كسمع فهذا لا يكون تشبيهاً وهو كما قال الله تعالى في كتابه: **لَيْسَ كَمِثْلِهِ شَيْءٌ وَهُوَ السَّمِيعُ الْبَصِيرُ**

It has been stated by more than one person from the People of Knowledge about this hadīth and what resembles it from the narrations, such as (those of) the Attributes, and the descent of our Lord, the Blessed and Exalted, to the lowest heaven every night. They said the narrations regarding this are established and they are to be believed. No presumptions are to be made and it is not said “How?” The likes of this has been related from Mālik [bin Anas], Sufyān Ibn ‘Uyainah and ‘Abd Allāh bin al-Mubārak, who all said about such

ahādīth, “*Leave them as they are, without asking how.*” Such is the saying of the People of Knowledge from the Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā‘ah. However, the Jahmiyyah opposed these narrations and said “This is tashbīh!” But, Allāh the Exalted, has mentioned in various places in His Book, the attribute of *al-yad* (hand), *as-sama‘* (hearing), and *al-basr* (seeing), yet the Jahmiyyah make *ta’wīl* of these verses, explaining them (*fassarūhā*) in a way, other than how they are explained by the people of knowledge.<sup>10</sup> They say, “Indeed, Allāh did not create Ādam with His own hand - they say that hand (yad) means the power (qudrah) of Allāh.” Ishāq ibn Ibrahīm al-Rāhūyah said: Tashbīh (resemblance) is if it is said: “*Hand like my hand, or similar to my hand*”, or it is said: “*Hearing like my hearing, or similar to my*

---

<sup>10</sup> When the Salaf said that the attributes are not to be explained (yufassar), they were referring to the practice of the Jahmiyyah who were giving their own novel explanations. This was misunderstood by the Ash‘arites and Māturīdīs who claimed that the Salaf denied the texts of attributes have meanings. This saying is the most futile of sayings and its futility is known by necessity from the sum whole of what has been narrated from the Salaf in refutation of the Jahmiyyah and Mu‘tazilah. The Salaf were not upon *tafwīd*, rather they were upon *ithbāt* (of the meaning) and negation of *tashbīh* and *takyīf*. When the Salaf rejected “*tafsīr*”, they were speaking about the false *ta’wīls* of the Jahmiyyah and Mu‘tazilah who were trying to explain away the attributes with novel explanations. The Salaf never denied that the texts of the attributes had meanings, rather they denied that realities of these meanings resemble the realities of the attributes of the creatures.

*hearing*”, then this is *tashbīh*. But if what is being said is what Allah has said, “Hand, Hearing, Seeing” and it is not asked how, nor is it said, “*Like my hearing, or similar to my hearing*” then it is not *tashbīh*. Allāh, the Most Blessed, Most High, said in His Book, “**There is no likeness unto Him, and he is the all-Hearer, the all-Seer.**” (42:11)<sup>11</sup>

Within this statement is a clear and decisive refutation of the Ash‘arī and Māturīdī schools whose position in the *Şifāt* has been inherited directly from the Jahmiyyah and Mu‘tazilah and not from the Salaf. However, seeing that the people will recognize their falsehood, they try to make it appear that they are following the way of the Salaf. At the very same time, they throw the very same accusations against the Salafis today that their ancestors—the Jahmiyyah and Mu‘taziilah—used to throw against the Salaf! Hence, they are exposed in broad daylight by their own actions.

As for what the testimony of Imām al-Tirmidhī contains, then the following:

1. The Salaf accepted the authentic narrations regarding the *Şifāt*, had faith (īmān) in them and made submission (taslīm) because they are revelation from Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ).

---

<sup>11</sup> *Al-Sunan* of at-Tirmidhī, 1/128-129.

2. The Salaf did not distinguish between mutawātir and āḥād, this was an innovation of the Mu'tazilah as a tactical method to fight against the Salaf because they themselves were paupers in ḥadīth and āthār. This was a device to dismiss the ḥadīths of the attributes.

3. There is no presumption of tashbīh in anything that Allāh has described himself with in the Qur'ān or the Sunnah. This presumption is only in the minds of the Jahmiyyah and Mu'tazilah and those who inherited their way from the Ash'arīs and Māturīdīs. The tashbīh actually originates in their hearts because it is presumed by them to exist in the texts. As for Ahl al-Sunnah there is no tasbhīh in anything Allāh described Himself with.

4. The way of the Salaf is to leave these texts intact, upon their meanings, without asking about their realities, and without giving explanations as was done by the Jahmiyyah. The fight between the Salaf and the Jahmiyyah and Mu'tazilah was not about the words, but about the meanings. If this had not been the case, then the Jahmiyyah and Mu'tazilah would not have resorted to innovated explanations of these words. Thus, there are words, meanings and realities. The Salaf affirmed the words and meanings but denied knowledge of the realities.



5. The Jahmiyyah declared the way of the Salaf as tashbīh (anthropomorphism), just as the Ash‘arīs and Māturidīs today accuse the Salafīs of the same thing. However, to conceal the fact that they are following the way of their Jahmite ancestors, they use numerous tricks and deceptions. From them is their claim that the Salaf were upon tafwīḍ of the meaning (ma‘nā), in addition to the kaifiyyah and ḥaqīqah (reality). But this is evidently not true when one looks at the statements and writings of the Salaf in the second and third centuries after hijrah. Their battle with the Jahmiyyah and Mu‘tazilah was not about the mere words alone, but the words and meanings.

6. After declaring the Salaf to be Mushabbihah, the Jahmites made distortions and false interpretations of the texts of the attributes, following the way of the Jews and Christian kalām theologians before them. Hence, they reduced the attributes to mere metaphors and allegories. This is what the Salaf forbade when they said that we do not make tafsīr (interpretation) of the attributes, because this was exactly what the Jahmites were doing in that time with their false ta‘wīls. The Imām of these ta‘wīls in the second century was **Bishr al-Marīsī** (d. 218H), the Ḥanafī Jahmite. It is from al-Marīsī that the Māturidīs and Ash‘arīs inherited all their ta‘wīls which they spuriously call “the Ta‘wīls of Ahl al-Sunnah”. Abu Manṣūr al-Māturidī wrote a work with this very name, “Ta‘wīlāt Ahl al-Sunnah” which

are in fact a compilation of the ta'wīls of Bishr al-Marīsī and the Jahmites and not of Ahl al-Sunnah, the Righteous Salaf.

7. The reality of the tashbīh denied by the Salaf is when a person says, “Hand like my hand, hearing like my hearing, seeing like my seeing.” This is the reality of tashbīh and this is what the Salaf spoke against. As for when one affirms the attributes but without likening them or asking how, then this is what the Qur’ān and the Sunnah came with. But this is tashbīh according to the Jahmiyyah, Mu‘tazilah, Ash‘ariyyah and Māturīdiyyah!

The statement of Imām al-Tirmidhī is a decisive refutation of the kalām schools and particularly of the Ash‘arīs and Māturīdīs. It provides a glimpse of the nature of the battle between the Salaf and the Jahmites in the second and third centuries hijrah before the Ash‘arī and Māturīdī schools developed. They schools are unable to validate their theology on the basis of the kalām philosophy that is found in their earlier, older works, because the common person with his fiṭrah is just not going to accept it. This is something that the Ash‘arī and Māturīdī scholars realised a long time ago.

From them is al-Ghazālī (d. 505H) who stated that if the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) invited the common people through this type of philosophical language used by the Ash‘arīs and

Ahl al-Kalām in general, not even one person in a thousand would accept belief in Allāh and would turn to atheism (taṭīl).<sup>12</sup>

So they know that their kalām theology cannot stand on its own. For this reason, they have a deceptive method of justifying their theology. It is to accuse the followers of the Salaf with tajsīm and tashbīh and to demonise and vilify them in front of their audiences—a kind of intellectual terrorism—so that their audiences become naturally averse to the creed of the Salaf.

This is the tactic used today by intellectually defunct and dishonest Ash‘arīs and Māturīdīs, because they know that their kalām theology cannot stand on its own merits. They also employ a large number of **diversionary tactics** and **emotional arguments** to hide the clear evidence that their theology is fundamentally derived from the uṣūl of the Jahmiyyah and Mu‘tazilah. One of their main tactics is to use ad hominem attacks (attacks of a personal nature) upon certain Salafī scholars of the past or present or upon Salafī callers rather than discussing actual evidences in light of what the Salaf were upon which is clear from the hundreds of narrations from them.

Alḥamdulillāh, the Imāms of the Salaf and those upon their way already made clear for us the reality of these

---

<sup>12</sup> In his book *Ijām al-‘Awwām ‘an ‘Ilm al-Kalām*. For more details on this matter visit: <http://www.asharis.com/creed/?ykoxo>

people, such that there should be absolutely no confusion about them at all:

**Abū ‘Uthmān al-Ṣābūnī** (d. 449H) (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said: “And the characteristics [resulting] from [the effects of] innovations upon their people are obvious, and manifestly clear. The most apparent of their signs and characteristics is the severity of their enmity and hatred towards the Carriers of the narrations of the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), their disdain of them, their scorn of them [considering them to be valueless] and naming them with *Ḥashawiyyah* (Worthless People), *Jahalah* (the Ignorant), *Dhāhiriyyah* (Literalists), and the *Mushabbihah* (those who liken Allaah to the creation). [And this], due to their belief [concerning] the narrations of the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) - that they are devoid of any knowledge and that the [real] knowledge is that which *Shayṭān* throws at them from the results of their corrupt intellects, the dark whisperings of their chests [i.e. souls], the false notions of their hearts [which are] empty of any goodness, their words and proofs which are devoid [of truth] and their unjustified and futile doubts.... The sign of the *Jahmiyyah* is that they call the *Ahl al-Sunnah* ‘*Mushabbihah*’ (those who liken Allāh to the creation)”.<sup>13</sup>

والحمد لله رب العالمين والصلاة والسلام على سيدنا محمد وعلى آله وصحبه أجمعين

---

<sup>13</sup> *Aqīdat al-Salaf wa Ashāb al-Ḥadīth* (p.101-107) of Abū ‘Uthmān al-Ṣābūnī.

Abu 'Iyaad  
6th Jumādā al-Ūlā 1439 / 24th January 2018  
@abuiyaadsp  
abuiyaad.com  
1.4