

A TREATISE ON PREDESTINATION
–*Sbarḥ Ḥadīth İhtijāj Ādam wa-Mūsā* of Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda
al-Iznīqī –

Abdullah Karahan
Uludağ University
&
Mehmet Şakar
Uludağ University

Abstract

The ḥadīth that is well-known in Islamic theology as “İhtijāj Ādam wa-Mūsā/Discussion between Adam and Moses” often comes to the fore in debates about predestination because of its content. Almost any scholar studying fate has an affirmative or contrary comment on this ḥadīth. The Ottoman scholar Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda al-Iznīqī (d. 885/1480) was among those who analyzed the ḥadīth. He joined the discussion with a specific treatise that became important on this issue. As a Sufi scholar, he treated the ḥadīth through the Sufi approach and brought a different point of view. This study seeks to introduce the precious treatise by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda to present scientific circles through analysis, interpretation, and translation.

Key Words: *İhtijāj Ādam wa-Mūsā*, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda al-Iznīqī, predestination, *qadar*, problem of fate

Introduction

With regard to predestination, relevant parties use many forms of proof to support their views or refute those of opponents. These

pieces of evidence consist of the Qurʾān verses, ḥadīths and rational deductions and are discussed in depth among scholars. Some of this proof is at the center of debates due to its importance and constitutes the major axis of the problem of fate, with affirmative and opposing opinions expressed by scholars according to their sides in the discussion. The ḥadīth known as “İhtijāj Ādam wa-Mūsā/Discussion between Adam and Moses,” which is at the core of this study, has an important place among this evidence. The ḥadīth is considered proof, especially among the followers of the Jabriyya school, due to fatalist elements within its content.

As for Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda al-Iznīqī, this Ottoman scholar attached so much importance to the ḥadīth that he wrote a separate treatise on it. The author sought to contribute to relevant discussions through a treatise and made interesting assessments. In fact, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda was a Sufi scholar, and under the influence of his disposition, he created a rather Sufi framework for the ḥadīth. Consequently, a different aspect of the issue comes to the fore. The Jabriyya school interprets the ḥadīth in such a manner that it relates Adam’s removal from Heaven/descent to earth to predestination. Al-Iznīqī, however, took an alternative view, and his comments address not only the problem of predestination but also that of prophecy.

This work is chosen not only because of its genuine content but also because one of the four existing copies of the treatise is with handwriting of Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda himself, thus ensuring a solid line of authors. Indeed, the presence of the manuscript written by the author himself is crucial for determining to whom it belongs.

Life of Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda

Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda Muḥyī al-Dīn Meḥmed ibn Mawlā Quṭb al-Dīn al-Iznīqī was the son of Quṭb al-Dīn al-Iznīqī (d. 821/1418), a notable scholar and Sufi of the Ottoman era. He was named Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda after his father. A descendant of the Prophet, he was born and raised in Iznik. He was among the elite disciples of Mullā al-Fanārī (d. 834/1431), the renowned Ottoman scholar.¹

¹ Tāshkuprī-zāda ‘İşām al-Dīn Abū l-Khayr Aḥmad ibn Muştafā ibn Khalīl, *al-Sbaqā’iq al-Nu‘māniyya fī ‘ulamā’ al-Dawla al-‘Utmāniyya* (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1975), 65; Bursali Meḥmed Tāhir Efendī, *‘Utmānli Mu‘alliflari* (Istanbul: Maṭba‘a-i ‘Āmira, 1333), I, 159; Reşat Öngören, “Kutbüddinzāde İznikī,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXVI, 489-490.

After higher education in religious sciences, he joined the Sufis and lived as a scholar who combined *sharī'a* with *ṭarīqa*. According to his comments in his *al-Ta'bir al-munīf wa-l-ta'wil al-sbarīf*, he participated in the Zayniyya order, and his sheikh was 'Abd al-Raḥīm Rūmī (d. after 865/1461), a caliph of Zayn al-Dīn al-Ḥāfī.² Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda was also a member of the Bayrāmiyya order.³ Certain expressions in his works indicate that he attained sheikhdom in both orders.⁴

Moreover, he pursued the views of the Akbariyya school, which are attributed to Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn 'Arabī (d. 638/1240) and were presented by scholars such as Dāwūd al-Qayṣarī (d. 751/1350) and Mullā al-Fanārī in Anatolia.⁵

The Arabic and Turkish works by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda made significant contributions to Ottoman scientific circles. In particular, *Faṭḥ Miftāḥ al-ghayb*,⁶ a commentary that he wrote at the behest of Mehmed II on *Miftāḥ al-ghayb* by Şadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī, and *Tanwīr al-awrād*,⁷ a commentary on *Awrād al-Zayniyya* by Zayn al-Dīn al-Ḥāfī, are his well-known works. Another notable work by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda is *Muzīl al-shakk fī aqsām al-kafara*,⁸ which treats the position of people in the afterlife whom the message of Islam does not reach. In the introduction to the text, he gives certain explanations about the validity of the faith of Pharaoh and the situation of the unbeliever in Hell. Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda wrote this work under the influence of severe conflicts and havoc after Muḥyī al-Dīn

² Citing the noted work by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda: Reşat Öngören, "Bir Rüya Yorumcusu Olarak Mutasavvif-Âlim Kutbuddin-zâde Mehmed İznikî," *Uluslararası İznik Sempozyumu (5-7 Eylül 2005) (International Iznik Symposium [5-7 September 2005])* (Iznik: İznik Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2005), 382.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Öngören, "Kutbuddin-zâde İznikî," 489.

⁶ MS Istanbul, Râgıb Paşa Library, 692; MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Şehid Ali Paşa, 1271; Konya Mevlânâ Museum, 1632. (Öngören, "Kutbuddin-zâde İznikî," 489).

⁷ MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Amcazâde Hüseyin Paşa, 290; Fâtih, 2852; Lâleli, 1593.

⁸ MS Istanbul, Râgıb Paşa Library, 692; MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, 2504, 4223.

Ibn ‘Arabī claimed that the faith of Pharaoh at the moment of the beginning of eternal punishment was valid.⁹ Defending this important claim about Pharaoh, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda shows that he is a follower of the views put forth by Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī and the Akbariyya school.

Additionally, his notable works include the ḥadīth commentaries, such as *İhtijāj Ādam wa-Mūsā* ^{‘alaybimā l-salām},¹⁰ *Risāla fī qawl al-Nabī* ^{‘alaybi l-salām} *al-‘ulamā’ warathat al-anbiyā’*,¹¹ and *al-Ta‘bīr al-munīf wa-l-ta’wīl al-sbarīf*¹² on interpretation of dreams. He also produced Turkish treatises¹³ on *tarāwīḥ* prayer¹⁴ and *jibād*;¹⁵ the literature ascribes other works to him as well.¹⁶

Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda, who was a professor at Iznik Orhan Gazi Madrasa and qāḍī and muftū of Iznik,¹⁷ passed away in Iznik in 885/1480. His tomb is near that of his father in Iznik.¹⁸

⁹ Öngören, “Kutbüddinzāde Iznikî,” 489.

¹⁰ MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, 4223; Lâleli, 1593; MS Istanbul, Râgıb Paşa Library, 692.

¹¹ MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, 4223; Fâtih, 2852.

¹² MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Ayasofya, 1733; Hasan Hayri, 112.

¹³ Öngören, “Kutbüddinzāde Iznikî,” 489.

¹⁴ MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Ayasofya, 1802.

¹⁵ MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Ayasofya, 1802.

¹⁶ For further information see Öngören, “Kutbüddinzāde Iznikî,” 489. Also see Bürsâli Mehmed Tâhir, *‘Utmânli Mu’alliflari*, I, 160; Ismâ‘il Pâshâ al-Baghdâdî, *Hadiyyat al-‘arifin asmâ’ al-mu’allifin wa âtbâr al-muşannifin* (eds. Mahmut Kemal İnal and Avni Aktuç; Istanbul: Maarif Basımevi, 1955), II, 211.

¹⁷ Muḥammad Majdî Efendî, *Ḥadâ’iq al-sbaqâ’iq* (ed. Abdülkadir Özcan; Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989), I, 125.

¹⁸ For further information see Tâshkuprî-zāda, *al-Sbaqâ’iq*, 65; Muḥammad Majdî Efendî, *ibid.*, I, 124-125; Hâjî Khalifa Muşafâ ibn ‘Abd Allâh Kâtib Chalabî, *Süllemü’l-Vusûl ilâ Tabakâti’l-Fuhûl [Sullam al-wuşûl ilâ ṭabaqât al-fuhûl]* (eds. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, Maḥmūd ‘Abd al-Qâdir al-Arna’ût and Şâlih Sadawî; Istanbul: IRCICA Yayınları, 2010), III, 224; Kâtib Chalabî, *Kashf al-zunûn ‘an asâmi l-kutub wa-l-funûn* (eds. M. Şerefettin Yaltkaya and Kilisli Rifat Bilge; Ankara: Maarif Vekaleti, 1943), II, 1655, 1768; Bürsâli Mehmed Tâhir, *‘Utmânli Mu’alliflari*, I, 159-160; Ismâ‘il Pâshâ al-Baghdâdî, *Hadiyyat al-‘arifin*, II, 211; Öngören, “Kutbüddinzāde Iznikî,” 489.

Treatise *Sharḥ Ḥadīth Iḥtijāj Ādam wa-Mūsā*^{alayhimā l-salām}

The treatise is the commentary of the ḥadīth on a discussion between Moses and Adam and tells of the sending of Adam from Heaven down to earth due to his mistake and the resulting obligation of man to live on earth.

The meaning of the ḥadīth is as follows:

Adam (pbuh) and Moses (pbuh) argued in the presence of their Lord. In the end, Adam beat Moses. Moses told Adam “You are Adam, whom Allah created by His hand, into whom He blew His soul, before whom He got His angels to prostrate and whom He placed in Heaven. However, you caused the sending of men down to earth due to your mistake.” In response, Adam said: “You are a chosen one whom Allah found worthy as a messenger and talked to in person, whom He handed the plates that included explanation of everything, whom He brought to his convent of dignity as a confidant. How many years before Allah created me did He write Torah?” he asked. “Forty years beforehand,” answered Moses. Thereupon, Adam asked once again, “Did you see the verse, ‘Adam rebelled his Lord and went astray’?”¹⁹ As Moses responded “Yes,” Adam said: “Will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!” Upon this answer, Muḥammad (pbuh) said, “Adam won this debate.”²⁰

As told in the ḥadīth, Moses sees Adam as the reason for the expulsion of man from Heaven and his obligation to live on earth and criticizes him, bringing him, in a sense, to book. In return, Adam defends himself, claiming that he cannot be accused because his sin was prescribed as destiny by Allah even before his creation. The Prophet recognizes Adam in the discussion and puts forth a significant verdict about destiny.

The progress of this discussion, reportedly between Adam and Moses, and relevant explanations show that it includes certain important, evidential information about the question of destiny.

¹⁹ Q 20:121.

²⁰ Muslim, “Qadar”, 15. For similar texts, see al-Bukhārī, “Anbiyā’”, 29; “Qadar”, 11; Muslim, “Qadar”, 13-14; al-Tirmidhī, “Qadar”, 2; Abū Dāwūd, “Sunna”, 17; Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, II, 248, 264, 268, 398.

Accordingly, Muslim scholars, and theologians above all, have put forth arguments on various aspects of the ḥadīth.

The first matter of debate is whether such a quarrel between Adam and Moses is possible and where and when, if ever, it took place. The second question is whether Adam's fate was written prior to his creation and if so, when. Another point about the ḥadīth is whether the sinning of Adam as a prophet damages his prophecy. Adam's response to Moses: "Will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!" and the Prophet's declaration that he is the winner of the debate constitute the most controversial aspects of the narration (*riwāya*). Indeed, these phrases and their content seem to support the fatalist approach, known as the compulsory approach in Muslim theology and adopted by the Jabriyya. As a natural consequence of intense discussion on the narration, there is also debate regarding whether the ḥadīth is authentic.

An extensive emphasis on the above controversies would go far beyond the frame of this article. Nevertheless, for a solid assessment of the interpretations by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda on the ḥadīth, the approach of Muslim scholars on these points should be treated at least in general terms.

Before addressing the matters of debate, it is necessary to verify the authenticity of the narration. The narration reached posterity through the Prophet and companions such as Abū Hurayra, ʿUmar, Jundub ibn ʿAbd Allāh and Abū Mūsā; therefore, it has many lines of narration. Musa Bağcı determined sixty-eight different paths/chains of narration/transmission for the ḥadīth.²¹ By means of these various chains of transmission, the ḥadīth appears in almost all renowned and reputable ḥadīth sources, *al-Kutub al-sitta* above all.²² Almost all scholars and Sunnī theologians acknowledge the ḥadīth as authentic;²³ some even consider it multiple successive (*mutawātir*).²⁴

²¹ Hacı Musa Bağcı, *İnsanın Kaderi: Hadislerin Telkin Ettiği Kader Anlayışı* (Ankara: Ankara Okulu Yayınları, 2009), 228-235.

²² For further information about chains of transmitters and their sources, see *ibid.*, 228-235.

²³ Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Manda, *al-Radd ʿalā l-Jabriyya* (ed. ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad Nāşir al-Faqihī; n.p., 1982), 71-72; Abū ʿUmar Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr al-Namarī, *al-Tambīd li-mā fi l-Muwaṭṭaʾ min al-maʿānī wa-l-asānīd* (eds. Saʿīd Aḥmad Aʿrāb, Muḥammad al-Fallāḥ et al.; Maghreb:

The latter have mostly put forth their views in consideration of chains of transmission. Evaluations of the text are not mere criticism; rather, they intend to prove that the sections, which allegedly conflict with the Qurʾān, do not actually bear such contradiction. According to scholars from the Jahmiyya and Muʿtazila schools, the noted ḥadīth runs counter to the Qurʾān and is fabrication.²⁵ They never give credit to such criticisms of chains of transmission, and put forth their views in consideration of elements that they see as contrary to the Qurʾān in the text.

The first matter of debate about the ḥadīth is when and where the discussion between the two prophets took place. According to Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ (d. 544/1149), the discussion occurred on earth and in the lifetime of Moses; the Almighty Allah probably resurrected Adam upon the request of Moses and brought him into his presence. Likewise, in the night journey, the Prophet also came together with other prophets at Bayt al-Maqdis and led them in the prayer. Again, Moses and Adam may have had this discussion in the lifetime of Moses.²⁶ According to al-Qābisī (d. 403/1012), Ibn Baṭṭāl (d. 449/1057) and Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (d. 463/1071), Allah may have brought together the souls of both prophets in Heaven after the

Wizārat ʿUmūm al-Awqāf wa-l-Shuʿūn al-Islāmiyya, 1992), XVIII, 12, 13; id., *al-Istidbkār al-jāmiʿ li-madbāhib fuqabāʾ al-amṣār wa-ʿulamāʾ al-aqtār fīmā taḍammanab^h al-Muwaṭṭaʾ min maʿānī l-raʾy wa-l-āthār wa-sbarḥ dbālīka kullībⁱ bi l-ḥjāz wa-l-ikhtiṣār* (ed. ʿAbd al-Muʿṭī Amīn Qalʿajī; Cairo: Dār al-Waʿy, 1993), XXVI, 84, 85; Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn ibn Masʿūd al-Baghawī, *Sbarḥ al-Sunna* (eds. Zuhayr al-Shāyish and Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ; Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1983), I, 124, 126; Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Sbifāʾ al-ʿalīl fī masāʾil al-qaḍāʾ wa-l-qadar wa-l-ḥikma wa-l-taʿlīl* (ed. Muṣṭafā Abū l-Naṣr al-Shalabī; Jeddah: Maktabat al-Sawādī, 1991), I, 46; Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī bi-sbarḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukbārī* (eds. Muḥammad Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī and Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb; Cairo: Dār al-Rayyān, 1986), XI, 514.

²⁴ Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *al-Istidbkār*, XXVI, 85.

²⁵ *Ibid.*; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī*, XI, 518.

²⁶ Abū l-Faḍl ʿIyāḍ ibn Mūsā l-Yaḥṣubī Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ, *Ikmāl al-muʿlim bi-fawāʾid Muslim* (ed. Yaḥyā Ismāʿīl; Manṣūra: Dār al-Wafāʾ, 1998), VIII, 137; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī*, XI, 514; Abū Muḥammad Badr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Aḥmad ʿAynī, *Umdat al-qārī sbarḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukbārī* (ed. Muḥammad Munīr Abdah Aghā l-Dimashqī *et al.*; Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, n.d.), XIX, 60.

demise of Moses.²⁷ Some scholars, however, claim that the discussion will take place in the afterlife,²⁸ grounded in a phrase of Abū Dāwūd (d. 275/889) in his *Sunan*.²⁹ For Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1201), the narrative can be a mere exemplary saying referring to the initial phrase of the ḥadīth, which reads: “If they ever met, such a discussion would take place between them.”³⁰

Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda makes no specific remark on where Adam and Moses met and argued. Nevertheless, the following phrases in the treatise may hint that it took place in *barzakb*:

As Moses was resurrected at *barzakb*, he thought about the response of his father, Adam, and found out the truth; thereupon, he was acquainted with the secrets and eternal knowledge thanks to the attribute of “walī,” which is the true way of closeness to Allah Almighty; thus, he accepted the response of his father. Therefore, all the curtains that had hindered and dominated him due to provisions of being a prophet in his lifetime were lifted. In proportion to his divergence from earthly life, the veils were removed and the first lights of the truth became apparent.

The second issue with the narrative is whether Adam’s destiny was sealed prior to his creation and if so, when it was sealed or even whether that destiny was predetermined. The following passage in the narrative states that the destiny of Adam was sealed forty years before his creation:

“How many years before Allah created me did He write Torah?” he asked. “Forty years beforehand,” answered Moses. Thereupon, Adam asked once again, “Did you see the verse, ‘Adam rebelled his Lord and went astray?’ As Moses responded “Yes,” Adam said: “Will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!”

According to Ibn al-Ṭīn (d. 611/1214), the forty years signify the period between the time when Allah said in the verse, “*I am going to*

²⁷ Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *al-Tambīd*, XVIII, 16; Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Khalaf Ibn Baṭṭāl al-Qurṭubī, *Sharḥ Saḥīḥ al-Bukhārī li-Ibn Baṭṭāl* (ed. Abū Tamīm Yāsir ibn Ibrāhīm; Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2003), X, 314; Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Fathḥ al-bārī*, XI, 514; al-‘Aynī, *‘Umdat al-qārī*, XIX, 60.

²⁸ Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Fathḥ al-bārī*, XI, 514.

²⁹ Abū Dāwūd, “Sunna,” 17.

³⁰ Al-‘Aynī, *‘Umdat al-qārī*, XIX, 60.

*place a caliph on earth*³¹ and the time when He blew His soul into Adam.³² Ibn al-Jawzī claims that Adam waited as soil before the blowing of spirit. Ibn al-Jawzī grounds his view in a narrative³³ in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* that indicates that forty years passed between formation of Adam from soil and the blowing of soul into him.³⁴ According to some scholars, the beginning of the forty years signifies the time of writing on the tablets, and its end is the time of Adam's creation.³⁵ Al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277), however, adopts a different approach. According to him, "Adam's experiencing this event means that it was written in *al-Lawḥ al-maḥfūz*, Torah, or the tablets. It is inappropriate to refer to destiny itself here because destiny is eternal. Allah knows beforehand all incidents to come. His knowledge does not take shape subsequently."³⁶ Al-Māzarī (d. 536/1141) says the following: "This expression indicates that Allah wrote it forty years prior to the creation of Adam. Nevertheless, it may also signify that Allah disclosed this fact to angels or carried out an act to which He attributed the mentioned date. Otherwise, the will and discretion of Allah is eternal (*qadīm*)."³⁷

In his treatise, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda makes no evaluation regarding when Adam's destiny is written.

Another issue regarding this ḥadīth is whether Adam's commission of the forbidden deed constitutes a sin, and if so, whether this sin prejudices his being a prophet.

According to some theologians, Adam's commission of forbidden deed is a sin. In fact, the deeds *عصى* and *غوى* in the verses are used for those who commit major sins.³⁸ According to most commentators and Kalām scholars, Adam touched the forbidden tree or fruit forgetting the ban, as indicated in the verse "*but he forgot; and We*

³¹ Q 2:30.

³² Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī*, XI, 517; al-ʿAynī, *ʿUmdat al-qārī*, XXIII, 158.

³³ Muslim, "Qadar," 15

³⁴ Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī*, XI, 517; al-ʿAynī, *ʿUmdat al-qārī*, XXIII, 158.

³⁵ al-ʿAynī, *ibid*.

³⁶ Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā ibn Sharaf al-Nawawī, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim bi-Sharḥ al-Nawawī* (Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Miṣriyya, 1930), XVI, 201.

³⁷ Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī*, XI, 517.

³⁸ Abū ʿAbd Allāh Fakhr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar al-Rāzī, *Maḥāṭib al-ghayb -al-Tafsīr al-kabīr* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1981), XXII, 127.

found not his part no firm resolve.”³⁹ According to *sharī‘a*, one cannot be held responsible for deeds that he unwittingly commits; therefore, Adam’s behavior should be described as a mistake (*zalla*) rather than a sin.⁴⁰ For some scholars, this prohibition by Allah signifies exoneration and not *ḥarām*. Therefore, they consider Adam’s flouting of the prohibition as abandoning the good rather than rebellion or a sin.⁴¹ Certain Mu‘tazilī scholars evaluate the behaviors of prophets that cause suspicion of sin as mistakes of *ta’wīl* (interpretation) and *ijtibād* (diligence). Although Almighty Allah meant that it was forbidden to eat the fruit of any trees of that type, Adam thought that only the fruit of the particular tree to which He had pointed was forbidden, whereupon he obtained the fruit from another tree of the same type and erred in diligence.⁴²

The scholars who describe this act by Adam as a sin or mistake also disagree about whether this incident took place before or after he became a prophet.

According to Sunnī authorities, Adam ate the forbidden fruit before becoming a prophet. Nevertheless, some scholars claim the opposite, including, for example, the Ḥashwiyya and certain Mu‘tazilīs.⁴³ Apart from Ḥashwiyya, Ahl al-sunna agrees that prophets are protected from deliberately committing major or minor sins after becoming prophets. Generally, Shī‘a and Mu‘tazila share this opinion. They take this view because otherwise, the purpose of their coming to earth becomes void and their reliability among people is harmed. According to these scholars, certain mistakes can occur after becoming a prophet; however, they are not deliberate and take place

³⁹ Q 20:115.

⁴⁰ Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi‘ li-ahkām al-Qur’ān* (ed. ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī; Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, 2006), I, 459; Abū I-Khayr ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar al-Bayḍāwī, *Anwār al-tanzīl wa-asrār al-ta’wīl* (ed. Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Mar‘ashlī; Beirut: Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, n.d.), IV, 41; Abū I-Barakāt ‘Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-Nasafī, *Tafsīr al-Nasafī* (Istanbul: Dāru Qahramān, 1984), III, 68.

⁴¹ Al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*, XXII, 127; al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi‘*, I, 459.

⁴² Al-Rāzī, *ibid.*, III, 8; al-Qurṭubī, *ibid.*, I, 459.

⁴³ Abū I-Yusr Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn* (ed. Hans Peter Linss; Cairo: al-Maktaba al-Azhariyya li-l-Turāth, 2003), 172; Abī Bakr Nūr al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Maḥmūd al-Şābūnī, *al-Bidāya fī uṣūl al-dīn* (ed. Bekir Topaloğlu; Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1979), 54; al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*, III, 7; al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi‘*, I, 459.

through error or forgetting.⁴⁴ According to Ahl al-Sunna, the commission of minor sins by a prophet before becoming a prophet is permissible if there is no reasonable cause that makes the transition to prophet impossible, it occurs rarely and the prophet repents afterward. Nevertheless, they cannot commit minor sins often or a major sin at all prior to becoming prophets. Most Mu‘tazilī and Khārijī claim that prophets are also protected from sin before becoming prophets. According to Ḥashwiyya and some Khārijī, Murji‘ī and Mu‘tazilī scholars, prophets are not free of committing minor or major sins either before or after becoming prophets.⁴⁵

As for Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda, he considers Adam’s eating of forbidden fruit as a mistake rather than a sin. Nevertheless, according to him, this mistake is not actual; rather, Allah deliberately made Adam make this error to teach people, who must live on earth, certain lessons more effectively. Therefore, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda describes this sin as esoteric, probably influenced by the theory of unity of existence (*waḥdat al-wujūd*) and the related immutable entity (*a‘yān thābita*) approach of Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī.⁴⁶ These influences are even more apparent in the following expressions, which are indicated as the fifth component of wisdom in the explanation of the purposes and wisdom of Adam’s commission of this esoteric mistake at the behest of Allah:

The object learns that the verdict of Allah is conclusive with regard to inflicting punishment for his crime. Because sin, eternally, is a necessity of the *‘ayn [thābit]* of the object. Allah rules a sin for the object [toward sinning] only because of His knowledge on his/her

⁴⁴ Al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, 172; al-Şābūnī, *al-Bidāya*, 54; al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*, III, 7; al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi‘*, I, 459.

⁴⁵ Al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, 172-176; al-Şābūnī, *al-Bidāya*, 54; al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*, III, 7-8; al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi‘*, I, 459. For further information, see Ferruh Kahraman, “Hz. Ādem’in Yasak Ağaca Yaklaşması,” *Sakarya Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 15/27 (2013/1), 207-220.

⁴⁶ We do not provide many details on this issue because it is not the direct theme of our paper. For further information on this issue, see Ekrem Demirli, “Vaḥdet-i Vücūd,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXXXII, 431-435; Süleyman Uludağ, “A‘yān-ı sâbite,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, IV, 198-199; Hatice Arpağuş, “Sofyalı Bâli Efendi’nin Kazâ ve Kader Risâlesi ve A‘yān-ı Sâbite Açısından İnsanın Sorumluluğu,” *Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 30/1 (2006), 51-88.

[object] *‘ayn [thābit]* of the object. Therefore, it is nothing but the self/existence of the object that pushes his *nafs* to sin. Once the object understands this, he discovers that Allah’s order is just the opposite of his will. Thus, the object comprehends the justice of Allah while He punishes.

At this point, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda seems to mean the following: When an object commits a sin, this is a consequence of his *‘ayn thābit* in pre-eternity. In pre-eternity, an object has the attribute of sinning or not sinning. Allah only gives a verdict on how the object will act pursuant to his attributes and his *‘ayn thābit*. Otherwise, Allah does not make His objects sin. It is the *‘ayn thābit* of the object that pushes him to sin. As for Adam, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda claims that Adam actually has no attribute of sinning in his *‘ayn thābit* because he is a prophet and distant from sins. However, Allah makes something that is not in Adam’s *‘ayn thābit* happen to Adam to teach His objects that His verdict is valid with respect to punishing crimes by objects.

Adam’s response to Moses, “will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!” and the Prophet’s declaration that Adam is the winner of the debate constitute another point of discussion. Indeed, these expressions can serve as evidence of the meaning of destiny (*qadar*) and the part of human will in Adam’s deeds. Therefore, the views of various Islamic schools about fate and the will of man in his deeds are important to carry out a solid assessment of this section of the ḥadīth. In fact, each order has a different interpretation regarding these questions.

At first glance, Adam’s words, “will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!” give the impression that man has no will in his deeds and must live the destiny written for him. This view is coherent with the Jabriyya’s approach to fate. According to Jabriyya, led by Jahm ibn Ṣafwān (d. 128/745), man is but a convict in the face of destiny. He has no will or freedom to choose. No one can commit any act or deed except Allah. In this respect, there is no difference between man and non-living things. Man has no power, intention or freedom

to choose. All occurs at the discretion of Allah, pursuant to His will, desire and power.⁴⁷

Nevertheless, Sunnī scholars do not interpret the ḥadīth in this manner. According to them, Adam sinned in this instance not because of his fate; instead, he tries to indicate that the reason for his expulsion to earth is destiny. In other words, he does not take refuge in fate for his sin and does not try to use it as an excuse.⁴⁸ As a prophet, Adam knows that it is not a valid creed to absolve him from his sin, putting forth “fate as evidence.” In fact, Allah condemns polytheists who, after committing a sin, say that “*If Allah had willed, we would not have associated [anything] and neither would our fathers.*”⁴⁹ Indeed, as indicated in the verse “*Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves, and if You do not forgive us and have mercy upon us, we will surely be among the losers,*”⁵⁰ Adam acknowledges his fault. And Allah says that He forgives him.⁵¹ There is no need to allege an excuse for an already forgiven sin. Because Allah, through His eternal knowledge, knows all that the object will undergo, this should be construed as a predestination of what that object will live.⁵² Moreover, in Sūrat al-Baqara, Allah indicates that man will live on earth, and not in Heaven, even before the creation of Adam.⁵³ Therefore, the deception of Adam by Devil is only a motive for sending man to earth.⁵⁴ The following interpretation on the ḥadīth by al-Khaṭṭābī (d. 388/998) can help better understand the Sunni approach to this issue. Most people understand from the expression “*qadāʾ*” and *qadar* is from Allah” that the object is under an obligation

⁴⁷ Abū Maṣṣūr ‘Abd al-Qāhir ibn Ṭāhir al-Baghdādī, *al-Farq bayna l-firaq wa-bayān al-firqa al-nājiya minhum* (ed. Muḥammad ‘Uthmān al-Khusht; Cairo: Maktabat Ibn Sīnā, n.d.), 186.

⁴⁸ Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *al-Tambīd*, XVIII, 15; id., *al-Istidbkār*, XXVI, 88; Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Shifā’ al-‘alīl*, I, 56-57.

⁴⁹ Q 6:148.

⁵⁰ Q 7:23.

⁵¹ Q 2:37.

⁵² Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *al-Tambīd*, XVIII, 15; id., *al-Istidbkār*, XXVI, 88; al-‘Aynī, *‘Umdat al-qārī*, XV, 307.

⁵³ Q 2:30.

⁵⁴ Abū Sulaymān Ḥamd ibn Muḥammad al-Khaṭṭābī, *Ma‘ālim al-Sunan wa-buwa sbarḥ Sunan al-Imām Abī Dāwūd* (ed. Muḥammad Rāghib al-Ṭabbākh; Aleppo: al-Maṭba‘a al-‘Ilmiyya, 1932), IV, 323; al-‘Aynī, *‘Umdat al-qārī*, XV, 307; XIX, 60.

and compulsion with regard to fulfillment of fate. Some even think that this is why Adam got the better of Moses in the above-mentioned debate. Nevertheless, this is not the case. Indeed, Allah's knowledge precedes the deeds and will of objects; these appear at His discretion, and He creates what is good and evil for such deeds and will.⁵⁵

Qadariyya and Mu'tazila do not accept a conception of *qadar* and *qadā'* as decisive of human deeds; according to these schools, man can commit any good or evil act under his own will. Man creates and builds his future with his own hands, without intervention by Allah. In other words, the will of man is absolute, and no one interferes.⁵⁶ In this respect, Adam committed the mistake/sin that led to his expulsion from Heaven by his own will. Adam's words refer to no obligation. Certain Mu'tazilī scholars, such as Abū 'Alī al-Jubbā'ī (d. 303/916), refuse this ḥadīth on the grounds that it presents fate as the reason behind Adam's sin. According to these scholars, if this ḥadīth were sound, then the prophets would no longer be prophets. Orders and bans would have no meaning if fate were an excuse for sinners. If it were permissible to hide behind predestination after ignoring an order or violating a prohibition, such a person could not be condemned.⁵⁷ Moreover, those who do not refuse the ḥadīth do not consider it evidence because it descends via single report (*khabar al-wāḥid*). According to Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209), the Mu'tazila criticize this ḥadīth on the following grounds: If we declare Moses the winner, then Moses condemns Adam for committing a minor sin. In this case, Moses would have to be ignorant; however, ignorance is impermissible for a prophet. Another justification is that it is not appropriate that Moses uses a rough tongue on Adam. Moreover, Moses already knows that Adam is not the reason for mankind's unhappiness and expulsion from Heaven but rather that it is Allah who willed this predicament. Adam has put forth proof that is actually inadequate. If this justification were valid, heathens such as Pharaoh and Haman could provide the same explanation for their situations. This justification, however, would be mostly void; therefore, Adam's reasoning is also invalid. Mu'tazila also criticizes

⁵⁵ Al-Khaṭṭābī, *Ma'alim al-Sunan*, IV, 322.

⁵⁶ Al-Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār Abū l-Ḥasan 'Abd al-Jabbār ibn Aḥmad, *al-Mughnī fī abwāb al-tawḥīd wa-l-'adl* (eds. Tawfiq al-Ṭawīl, Sa'īd Zāyad, Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, and Ibrāhīm Madkūr; Cairo: Wizārat al-Thaqāfa wa-l-irshād al-Qawmī, al-Sharika al-Miṣriyya, 1960-65), VIII, 3-4.

⁵⁷ Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Shifā' al-'alīl*, I, 46.

the ḥadīth in that according to this narrative, Muḥammad is in a position of approving something that is clearly untrue and unfair. Later, al-Rāzī tried to find a more sensible basis for the ḥadīth to respond to the Muʿtazilī criticisms.⁵⁸ The Qadariyya also inveighs against the assumption that Allah wrote the event that would happen to Adam forty years beforehand. According to Qadariyya, Allah does not know something until it occurs. According to Ashʿariyya, however, predestination of the incident by Allah in the ḥadīth is proof that the abovementioned claim by Qadariyya is void.⁵⁹

In his *al-Tambīd*, Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (d. 463/1071) indicates that the ḥadīth on the discussion between Adam and Moses is the most explicit for proof of fate among narratives from Muḥammad and that it annuls the Qadārī view.⁶⁰

For al-Baghawī (d. 516/1122), any unilateral assessment without consideration of the fate or will of an object will be erroneous:

In fact, both were equal on the verdict they were discussing. No one has the right to disregard the “essential” fate; however, no one has the right to disregard the will, which is the “cause,” either. Whomever disregards one of these two (overlooks “essential” or “cause”), he deviates from the true objective and approaches one of two extremist schools, namely, Qadariyya or Jabriyya.⁶¹

According to Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda, upon Adam’s winning response to Moses “Will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!” the following question springs to mind: “If the predestination of the crime of Adam before his creation would absolve him from condemnation, the predetermination of the sins of his offsprings prior to their birth should have exempted them from torment and absolved them from condemnation.”

Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda touches upon certain views that seek an answer to this question; nevertheless, he states that none provides a reasonable answer and that such evaluations do not mesh with the

⁵⁸ Al-Rāzī, *Maḥāṭib al-ghayb*, II, 53

⁵⁹ Abū I-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn ʿIsmāʿīl al-Ashʿarī, *al-Ibāna ʿan uṣūl al-diyāna* (ed. Bashīr Muḥammad ʿUyūn; Damascus: Maktabat Dār al-Bayān, 1990), I, 156.

⁶⁰ Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *al-Tambīd*, XVIII, 17.

⁶¹ Al-Baghawī, *Sbarḥ al-Sunna*, I, 127.

ḥadīth text. In this respect, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda cites the opinions of his father Quṭb al-Dīn al-Iznīqī⁶² but indicates that these do not solve the problem either and puts forth his own views. According to Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda, the incident that befell Adam is an esoteric mistake entailing various problems and wisdom, and Allah deliberately had Adam commit this error. Adam wins the debate, giving the evidence that he is but a toy in the hands of the will and pleasure of Allah, who made him commit the mistake. However, that Adam had to commit this mistake does not mean he has no will in his deeds; moreover, it does not mean that mankind must live the fate predetermined for him, as Jabriyya asserts. According to Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda, this incident is a single and special event ordered by Allah to better teach people certain lessons. Later, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda tries to explain the ḥadīth through his own view by means of a detailed interpretation of wisdom and affairs with regard to Adam's commission of this error at the behest of Allah. He has a Sufi approach to the problem and explaining the noted profundity and problem.

The section in which the Prophet declares Adam the winner of the debate is another point of discussion between Ahl al-sunna and Mu'tazila, and Jabriyya schools. According to Sunnī scholars, the word "Ādam" in the expression "فحج آدم موسى" at the end of the ḥadīth should be read as *marfū'*, and on that basis, Adam wins the discussion.⁶³ Nevertheless, pursuant to some grammatical assessments, the Qadariyya maintains that the word "Mūsā" is *marfū'*, whereupon Moses wins the debate.⁶⁴ This is because Moses's victory is more suitable to the Qadariyya comprehension of destiny. According to Qadariyya, if Adam is considered victorious, then a prophet holds fate responsible for commission of a sin. In this case, any rebel against the prophets of Allah can use the same excuse grounded on the example of Adam.

For Ahl al-sunna, it is inarguably clear that the word "Ādam" should be *marfū'* pursuant to Arabic grammar, and it would be

⁶² The treatise comprehensively touches upon Quṭb al-Dīn al-Iznīqī's explanations on the ḥadīth. For all the remarks by Quṭb al-Dīn al-Iznīqī on the solution to the problem, see the relevant paragraphs under the title of "Translation of the Treatise."

⁶³ Ibn Baṭṭāl, *Sbarḥ Şahīḥ al-Bukhārī*, X, 315; al-Baghawī, *Sbarḥ al-Sunna*, I, 126; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī*, XI, 517; al-ʿAynī, *ʿUmdat al-qārī*, XV, 307.

⁶⁴ Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *ibid.*

pushing the term too far to read the word as *manṣūb*. Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852/1448), al-ʿAynī (d. 855/1451) and al-Qaṣṭallānī (d. 923/1517), the most famous commentators on *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, indicate the consensus on reading the word “Ādam” as *marfūʿ* and that it is irregular, exceptional and therefore disreputable to read it as *manṣūb*.⁶⁵ Moreover, in his *al-Musnad*, Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855) asserts that the expression “فحجه آدم” in a narrative through Abū Hurayra reveals that the word “Ādam” is *marfūʿ* and solves the problem in the *iʿrāb* of the phrase.⁶⁶

According to Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064), Moses was beaten in the debate because he accused Adam of something that the latter never did, namely, causing man’s expulsion from Heaven. This expulsion is not an act by Adam but rather by Allah. If Moses had condemned Adam for eating fruit from the forbidden tree, leading to expulsion from Heaven, then this reproach would have been appropriate and Adam would have had nothing to say.⁶⁷

The treatise extensively treats on who won the debate between Adam and Moses. After introducing various opinions and their justifications, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda gives a detailed account of opinions from his father al-Iznīqī, as well as from scholars, such as al-Baghawī and ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAlī al-Suhūmī al-Ḥanafī (d. 763/1361). We will not touch upon the details to avoid pushing the limits of this study; however, we will put forth the following words by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda on why the evaluations by the above scholars, including his father, are not satisfactory to him:

You should know that according to all of these responses, Adam silenced Moses because Moses laid the mentioned sin exclusively at Adam’s door, overlooking the influence of Allah. Nevertheless, a more attentive approach will reveal the following meaning in Adam’s words: “O Moses! You overlook the true power, the dominant and strongest overwhelming power, and show the impotent and almost non-present power of the object as the only reason behind my sin;

⁶⁵ Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *ibid.*; al-ʿAynī, *ibid.*, XXIII, 158; Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Qaṣṭallānī, *Irsbād al-sārī li-sbarḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (Būlāq: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Kubrā al-Amīriyya, 1305), IX, 358.

⁶⁶ Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *ibid.*; al-ʿAynī, *ibid.*, XXIII, 158.

⁶⁷ Abū Muḥammad ʿAlī ibn Aḥmad Ibn Ḥazm al-Qurṭubī, *al-Iḥkām fī uṣūl al-aḥkām* (ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir; Beirut: Dār al-Āfāq al-Jadīda, 1983), I, 26.

such a behavior is inaccurate and beneath you. Dispute, in other words, the effort to prove the correctness of one's view through bilateral evidence in order to attain the true solution of a problem, can be carried out with proof that lacks opposition, or by means of preferring the stronger evidence over the other.”

For Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda, Adam is victorious because he notes that Adam is but a toy in the hands of the will and dominance of Allah, who necessitated the occurrence of this esoteric mistake, which comprises complexity and profundity. After discussing these complex aspects and profundity, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda describes how Moses is convinced and accepts Adam's response:

As Moses was resurrected at *barzakb*, he thought about the response of his father, Adam, and discovered the truth; thereupon, he was acquainted with the secrets and eternal knowledge thanks to the attribute of “walī,” which is the true way of closeness to Allah Almighty; thus, he accepted the response of his father. Therefore, all the curtains that had hindered and dominated him due to provisions of being a prophet in his lifetime were lifted. In proportion to his divergence from earthly life, the veils were removed, and the first lights of the truth became apparent.

Copies of the Treatise

There are four remaining copies of the treatise at various libraries. One is the author's copy, written by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda in person. According to the colophon, the dictation of the treatise was completed in late Rabī' al-ākhir in 863 AH (March 1459). This copy, available under no. 290 in the Amcazade Hüseyin Section of Süleymaniye Library, takes place between leaves 37b-40a of a corpus that includes other works by the same author.⁶⁸ The treatise is written in *ta'liq* script and each page consists of 21 lines, with some notes by the author in the margins. These notes, apparently added by the author afterward, include an additional verse to clarify the matter, certain explanatory/evocative information and citations from relevant scholars, such as Ibn 'Arabī or al-Qūnawī.

⁶⁸ The edited text of the treatise, given at the end of this paper, is based on this copy. Accordingly, letters and phrases that are different in other three versions are marked and shown in the footnotes.

The copy at Fatih Library no. 2852 is between leaves no. 104b-108a of a corpus.⁶⁹ It is also written in *ta'liq* script and each page consists of 17 lines; the beginnings of phrases are highlighted with red lines. There is almost no word difference between this copy and that written by the author; according to the colophon, it was written in Shawwāl 827 AH (May 1468) and does not bear the name of the copyst. It must have been scripted by the author himself or one of his disciples because it was written in the lifetime of Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda, it is almost identical to the author's version, and its calligraphy is similar to that of the author.

The third copy is located under no. 692 at Râgıb Paşa Library, between leaves 226b-230a of a corpus that comprises five works by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda.⁷⁰ The name of the copying person is not given but should be copied from the author's version because authors' notes are invariably copied. The copy is written in *naskh* style and each page consists of 21 lines; the pages are edged with red lines.

The final known copy of the treatise is found under no. 4223 in the Hacı Mahmud Efendi section of Süleymaniye Library, between leaves 27b-34a of a corpus.⁷¹ The name and date of the scripture is unknown; the text is written in legible *naskh* script and each page consists of 17 lines. The notes in the author's version are also copied on the edges of the pages.

Translation of the Treatise

The Messenger of Allah (pbuh) spoke as follows:

Adam (pbuh) and Moses (pbuh) argued in the presence of their Lord. In the end, Adam beat Moses. Moses told Adam "You are Adam, whom Allah created by His hand, into whom He blew His soul, before whom He got his angels to prostrate and whom He placed in Heaven. However, you caused the sending of men down to earth due to your mistake." In response, Adam said: "You are a chosen one whom Allah found worthy as a messenger and talked to in person, whom He handed the plates that included explanation of everything, whom He brought to his convent of dignity as a confidant. How many years before Allah created me did He write Torah?" "Forty years

⁶⁹ This copy is indicated with the symbol (ف) in the edited text of the treatise.

⁷⁰ This copy is indicated with the symbol (وب) in the edited text of the treatise.

⁷¹ This copy is indicated with the symbol (حم) in the edited text of the treatise.

beforehand,” answered Moses. Thereupon, Adam asked once again, “did you see the verse, ‘...Adam disobeyed his Lord, and went astray?’” [Q 20:121]. As Moses responded “yes,” Adam said: “Will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!” Upon this answer, Prophet Muḥammad (pbuh) said, “Adam won this debate.”⁷²

Adam’s response and how he silenced Moses prompted several relevant objections. Namely, if the predestination of the crime by Adam before his creation would have absolved him from reprimand, then he would have exempted his offsprings from wrath and reprimand because their sins were also decided before their respective creation.

Due to this complex situation in the ḥadīth, some scholars said that these words belonged to Jews; however, the narrator quotes the *riwāya* from Muḥammad because he stepped in mid-conversation and did not hear it in full.

For others, however, the word “Ādam” is *mansūb*; therefore, Moses is the winner.

According to a third group, the criticism by Moses of Adam is not appropriate because it takes place after Adam’s penitence and forgiving by Allah.

In the eyes of some scholars, issues such as liability, *kasb* (deed through will) and the need for warning against sins are valid only after this life; therefore, because this condemnation takes place in the afterlife, it has no meaning but to bring Adam into contempt; however, in the afterlife, such embarrassment is to no avail.

According to certain scholars, the reprimand by Moses occurs after the truths are revealed in the afterlife and physical circumstances disappear; for others, Moses, during his condemnation, is not assigned this duty by Allah; therefore, his reprimand is not appropriate.

My father Quṭb al-Dīn, who was born in Niğde and lived in Iznik as a zealous scholar and virtuous person, wrote the following in his *ḥashiya* called *Talfīqāt to Maṣābiḥ*:

⁷² Muslim, “Qadar,” 15. For similar texts, see al-Bukhārī, *Anbiyāʾ*, 29, “Qadar,” 11; Muslim, “Qadar,” 13-14; al-Tirmidhī, “Qadar,” 2; Abū Dāwūd, “Sunna,” 17; Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad*, II, 248, 264, 268, 398.

None of the above-mentioned responses about the complicated aspect of the ḥadīth comply with the text of the ḥadīth. This is because Adam says, “Will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!” Nevertheless, one’s departure from this world of servitude does not absolve him from reprimand. Otherwise, no sinner could have been reprimanded in the afterlife due to his crimes in this world. Moreover, if one says that condemnation is carried out only by Allah, this would be ignoring the condemnation of sins by prophets and scholars in this world and by angels in the afterlife; however, this is not the case. In the afterlife, the true situation about the question of *qadā’* and *qadar* will be unearthed, and this emergence will not remove condemnation and wrath due to disobedience. If you look for a solid, final and complete response in order to annihilate all these strong objections, you should know the following:

The phrase “Will you now reprimand me...” by Adam includes two indications: (1) Moses gets ahead of himself in condemnation, and (2) the predestination of the sin of Adam before his emergence in the realm of existence. Therefore, this expression is accepted as certain (*naṣṣ*) about these two indications. Some scholars ground it in the first indication. Nevertheless, you learn/know that it is unreasonable. Then, the reason for Adam’s rejection of the condemnation by Moses should be that the condemning takes place due to something that is decided prior to his creation. This is the only way to make the objection against the ḥadīth discussable. Then, we will give the following answer:

The mentioned sin by Adam took place through two forces. We have to take both forces into consideration. Nevertheless, as Moses opposes Adam only because of the force of the object, Adam argues against Moses for the latter associates the sin only with the will of Adam and overlooks the true/authentic divine will that caused the disobedience. In short, as Moses brings along evidence and gets into discussion with Adam, the latter opts for responding and silencing him by not proving the weakness, but disproving his claim. Adam, in a manner, said the following: “Yes, I deserve condemnation and reprimand due to my disobedience. Indeed, Allah said, ‘*Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves*’ [Q 7:23], ‘*...Adam disobeyed his Lord and erred*’ [Q 20:121], ‘*...Did I not forbid you from that tree...?*’ [Q 7:22] and ‘*...Satan caused them to slip out of it...*’ [Q 2:36]. However, you –

Oh Moses – also erred seemingly, by grounding on a claim that I sinned on my own, and by attributing this sin only to my will. In fact, you are a prophet who knows that the true and victorious will with regard to disobedience (and any other deed) is that of Allah! What befits your status was to take both [the will of the object and the divine will] into account. Indeed, as a prophet, you know that overlooking one of the two would be the consequence of a Jabrī or Qadarī approach.”

There are many examples for this point [indicated by Adam]. For instance, the Prophet told Abū Hurayra, “The pen of God has already written and settled what will become of you.”⁷³ Hearing these words, Abū Hurayra only focused on the cause and deemed it the only factor for the consequence; thereupon, he said he wanted to be desexualized or to marry in order to protect himself from the malice of lust. Muḥammad, however, did not accept these wishes because Abū Hurayra considered the causes the only factor, overlooked the will of Allah, and ignored the fact that the causes may not always bring the expected consequences.

Assessments by (my father) Quṭb al-Dīn al-Iznīqī are essentially as above. Similar explanations are available in the commentary of *Maṣābiḥ* called *Manḥal al-yanābi*.⁷⁴ The relevant opinions have the same focus: The two [the power of the object and the omnipotent power of Allah] are inseparable; one is, so to speak, the foundation of the building, while the other signifies the stories. Whomever tries to separate them will demolish the building.

The same approach, albeit through different words, can be found in *Sharḥ al-Sunna*: “In fact, both were equal on the issue in discussion. Nobody has the right to disregard the ‘true’ predestination, just as nobody has the right to disregard the will, which is the ‘cause.’ Whomever does one of the two [overlooks ‘truth’ or ‘cause’] deviates from the purpose and draws close to two extremist views, namely, the Qadarī and Jabrī approaches.”⁷⁵ Allah knows best of all.

⁷³ al-Bukhārī, “Qadar,” 2.

⁷⁴ This work is a commentary of the famous *Maṣābiḥ al-sunna* by al-Baghawī (d. 516/1122) and is written by ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Alī al-Suhūmī al-Ḥanafī (d. 763/1361).

⁷⁵ Al-Baghawī, *Sharḥ al-Sunna*, I, 127.

Remember that according to all these responses, Adam silenced Moses because Moses attributed the mentioned sin only to the object, overlooking the influence of Allah. Nevertheless, a more attentive analysis will show [the meaning of Adam's words]: "Oh Moses! You overlook the true force, the dominant and strongest, overwhelming and victorious power, and show the weak, impotent power of the object as the only reason behind the occurrence of sin; this inaccurate behavior is not worthy of someone like you." A dispute can be carried out based on proof without opposition; it can also occur in the form of preferring the stronger of two pieces of evidence.

The object [Muḥammad Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda], destitute of the mercy of Allah Almighty, says the following about analysis and review of this ḥadīth thanks to His assistance and guidance to success:

Adam defeated Moses because the former showed that the reason behind the occurrence of this formal error, which includes many issues and much wisdom, is nothing but a type of toy in the hands of the dominant Allah with regard to will and wish.

The referenced issues and wisdom include the following:

1. The object's recognition of Allah's sovereignty and power. This takes place as follows: Allah rules something in such a way that the object can never oppose; the object has no power to reverse the verdict due to the endless power of Allah, and he errs.
2. The object learns of Allah's attribute of "gentleness." That is, Allah does not punish the object at once and allows him to repent, apologize and pray for forgiveness of his sins.
3. The object discovers Allah's "favor" after He accepts the apology of His object. Indeed, Allah Ta'ālā speaks as follows: "*They said, 'Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves...'*" [Q 7:23].
4. The object learns the "grace" of Allah following His forgiveness and seeing how He abundantly bestows the merits of repentance.
5. The object learns that the verdict of Allah is conclusive with regard to inflicting punishment for his crime. Because sin, in pre-eternity, is a necessity of the *'ayn [thābit]* of the object. Allah rules a sin for the object [toward sinning] only because

of His knowledge on the *‘ayn [thābit]* of the object. Therefore, it is nothing but the self (existence) of the object that pushes his *nafs* to sin. Once the object understands this, he discovers that Allah’s order is just the opposite of his will. Thus, the object comprehends the justice of Allah while He punishes.

Remember that pursuant to these five points, the object learns that Haqq wants to be known through His attributes of honor, gentleness, favor, grace, and justice. Thus, the object prefers Allah over himself, and does not compete with Him for dominance and finally attains the stage of “surrender.” Moreover, he forgets his crime, blesses the benedictions by Allah, and begins to “observe His sublime attributes.” He comes together with Haqq and becomes indifferent to all others, which is a desirable transformation. Rigor is the remembrance of annoyances at the moment of happiness.

6. The object knows the truth of things as they are and becomes prudent enough not to err in comprehending the truths. In other words, when he sees his good deeds, including final repentance, he interprets them as the favor and benediction of Allah. When he sees evil deeds, he understands that they are flaws of his self and a necessity of his being. Thus, the object takes a step forward in terms of observing the benediction and distinguishing the flaws. This is a supreme position because there is no better point of view for an object.
7. Divine perfection becomes apparent in the object as the attributes belonging to the self of the object disappear, as well as the veils of egocentrism. Due to self-complacency, an object may think himself impeccant and immaculate; in this case, the divine perfection within the object remains “capacity/potential” and cannot become actual. When Allah tests His object through a fallacy, the self of the object is overwhelmed, tends toward Allah and repents Him. Thereupon, Allah forgives/erases his sin, the veils are removed and divine perfection becomes visible. As a result, the object becomes much closer to Allah than before the fallacy. The case of Solomon (pbuh) is an example. When Solomon (pbuh) swore of his love for horses, the wind, which blows sometimes as a breeze and sometimes as a storm, was put under his order instead of the repented

- love. This wind blew every day at this behest, in the morning and in the evening over a period of two months.
8. The object contemplates the unity of Ḥaqq in every occurrence. Allah brings whomever He likes to the stage of “togetherness” (*jamʿ*) or into heresy through the veil of “separation.”⁷⁶ Once an object attains the stage of togetherness, he sees no competent being other than Allah.
 9. The emergence of the requisites of the status in which the manifestation, perfection and conduct in his nature come together. If [Adam] had not descended to the lower/material world, he would not have observed actual providences by Allah, such as remorse, collection, trouble, test, forgiveness, mercy and punishment. Therefore, even if Adam’s descent seems, at first glance, an expulsion, it is in fact to clothe him with the garments of closeness and manifestation.
 10. The perfection of Adam is revealed. In other words, Adam left for the realm of responsibility and undertook a burden that even the heavens and earth refrained from carrying. He remained on his path despite his lust, the perverting potential of anger and his misleading demons. If Allah did not expel him to this world, one might have thought that Adam’s perfection was innate, totally dependent on the favor of Allah, without any increase in his perfection worthy of such honoring and grace. Nevertheless, his error revealed his perfection in the realm of justice and favor; consequently, he became worthy of the following verse: “*And We have certainly honored the children of Adam...*” [Q 17:70].

⁷⁶ “Togetherness” (*jamʿ*) means “to be preoccupied only by Ḥaqq,” “turn away from sensible world toward the holy realm,” “turn away from all other things thanks to contemplation of Allah,” and “to see that all things and beings are present thanks to Allah;” “separation” (*tafriqa*) means “the preoccupation of self with bodily forces, to get overwhelmed by them in their affairs and tastes.” (ʿAbd al-Razzāq Kamāl al-Dīn ibn Abī l-Ghanāʾim al-Qāshānī, *Laṭāʾif al-iʿlām fī isbārāt abl al-ilbām* (eds. Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Raḥīm al-Sāyih *et al.*; Cairo: Maktabat al-Thaqāfa al-Dīniyya, 2005), I, 322-324.

The following comments can also be given in response [to objections about Adam's expulsion from Heaven to earth in the ḥadīth]:

- a. This [Adam's expulsion from Heaven by Allah and descent to earth] can also be in the form of simulation. The purpose here is to show that even a person with such high status in terms of knowledge and closeness to Allah can be reprimanded; his situation is manifested through verses such as "*Adam disobeyed his Lord and erred*" [Q 20:121] and "*Did I not forbid you from that tree and tell you that Satan is to you a clear enemy?*" [Q 7:22], and to teach the objects that Adam was expelled and sent, together with Eve, to earth to ensure that the sons of Adam, who may sink into misleading fallacy/pride, have no doubt about the torment of Allah but also that they do not despair of His grace. This is because a person, bestowed with such abundant divine benediction – for Adam, these blessings include that Allah, in person, created him, blew into him a soul from His own, taught him all names, ordered angels to grovel to him, chose him as a special person, and placed him in Heaven – and Heaven with the best possible food and beauties, is subject to a clear prohibition although he needs no forbidden thing; however, when he sins, he does not lose the grace of Allah and his repentance is accepted: "*Then, his Lord chose him and turned to him in forgiveness and guided him*" [Q 20:122].
- b. This [expulsion of Adam from Heaven down to earth] might have occurred to draw attention to the negative influence of evil friends and the need to refrain from such an attitude. Accordingly, the Qurʾān reads "... *when you see those who engage in offensive discourse concerning Our verses, then turn away from them*" [Q 6:68], while Muḥammad says: "Be friends only with the pious."⁷⁷ In other words, the fallacy will be committed by disobedient descendants of Adam.
- c. Additionally, Adam's formal fallacy may have occurred to demonstrate that sinning is one of the innate attributes of

⁷⁷ Research on the source of the ḥadīth failed to locate the expression "*be friends only with the pious.*" The only present version is "Be friends only with the believers, let the pious eat your food" in works by al-Tirmidhī ("Zuhd," 55) and Abū Dāwūd ("Adab," 19).

mankind. That is, Adam was created for the complete appearance of all possible things. Accordingly, Muḥammad speaks as follows: “Had you not sinned, Allah would destroy you and replace you with a community who sins but asks for His mercy afterward; then, He would forgive them.”⁷⁸ Creatures are either innocent like angels or evil like demons or are not liable. As a fourth possibility, creatures are “liable”, open to obedience and disobedience; this is the best manifestation/appearance and mirror to explain the situation. I believe you understood that by “liable creatures” I mean mankind.

- d. Rumor has it that when Satan, after worshipping Allah for eighty thousand years, was cursed because of Adam, Allah granted him, pursuant to His fairness, the right to take revenge on Adam in exchange for his long-lasting worship – thus Allah says: “*And whoever does good an atom’s weight will see it then*” [Q 99:7]. Thereupon, Satan asked Allah to make Adam and his sons deviate from the right path through groundless doubts and allow for him until doomsday. In this case, it is as if Satan sells all his deeds in exchange for this request. Because Adam’s crime was not sincere/true but only formal, Allah apparently punished him with expulsion for his sin. Nevertheless, as the verse “*Indeed, I will make upon the earth a successive authority*” [Q 2:30] reveals, He actually intended to draw His object closer and render him valuable by making him caliph. Consequently, Adam, before he knew it, did what his creation truly required. This is why Satan envied and angels admired him.
- e. There is another possible and interesting response from this weak object in need of the grace of his Lord [to clarify the obscurity in the ḥadīth]: Adam probably saw what *Upper Pen* and *qadar* wrote about him, noted the wisdom [of committing that sin] – this wisdom is that “there is no influence other than Allah, to whom all verdict, deed and influence belongs”– and flawlessly comprehended the meaning of the verse “*Everything will be destroyed except His face. His is the judgment, and to Him you will be returned*” [Q 28:88], whereupon he understood

⁷⁸ Muslim, “Tawba,” 11.

that he had attained a privileged status to raise him from the world of order and knowledge (*‘ālam al-amr wa-l-‘ilm*) to the world of verdict (*‘ālam al-ḥukm*) and that appreciation of a good deed or condemnation of a bad one cannot emerge from him as an object. If “order” and “knowledge” conflict with “situation” and “*ma‘rifa*,” this occurs because the situation is weak or is not as it should be. This means the victory of body over soul, a reversion, and an embrace of one’s own choice, leaving aside the will and preference of God. The Almighty Lord says as follows: “*And your Lord creates what He wills and chooses; not for them was the choice ...*” [Q 28:68] and “*It is not for a believing man or a believing woman, when Allah and His Messenger have decided a matter ...*” [Q 33:36]. As the intuitions and supremacy of the situation fade and such persons gather themselves, they see the right situation of “knowledge” and “order” as it is and the true condition of “situation” in its aspect, whereupon they sink into sorrow for missing the opportunity to surrender to Allah. This sorrow is what pushes them to repent and pray for forgiveness. However, these are sins committed during the “situation,” and even the most cautious are not safe in regard to avoiding such sins. Indeed, the Messenger of Allah said, “*When I chagrin, I too ask for mercy of Allah seventy times a day.*”⁷⁹

As for Moses, his status as a prophet was overwhelming. His boldness in forbidding the denounced is proof of his character. His harsh attitude is evidenced in his relationship with Khidr, his older brother Aaron, the Egyptian Copt, the Samaritan, and his tribe. As grace bestowed by Allah, the secret of predestination is hidden from the prophet and is not revealed to him, as a requisite of prophecy. Otherwise, the prophet would know that some of his orders would not take place and that his efforts would not provide some people with benefit, whereupon he would become too dispirited to carry out his assigned task of communicating the message to the people. In fact, however, his duty is nothing but notification –regardless of whether his orders are fulfilled. If the secret of predestination were not hidden from the prophet, then he would have abandoned the duty of notification or his duty would have been too difficult to overcome. Therefore, Allah bestows upon His prophets by

⁷⁹ Muslim, “Dhikr,” 41-43.

concealing the secrets of predestination from them in accordance with His benevolence. This fact does not harm their status as prophets or diminish their genuine attributes of perfection.

There is, however, a point to consider at this stage: Any deed by Moses, his every move, and any behavior against or in relation to him occur pursuant to the will of Allah and His “actual,” if not “verbal,” order, although the prophet remains unaware of this fact. His killing of the Copt is an example. His deed was the right one. Allah knew that if that Copt lived, he would drive a wedge among Israelites and cause massive sedition. Thus, Allah inspired the heart of Moses to kill this man in such a manner that the prophet never distinguished that all took place upon the will and actual order of Allah to prevent sedition.

As Moses rose in *barzakh* and discovered the truth through the answer of his father Adam, he became acquainted with secrets and innate sciences thanks to the attribute of “*walī*,” the true way of closeness to Allah. Therefore, all the curtains that had hindered and dominated him due to provisions of being a prophet in his lifetime were lifted. In proportion to his divergence from earthly life, the veils were removed and the first lights of the truth became apparent. In the afterlife, Moses immediately comprehended the secret of Allah’s will upon the response of his father Adam; nevertheless, he notably failed to completely comprehend the news from Khiḍr. Khiḍr showed Moses that the latter had killed the boy; however, Moses refused and could not remember that he had killed the Egyptian Copt. Khiḍr remarked upon Moses’s status before his innocence about this murder was conveyed to him, saying, “*And I did it not of my own accord*” [Q 18:82]. Khiḍr also showed Moses how the latter bore a hole through the ship. At first glance, this act seemed like destruction; however, in fact, it was an escape from bandits. Khiḍr did this as a reaction to being thrown into the water in a coffin, which appeared to be destruction but was in fact salvation from the hands of Pharaoh.

Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī quoted the following from his sheikh, Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī – may Allah refresh their souls: “He (Ibn ‘Arabī) came together with Khiḍr. Khiḍr told him: ‘I prepared many questions for Moses, son of ‘Imrān, in order to demonstrate to him that any incident that happened to him from his birth until our meeting, occurred through the will and irreversible knowledge of

Allah. However, he could not endure even just three of these questions.” Additionally, our Prophet said the following: “If only my brother Moses kept quiet and Khidr told us all this news!”⁸⁰

As for the Muḥammadan temperament, he (pbuh) neither becomes complacent nor is affected by reprimand when he observes the secret of the will of Allah because he (pbuh) sees these secrets and prays to Allah in prudence. No other prophet is like him. The prophets, who are perfect in every aspect, know these secrets not because they are messengers but because they are *awliya*[?]. They are the examples in the following verses: “*He released the two seas, meeting side by side. Between them is a barrier so neither of them transgresses*” [Q 55:19-20].

Let us end our words here because this ḥadīth is a bottomless sea. May Allah make us the objects who obtain pearls from beneath and who find the brightest of them!

Hereby the treatise is completed on the last Saturday of Rabī^c al-ākhir in the year eight hundred sixty three, having been written and reviewed by Muḥammad Quṭb al-Dīn, an object in need of the benevolence of Allah.

⁸⁰ al-Bukhārī, “Anbiyā’,” 27.

رسالة في شرح حديث احتجاج آدم و موسى عليهما السلام¹

لقطب الدين زاده الإزنيقي

قال النبي عليه السلام احتج آدم موسى² عند ربهما فحج آدم موسى قال موسى عليه السلام أنت آدم الذي خلقك الله بيده و نفخ فيك من روحه و أسجد لك ملائكته و أسكنك في جنته ثم أهبطت الناس بخطيئتك إلى الأرض فقال آدم عليه السلام أنت موسى الذي اصطفاك الله برسالته و بكلامه و أعطاك الألواح فيها تبيان كل شيء و قربك نجيا فبكم وجدت الله كتب التوراة قبل أن أخلق قال بأربعين عاما قال آدم فهل وجدت فيها و عصى آدم ربه فغوى قال نعم قال أفتلومني على أن عملت عملا³ كتبه الله تعالى علي أن أعمله قبل أن يخلقني بأربعين سنة. قال عليه السلام⁴: فحج آدم موسى⁵.

وعلى جوابه⁶ وإلزامه اعتراض مشكل⁷ لأن تقدير⁸ ذنب آدم قبل خلقه لو كان⁹ رافعا اللوم عليه¹⁰ لكان¹¹ تقدير ذنوب أولاده قبل خلقهم دافعا العذاب

¹ عملنا في هذا التحقيق: اعتمدنا في هذا التحقيق على أربعة نسخ: راغب باشا، محمود أفندي، فاتح و عمجه زاده حسين. و اخترنا منها نسخة عمجه حسين. وهو ما خطه يد المؤلف. أساسا و أشرنا إلى النسخ الأخرى في الهامش برموز. إن كان هناك ما سقط أو ما اختلف مع هذا الأصل. هي: لنسخة راغب باشا ب"رب"، و لنسخة محمود أفندي ب"حم"، و لنسخة فاتح ب"ف". و خرجنا كل ما يحتاج استخراجا من آية قرآنية و حديث نبوي.

² في (حم) "مع موسى"

³ في (حم) "على عمل"

⁴ في (حم) "قال النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم"

⁵ أخرجه البخاري في كتاب القدر (١١) و مسلم في كتاب القدر (١٤) و الترمذي في كتاب

القدر (٢) و أبو داود في كتاب السنة (١٧) و أحمد في المسند (٢)، ٢٦٤، ٢٦٨، ٢٦٨، ٣٩٨

⁶ في (حم) و (رب) "اعلم أن جوابه"

⁷ في (حم) و (رب) "اعتراضا مشكلا"

⁸ في (حم) "هو أن تقدير"

⁹ في (حم) و (رب) "إن كان"

¹⁰ في (حم) "عنه"

¹¹ في (حم) و (رب) "كان"

عنهم و رافعا الملام عليهم ولصعوبته¹² قال بعض هذا الحديث حكاية عن اليهود إلا أن الراوي لما دخل عليه¹³ في أثناء الحديث و ظن أنه عليه السلام أخبر عن نفسه روى عنه عليه السلام و قال بعض آدم منصوب و الغالب موسى. أجاب¹⁴ بعض بأن لوم موسى عليه السلام كان بعد التوبة و الغفران ولذا لم يكن موجها. و بعض بأن اللوم كان بعد خروجه عن دار التكليف و الكسب و الحاجة إلى الزجر فلم يكن في لومه¹⁵ سوى التخجيل و هو في ذلك الوقت غير مفيد.¹⁶ و قوم بأن موسى عليه السلام ليس مأمورا بلوم آدم من قبل الله تعالى فلم¹⁷ يكن موجها. و قال المولى العالم العامل و الكامل الفاضل و الادي مولانا قطب الدين النكيدي¹⁸ مولدا و الإزنيقي محتدا¹⁹ هذه الأجوبة غير مناسبة لمتن الحديث لأن آدم عليه السلام قال أفتلومني على عمل قدره الله تعالى²⁰ قبل خلقي مع أن الخروج عن دار التكليف لا يرفع اللوم و إلا لا يكون أحد من العصاة ملوما على عصيانه في الآخرة و لو كان اللوم مخصوصا بالله تعالى لا يكون لتوبيخ الأنبياء و العلماء في الدنيا و توبيخ الملائكة في الآخرة²¹ على العصاة وجه و ليس كذلك و أيضا يظهر في الآخرة حقيقة الحال في مسألة القضاء و القدر و لا يدفع ذلك الظهور اللوم و التعذيب على المعصية فلا بد في دفع ذلك الاعتراض القوي²² من جواب شافٍ و كلام وافي و إذا أردت الجواب المستقيم فاعلم أن قول آدم عليه السلام أفتلومني إلخ مشتمل على قيدين كون موسى مباشرا في اللوم و

12 في (حم) "ولصعوبة هذا الإشكال و ليس كذلك"

13 في (حم) "على النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم"

14 في (حم) و (رب) "وأجاب"

15 في (حم) "في لومه فائدة"

16 في (حم) و (رب) " و قوم بأن اللوم كان بعد ظهور الحقائق في العالم العلوى و اضمحلال

الرسوم و الإطلال"

17 في (حم) "ولم"

18 في (حم) "النكيد"

19 في (حم) و (رب) "في حواشيه على المصاييح المسماة تلفيقات"

20 سقط من (ف) و (رب) "الله تعالى"

21 في (ف) "وتوبيخ الملائكة في الملائكة في الآخرة"

22 سقط من (حم) "القوي"

كون ذنب آدم مقدراً قبل وجوده فيكون الكلام نصاً في ذنبك القيدين²³ فذهب البعض إلى الأول وقد عرفت أن لا وجه له فتعين أن الإنكار راجع إلى لومه على مقدر قبل²⁴ فتوجه الاعتراض فنجيب أن عصيان آدم صدر بواسطة القدرتين فلا بد فيه²⁵ من ملاحظتهما لكن لما نظر موسى إلى مجرد قدرة العبد فأنكر أنكر²⁶ آدم على موسى في تخصيصه قدرة آدم بصدور المعصية من غير ملاحظة القدرة الغالبة الربانية فالحاصل أن موسى لما كان محاجاً ومناظراً²⁷ مع آدم سلك آدم معه طريق المباحثة و الإلزام بتزييف دليله لا بتضعيف مدعاه فكأنه قال إني وإن كنت مستحقاً باللوم و التوبيخ بصدور العصيان مني ولهذا قال ربنا ظلمنا أنفسنا²⁸ وقال تعالى²⁹ "و عصى آدم ربه" فغوى³⁰ وقال " ألم أنهكما عن تلكما الشجرة"³¹ وقال "وأزلهما الشيطان"³² لكنك يا موسى أخطأت بإسناد تلك المعصية إلى قدرتي بعبارة دالة في الظاهر على استقلالي مع أنك نبي عارف بأن الأصل والمستقل³³ فيها قدرة الله تعالى فاللايق بشأنك أن تظهر³⁴ إلى³⁵ الجانبيين لما عرفت أن النظر بأحدهما مجرداً ينبئ عن الجبر أو القدر و أمثال هذه النكتة كثيرة منها قوله عليه السلام³⁶ لأبي هريرة رضى الله عنه جف القلم بما أنت لاقٍ³⁷ يعني³⁸ إن

23 سقط من (ف) "قيدين"

24 في (حم) و (رب) و(ف) " + خلقه"

25 سقط من (حم) "فيه"

26 سقط من (حم) "أنكر"

27 في (حم) "وناظراً"

28 الأعراف (٢٥)

29 سقط من (حم) "الله"

30 طه (١٢١)

31 الأعراف (٢٢)

32 البقرة (٣٦)

33 في (حم) و (رب) "والغالب"

34 في (رب) "أن تنظر" هذا هو الصواب

35 سقط من (حم) "إلى"

36 في (حم) "قول النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم"

37 أخرجه البخاري في كتاب القدر (٢) عن أبي هريرة

38 سقط من (حم) "يعني"

أبا³⁹ هريرة نظر⁴⁰ إلى السبب و زعم أنه تام في وجود المسبب ودفعه⁴¹ وقال أريد أن أختصي حتى أسلم من شر الشهوة الباعثة إلى⁴² الزنا أو التأهل فرد⁴³ النبي عليه السلام كلامه لتأدية⁴⁴ بظاهره إلى ملاحظة السبب و ترك الطرف الأقوى و ذهوله عن أن تأثير الأسباب باعتبار السنة الإلهية لا بالإيجاب و العلية⁴⁵. تم محصول كلامه. و يقرب من هذا الجواب ما ذكر في شرح المصاييح المسمى منهل الينابيع⁴⁶ بهذه العبارة. وإجماع⁴⁷ القول في هذا الباب أنهما أمران لا ينفك أحدهما عن الآخر لأن أحدهما بمنزلة الأساس و الآخر بمنزلة البناء فمن رام الفصل بينهما فقد رام هدم البناء و نقضه. و في شرح السنة بعبارة أخرى وهي أن الحكم الذي تنازعه فهما⁴⁸ فيه سواء لا يقدر أحد أن يُسقط الأصل الذي هو القدر و لا أن يُبطل الكسب الذي هو السبب و من فعل واحدا منهما خرج عن المقصد⁴⁹ إلى أحد الطرفين أى إلى مذهب القدر أو الجبر.⁵⁰ والله أعلم.

اعلم⁵¹ أن هؤلاء الأجوبة تشعر بأن إلزام آدم عليه السلام موسى راجع إلى تخصيص موسى جانب العبد وحده بلا ملاحظة جانب الله تعالى لكن النظر الدقيق⁵² يفيد أن تخصيصك يا موسى قدرة العبد الضعيفة الأثر بل العديمة⁵³ الأثر بصدور المعصية بغير ملاحظة القدرة الغالبة القاهرة⁵⁴ هي

39 في (حم) "فإن"

40 في (حم) لما نظر

41 في (حم) "فنفى في دفعه"

42 في (حم) "على"

43 في (حم) "رد"

44 في (حم) "التأديه"

45 في (حم) "والغلبة"

46 هذا الكتاب لعلاء الدين السهومي الحنفي المتوفى في سنة ٧٦٣ هـ. ١٣٦١ م.

47 في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "وإجماع"

48 في (حم) "فيهما"

49 في (حم) "القصد"

50 مصاييح السنة للبعوى في ١، ١٢٧

51 سقط من (رب) "اعلم"

52 في (حم) و (رب) "فكأنَّ آدم يقول أن النظر الدقيق"

53 في (ف) "القديمة"

الأصل والرُّجْحَى والقُوَى غير موجه بين⁵⁵ مثلك وقد يقع المعارضة بالترجيح كما يقع بالبرهان الذي لا معارض له.⁵⁶ يقول العبد الفقير بعون الله تعالى وتوفيقه في حل هذا الحديث وتدقيقه، أن⁵⁷ غلبة آدم على موسى بالحجة⁵⁸ بإشارته إلى أنه كان كرة لصولحان⁵⁹ إرادة الله و مشيئته التي اقتضت صدور هذه الزلة الصورية المشتملة على حكم و مصالح من وجوه: أحدها معرفة العبد عزته تعالى بأن حكم عليه بما لا يمكن رده فأذل نفسه بما لم يقدر على دفعه لكمال عزه. وثانيها معرفة حلمه⁶⁰ تعالى بأن لم يعاجل⁶¹ بالعقوبة وأمهلته حتى تاب واعتذر إليه واستغفر عن ذنبه⁶². و ثالثها معرفة الآية⁶³. ورابعها "ربنا ظلمنا أنفسنا" كرمه تعالى في قبول العذر منه كما قال معرفة فضله تعالى بالعفو عنه وإفاضة⁶⁴ ثواب التوبة عليه. وخامسها معرفة العبد أن حجة الله قائمة عليه في عقابه على ذنبه لأن الذنب مقتضى عينه في الأزل فلم يحكم عليه به⁶⁵ إلا لعلمه التابع لمقتضى عينه فعيّنه هي التي جَنَتْ على نفسه فإذا عرف ذلك عرف أن أمر الله بخلاف إرادته لأن يعرف العبد عدله في عقابه. اعلم أن العبد يعرف في الوجوه الخمسة أن مراد الحق كونه معروفاً بصفة العزة والحلم والكرم والفضل والعدل فيؤثر الله على نفسه ولا ينازعه في ملكه فيبلغ مقام التسليم بل يكون في مشاهدة صفاته العُلَى

⁵⁴ في (حم) و (رب) "القاهرة التي"

⁵⁵ في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "عن"

⁵⁶ في (حم) و (رب) "إذا تأملت ما قالوا عرفت أنهم ما قدروا على افتراء إكبار معانيه ولا فتقوا رتق مبانيه لأنهم نزلوا معناه منزلتهم وهم من أهل الظاهر. والحال أن النبي عليه السلام يشير أحياناً لمقام أهل الطريقة وأحياناً لمقام أهل الحقيقة، وهذا رمز منه عليه السلام إلى ما عليه أهل الحقيقة. وإن شئت كشف الإشارة فاستمع ما يقول العبد الفقير..."

⁵⁷ في (حم) و (رب) "و هو أن"

⁵⁸ سقط من (حم) و (رب) "بالحجة"

⁵⁹ في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "الصولحان"

⁶⁰ في (حم) "حكّمه"

⁶¹ في (حم) "لم يعجل"

⁶² في (حم) "الذنبه"

⁶³ في (حم) و (رب) "وقال الله تعالى فتاب عليه و هدى"

⁶⁴ في (حم) "وإفاضته"

⁶⁵ في (حم) "فلم يحكم به عليه"

ذاهلا عن الجناية شاكرا لأنعمه والحضور مع الحق والذهول عما سواه مطلوب شريف فإن ذكر الجفاء في وقت الصفاء جفاء. وسادسها معرفة العبد حقائق الأشياء كما هي وكونه بصيرا لا يخطئ⁶⁶ في الإدراك بحيث أن رأى حسناته التي من جعلتها التوبة النصوح يحمل انها منة من الله وفضل وإن رأى سيئاته يعرف أنه من عيوب نفسه ومقتضى ذاته فيكون سايرا بين مشاهدة المنة وتطلع عيب⁶⁷ النفس وهذا مقام سني لأنه لم يبق للعبد⁶⁸ رؤية⁶⁹ حسنة. وسابعها إن ظهور الكمالات الإلهية على العبد بفناء صفات نفسه ورفع حجاب أنانيته ولهذا قد يكون الكمالات غير خارجة من القوة إلى الفعل بصفة نفسه⁷⁰ كالعجب ورؤية تزئين نفسه بالعصمة والتطهر فإذا ابتلاه الله بهفوة تنكسر⁷¹ نفسه⁷² فيتوب وينيب حتى تمحي⁷³ وترتفع الحجب وتظهر⁷⁴ كمالاتها وتحصل⁷⁵ من القرية أضعاف ما كانت له قبل الهفوة كما كان لسليمان عليه السلام حين تاب عن حبه⁷⁶ الخيل وعوض بالريح تجري بأمره رخاء أو عاصفة وكانت تجري بأمره كل يوم⁷⁷ مسيرة شهرين غدوها شهر ورواحها شهر. وثامنها شهود انفراد الحق في كل ما يصدر يهدي من يشاء إلى الجمع ويضل من يشاء باحتجابه بالترفة فلا يرى مصرفا غيره في كل تعريف⁷⁸. وتاسعها وجود مقتضى ما ركب في خميرته من مقام جمعية

66 في (حم) "لاعطاء"

67 في (ف) "معيب"

68 في (حم) و (رب) "لا يبقى فيه"

69 في (حم) و (رب) "مروية"

70 في (حم) و (رب) "فيتوب وينيب و يرتفع الحجب ويظهر كمالاتها ويحصل من القرية اضعافا ما كانت له"

71 في (حم) و (رب) "تنكر"

72 سقط من (حم) و (رب) "نفسه"

73 سقط من (حم) و (رب) "حتى تمحي"

74 في (حم) "يظهر"

75 في (حم) "يحصل"

76 في (حم) و (رب) "حبة"

77 في (ف) "مرة"

78 في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "تصريف"

التجليات والكمالات والأطوارات ولو⁷⁹ لم ينزل الى العالم العنصري السفلي لم يشاهد ما فيه من ظهورات التصرفات الأفعالية من القهر والقبض والبلايا والمحن والعفو والمغفرة والانتقام وغير ذلك فهذا في الصورة طرد في المعنى⁸⁰ تقريب وألباس⁸¹ خلع من التجليات. وعاشرها إظهار كماله حيث ألقى في دار التكليف وحمل عليه⁸² الأمانة التي لم يحملها السموات والأرض واستقام⁸³ مع ما فيه من الشهوة الصادرة⁸⁴ عنه⁸⁵ والقوة الغضبية العاقبة ومن الشياطين العدو المضلة⁸⁶ ولولاه لربما توهم متوهم إن كماله وهبي فضلي لا يرى فيه زيادة كمال بحيث يستحق هذا التكريم والتفضيل فبهذا⁸⁷ الزلة ظهر كماله في عالمي العدل والفضل وكان لايقا⁸⁸ لتشريف كرمنا⁸⁹. ويمكن أن يقال في الجواب أنه يحتمل أن يكون هذا على صورة المواضع تعليمًا للعباد وموعظة⁹⁰ بأن الذي كان من العلم والقربة⁹¹ بهذه "وعصى آدم ربه فغوى" المنزلة والمكانة عُوتب وشُهر حاله بقوله تعالى⁹² " ألم انهكما عن تلكما الشجرة وأقل لكما إن الشيطان لكما عدو " وقوله⁹³ وأخرج من الجنة وأهبط الى الأرض مع حوا⁹⁴ لثلا يغتر أولاده ولا " مبين

79 في (رب) "ولو لم يعص ولم ينزل"

80 في (رب) "وفي المعنى"

81 في (حم) و (رب) "والأبس"

82 سقط من (ف) "عليه"

83 سقط من (ف) "مع ما فيه من الشهوة الصادرة عنه والقوة الغضبية العاقبة ومن الشياطين العدو المضلة"

84 في (رب) "الصادة"

85 سقط من (رب) "عنه"

86 في (حم) و (رب) "من الإنس والجن"

87 في (رب) "فبهذه"

88 في (ف) "وكان لا"

89 في (حم) و (رب) "ولقد كرمنا" و الآية من سورة الإسراء (٧٠)

90 في (حم) و (رب) "وموعظة للأولاد"

91 في (ف) "والاصطفاه"

92 في (حم) و (ر) "بقول"

93 في (ح) "وقول"

94 في (حم) و (رب) و(ف) "حواء"

يأمنوا من مكر الله ولئلا⁹⁵ يقنطوا من رحمة الله لأن من كان منعما عليه بجلائل النعم وهى التي تعرف في حق أبينا آدم عليه السلام من خلقه⁹⁶ بيده ونفخ روحه وإنباء الأسماء كلها⁹⁷ وأمر الملائكة بالسجود واصطفائه⁹⁸ وإسكانه الجنة وغيرها وكان مخاطبا عيانا بصريح النهى مع عدم الاحتياج الى المنهى عنه لكونه في جنة أكلها دائمة⁹⁹ من اطياب الأشربة والأطعمة ما¹⁰¹. "فتاب عليه وهدى" خاب من رحمته وقبل توبته كما قال تعالى¹⁰⁰ ويحتمل أن يكون فيه إشارة إلى أن مصاحبة سوء الأخدان والإخوان¹⁰² فلا تقعد بعد الذكرى مع "مؤثرة يجب الاحتراز"¹⁰³ كما نطق به الكتاب¹⁰⁴ ¹⁰⁵ "القوم الظالمين".

والحديث "لا تصاحب إلا تقيا"¹⁰⁶ يعني أن صدور الزلة من جهة الذراري العصاة في صلبه عليه السلام. ويحتمل أن يكون صدور صورة الزلة منه ليندرج فيما فُصد من خلقة الإنسان وبيانه أنه خُلِق لاستيفاء¹⁰⁷ الأقسام الممكنة الايجاد كما يفهم من قوله¹⁰⁸ عليه السلام "لو لم تذنبوا لذهب الله¹⁰⁹ بكم ولجاء بقوم يذنبون ويستغفرون الله فيغفر¹¹⁰ لهم"¹¹¹ لأن الخلق

⁹⁵ في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "وارشادا على أن لا يقنطوا"

⁹⁶ في (حم) "خلقني"

⁹⁷ سقط من (حم) و(ف) "كلها"

⁹⁸ في (حم) "واصفائه وفي ف واصطفابه"

⁹⁹ في (حم) "دائم"

¹⁰⁰ في (حم) "قال الله تعالى"

¹⁰¹ طه (١٢٢)

¹⁰² في (حم) "لاخوان والاخدان"

¹⁰³ في (حم) "لاحتراز عنها"

¹⁰⁴ في (حم) و (رب) "لكتاب الكريم"

¹⁰⁵ الأنعام (٦٨)

¹⁰⁶ أخرجه الترمذي في الزهد (٥٥) عن السعيد الخدري

¹⁰⁷ في (ف) "الاستيفاء"

¹⁰⁸ في (حم) "قول النبي"

¹⁰⁹ في (رب) "لم يوجد الله"

¹¹⁰ في (حم) "فغفر"

¹¹¹ أخرجه مسلم في كتاب التوبة (١١) عن أبي هريرة

معصومون¹¹² كالملائكة وإما شريرون كالشياطين وإما أنهم ليسوا بمكلفين فبقي¹¹³ قسم مكلف من شأنه الطاعة والمعصية وهو المظهر الأتم والمرأة المثلى أعني الإنسان فافهم ويحتمل أن إبليس لما عبد الله ثمانين ألف سنة في رواية وكان ملعونا بسببه¹¹⁴ فجازاه¹¹⁵ من تلك العبادة بأخذ انتقامه منه بمقتضى عدله كما قال تعالى "ومن¹¹⁶ يعمل مثقال ذرة خيرا يره"¹¹⁷ فإن إبليس¹¹⁸ طلب¹¹⁹ إغواءه وطلب الإنظار بوسوسة¹²⁰ أولاده فكأنه باع كل عمله بهذه الطلبة وإذا كان عمله ظاهريا لا بالإخلاص جازاه بالطرد الظاهري وحقيقته¹²¹ في المعنى تقريب وتكريم بالإستخلاف في الأرض وهو المراد من خلقته كما قال تعالى "إني جاعل في الأرض خليفة"¹²³ فكأنه في الحقيقة من حيث لا يشعر ساعيا¹²⁴ لما اقتضى فطرته وهو الذي كان محسودا¹²⁵ له ومغبوطا¹²⁶ للملائكة منه¹²⁷.

وهنا جواب¹²⁸ عجيب عند الفقير الغريب¹²⁹ وهو أن آدم عليه السلام لعله لما¹³⁰ كان مطلعاً على ما جرى القلم والقدر¹³¹ في حقه ومشاهدا

112 في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "إما معصومون" هذا هو الصواب

113 في (حم) "فبقي"

114 في (حم) "بسبب آدم عليه السلام"

115 في (حم) "و رب فجازاه الله تعالى"

116 في (حم) و (رب) "وف فمن"

117 الزلزال (٧)

118 سقط من (ف) "ابليس"

119 في (حم) و (رب) "لما طلب"

120 في (حم) و (ف) "لوسوسة"

121 في (ف) "وبالحقيقة"

122 في (حم) "قال الله تعالى"

123 البقرة (٣٠)

124 في (حم) و (رب) "ساعيا من حيث لا يشعر"

125 في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "كان به محسودا"

126 ف (حم) "ومضبوطا"

127 سقط من (حم) و (رب) "منه"

128 في (حم) و (رب) "جواب آخر"

129 في (حم) "غريب"

الحكم وهو أن لا يرى مؤثرا الا الله ولا حكما ولا أثرا ولا فعلا إلا له ومتحققا عنده عيانا معنى قوله "كل شئ هالك إلا وجهه له الحكم" ¹³² أشار ¹³³ إلى أنه عليه السلام في مقام لا يتأتى منه استحسان حسنة ¹³⁴ واستقباح سيئته ¹³⁵ لصعوده من عالم الأمر والعلم إلى عالم الحكم فإن عارض الأمر ¹³⁶ الحال والمعرفة فإنما يكون لضعف الحال ولعدم صحته فذلك انتكاس وغلبة الجسم الروح ورجوع القهقري وترك إرادة الحق واختياره مع اختيار نفسه قال الله ¹³⁷ تعالى "وربك يخلق ما يشاء ويختار ما كان لهم الخيرة" ¹³⁸ وقال تعالى ¹³⁹ "وما كان لمؤمن ولا مؤمنة إذا قضى الله ورسوله أمرا أن يكون لهم الخيرة" ¹⁴⁰ فإذا زال الوارد وغلبة الحال من هذه الطائفة ¹⁴¹ وتمكنوا عرفوا صحة العلم والأمر في طوره وصحة الحال في طوره فيتحننون لما فاتهم من التسلم للأمر ¹⁴² فذا سبب توبتهم واستغفارهم لكن هذا من ذنوب الأحوال لا يأمن من ¹⁴³ مثلها أرباب التمكين أيضا ولهذا قال ¹⁴⁴ عليه السلام "انه ليغان على قلبي فأستغفر الله في اليوم سبعين مرة" ¹⁴⁵ . أما موسى عليه السلام فكان جهة نبوته قوية يدل عليها ¹⁴⁶ صولته

¹³⁰ سقم من (رب) "لما"

¹³¹ في (حم) "أو القدر"

¹³² القصص (٨٨)

¹³³ في (حم) و (رب) "فأشار"

¹³⁴ في (حم) "حسته" هذا هو الصواب

¹³⁵ في (حم) و (رب) "سيئة وفي ف سيئه"

¹³⁶ سقط من (حم) و (رب) "والعلم"

¹³⁷ سقط من (رب) "الله"

¹³⁸ القصص (٦٨)

¹³⁹ سقط من (ف) "و قال تعالى"

¹⁴⁰ الأحزاب (٣٦)

¹⁴¹ سقط من (ف) "من هذه الطائفة"

¹⁴² في (حم) و (رب) "لما فاتهم من موجب الأمر"

¹⁴³ سقط من (ف) "من"

¹⁴⁴ في (حم) "قال النبي"

¹⁴⁵ أخرجه مسلم في كتاب الذكر والدعاء (٤١)

¹⁴⁶ في (حم) "عليه"

في النهي عن المنكر مصداقه شأنه مع الخضر وأخيه هارون ومع القبطي و السامري وقومه¹⁴⁷ ومن شأن النبوة أن يُطوى على النبي سرُّ القدر رحمة من الله به لئلا يغتر همته عن إبلاغ ما أمر بتبليغه علما بعدم وقوع المأمور به وكون سعيه بلا طائل في حق البعض والحال أن منصبه التبليغ فقط سواء وقع المأمور به أو لا ولو لم يطو لربما يتقاعد عن التبليغ¹⁴⁸ أو يشق عليه¹⁴⁹ فمن الله على الأنبياء بالستر رحمة بهم فذا لا يوجب نقصا في مراتبهم النبوية ولا يقدر في كمالاتهم الخصيصة¹⁵⁰ بهم لكن ينبغي أن يعرف أن جميع أفعال موسى عليه السلام وحركاته وما جرى عليه ومنه إنما كان بإرادة الله تعالى وأمره بالفعل¹⁵¹ لا بالقول¹⁵² وإن لم يشعر به كقتله القبطي فإنه الحق الصواب لما كان الله يعلم أنه لو بقي أفسد¹⁵³ ما¹⁵⁴ بين بني إسرائيل وأفضى إلى فتنة عظيمة فرد الله بالهام القتل في ستر سر¹⁵⁵ موسى من حيث لا يعلم¹⁵⁶ ظاهره أنه كان بإرادته¹⁵⁷ وأمره الفعلي الفتنة هذا فلما¹⁵⁸ تنبه في النشأة البرزخية من جواب أبيه آدم عليه السلام على حقيقة الحال سلم جوابه بحكم ولايته التي هي جهة قربه بها يطلع على الأسرار والعلوم اللدنية¹⁵⁹ وزال¹⁶⁰ الحجاب الذي كان ملكة فيه بحكم النبوة الظاهرة السلطنة في النشأة الدنياوية¹⁶⁰ فيقدر¹⁶¹ بعد العهد من هذه النشأة زال الحجاب وظهر تبشير

¹⁴⁷ سقط من (حم) و (رب) "وقارون"

¹⁴⁸ سقط من (حم) و (رب) "فقط سواء وقع المأمور به أو لا ولو لم يطو لربما يتقاعد عن التبليغ"

¹⁴⁹ في (حم) و (رب) "أو ليشق عليه"

¹⁵⁰ في (ف) "الخصيص"

¹⁵¹ في (حم) و (رب) "الفعلي"

¹⁵² في (حم) و (رب) "القول"

¹⁵³ في (حم) و (رب) "لأفسد"

¹⁵⁴ سقط من (حم) "ما"

¹⁵⁵ في (حم) "في سر موسى" وفي (رب) "سرير"

¹⁵⁶ في (حم) و (رب) "لا يشعر"

¹⁵⁷ في (رب) "إراداته"

¹⁵⁸ في (حم) "إما أنه" وفي (رب) "إما أنه لما"

¹⁵⁹ في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "لأنه زال"

¹⁶⁰ في (حم) و (رب) "الدنياوية"

الحق. ألا ترى كيف تنبه موسى عليه السلام لسر الإرادة¹⁶² من جواب أبيه سريعا في ذلك العالم ويتفطن¹⁶³ من إنباء الخضر حيث أرى موسى قتل الغلام فأنكر عليه ولم يتذكر قتله القبطي فقال له الخضر ما فعلته عن أمري¹⁶⁴ منها¹⁶⁴ على مرتبته قبل أن يُنبأ أنه كان معصومة¹⁶⁵ الحركة في نفس الأمر وأراه¹⁶⁶ خرق السفينة التي ظاهرها هُلُكٌ وباطنها نجاة عن¹⁶⁷ يد الغاصب¹⁶⁸ جاعلا له في مقابلة التابوت الذي كان في اليم مُطْبَقا عليه فظاهره هلك¹⁶⁹ وباطنه نجاة من يد الغاصب فرعون أن يذبحه¹⁷⁰.

روى صدر الدين القُونَوِي عن الشيخ العربي¹⁷¹ رَوَّحَ اللهُ رُوحَهُمَا أَنَّهُ اجْتَمَعَ مَعَ خَضْرٍ¹⁷² عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ فَقَالَ لَهُ كُنْتُ قَدْ أَعَدَدْتُ لِمُوسَى بْنِ عِمْرَانَ مَسْئَلَةً¹⁷³ تَنْبِيهَا مِنْهُ¹⁷⁴ لِمُوسَى¹⁷⁵ أَنْ جَمِيعَ مَا جَرَى عَلَيْهِ مِنْ أَوَّلِ مَا وُلِدَ إِلَى زَمَانِ اجْتِمَاعِهِ بِإِرَادَةِ اللَّهِ¹⁷⁶ وَعَلِمَهُ الَّذِي لَا يُمْكِنُ وَقُوعُ خِلَافِهِ فَلَمْ يَصْبِرْ عَلَى ثَلَاثِ مَسَائِلٍ وَقَالَ نَبِينَا عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ "لَيْتَ أَحْيَى مُوسَى سَكَتَ حَتَّى يَقْضَى عَلَيْنَا مِنْ أَنْبَاءِهَا"¹⁷⁷.

- 161 في (رب) "فَيَقْدُرُ"
 162 في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "سر الإرادة"
 163 في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "ولم يتفطن" والصواب هو
 164 في (حم) "متنبها"
 165 في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "معصوم"
 166 في (حم) و (رب) "وارادة"
 167 في (حم) و (رب) "من"
 168 في (رب) "الغاصب" هذا هو الصواب
 169 في (حم) و (ف) "هلاك"
 170 في (حم) و (رب) "أن يذبحه فأنكر عليه"
 171 في (ف) "ابن العربي"
 172 في (حم) "الخضر"
 173 في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "الف مسألة" والصواب هو
 174 في (حم) "له وفي رب تنبها لموسى"
 175 سقط من (حم) "لموسى"
 176 في (حم) و (رب) "كان بإرادة الله تعالى وأمره الفعلى"
 177 في (حم) "أنبائهم"، وفي (ف) "أنبائهما"

وأما المحمدي المشرب فلا يأخذه عند شهود سر القضاء والإرادة فتور ولا¹⁷⁸ لومة لائم لأنه يرى ذلك ويدعو إلى الله على بصيرة ولم يكن غيره من الأنبياء كذلك¹⁷⁹. وعلم هذه الأسرار للأنبياء الكمل من كونهم أولياء لا من كونهم رسلا فإنهم على مثال "مرج البحرين يلتقيان بينهما برزخ لا يبغيان". فلنختم¹⁸⁰ الكلام هنا فإنه بحر عميق. لا يدرك غوره جعلنا الله من الغواصين المستخرجين من الأصداف درره ومن الفايزين من الدرر غوره.¹⁸¹ قد¹⁸² وقع الفراغ¹⁸³ تقريرا وتحريرا¹⁸⁴ في أواخر¹⁸⁵ ربيع الآخر ليلة السبت سنة ثلاث وستين وثمانمأة¹⁸⁶ من يد الفقير محمد قطب الدين¹⁸⁷.

¹⁷⁸ في (حم) "ولا يشبهه"

¹⁷⁹ في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "إلا شاذا أو نادرا"

¹⁸⁰ في (حم) "لنختم"

¹⁸¹ في (رب) "انتهى رساله هنا"

¹⁸² سقط من (حم) و (رب) "قد"

¹⁸³ في (حم) و (رب) "من تأليف هذه الرسالة"

¹⁸⁴ سقط من (حم) و (رب) "تقريرا وتحريرا"

¹⁸⁵ في (ف) "في أواخر شوال سنة اثني وسبعين وثمانمأة"

¹⁸⁶ في (حم) و (رب) "بحمد الله والمنة"

¹⁸⁷ سقط من (حم) و (رب) "من يد الفقير محمد قطب الدين"

REFERENCES

- Abū Dāwūd, Sulaymān ibn al-Ash‘ath al-Sijistānī, *Sunan Abi Dāwūd*, 5 vols., (Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1981).
- Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Shaybānī, *al-Musnad*, 6 vols., (Istanbul: Çağrı Yay., 1982).
- Arpaguş, Hatice, “Sofyalı Bâli Efendi’nin Kazâ ve Kader Risâlesi ve A’yân-ı Sâbite Açısından İnsanın Sorumluluğu,” *Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 30/1 (2006), 51-88.
- al-Ash‘arī, Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn ‘Ismā‘īl, *al-Ibānah ‘an usūl al-diyānah* (ed. Bashīr Muḥammad ‘Uyūn; Damascus: Maktabat al-Dār al-Bayān, 1990).
- al-‘Aynī, Abū Muḥammad Badr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Aḥmad, *‘Umdat al-qārī Sharḥ Şaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 25 vols., (eds. Muḥammad Munir Abdah Aghā l-Dimashqī et al.; Beirut: Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, n.d.).
- al-Baghdādī, Abū Manşūr ‘Abd al-Qāhir ibn Ṭāhir, *al-Farq bayn al-firaq wa-bayān al-firqa al-nājiya minhum* (ed. Muḥammad ‘Uthmān al-Khusht; Cairo: Maktabat Ibn Sīnā, n.d.).
- al-Baghawī, Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn ibn Mas‘ūd, *Sbarḥ al-Sunna*, 16 vols., (ed. Zuhayr al-Shāyish and Shu‘ayb al-Arnā’ūt; Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1403/1983).
- al-Baghdādī, Ismā‘īl Pāshā ibn Muḥammad, *Hadiyyat al-‘arifin asmā’ al-mu’allifin wa āthār al-muşannifin*, 2 vols., (eds. Mahmut Kemal İnal and Avni Aktuç; Istanbul: Maarif Basımevi, 1955).
- Bağcı, Hacı Musa, *İnsanın Kaderi-Hadislerin Telkin Ettiği Kader Anlayışı* (Ankara: Ankara Okulu Yayınları, 2009).
- al-Bayḍāwī, Abū al-Khayr ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar, *Anwār al-tanzil wa-asrār al-ta’wīl*, 5 vols., (ed. Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Mar‘ashlī; Beirut: Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, n.d.).
- al-Bazdawī, Abū al-Yusr Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad, *Uşul al-dīn* (ed. Hans Peter Linss; Cairo: al-Maktaba al-Azhariyya li-l-Turāth, 2003).
- al-Bukhārī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn İsmā‘īl, *al-Jāmi‘ al-şāḥiḥ*, 8 vols., (Istanbul: al Maktaba al Islāmī, 1979).
- Bursali Mehmed Ṭāhir Efendi, *‘Uthmānli Mu’alliflari*, 2 vols., (Istanbul: Maṭba‘a-i ‘Āmira, 1333).
- Demirli, Ekrem, “Vahdet-i Vücūd,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXXXII, 431-435.
- Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Abū ‘Umar Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd Allāh, *al-Istidbkār al-jāmi‘ li-madbāhib fuqabā’ al-amşār wa-‘ulamā’ al-aqtār fīmā taḍammanah^ü l-Muwaṭṭa’ min ma‘ānī l-ra’y wa l-āthār wa-sbarḥ*

- dhālika kullibī bi-l-ṛjāz wa-l-ikbtīṣār*, 30 vols., (ed. ‘Abd al-Mu‘ṭī Amīn Qal‘ajī; Cairo: Dār al-Wa‘y, 1993).
- Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Abū ‘Umar Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd Allāh, *al-Tambīd limā fi l-Muwatta‘a min al-ma‘ānī wa-l-asānīd*, 26 vols., (eds. Sa‘īd Aḥmad A‘rāb, Muḥammad al-Fallāḥ et al.; Maghreb: Wizārat ‘Umūm al-Awqāf wa-l-Shu‘ūn al-Islāmiyya, 1992).
- Ibn Baṭṭāl, Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Khalaf al-Qurṭubī, *Sbarḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukḥārī li-Ibn Baṭṭāl*, 10 vols., (ed. Abū Tamīm Yāsir ibn Ibrāhīm; Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2003).
- Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī, *Faiḥ al-bārī bi-sbarḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukḥārī*, 13 vols., (eds. Muḥammad Fu‘ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī and Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb; Cairo: Dār al-Rayyān, 1986).
- Ibn Ḥazm, Abū Muḥammad ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Qurṭubī, *al-Iḥkām fi uṣūl al-aḥkām*, 8 vols., (ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir; Beirut: Dār al-Āfāq al-Jadīda, 1983).
- Ibn Manda, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Ishāq, *al-Radd ‘alā l-Jabmiyya* (ed. ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Faqīhī; n.p., 1982).
- Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Abū Bakr, *Shifā’ al-‘alīl fi masā’il al-qaḍā’ wa-l-qadar wa-l-ḥikma wa-l-ta’līl*, 2 vols., (ed. Muṣṭafā Abū l-Naṣr al-Shalabī; Jeddah: Maktabat al-Sawādī, 1991).
- Kahraman, Ferruh, “Hz. Âdem’in Yasak Ağaca Yaklaşması,” *Sakarya Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 25/27 (2013/1), 191-226.
- Kātib Chalabī, Ḥājī Khalīfa Muṣṭafā ibn ‘Abd Allāh, *Kashf al-zunūn ‘an asāmī al-kutub wa-l-funūn*, 2 vols., (eds. M. Şerefettin Yaltkaya and Kilisli Rifat Bilge; Ankara: Maarif Vekaleti, 1943).
- Kātib Chalabī, Ḥājī Khalīfa Muṣṭafā ibn ‘Abd Allāh, *Sullam al-wuṣūl ilā ṭabaqāt al-fuḥūl*, 6 vols., (eds. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, Maḥmūd ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Arna’ūt and Şāliḥ Sa‘dāwī Şāliḥ; Istanbul: İrcica Yayınları, 2010).
- al-Khaṭṭābī, Abū Sulaymān Ḥamd ibn Muḥammad, *Ma‘ālim al-sunan wa-buwa sbarḥ Sunan al-Imām Abī Dāwūd*, 4 vols., (ed. Muḥammad Rāghib al-Ṭabbākh; Aleppo: al-Maṭba‘a al-İlmiyya, 1932).
- Muḥammad Majdī Efendī, *Ḥadā’iq al-Shaqā’iq*, 5 vols., (ed. Abdülkadir Özcan; Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989).
- Muslim, Abū l-Ḥusayn Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 5 vols., (ed. Muḥammad Fu‘ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī; Cairo: Dār İhyā’ al-Kutub al-‘Arabiyya, 1955).
- al-Nasafī, Abū l-Barakāt ‘Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad, *Tafsīr al-Nasafī*, 4 vols., (Istanbul: Dāru Kahramān, 1984).

- al-Nawawī, Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā ibn Sharaf, *Şaḫīḫ Muslim bi-sbarḫ al-Nawawī*, 18 vols., (Cairo: al-Maṭba‘a al-Miṣriyya, 1930).
- Öngören, Reşat, “Bir Rüya Yorumcusu Olarak Mutasavvif-Âlim Kutbuddinzâde Mehmed İznikî,” *Uluslararası İznik Sempozyumu (5-7 Eylül 2005) [International Iznik Symposium (5-7 September 2005)]* (Iznik: İznik Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2005), 381-387.
- Öngören, Reşat, “Kutbuddinzâde İznikî,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXVI, 489-490.
- al-Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār, Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Abd al-Jabbār ibn Aḥmad, *al-Mughnī fī abwāb al-tawḥīd wa-l-‘adl*, 20 vols., (eds. Tawfiq al-Ṭawīl, Sa‘īd Zāyed, Ṭahā Ḥusayn et al.; Cairo: Wizārat al-Thaqāfa wa-l-İrshād al-Qawmī, al-Sharika al-Miṣriyya, 1960-65)
- Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ, Abū l-Faḍl ‘Iyāḍ ibn Mūsā l-Yaḥşubī, *İkmāl al-mu‘lim bi-fawā’id Muslim*, 9 vols., (ed. Yaḥyā İsmā‘il; Manşūra: Dār al-Wafā’, 1998).
- al-Qāshānī, ‘Abd al-Razzāq Kamāl al-Dīn ibn Abī l-Ghanā‘im, *Laṭā’if al-‘ilām fī isbārāt abl al-ilbām*, 2 vols., (eds. Aḥmad ‘Abd al-Raḥīm al-Sāyih et al.; Cairo: Maktabat al-Thaqāfa al-Dīniyya, 1426/2005).
- al-Qaşṭallānī, Abū al-‘Abbās Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad, *İrsbād al-sārī li-sbarḫ Şaḫīḫ al-Bukḫārī*, 10 vols., (Bülāq: al-Maṭba‘a al-Kubrā al-Amīriyya, 1305).
- al-Qurtubī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, *al-Jāmi‘ li-ahkām al-Qur‘ān*, 24 vols., (ed. ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī; Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, 2006).
- al-Rāzī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Fakhr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar, *Maḫāṭib al-gḫayb -al-Taḫsīr al-kabīr*, 32 vols., (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1981).
- al-Şābūnī, Nūr al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Maḥmūd Abī Bakr, *al-Bidāya fī uşūl al-dīn* (ed. Bekir Topaloğlu; Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1396/1979).
- Ṭāshkuprī-zāda, ‘İşām al-Dīn Abū al-Khayr Aḥmad ibn Muşṭafā ibn Khalīl, *al-Sbaqā’iq al-Nu‘māniyya fī ‘ulamā’ al-Dawla al-Uṭhmāniyya* (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1975).
- al-Tirmidhī, Abū ‘Īsā Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā, *al-Jāmi‘ al-şaḫīḫ*, 5 vols., (eds. Aḥmad Muḥammad Şākir, Muḥammad Fu‘ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī and Yūsuf Kamāl al-Ḥūt; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-İlmiyya, 1987).
- Uludağ, Süleyman, “A’yân-ı sâbite,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, IV, 198-199.