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A treatise written in Fusha Arabic. It begins with a series of questions, posed to al-Mishri (r.a.a.) by an unknown murid, though al-Mishri (r.a.a.) may have posed the questions to himself, which was a habit of his in his writing.

Al-Hamdu Lillah, Lord of the Worlds, and may salah and salam be upon the noblest of all earlier and later peoples.

May the highest degree of peace suitable for this station be unto the esteemed Sayyid Muhammad al-Mishri. I am letting you know that I was doing mudhakarah with some of the greats and I found a certain amount of difficulty in some matters, so I resolved to meet with you so that I could do mudhakarah in them with you. Then I feared that I would not find the time to do so, and wanted to delineate the matters so they could remain with you until you find some free time for them, and so any benefit to be gained from them could be spread. I request that your noble self give them importance, for I am in need of their elucidation, so perhaps I shall ask about some of them (as I am well aware of what you have!). Here are the questions:

1. What is the reason behind denying matters about the awliya’ of Allah (t.w.t.)?
2. Is the only one to deny them a deprived person?
3. Does denial harm them?
4. What about them is denied?
5. Does denial come from vast knowledge or blatant ignorance?
6. Regarding people who go through hals, have you denied any of their hals?
7. Why did you join Shaykh Ibrahim?
8. What do you say about the statement, “A shaykh’s descendant is like the shaykh”?
9. What regarding Shaykh Ibrahim is denied?
10. What do you have to say about his words, “What sincere youth do I have who will prostrate to my مظهر”?
11. What do you say regarding whether someone who attributes him- or herself to

الحمد لله رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ وَالصَّلاةَ وَالسَّلَامَ عَلَى أَشْرَفِ الأُولَىَّينَ وَالآخِرِينَ.
فَإِلَيْهِ جَنَابُ السَّيِّدُ مُحَمَّدُ الْمُشْرِي أُرْفِعَ ما يَنَاسِب
المقام من السلام وأَحْيَا تَمَّ الْعَلَّامَةُ بَيْنَنَا كُنْتَ أَتَذَاكَرَ مَع
بعض الأُكْبَرِ فِي أَشْيَاءِ فَاسَتَخْلَكْتِ مِنْهَا الْبَعْضَ
فَهَّمْتُ الْاِلْتِقَاءَ بِكَمْ لَأَتَذَاكَرَ مَعْمُوْكَ فِي هَذَا أَفْخَفْتَ أَنْ لَا
أُصَافِدُ وَقُتِّ فَرَاغٍ فَأَخْبِبْتُ أَنْ أَقِيّۡدُهَا لِتَبْقَىٰ عَنْدَكَ
إِلَى وَقُتٍّ تَحْجَدُونَ لَهَا فِي فَرَاغٍ وَلِيَعُمّ الْإِلْتِقَاعَ بِهَا
وَأَنْتَ مِنْ سَبَدَكَمْ أَنْ تَهْيَمَوا بِهَا فَإِنَّ أَحْجَازَ لِتَتْبِيِّنَهَا
وْرَبَما أَسْأَلَ عَنِ الْبَعْضِ مِنْهَا وَلَا يَخْفَى عَلَيْهِ مَا أَنْتُم
فِيهِ وَهَذَا نَصُّ الأَسْئَلَةِ:
1. ما السبب في الإنكار على أولياء الله تبارك
وبالتعالى؟
2. هل ينكر عليهم إلا محروم؟
3. هل يضرهم الإنكار؟
4. لماذا ينكر عليهم؟
5. هل الإنكار من سعة العلم أو من فادح
الجلال؟
6. هل أنكرت على أهل الأحوال شيئاً من
الأحوال؟
7. ما سبب اختراعك في سلك الشيخ؟
8. ما تقول في قولهم ابن الشيخ كاتب الشيخ؟
9. لماذا ينكر على الشيخ إبراهيم؟
Shaykh Tijani and accepts him, while considering Shaykh Ibrahim to be a misguided liar, can be considered Tijani?

12. What is the difference between Shaykh Tijani’s sealhood and his concealedness?

13. What is the difference between the Name, the Attribute, and the Khalifah?

14. What is the difference between the Khalifah and the Qutb?

15. Are the haqa’iq always four—never having been more or less, nor will they ever be—or does that change according to states and means?

16. What is the meaning of Shaykh Tijani’s words, “A man from the group who is not known in the Dunya, nor in the Akhirah”?

17. Do arifs have a unique understanding of Allah’s (t.) speech?

18. What is the meaning of Allah’s (t.) speech, “O Prophet, have taqwa of Allah”?

19. For the people of haqiqah, what is subtly indicated by His speech, “by Asr”?

20. What is the wisdom behind the extraction of mineral wealth and the many peculiar kinds of engineering?

I kindly request a satisfactory reply, with as-Salāamu alaikum wa Rahmatullahi wa Barakatuh returning to you.

The one who wrote this is someone whose handwriting you will recognize.

**Introduction to the Responses**

Al-Hamdu Lillah, and may salah and salam be upon Allah’s Messenger.

My dear Sayyid Muhammad Abdullah, I have looked at the questions and they require a proper written answer. I cannot deal with them in full because of the many lordly secrets and effusions to which these questions are related, and because of the widespread corruption of people’s states and their negative opinion about the people of Allah. We are in a time in which few are congenial toward the people of Allah; rather, you find those who look into the private faults of others and seize every opportunity to harm them.

ما عندكم في قوله “من لي بفتيان صدق يسجدون لمسكر؟”

ما تقول في تجنبية من ينسب للشيخ التجاني ويكذبه ويكدب الشيخ ويتغزل؟

ما الفرق بين ختمية الشيخ التجاني وكمتيته؟

ما الفرق بين الاسم والصفة والخليفة؟

ما الفرق بين الخليفة والقطب؟

هل الحقائق أربع لا تزيد ولا تنقص أرا وأبدا أم هي بحسب الأحوال والوسائل؟

ما يعني قول الشيخ التجاني، ‘رجل من الطائفة لا يعرف في الدنيا ولا في الآخرة’؟

هل للعارفين فيهم خاص في كلام الله تعالى؟

ما يعني قوله تعالى: ‘يا أيها الذين آمنوا أتئق أنفسكم’؟

ما الإشارة عند أهل الحقيقة في قوله تعالى: وألقصر؟

ما الحكمة في استخراج الكتب وكثير من غريب أنواع الهندسة؟

أطلب جوابا شافيا والسلام عائد عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته.

وكتب من لا يخشى عليكم خطبه.

**توطنة الأجنحة**

الحمد لله والصلاة والسلام على رسول الله.

أيها السيد محمد عبد الله أني طالعت الأستاذة فإذا تحجب إلى تأليف ولا يمكن لي من أي وجه أن آتي بجميع ما احتوت عليه لكثرة ما انطلت عليه
to distort the meaning of their words. Whenever they hear something that could potentially carry different meanings and interpretations, they fly toward the interpretation that would not fittingly come from the pure chosen people of Allah. This is what they do, even if that interpretation is far-fetched, and they distort the meaning of words to fit that interpretation, taking recourse to the intellectual and textual sciences and whatever logic and philosophy they contain to prove that the only possible interpretation of the wali’s words that is even slightly linguistically, grammatically, or logically plausible is the one they have mentioned. They do this in order to make the wali appear outside the circle of Islam. This is why I do not like to say—let alone write—anything, for fear that it be heard or seen by one not fit for it, who will then be destroyed as a result. However, given your request, I am going to clarify what I can and hint at some matters regarding some of the questions, as much as the circumstances allow. I ask Allah to give me, you, and all believers success and guidance. Indeed He is the one in charge of that and the one able to grant it.

**Question 1: What is the reason behind denial?**

**Answer:** I say—and by Allah I charge victoriously—that there are many reasons, but they all go back to one: distance from Allah (t.w.t.). This is the root of all tribulations. Just as closeness to Allah is the root of all good, so distance from Him is the root of all evil. Know that closeness is of two kinds, as is distance. By that I mean Allah’s closeness to you and your closeness to Him, and distance from Allah and—well, we do not really say “Allah’s distance” except in the sense of His dealing with us through the known consequences of distance, in the same manner as you say “Allah’s plot” and “Allah’s deception” with regard to His wrath. Far be it from Allah to have such traits, but since He describes himself thus in His own speech, we know that what is meant is His dealing with us according to what normally results from plots and deception; it is the same case with His distance. Allah’s being closer than the jugular vein or coming between a person from the pure chosen people of Allah. This is what they do, even if that interpretation is far-fetched, and they distort the meaning of words to fit that interpretation, taking recourse to the intellectual and textual sciences and whatever logic and philosophy they contain to prove that the only possible interpretation of the wali’s words that is even slightly linguistically, grammatically, or logically plausible is the one they have mentioned. They do this in order to make the wali appear outside the circle of Islam. This is why I do not like to say—let alone write—anything, for fear that it be heard or seen by one not fit for it, who will then be destroyed as a result. However, given your request, I am going to clarify what I can and hint at some matters regarding some of the questions, as much as the circumstances allow. I ask Allah to give me, you, and all believers success and guidance. Indeed He is the one in charge of that and the one able to grant it.

**Question 1: What is the reason behind denial?**

**Answer:** I say—and by Allah I charge victoriously—that there are many reasons, but they all go back to one: distance from Allah (t.w.t.). This is the root of all tribulations. Just as closeness to Allah is the root of all good, so distance from Him is the root of all evil. Know that closeness is of two kinds, as is distance. By that I mean Allah’s closeness to you and your closeness to Him, and distance from Allah and—well, we do not really say “Allah’s distance” except in the sense of His dealing with us through the known consequences of distance, in the same manner as you say “Allah’s plot” and “Allah’s deception” with regard to His wrath. Far be it from Allah to have such traits, but since He describes himself thus in His own speech, we know that what is meant is His dealing with us according to what normally results from plots and deception; it is the same case with His distance. Allah’s being closer than the jugular vein or coming between a person
and their heart is a reality that does not change under any circumstances, meaning that it is something pertaining to Allah’s Essence. Therefore, from this point of view, Allah’s closeness to His creation does not change, whether we are speaking of the closest creature to Him or the most distant, as indicated by the hadith “Do not consider me better than my brother Yunus bin Matta.” The Prophet is the one who traversed the seven heavens, the Throne, and the uppermost limit, until he was at two bows’ length or closer; yet Allah is not closer—i.e., in His Essence, which is not to be found in any particular direction—to him in that state than to Yunus, who found himself in three types of compounding darkness. As for the special type of closeness that carries the meaning of assistance, that is His closeness to the people of Ihsan. Therefore, understand the difference between closeness from the point of view of divine will and closeness from the point of view of wisdom, and between closeness with regard to Allah’s Essence and closeness with regard to His Attributes.

Now let us return to the reasons behind denial, which all ultimately come from distance from Allah. The first of them is envy, which is the terminal illness that prevented the Jews from following the Master of Existence (s.a.w.s.). Other causes for denial are arrogance, being pleased with oneself, ignorance of the nafs’ shameful traits—because if people look at their own faults, they turn away from looking at the defects of others—and ignorance of the hals that the people of Allah go through. Add to this the fact that whenever people are involved in denial, it increases them in distance, which in turn increases them in denial, and the fact that the wali’s first step in wilayah is to kill their nafs and then fight other nufus. This means that whenever they find an opportunity to kill someone’s nafs, they will kill it with Allah, as in Allah erases whatever He wills from the nafs’ sense of self and establishes whatever He wills of His own sense of self. It is no secret that the people of nufus are regimented soldiers who know their enemies and are constantly striving against anyone who enters their field of vision.

**Note:**

8 This discussion of Yunus (a.s.) in the transcription seems to be out of place—it makes more sense for it to be earlier in the passage, and has been placed so in the translation.
who is not on their side, waging war against whoever wages war against their nafs and fighting against whoever fights them. They are thus enemies of the Truth, while the wali is the enemy of falsehood.

The origin of this dispute is to be found in the dispute between the nafs and the ruh, for these are two companions who reside in every human at all times; until either the nafs dies or the ruh dies, they will remain companions and no human will be free of their contesting with each other. The nafs fights the ruh in order to kill it and then, once the ruh is dead, drag it to what it sees as beneficial—eating, drinking, worldly pleasures, amassing wealth, and amassing pride—so that the nafs can hold onto all of its vile traits without someone to disturb it and complicate things. As long as there is some life in the ruh—even if slight—the nafs will never be completely free from the disturbance of the ruh. When the ruh does die and the nafs is able to get what it wants from it, blowing its own breath of nafs-life into it, the ruh becomes the property of the nafs, which does whatever it wants. Thus, the nafs becomes twice as strong, since it now is not only free to do what it wants, but also has a servant working for it. And even if the nafs is not quite stronger than its servant, at least it is not ruled by it. Thus a human becomes the worst of creatures—even worse than predatory beasts—because of the servant that works with their nafs towards their egotistical aims, thereby deserving two portions of evil: one for that nafs, and another for the nafs’ servant.

The ruh, on the other hand, likewise fights the nafs to own it; if it manages to kill the nafs, breathe its own ruh-life into it, take ownership of it, and ascend with it to the spiritual realm, then the ruh becomes free and gains a humbled, obedient servant who follows its orders. This is the meaning of the saying, “Put forward an imam to whom you were his imam…”1—the ruh is the final imam, whereas the nafs used to be the imam. Just like the nafs, in this

ويعملون أعدائهم ويجاهدون دون أنفسهم دائمًا يحاربون من يحاربونه ويقاتلون من يقاتلونهم فهم أعداء الحق والولاي ولاء الباطل.

وأصل هذا الخلاف من الخلاف الذي بين النفس والروح فيما عرفان في كل إنسان دائمًا وقيل أن تموت النفس أو تموت الروح فيما عرفان فلا يخلو إنسان من مصارعتهما. فالنفس تقاتل الروح لقتلافها وتجها إذا ماتت إلى مصالحها في أكل وشرب ولذة وتكتاف وتتامس بمعينة أو صفيح الخبيثة دون مشوش وما دامت في الروح حياة ولو فلت لا تسلم النفس من تشوشها ولو ولد وحيث حصلت النفس على مرادها من الروح بعد أن تموت الروح وتتفخ النفس فيها حياتها النفسانية تكون الروح تحت ملك النفس وتتصرف فيها كيف شاءت تقوى النفس بالضعف لكونها صارت حرة وعددها ملك يكن معها وإن لم يكن أقوى منها فليس دونها ولهد ومعنى ينصبر الإنسان شر البرية حتى السبع بسبب المملك الذي يعمل مع نفسه لمصالحه النفسانية يستحق سهماً من الشر واحد نفسه والأخر لمملوكه.

والروح تقاتل النفس لتملكها مثل الذي سبق فإن قتلتها وتتفخ فيها حياتها الروحانية وملكتها وطارت بها إلى عالم الأمر فتصدر الروح حرة ولها مملك ذايل من فقد لطاعتها وأوامرها وهذا هو معنى قولهم "وقد سأ إمامًا كنت أنت إمامًا...("البيت)" في هذا الإمام الأخير هي الروح والأول النفس. فهذا أيضًا تقوى

---

1 This line of poetry is usually attributed to the early Sufi Imam al-Junayd (r.a.a.), and is often interpreted slightly differently, viz. “Put forward an imam whom you used to face…” (thereby bowing the last word of the Arabic quoted here as “إمامًا”, not “إمامًا”), referring to the murid’s act of taking a shaykh with whom the murid was acquainted in the spiritual realm before this world. Mishri (r.a.a.) interprets the line differently.
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way the ruh becomes twice as strong as it was before, and deserves two portions of good. Thus a human becomes the best of creatures, even better than angels—which do count as a type of creature—because Allah placed in the human a tool for good (i.e. the ruh) and a tool for evil (i.e. the nafs), yet if they are able to subjugate this tool for evil, it becomes a tool for good, having reached the stage of the “pleased and pleasing” nafs. As for the angels, Allah gave them only the ruh, which cannot be used for anything but good as long as it is stands alone and apart from a nafs. The nafs and the ruh only come into agreement in the heart of the perfect wali, to whom they become submissive; the Iman of the nafs and the ruh will never be complete until the two of them have the wali decide between them whenever they dispute, as indicated by the ayah, “Nay, by your Lord, they do not fully believe until they have you decide between them in whatever disputes arise between them” (Qur’an 4:65).

Know that for the ruh to be alive and the nafs to be dead—that is the real life after which there is no death, whether the one who has it is currently with us or has passed; whereas, for the nafs to be alive and the ruh to be dead—that is the death after which there is no life, similarly regardless of whether the one who has it is physically dead or alive. In this way, some of the dead are living and some of the living are dead, and few are those who understand the difference between death and life, since it is a subtle difference. The Shaykh indicated this in saying, “Does life inhere in death, or death in life? Who knows?”

These two opposing sides of the nafs and the ruh are in constant battle, as long as there exists truth and falsehood. The origin of their dispute is to be found in the different factors that enter into them, both explicitly and implicitly. These factors are none other than the divine tajalliyat, so in fact the origin of the dispute between these two—indeed, the origin of every dispute—is a difference in madhhabh. This is the case whether the dispute is between two separate things, or between two nisbahs of the same thing: a dispute between two separate things must involve a dispute between two nisbahs of the same thing, just as a dispute between two
nisbabs must involve a dispute between two madhhabs. An example of this is the dispute between the nisbah of the ruh and the nisbah of the physical form: one is a nisbah of manifestness, the other is a nisbah of hiddenness, and neither of them can accept anything but its own hadrah.

From this you can know that the affair between the wali and their enemy is more serious than that between a Muslim and a disbeliever, since the Muslim’s only goal they call to is Islam, while the disbeliever only wants benefit for their own nafs (in terms of having a good reputation and wealth); the wali, on the other hand, calls to Islam, Iman, and Ihsan—therefore calling to true Iman, the lowest degree of which is fana’ of the nafs and baqa’ in Allah in the hadrahs of His Names and His Attributes. It is well known that it is easier for the nafs to follow an average Muslim than follow a wali; similarly, just as the wali fights more aggressively because of the strength of their Iman, so the denier fights more aggressively because of their Iman, since the denier’s opposition comes from two vile reasons: on the surface, they want to stand up for the deen, defend it, and display zeal for it, while inwardly they are covetous over their own uniqueness, status, physical comforts, the view of the deen they have always grown up with, and other matters that the nafs has made enticing. May Allah suffice us from the nafs’ evil!

**Question 2: Is the only one to deny them a deprived person?**

**Answer:** Naturally, the only one to deny them is deprived, in all manners of the word: not just deprived from picking up on whatever closeness, sincerity, emanation, secrets, and illuminations Allah has favored His wali with, but also deprived from picking up on Allah’s grace at all.

You should know that there are levels of denial. The lowest level simply involves not believing in a wali, without opposing them or standing in the way of their call. The highest level involves outright enmity. One who denies on the first level—who incurs no sin except in that they did not believe in or follow the wali—is said to be deprived from what Allah
gave that wali. The one who denies on the latter level
is the one whose state would be termed absolute
deprivation, because they are the absolute enemy of
Allah, as shown by the hadith qudsi, “I have declared
war on whoever shows enmity to a wali of Mine”
(Bukhari), and it is only on His enemies that Allah
wages war. You can also understand Allah’s enmity
towards that person from His speech “Whoever is
an enemy to Allah, His angels, His messengers,
Jibril, and Mikail—then Allah is indeed an enemy
to such disbelievers” (Qur’an 2:98): since Allah is an
enemy to the angels’ enemy, He must necessarily be
an enemy to whoever is the righteous believer’s en-
emy, because Allah mentioned that person before
the angels in His (t.) speech, “For truly Allah is his
Protector, and Jibril, the righteous believers, and the
angels are reinforcements after that” (Qur’an 66:4).
Shaykh Tijani used this ayah as proof that the right-
eous believer is better than the angels, so logically
Allah’s enmity towards the enemy of someone of a
lesser status necessitates His enmity towards the en-
emy of someone of a greater status. Those are the
best of creatures; as for the enemies of Allah, do not
ask about them… May Allah suffice us from their
evil.

Question 3: Does denial harm them?

Answer: It does not harm them; on the contrary, it
benefits them, just as the Shaykh said, “The one who
aims to harm me has striven to my advantage.” What
this means is that Allah is the one who gave the cre-
ation power over the wali, for reasons that all return
to the wali’s advantage. For one, when Allah ap-
proaches the wali with His pure grace and pleasure
and the whole creation approaches them with evil
and denial, the wali has no choice but to turn to Al-
lah (t.w.t.) with their whole being and flee to Him in
every matter great or small, because they have none
other than He. That is the meaning of the saying,
“May Allah reward our brothers and sisters on our
behalf—by their harshness with us, they returned us
to Allah.” The Shaykh also indicated this by saying:
He made harm flow from them lest you lean
On them—rather, on God should you lean

الولي والثاني هو المراد بالحرمان المطلق لأنه عدو
الله قطعاً بدليل "من عادٍ لي ولاء فقد آذنه بالحرب" Allah لا يحارب إلا أعداءه، وتفهم معاداة الله من
 قوله تعالى "من كان عدواً لِله وملائكته... الآية" فلزم
من كونه تعالى عدوا لعدو الملائكة أن يكون عدوا
لمن كان عدوا لصالح المؤمنين لأن الله قدمه عليهم
في الذكر في قوله تعالى "فإن الله هو مؤلاً وجدلٌ
وصالح المؤمنين والملائكة بعد ذلك ظهيرٌ" وقد احتج
شیخنا التجاني بهذه الآية على أن صالح المؤمنين
أفضل من الملائكة فمعاداته لعدو الفضول تلزم منها
معاداته لعدو الفاضل من باب الأولية. اولئك هم خير
البرية ولا تسأل عن أعداء الله كفانا الله شرهم.

السؤال الثالث: هل يضرهم الإنكار؟

الجواب: لا يضرهم بل ينفعهم كما قال الشيخ، "فمن
رام ضري فقد سعي في مصالحي" ومعنى ذلك أن الله
هو الذي سلط الخلق على الولي لأمور كلها ترجع
إلى مصالح الولي، منها أن الولي إذا أقبل الله عليه
بمحض فضله ورضاه وأقبل عليه الخلق بالشر
والإنكار لا يجد بدا عن التوجه إلى الله تبارك وتعالى
بالكلية والاجتهاد إليه في كل أمر دق أو جل لأنه ليس
علمه غيره وهذا هو معمى قولهم "جزى الله عنا إخواننا
خيرا ردوا برفقاءهم إلى الله" وقد أشار الشيخ إلى ذلك
بقوله:
أجْرِي الأذى منهم لنلا تركنا
إليهم بل للاه فاركنا
For another reason, the wali bears their harm, so Allah rewards them for their forbearance. For another, Allah replaces their bad deeds with the good deeds of the deniers. For another, denial of the wali increases their fame, as in the line of poetry:

And if Allah wants to spread the news of a virtue
That was buried, He gifts it the tongue of an envier

For another, the denier is tortured every time they see an increase of Allah’s blessing on the wali, so Allah makes more miracles manifest at the wali’s hands in order to punish His enemies.

**Question 4: What about them is denied?**

**Answer:** Usually, the denier goes through stages: he or she denies this thing once, and that thing another time, like a wolf that tries to steal from every direction, sometimes quite openly, and when one approach is blocked it comes from another...his or her real goal is to show opposition to the people of Allah, which entails extinguishing Allah’s light. The wali’s only desire is to let Allah’s light shine through all of his or her words and actions, so if he or she says, “I’m this” and “I’m that,” describing him- or herself in all kinds of beautiful ways, his or her only intention in that case is to call to Allah. In such a situation, the denier will say that the wali is just making false claims and only wants to call to himself- or herself. That is because the denier does not see the Manifest Truth over Whom there is no veil—if he or she were to see that, he or she would know that the wali is simply translating what the Truth has said; instead, the denier sees nothing but the nafs, calling to oneself, plotting, and treachery—thereby his or her own attributes appear to him or her in the wali, so he or she uses those vile traits to translate what is being said. On the other hand, after the wali has experienced fana’, extinction, closeness, flooding over, and tajalli, the attributes of Truth appear to him or her and he or she uses them to translate accordingly. Thus the wali translates only for Allah, while the denier translates only for his or her nafs.

I once saw a metaphor for this when I was standing near a small, new-looking car. Suddenly, a
rooster appeared next to it and saw his own reflection in the car, so he immediately started moving his feathers, screaming, and pecking at the car with his beak. Every time he made a movement and showed off more, he saw that his rival had done the same, so he screamed at him and struck him with his beak more violently than before, until he almost died, thinking—nay, knowing for sure—that he was fighting another rooster, whereas in reality he was only fighting himself.

Similarly, the denier only sees his or her own attributes and only fights him- or herself, and if the wall speaks from the maqam of selfless slavehood and uses attributes of deficiency to describe him- or herself, the denier has no choice but to say, “He just said what he did to show everyone how pious he is, because everyone knows that pious people use attributes of deficiency when they talk about themselves.” And if he or she sees someone making dhikr who then becomes engrossed in what he or she is making dhikr of and thus distracted from the act of dhikr itself, the denier says, “She left out a letter and I didn’t hear her say it,” as if the one making dhikr was only doing it so the denier would hear it. That is how the denier gives his or her own nafs the right to judge the one making dhikr, and to judge Allah—where on earth did the denier get the idea that the person making dhikr is only doing it for the denier to hear it, and that the one of whom he or she is making dhikr (i.e. Allah) only hears what the denier hears? May Allah be exalted high above what they say.

The denial can also start going into elements of creed and shari’ah, such that every time the denier sees something that is not the established opinion in his or her imam’s madhhab, he or she denies it, as if he or she had all-encompassing knowledge of the madhhab of his or her imam, the imam had all-encompassing knowledge of the shari’ah, and his or her own heart were the Preserved Tablet—nay, even above that: Umm al-Kitab (which is the hadrah that contains what is in the Preserved Tablet, and not vice versa)!

نفسه فيها فإذا بالديك يحرك ريشه ويصبح وينقر

بمنقارة السيارة وكلما تحرك وارداد ما به يرى أن

صاحب وقع له مثل ذلك ويصبح عليه وضربه

بمنقاره أشد مما كان يفعل حتى كاد أن يموت ظنا

منه بل تحقق أنه يقاتل ديك آخر وهو لا يقاتل إلا

نفسه.

فكلما ذلك المنكر لا يرى إلا صفاته ولا يقاتل إلا

نفسه وإذا كان الولي في مقام العبودة وترجم عن نفسه

بصفات النقص لا بد أن يقول المنكر هذا قاله ليظهر

للسما صاحب لأنه من شأن الصالحين أن يترجموا

عن أنفسهم بالنقص وإذا رأى المنكر ذاكرًا يذكر الله

غالبًا عن الذكر في المنكر يقول حذف حرفًا فما

سمعته نطق به كان الذكر ما ذكر إلا ليسمه هو

فيجع نفسه على حال الذكر وبحكمها على الله فمن

أين للمنكر أن الذكر ما ذكر إلا ليسمه وأن المنكر

الذي هو الله لا يسمع إلا ما يسمع المنكر فتعالى الله

عما يقولون علوا كبيرا.

وإمّا تطور الإكبار إلى العقائد والشريعة فكلما

رأى المنكر شيئًا لا يعلم شेته في مذهب إمامه ينكره

كانه محيط بذهيب إمامه وكان إمامه محيط بالشريعة

وكان قليبه عدده هو اللوح المحفوظ بل أم الكتاب التي

هي الحضرة التي تحوي ما في اللوح ولا يحوي اللوح

ما فيها.

السؤال الخامس: هل الإنكار من سعة العلم...إلخ؟

الجواب: الإنكار لا يكون إلا من الجهل فكل ولي فوق

ولي يصدقه ولا عكس وقد قال ابن عربي الحاتمي:
Question 5: Does denial come from vast knowledge or blatant ignorance?

Answer: Denial only comes from ignorance. Every wali has a wali over him or her who is able to confirm what he or she has, but not the other way round. Ibn Arabi al-Hatimi said, “Humanity consists of common people, fiqh scholars, aspiring Sufis, Sufis, those who have received their spiritual opening, and arifs—each group denies the group that is above it, due to the veil between them.” The level of the arifs is where the path of this great qutb Ibn Arabi al-Hatimi ended—hence why he listed it last—yet it is where the path of Shaykh Tijani’s (r.a.a.) companions begins, and beyond it remain many levels...

Question 6: Regarding people who go through hals, have you denied any of their hals?

Answer: People fall into four categories in this regard:

1. those who make empty claims that have basis neither in shari’ah nor in haqiqah
2. majdhubs who base their sayings on haqiqah but must understand how to speak more wisely
3. those who have entered the da’irah of ma’rifah
4. the complete ones

As for those in the first group, I am the most vehement denouncer of them, but my denunciation occurs only in the heart, since there is no point in doing anything else.

As for those in the second group, I confirm them internally by haqiqah, but deny them by the tongue of shari’ah. I excuse them and pay attention to their future states: if I see that they are journeying step by step towards completion and surpassing those slips that result from their submergence in the ocean of divine unity, I rejoice at their hal and hope for their success. If, on the other hand, I see them staying in one place and not surpassing it, girded always by the speech of jadhb, moving towards their desires and covering themselves up with the darkness of jadhb, I know that they have mixed a good...
The third group, who have entered the circle of ma’rifah, are rarely to be criticized, except for their lack of familiarity with the fine points of the nafs’ plotting, since that is something from which one is rarely free. This is because the nafs is always present, and one cannot be blamed for one’s nafs being present, but rather for one’s lack of awareness of its presence and lack of knowledge of its cunning and plots. Such is the jihad against the nafs, without which perfection is impossible. For as long as the arif’s hands are tied when it comes to the conspiracies of the nafs and its plots—stealing with thieves and then joining the detectives to follow the clues of the crime—he or she will not attain the rank of perfection, that of the fourth group, who are the people of perfection.

Those in the fourth group are in reality the people of perfection. Perfection belongs to Allah, so they belong to Him as well. Whoever sees a defect in them should know that that is from his or her own nafs, not from them; as for me, I just like to lower my gaze and I know—al-Hamdu Lillah—of the plots of my own nafs, which prevents me from looking into the plots of others. May Allah give us success to do that which He loves and is pleased with, and may He cure, by His grace, our diseased hearts.

Question 7: Why did you join Shaykh Ibrahim?

Answer: That is something that Allah decreed in His pre-eternity and for which I praise and thank Him, because these are all affairs that He manifests in this life, but does not initiate here. In terms of the material causes we can point to, one of the reasons is that when I was young I had a grandmother who excelled in the science of sirah, and she would always entertain me as a child with the stories of Allah’s Messenger (s.a.w.s.), the rejection and plotting he encountered from his enemies, and how he was accused of using magic and being crazy. Love for him and a desire to support him therefore took root in my heart, and perhaps Allah will relent unto them. I believe this group from one angle and deny them from another—until they repent, for whoever repents, Allah has relented unto them.

The third group, who have entered the circle of ma’rifah, are rarely to be criticized, except for their lack of familiarity with the fine points of the nafs’ plotting, since that is something from which one is rarely free. This is because the nafs is always present, and one cannot be blamed for one’s nafs being present, but rather for one’s lack of awareness of its presence and lack of knowledge of its cunning and plots. Such is the jihad against the nafs, without which perfection is impossible. For as long as the arif’s hands are tied when it comes to the conspiracies of the nafs and its plots—stealing with thieves and then joining the detectives to follow the clues of the crime—he or she will not attain the rank of perfection, that of the fourth group, who are the people of perfection.

Those in the fourth group are in reality the people of perfection. Perfection belongs to Allah, so they belong to Him as well. Whoever sees a defect in them should know that that is from his or her own nafs, not from them; as for me, I just like to lower my gaze and I know—al-Hamdu Lillah—of the plots of my own nafs, which prevents me from looking into the plots of others. May Allah give us success to do that which He loves and is pleased with, and may He cure, by His grace, our diseased hearts.

The third group, who have entered the circle of ma’rifah, are rarely to be criticized, except for their lack of familiarity with the fine points of the nafs’ plotting, since that is something from which one is rarely free. This is because the nafs is always present, and one cannot be blamed for one’s nafs being present, but rather for one’s lack of awareness of its presence and lack of knowledge of its cunning and plots. Such is the jihad against the nafs, without which perfection is impossible. For as long as the arif’s hands are tied when it comes to the conspiracies of the nafs and its plots—stealing with thieves and then joining the detectives to follow the clues of the crime—he or she will not attain the rank of perfection, that of the fourth group, who are the people of perfection.

Those in the fourth group are in reality the people of perfection. Perfection belongs to Allah, so they belong to Him as well. Whoever sees a defect in them should know that that is from his or her own nafs, not from them; as for me, I just like to lower my gaze and I know—al-Hamdu Lillah—of the plots of my own nafs, which prevents me from looking into the plots of others. May Allah give us success to do that which He loves and is pleased with, and may He cure, by His grace, our diseased hearts.

The third group, who have entered the circle of ma’rifah, are rarely to be criticized, except for their lack of familiarity with the fine points of the nafs’ plotting, since that is something from which one is rarely free. This is because the nafs is always present, and one cannot be blamed for one’s nafs being present, but rather for one’s lack of awareness of its presence and lack of knowledge of its cunning and plots. Such is the jihad against the nafs, without which perfection is impossible. For as long as the arif’s hands are tied when it comes to the conspiracies of the nafs and its plots—stealing with thieves and then joining the detectives to follow the clues of the crime—he or she will not attain the rank of perfection, that of the fourth group, who are the people of perfection.

Those in the fourth group are in reality the people of perfection. Perfection belongs to Allah, so they belong to Him as well. Whoever sees a defect in them should know that that is from his or her own nafs, not from them; as for me, I just like to lower my gaze and I know—al-Hamdu Lillah—of the plots of my own nafs, which prevents me from looking into the plots of others. May Allah give us success to do that which He loves and is pleased with, and may He cure, by His grace, our diseased hearts.
until I carried in my heart the need to love and support everyone who met with the same adversities and accusations that he faced.

It is for this reason that I loved Shaykh Ibrahim from the beginning, before even knowing him. When I reached puberty and my attachment to ma’rifah of Allah was renewed, I thought about what means I should take to Allah, and I was torn between him and Muhammad Lamin Ould Beddi. The Shaykh’s virtue, and the spiritual effusion that had flooded over his companions, was apparent to me. However, Sayyid Muhammad Lamin’s istiqamah, scrupulousness, and knowledge were also apparent to me, in addition to the fact that his father Abba had been my father’s means, and, of course, people naturally incline to what their forefathers have followed. Abba was the Khalifah of his father Beddi, who took from Shaykh Muhammad al-Hafiz, who took from Shaykh Tijani—may Allah be pleased with all of them, may He please them, and may He be pleased with us through them, Amin! I did not doubt in this chain back to Shaykh Tijani (r.a.a.), yet there was also no doubt that what Shaykh Ibrahim had was true, and that it was an unstoppable divine flood. However, in the beginning, my confidence that Sayyid Muhammad Lamin was a real Tijani was stronger than my confidence in that regarding others, despite the fact that my confidence in the benefit to be gained at Shaykh Ibrahim’s hands surpassed my confidence in anyone else in that regard.

This is how the confusion that I mentioned earlier came about. But then, after pondering for several hours, I concluded that I should take the Tijani Tariqah from the place where I was sure it was to be genuinely found, and seek madad there; then, if I found madad there, that would be enough for me—otherwise, I would seek madad from where I knew it to be. Therefore, one night almost a year after reaching puberty, I went to Sayyid Muhammad Lamin and asked him for the Tijani Tariqah.

He asked me with adab and good character, “What about Shaykh Ibrahim?”

I said, “I have seen him, but I have come to you specifically.”

So he promised to give it to me once I returned to him. When I returned, he gave me the Tijani Tariqah.
Tariqah, and I spent almost two years reciting the wārids and approaching spiritual opening.

One night when I was asleep, I dreamt that I was busy demolishing a wall, until I had taken down enough of it to see through. When I looked through it, I saw on the other side a number of people—God knows how many—all busy demolishing the wall, and they had already gotten much of it done. So I rushed toward them and entered through the large breach they had made in the wall. In my dream, I did not recognize any of them except Muhammad al-Hafiz bin Muhammad Aali, so I grabbed on to him with my hand as I reached those in the middle of the wall, and I found him to be the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.). Once I reached him, the sun appeared to me from the west, and “the disbeliever was shocked into silence.”

I woke up and went to Shaykh Ibrahim, who renewed the wārid for me, and I received tarbiyah at his hands.

**Question 8: Is a shaykh’s descendant like the shaykh?**

**Answer:** I say that if the descendant of a shaykh is like the shaykh in knowledge, ma’rifah, and perfection, he or she is like the shaykh, and the same rings true for the descendant of a murid: if he or she has the same qualities as the shaykh, then he or she is like the shaykh. As for simply being a descendant in and of itself, that cannot at all mean that the descendant would necessarily be like the shaykh—unless we are talking about the respect we accord to them: in that case, properly honouring the righteous entails honouring their descendants. Allah (t.w.t.) has said in this regard, when explaining why He honoured two orphans, “Their forefather was a righteous man” (Qur’an 18:82). Another exception is if the descendant has some but not all of the same qualities as the shaykh, then he or she is like the shaykh, and the same rings true for the descendant of a murid. As for simply being a descendant in and of itself, that cannot at all mean that the descendant would necessarily be like the shaykh—unless we are talking about the respect we accord to them: in that case, properly honouring the righteous entails honouring their descendants. Allah (t.w.t.) has said in this regard, when explaining why He honoured two orphans, “Their forefather was a righteous man” (Qur’an 18:82). Another exception is if the descendant has some but not all of the same qualities as the shaykh, then he or she is like the shaykh, and the same rings true for the descendant of a murid. As for simply being a descendant in and of itself, that cannot at all mean that the descendant would necessarily be like the shaykh—unless we are talking about the respect we accord to them: in that case, properly honouring the righteous entails honouring their descendants.

2 A reference to Qur’an 2:258, in which the Prophet Ibrahim (a.s.) challenges the disbelieving ruler to make the sun rise from the west, as he claims to be all-powerful—since he cannot do that, “the disbeliever was shocked into silence.” In Al-Mishri’s (r.a.) dream, it is understood that the sun rising from the west is an allusion to Shaykh Ibrahim’s (r.a.a.) rising success in West Africa, while those who denied him are confounded.
qualities: in that case, for someone overcome by divine hals and able to see matters based on their ends, it is proper to look at that descendant according to what Allah has decreed for him or her in the Akhirarah and consequently consider him or her to enjoy the same station of his or her forefather, following Allah’s saying, “And for those who believe and have progeny who follow them in belief, We will unite them with their progeny” (Qur’an 52:21). It is well known that the station by which a wali has become a shaykh is a divine matter that has to do with the ruh—not the physical form—so if the descendant is a descendant in ruh, then he or she will be like the shaykh; otherwise, such will not be the case.

I was discussing this matter one day with the descendant of a shaykh, so he mentioned to me that another son of a shaykh came to someone who had some connection in deen—i.e. a shaykh-murid relationship, or something similar—with his father, but when the shaykh’s son came to him, he did not treat the son as he would have treated his father, so the son got angry, cut off ties with him, and displayed ill-will towards him. I said to him, “The descendants of shaykhs these days all act as if they are royal descendants, but the difference between the descendants of shaykhs and the descendants of kings should be plain and clear: the way set out for shaykhs’ descendants is to follow the path of their forefathers, in terms of selfless slavehood, honesty, sincerity, and good character. Then, if people see these good qualities in them, they would necessarily want to breathe in such sweet fragrances from them; and that is despite the fact that one who has such noble qualities is usually not as much in need of other people as they are in need of him or her, so those who turn away from such a person would only be harming themselves. As for the descendants of kings, no one rebukes them if they act violently and aggressively—at least, that used to be the case, but the twentieth century has largely risen above what used to be in the nature of kings and their descendants, and it is even more appropriate for the descendants of shaykhs to follow this trend. Today, the only way left for them is to find their way back to selfless slavehood and the democracy of this century.

And I was discussing this matter one day with the descendant of a shaykh, so he mentioned to me that another son of a shaykh came to someone who had some connection in deen—with his father, but when the shaykh’s son came to him, he did not treat the son as he would have treated his father, so the son got angry, cut off ties with him, and displayed ill-will towards him. I said to him, “The descendants of shaykhs these days all act as if they are royal descendants, but the difference between the descendants of shaykhs and the descendants of kings should be plain and clear: the way set out for shaykhs’ descendants is to follow the path of their forefathers, in terms of selfless slavehood, honesty, sincerity, and good character. Then, if people see these good qualities in them, they would necessarily want to breathe in such sweet fragrances from them; and that is despite the fact that one who has such noble qualities is usually not as much in need of other people as they are in need of him or her, so those who turn away from such a person would only be harming themselves. As for the descendants of kings, no one rebukes them if they act violently and aggressively—at least, that used to be the case, but the twentieth century has largely risen above what used to be in the nature of kings and their descendants, and it is even more appropriate for the descendants of shaykhs to follow this trend. Today, the only way left for them is to find their way back to selfless slavehood and the democracy of this century.
we find ourselves in, the century of freedom and equality.”

As for me, I have no idea how to treat the descendants of shaykhs these days, since you so rarely see any of them walking around as pious slaves to Allah, finding refuge in Allah (t.w.t.), humbling themselves before Him, relying solely on Him, and expressing something by the tongue of their own hal or saying some original words—rather, you find them submerged in accounts of their forefathers, obliterated in them. You always see each one of them expressing something his or her forefather said, mentioning nothing but him, what his life was like, and how many people benefitted from him. And that is the best state you might find them in—out of respect for their forefathers, I shall refrain from mentioning any other state you might find them in…Then every time someone oriented to Allah turns to Allah and calls to Him, they get zealous against him or her and accuse him or her of disbelief, magic, or madness, out of blind zeal for the deen of their forefathers—or to put it better, out of blind zeal for their forefathers, regardless of their deen. If their blind zeal were for that, they would not have gone against the awliya’ or tried to compete with them, but instead they flew up into the heavenly realm of blind zeal for their forefathers.

This has blinded them from the deen, and I do not know how to treat them. If I mention good things about their pious predecessors, they become even more misguided and enticed, whereas if I do not make mention of their forefathers, I can find no peace with them. Were it not for our fear of the awliya’, the most beneficial way to treat their descendants today would be to deny that they have anything special—perhaps one would thereby clear their hearts of their forefathers and engender in them fear and humility before Allah, such that they would return to Him. As long as they remain in the
first state, there is no other hope for them, since that state has taken possession of their hearts. I do not know what to do with them: should I take this last approach with them, even if it involves bad adab with a wali? Allah knows that I do not want that; I only want to do what is best for the descendant, while having proper comportment with Allah and fear of Him alone. Or should I cut them off by cutting myself off from their forefathers, leave them and whatever they are currently involved in, and say in regards to them what Allah said to Nuh regarding his disobedient son: “Indeed, he is not from your family—indeed, his actions were not righteous” (Qur'an 11:46)? If simply being the descendant of someone great does not suffice, that means that the real descendant is the descendant in deen, regardless of actual kinship.

I do not know where people these days got this idea from, this idea people keep repeating that the khilafah of a wali can only be a descendant—where did they get this from, and how did they derive it? When has khilafah ever worked like this? If we look at the origin of khilafah, the first example of it would be khilafah of Allah, as in the khilafah of Adam and Dawud—no one ever claimed that either one of them was a son of Allah, as was claimed in regards to Isa (a.s.) and Uzair. Then if we look at the khilafah of our Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.s.), his khilafah was Abu Bakr al-Siddiq (r.a.a.) by consensus, and Abu Bakr’s khilafah was Umar (r.a.a.). Abu Bakr was not a son of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.)—of all the Companions, he was not even among those closest to him in actual kinship—and similarly Umar to Abu Bakr, and after them the relationship between each successive pair of khilafahs (r.a.a.). Then if we look at the khilafah of Shaykh Tijani (r.a.a.), his khilafah was Ali Harazim, and another one of his khilafahs was Shaykh Muhammad al-Hafiz, and neither of them was Shaykh Tijani’s (r.a.a.) son. Then if we look at Shaykh Muhammad al-Hafiz, his khilafah was Beddi, who was not one of his sons. If only I knew where such revelation came from, since it did not come from Allah, nor His prophet, nor Shaykh

---

3 Adam and Dawud (a.s.) are mentioned specifically because they are the only prophets whom Allah mentions in the Qur’an as his khilafahs (see Qur’an 2:30 and 38:26).
Tijani, nor his khalifahs! That leaves nothing except for us to know that it comes from Iblis alone, and no one else—it is one of his matters, may Allah’s curse be upon him.

**Question 9: What regarding Shaykh Ibrahim is denied?**

**Answer:** You have bewildered me with this question. Everything regarding him is denied—why not ask about what regarding him is accepted, since encompassing that is much easier to do? How could the points of denial regarding him be encompassed, given that Allah manifested Shaykh Ibrahim in this corrupt time in which people of ignorance and darkness have taken over, such people have thrown Shari’ah and Haqiqah behind their backs, and no one calls to Allah in this time except that he or she is met with rejection? If the times are such, and the caller is the greatest one to call to Allah after Shaykh Tijani (r.a.a) and the Prophet (s.a.w.s), then how could we do what you have requested? Subhanallah al-Adhim. Indeed, this question is an extraordinary thing.

Or do you not see how rare it is these days that you would say to one of the scholars of Shari’ah—who are to be the inheritors of the prophets in any given time—“Allah (t.) said…” and “The Messenger (s.a.w.s.) said…” and have him or her say to you anything except, “That’s disbelief”? It has not escaped you, dear questioner, that there is no good, nor any escape, except in the words of Allah and the words of His Messenger, for they are the life of the hearts. No one but a sincere believer takes hold of them, and no one but a misguided misguider turns away from them. As you know, Shaykh Ibrahim holds tightly onto them by his back teeth all day and all night, and neither bombs nor missiles can distract him from his commitment. No one loves him and relies on him except...

---

9 Here al-Mishri (r.a.a.) quotes two lines of poetry, though the translator has not found any manuscript in which all the words of the poem are clear, so it has been taken out of both the Arabic and English text for now. What seems to be distinguishable is as follows:

"Whoever is not a mujtahid, then his or her action is like a text that is [???] / And when the scholar of fiqh cites evidence from Qur'an or hadith, he goes astray and leads others astray."
one who loves the words of Allah and His Messenger and relies on them. Therefore, all accusations of him being a liar, misguided, or heretical are baseless. Or do you not see how he calls for following the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) in words, deeds, hals, maqams, night journeys, and other matters that neither tongues can mention nor pens write? Subhanallah al-Adhim!

Or have you not seen his writings about Shari’ah, Tariqah, and Haqiqah? For the sake of Allah, I will mention in particular his works “Removing the Blame” and “The Greatest Secret.” If you were to look at “Removing the Blame,” you would find that he has left the fiqh scholars without a single proof by which they can justify their zealous adherence to any opinion not supported by the Qur’an or sunnah, so everything they are on has been erased—Truth has come and falsehood has perished. And if you were to take a look at “The Greatest Secret,” you would be bewildered, even if you had experienced the degree of effusions, points of ma’rifah, visions, and maqams from which the writing speaks—all of which no prior wali has ever talked about, nor will any future wali talk about except through madad from the Shaykh. By Allah, no one will believe what he says except those who have plunged into the oceans of Haqiqah—ocean after ocean and traversed its deserts—leap after leap—or hypocrites who believe with the tongue but lack understanding in the heart, using the external appearance of belief to mask their own ignorance, and trying to gain some benefit for their families.

The main point to take away from all of this is that were it not Allah who was the one to preserve the Shaykh, defend him, come to his aid, assist him, and debase his enemies, nothing else would have propped him up, and what has happened would not have happened—as the saying goes, “nothing could have occurred more spectacularly than what has occurred.” May Allah suffice him from the evil of his enemies and aid him against them, as He (t.) usually does.

Were it not for the fact that this situation does not allow for anything to be said except allusions, I would give you more and explain things to you such
that, were the veil to be lifted, you would have no more certainty to reach.

**Question 10: What do you have to say about his words, “What sincere youth do I have who will prostrate to my مظهر”?**

**Answer:** Before getting into anything, I would like to say that regarding the speech of the awliya’, “no one knows its explanation except Allah and those firmly rooted in knowledge say, ‘We believe in it—all is from the presence of our Lord’” (Qur’an 3:8), because the wali is always with Allah and may go through three possible states with Him.

Sometimes, the wali is with Allah and will speak with the tongue of the Truth, such as when Jili said, “Exalted be Me, how immense is My affair.” In that case, the wali’s words are equivalent to a hadith qudsi, and what the wali says will only be understood by someone who knows that hadra in which the wali stands. This is the case with the abbreviated letters at the beginning of surahs: no one understands them except the one who knows what they are indicating—even Jibril (a.s.), for when he came to the Prophet (s.a.w.s) with “K.H.Y.’. S.” (Qur’an 19:1), the Prophet (s.a.w.s) said at every abbreviated letter, “I know it,” and Jibril knew that between the two hadrahs was a secret unknown to anyone other than those two.

Other times, the wali is occupying a maqam in regards to Allah, so the wali speaks with the tongue of his or her martabah. Most of the speech of the arifs is of this type, though it could be from the tongue of a temporary hal, or from the tongue of a permanent maqam. No one understands the speech of someone in a hal except those who know that hal, and similarly no one understands the speech of someone occupying a certain maqam except those who know that maqam—unless they are from the people of affirmation, which is a light that Allah places in the heart.

The third state that the wali is seen to go through with Allah is when he or she speaks to people with the tongue of their own created existence وطورة الولي مع الله الثاني من حيث مقام الولي فتكلم الولي بلسان مرتبطه وهذا هو جل كلام العارفين إلا أنه يكون الكلام طورا بلسان الحال وقد يكون بلسان المقام. ولا يفهم كلام صاحب الحال إلا من يعلم ذلك الحال وكذلك صاحب المقام لا يفهم كلامه إلا من يعرف مقامه إلا من كان من أهل التصديق، فالتصديق نور يجعله الله في القلب.

الطور الثالث من أطوار الولي مع الله أن يتكلم للخلق بلسان خلقته ويم هو فيه حتى يصير فيما يرون واحدا منهم مع العقول فيما هو فيه، ظاهرهم معهم وباطنهم مع الله وكلما لبس ثوبا غير الذي يعلمن أنكره وأدرك عليه ورومة بالكفر والمحجون لأنه تكلم بما لا يعلمون، أو لا يعلمون أن للقلب ستة عشر عالمان إحتاطيا الدنيا والآخرة واحد من تلك العالم وهو يقدر أن يتكلم في الدنيا من حيث لا يعلمون ويدعو الرحمن إلى الإثارة يقدر أن يتكلم في الآخرة من حيث لا يعلمون ولا أظنه يدعون الإثارة بأمر واحد من أمر الدنيا فكيف بالأخرى فيكف بكلامهم في العالم الأولية، فكيف بكلام طيب، فكيف بكلام خليفة فأحرى كلام الخليفة.

فلا عجب في ذلك وإنما العجب كل العجب من تشوق العقول لفهم كلام أولياء الله تعالى وكلما سمعوا كلمة لم يفهموها بادروا بالإتناكر والتكسير والتفصيل تحكما منهم في ظاهر الأمر على الولي وفي الحقيقة إنما هو تحكيم منهم على الله وهم يتعجبون إذا لم يفهموا كلمة واحدة من كلام الولي، وإنما أشعج كيف
and whatever they are involved in, such that they see that he or she appears to have become one of the common people, with them in whatever they are doing; the wali is outwardly with them while inwardly with Allah. Yet every time the wali puts on a garment other that what they know, they deny it and deny the wali, accusing him or her of disbelief, magic, or madness. They do this when the wali speaks of something of which they have no knowledge—or do they not know that the qutb encompasses sixteen worlds, with the Dunya and the Akhirah being just one of those worlds? The qutb can speak simply about the Dunya in a way that others have no knowledge of, and I do not think that they ever claim to encompass even one matter of the Dunya, much less the Akhirah, so what about the other fifteen worlds? If this point is established, then there should be no issue with the generality of people not understanding what the awliya’ say, let alone a qutb, let alone a Khalifah, and especially the speech of the Khalifah himself.

So that should not be a cause for amazement. Rather, what is absolutely amazing is the longing that the generality of people have to understand the speech of Allah’s (t.) awliya’, yet every time they hear a word they do not understand, they rush to deny the wali and label him or her a disbeliever or misguided. They use the apparent aspect of the matter to make a judgment on the wali, while in reality it is nothing but a judgment they make on Allah. Then they are amazed when they do not understand a certain word from the wali’s speech; as for me, I wonder how they could understand any of it at all. What should be done with the speech of the awliya’ is to take whatever of it has an apparent and known meaning, and leave whatever of it has a hidden and unknown meaning. Shaykh Tijani (r.a.a.) indicated this in one of his established sayings, “When you hear something from me, weigh it on the scale of Shari’ah: whatever is in accordance with Shari’ah, take it, and whatever goes against Shari’ah, leave it.” He (r.a.a.) did not order them to reject it or label it a lie—rather, he ordered them to leave it covered until someone who understands it can be found. When he said “whatever goes against Shari’ah,” he meant that which goes against Shari’ah in the mind of

Bymuhammad al-Mishri: In Defense of the Spiritual Path of the Sufis
someone who hears but does not understand it, because Shaykh Tijani would not say anything that actually goes against Shari‘ah—far removed be he from that, for his degree of perfection is high above it.

As for Shaykh Ibrahim’s line of poetry in which he says, “What sincere youth do I have who will prostrate to my ﻣظﮭر,” Allah knows best what he meant by it. I myself know neither from the Shaykh, nor from any of the khalifahs of his whom I trust, an answer to: is ﻣظﮭر an active or a passive participle? If it were an active participle (thus reading “prostrate to the one who manifested me”) then it is not problematic, for anyone can understand this. If it were in the form of a passive participle (thus reading “prostrate to what I have manifested” or “prostrate to my manifestation”) and if by “prostrate” he meant “show deference”—as in when Allah (t.) says, “And when the Qur’an is recited to them, they do not prostrate” (Qur’an 84:21), meaning they do not show deference to it—then it is also not problematic, since the original, literal meaning of the Arabic word for “prostrate” is not the physical action we associate it with now. And if for the sake of argument we conceded not only that the contested word in the poem is a passive participle, but also that the meaning is real prostration, then the speech runs the course of the first of the three ways that a wali can speak, which we established above: the speech of a wali who is completely with Allah as He is. With this as such, for those who deny that a wali can ever speak with the tongue of the Real and who find fault with the hadith in which Allah says “when I love someone...I become his or her tongue by which he or she speaks,” or who do not understand it to begin with, it is possible for them to oppose this, but with the condition that they oppose every wali who speaks by such a tongue. As for those who believe in some of those cases and disbelieve in others, there is really no difference between one case and another, so essentially they just believe in all that they understand and deny all that they do not understand.

What a strange thing that for more than twenty years, we—whether old or young, knowledgeable or ignorant, murid or not—have busied ourselves with
this line of poetry, and before two years ago, from all these people I had not heard of a single person who found issue with it. It was well-known and in wide circulation; everyone in our tribe who memorized the Fatihah memorized this line, so I wish I knew what all this means. Were they pleased with him in some way that caused them to be silent about his claim of divinity, such that they would associate with one who made such a claim and praise him for his knowledge, deen, wilayah, ma’rifah, status as the qub and the fard, khilafah, and inheritance of Shaykh Tijani, and would bear witness to his being the owner of the Faydah that Shaykh Tijani had mentioned, in addition to other matters that neither pen nor paper could do justice? Or were they astray, but then found a guide who put them on the right path? Or was it the reverse, or what?

If the matter were clear, we would not have needed all this fuss, for there are many stages of disbelief that come before claiming divinity, and a disbeliever would naturally progress through different stages before arriving at such an advanced stage of disbelief. I know of no disbeliever who reached that stage and openly claimed divinity except Pharaoh, and it is well known what Iblis said to him: “Even I who misguided you did not claim divinity!” It is obvious that a Muslim who recites the book of Allah day and night, reflects on it, comments on all of it in every season, and sees what promises and threats it contains would not dare to approach such a height of disbelief that even Iblis shied away from. “It is not eyes that go blind—rather, hearts within the breasts are what go blind” (Qur’an 22:46).

The reality of envy is that it is a chronic illness. Good for envy—how just he is, that he starts with his owner and takes his or her life! “Those who do good do it for themselves, and those who do bad do it against themselves” (Qur’an 41:46 & 45:15), “The evil plot catches no one but its plotters” (Qur’an 35:43), and “Say, ‘Act, for Allah will see what you do, as will His Messenger, and the believers, and you will be returned to the Knower of the Unseen and the Seen, Who will then inform all of you about what you used to do’ ” (Qur’an 9:105). “Of you two, the...
Evil one of you is to be a sacrifice for the good one."5 O Allah, guide us with those whom You have guided, and grant us well-being with those whom You have granted it to.

LORD, indeed I have confirmed every wali,

Heeding his or her status with an ethic of respect

Except that in Ahmad Tijani lies my portion,

My refuge, my pillar, and my imam6

For those who only weigh matters on the scales of the intellect, we have an additional rational proof: we, the students of the Shaykh, believe him and follow him in every matter, large or small, and we obey his commands, despite a large number of lies that have been told about us. No one has ever said that anyone has prostrated to him; Allah has protected His awliya’ from this allegation, and perhaps the secret to that lies in the Prophet’s (s.a.w.s.) saying, “O Allah, do not make my grave an idol to be worshipped after me.” Since the awliya’ of Allah are the graves of the Prophet’s (s.a.w.s.) secrets, then the chests of the liberated—i.e. liberated from servitude to the nafs—are the graves of secrets, and all secrets come from him (s.a.w.s.). Shaykh Ibrahim indicated this point in his saying, “My chests are, for the secrets of the arifs, graves.” There is also no doubt that the Prophet’s (s.a.w.s.) supplications are answered and that he was given the gift of comprehensive speech, so his use of the word “grave” encompasses both meanings, i.e. his literal grave and his figurative grave. For this reason, you do not see a wali of Allah worshipped beside Him.

Another reason for this is that the wali’s da’irah is the da’irah of extinguishing; his or her task is to be completely extinguished in Allah’s (t.) Essence. He or she has no firm existence except that by which he or she is able to observe the guidelines of Shari’ah, as a protection from Allah lest he or she be turned away from the guidelines of Shari’ah and thereby fall away from Allah’s eye (may Allah protect us from His tribulation!). If you take issue with the fact that

5 This line is a quote from the poetry of Hassan ibn Thabit (r.a.a.) in praise of and defense of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.), in the face of his enemies. “The evil one of you” refers to Abu Sufyan (r.a.a.)—before his conversion to Islam, of course—and “the good one” is a reference to the Prophet (s.a.w.s).

6 These lines are from Ibrahim al-Riyahi (r.a.), the Tunisian student of Shaykh Tijani (r.a.a.). In the Arabic he refers to “Ibn Salim,” but this has been translated as “Ahmad Tijani,” given that many English speakers will be unfamiliar with Ibn Salim as an epithet of Shaykh Tijani (r.a.a.).
none of the awliya’ has been worshipped while several of the prophets (s.a.w.s.) have, then to respond to that: the prophets’ da’irah is the da’irah of firm existence, while it has already been mentioned that the awliya’s da’irah is the da’irah of extinguishing—therefore, each prophet has an existence upon which Allah can establish the Shari’ah, while the wali is not a lawgiver. Add to this the fact that the Prophet’s (s.a.w.s.) supplication was for those in his ummah who came after him—the less superior of the two has something the more superior does not.

**Question 11:** What do you say regarding whether someone who attributes him- or herself to Shaykh Tijani and accepts him, while considering Shaykh Ibrahim to be a misguided liar, can be considered Tijani?

**Answer:** I do not understand that at all, because Shaykh Ibrahim brought nothing except what Shaykh Tijani brought. Even if the physical form—for those for whom that is their sole aim—necessitates they be considered two separate people, what has been brought is one. Shaykh Tijani came only to guide others to Allah and His Messenger, expressing the secret of Allah’s (t.w.t.) oneness and the secret of His Names and Attributes; that was his true goal, and Shaykh Ibrahim neither added nor subtracted anything to it. So those who have only been following what Shaykh Tijani called to and remain so, there is no way in which they can go against Shaykh Ibrahim in any matter, great or small. As for those who have followed the same physical form, have no perception of anything else, and do not know that the Tijani tariqa is in fact a religious practice that involves following the practices and beliefs that Shaykh Tijani observed—not just following the physical form of Shaykh Tijani, or his children, or his khalfahas—then it is not surprising that those who fit this description would defy Shaykh Ibrahim, because Shaykh Tijani is white and Shaykh Ibrahim is black.

But for the one who knows the truth, in fact the only difference between the two of them is the difference between the white and black parts of the eye.
The part that perceives the Essence is the black of the eye—or rather, the black of the black—and not the white of it, nor anything else in all of existence. Whoever understands what I have alluded to knows that there is no difference between the blackness and the whiteness. Grace is in Allah’s hand—He gives it to whom He wills. The divine flood always flows and is not limited to a particular physical form—were it to have been, it would not have continued past Adam; nor is it limited to a particular haqiqah—were it to have been, it would not have continued past the Haqiqah Muhammadiyyah; nor is it limited to a particular color of skin, time, or place. Allah’s grace constantly pours forth.

**Question 12:** What is the difference between Shaykh Tijani’s sealhood and his concealedness?

**Answer:** I say that his sealhood is his martabah in the sealhood of wilayah, in the da’irah of the Attribute, in his state of being a representative of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) in this maqam. From this martabah, he is the one who gives madad to all the awliya’, and it is this martabah that he (r.a.a.) was indicating when he said, “My ruh and his (s.a.w.s.) ruh are like these two fingers—his (s.a.w.s.) ruh gives madad to the prophets and messengers, and my ruh gives madad to the qutbs and the arifs.” As for his (r.a.a.) concealedness, it is the martabah particular to wilayah, in regards to his wilayah in the da’irah of the Name. It is this that he (r.a.a.) was indicating when he said, “Whoever knows me knows me alone,” and, “We have a martabah that reaches so high that it is forbidden to either mention it or divulge it, and I’m not referring to what I have already mentioned to you…” He thereby concealed it, so we know that it is the martabah of his concealedness.

In other words, I say that the first is the martabah of his giving madad, and the second is the martabah of his receiving madad. Or, to put it differently, the first is the martabah of his hiddenness, and the other is the martabah of his hiddenness’ hiddenness. He (r.a.a.) indicated both of them together when he said, “These two feet of mine are on the neck of
every wali of Allah, from Adam until the time the horn is blown,” as well as other statements of his that can be neither written on pages nor looked at by human eyes. May Allah make us and all of you from among the unique elect of his companions and beloveds.

**Question 13: What is the difference between the Name, the Attribute, and the Khalifah?**

**Answer:** In the speech of the awliya’, when “the Name” is used, what is meant by it is the name of the martabah—it is the name that gathers all celestial names in one, it is the manifestation of the Truth through all that exists, and this is unity. In other words, it is the Haqiqah Muhammadiyyah, Lahut, manifestness. The Attribute, as well—when it is used in the speech of the awliya’—is the shadow of the Name and its martabah, gathering all attributes in one; according to the awliya’, it is his (s.a.w.s.) Muhammadiyyah, and it descends into the perfect man of the age. It is as if the perfect man of the age in every time stands in as the master of existence, and just as his Muhammadiyyah is his shadow, similarly the perfect man of the age is his shadow. Uwais al-Qarni indicated the shadowness of his Muhammadiyyah when he said, “You have seen only the shadow of the Messenger of Allah,” meaning that they knew the Haqiqah Muhammadiyyah yet had not seen it, because seeing it is not possible until the Akhirah.

As for the khilafah, it may in fact be a synonym for what comes before it, or it may be distinct from it, in that it is only its martabah. So that brings us back to its being an expression for the perfect man of the age, who is termed the Khalifah because he is neither the Name, nor the Attribute—rather, he is a Khalifah of both the Name and the Attribute. It is these martabahs that Sidi Abdul-Qadir al-Jili was talking about when he said:

*Allah has, after name and description, a madhbar*

*Yet the slumbering eyes of creatures are unable to see it*

In saying “a madhbar,” he (r.a.a.) meant himself, as he was the owner of this martabah in his time—
hence why he made it grammatically indefinite. Because of this maqam being attributed to him, he (r.a.a.) claimed sealhood—i.e. claimed to have become a shadow to the Prophet’s (s.a.w.s.) shadow—yet he did not perceive that the true owner of sealhood is a real shadow, and not just a shadow in appearance.

We, the companions of Shaykh Tijani, understand this line of poetry in a way that is unique to us, and thus is the speech of the complete ones: everyone has a level of understanding according to his or her hal and thinks that the only thing meant was what he or she has understood. One thing we can say regarding the line is that the term “name” as used means the Name of the Essence, “description” is the name of the martabah, and “madhhar” is the Khalifah, the slave of Allah. Thus the Truth sees the manifestation of the Truth through existent entities, while the Name is its manifestation behind existent entities, and the Khalifah is the martabah that joins between the other two martabahs and has two nisbahs: a nisbah corresponding to the Attribute, and a nisbah corresponding to the Name. The nisbah of the heart provides an indication for this, in that it joins between the ruh and the body: its hidden part corresponds to the ruh, while its manifest part corresponds to the body. The ruh and the body also are indications of the Attribute and the Name.

If we wanted to join between both maqams, we would say that the Greatest Name has a reality, a meaning, and an outer form. It becomes manifest as an utterance with all of its nisbahs in every da’irah, and the people of each da’irah see of it whatever is suitable for their hal and maqam. Every name of Allah is “the Greatest,” for every name of His (t.) has its greatness that is seen by the one who sees the name. Therefore there is much difference of opinion regarding the name: some say the name is this, some say it is that, others say it is something else—and all are right. If this point is established, we realize that the companions of Shaykh Tijani have spoken about “the name” in regards to the name unique to them, and others have spoken about the name that they see. Each of the two names has an even and an odd, and the even and odd for us is what we have mentioned, while the even and odd for others is what
Ibn Arabi has mentioned, and its meaning for them is what I explained in the beginning.

**Question 14: What is the difference between the Khalifah and the Qutb?**

**Answer:** I say that Qutbaniyyah is a martabah of the creation that the qutbs inherit from each other, one after another. Just as it moves from one person to another, it moves from one da’irah to another, so the da’irah of some of the qutbs will be the Attribute (though this attribution will only be completely true for one of them), for others it will be the Name (while with this as well, its full attribution will only be for one of them), and so on. As for Khilafah, this is a da’irah of the Truth and its owner is one—no one had it before him, nor will anyone have it after him. It is in itself a haqiqah whose da’irah is the lastness of all the haqa’iq in terms of both existence and madad, and it has within it the absolute intermediary, so “the qutb of qutbs” is one nisbah of the martabahs of the khalifah. The arif Muhammad al-Hafiz b. Feten (r.a.a.) indicated this when he said:

*They say to me that Ibrahim is a qutb—rather The qutbs are part of the dominion of a lowly servant of his And if you said, “Nay, he’s the qutb of the qutbs of his time” Then you’d still be as ignorant as you were before*

*But be is the greatest manifestation of the Essence His comprehensive wilayah is over every servant of God A lighthouse through which Allah guides to His Essence And turns those not guided away from their misguidance The qutb is not a haqiqah, for several reasons, such as what I mentioned above about Qutbaniyyah moving from one da’irah to another and from one person to another. Also, the haqiqah must have an existence unique to it—either firstness, lastness, manifestness, or hiddenness—and firstness is for the Hahut, lastness for the Lahut, manifestness for the Jabrut, and hiddenness for the Malakut. So if the qutb were to say to us, “I have a firstness, which is my secret; a lastness, which is my ruh; a manifestness, which is my body; and a hiddenness, which is my heart,” we would say to him, “Nothing of existence remains yours if firstness were to take its first-

**السؤال الخامس عشر: هل الحقائق أربعة لا تزيد ولا تنقص ألا وأبدا أم هي بحسب الأحوال والوسائط؟**

**الجواب:** إنها أربعة لا تزيد ولا تنقص، وقد تقدم طرف من هذا المعنى عند الكلام عن الفرق بين القطب
ness, lastness its lastness, manifestness its manifest-
ess, and hiddenness its hiddenness,” and he would find nothing to say to that.

From what has been mentioned above, you can know that the qutb is not a haqiqah, but he is the sayyid of his people, and the khalifah is several stages above that. Salatul-Fatihi indicates some of this: O Allah, send salah upon Sayyiduna Muhammad—the salah emerges from the Essence, understand. May Allah grant us understanding of His secrets.

Question 15: Are the haqa’iq always four—never having been more or less, nor will they ever be—or does that change according to states and means?

Answer: They are indeed four—no more, no less—and part of this has been mentioned above, in the words about the difference between the qutb and the khalifah. Here I shall speak to you about the secret of how existence and madad works, so that you may understand the secret involved in there being multiple haqa’iq, and understand the reason behind their being only four.

I say that the Exalted Essence was and there was nothing other than it, and it is now as it was before. It wanted to be known, so it manifested in itself, for itself, through itself; this manifestation is termed Ahadiyyah, and there is no difference between it and the Essence, i.e. it has no nisbah. Then it manifested through Wahidiyyah, and so that is the first thing to be, in which appeared Allah’s Names and Attributes. The haqa’iq came to be and emerged in the presence of the spiritual realm before the existence of Adam, as the hadith indicates: “I was a prophet, aware of my prophethood, when Adam was between water and clay.” Shaykh Tijani (r.a.a.) indicated this as well: “I was a wali, aware of my wilayah, when Adam was between water and clay.” To bring these haqa’iq and nisbahs into existence, Allah brought the Haqiqah Muhammadiyyah into existence, so were it not for that haqiqah, no nisbah of Allah would have become manifest or been known. Shaykh Ibrahim indicated this in saying, “So if not for you, the Truth would have remained Truth and
never been known;” therefore, there is nothing before this particular manifestation except Ahadiyyah, which has no nisbah. The secret of why Allah manifested the Haqiqah Muhammadiyyah is so that He might be absolutely known. Al-Hamdu Lillah, Rabbil-Alamin.

As for the third one, the secret in it is the descent to the da’irah of the Names inasmuch as they are behind all existent entities, so that knowledge of self and others could be completed, comprehension could happen, the external forms of things could appear, and the speaking of wisdom could be manifest. It is almost like a statue of what preceded it; it is the extended shadow and the existent barzakh. This selfsame manifestation is the shadow of Muhammadiyyah and the wellspring of Muhammadiyyah’s sealhood and martabahs, which gather all its Names and Attributes. Just as the Haqiqah Muhammadiyyah appeared so that the manifestation that is before it could be known, this haqiqah appeared so that the Haqiqah Muhammadiyyah could be known—that is why Allah brought it into existence in pre-eternity and made it appear in post-eternity.

As for the fourth haqiqah, what we would say about it is exactly what we said about the previous one, letter by letter, and the only thing to add would be its inseparability from the two previously mentioned haqiqahs. It is distinguished by its being the da’irah of perfection, i.e. in it are manifest the absolute Names and the absolute Attributes, and it gives everything that has a right its right. It is not the madhhar of the Name, which would make it fettered by names; nor is it the madhhar of the Attribute, which would make it fettered by attributes—this is how it is the madhhar of perfection. And you know quite well that the madhhars are three, while that which appears through the madhhars is one. The first madhhar is the madhhar of beauty, the second madhhar is that of might, and this madhhar is that of perfection. The arif of Allah Abdullah bin al-Hajj (r.a.a.) indicated this in some lines of poetry:

And the arifs have witnessed perfection for Him
Without the madhhar of might or beauty
He (r.a.a.) used to say, “The second half of this line has something that should be critiqued, and I would love to find someone to critique it,” meaning that he

لتعرف بها الحقيقة المحمدية، لهذا أوجدها الله آذاناً
 وأظهرها أبداً.
أما الحقيقة الرابعة فكما سبق حرف بحرف ولا
فرق إلا لعدم تميزها عن الحقيقتين اللتين سبق
ذكرهما، تمييزته بأنها هي دائرة الكمال أي تظهر فيها
الأسماء المطلقة والصفات المطلقة وتعطي كل ذي
حق حقه، ليست مظهر اسم فتقتيد بالأسماء ولا مظهر
صفة فتقتيد بالصفات، فهذا هو كونه مظهر الكمال،
ولا يخفى عليك أن المظهر ثلاثة والمنتظار واحد،
فالمظهر الأول هو مظهر الجمال والمظهر الثاني هو
مظهر الجلال، وهذا هو مظهر الكمال، ولهذا المعنى
أشار العارف بالله عبد الله بن الحاج يقوله في أبيات
رضي الله عنه:
والعارضون شهدوا له الكمال
من غير مظهر الجلال والجمال
وكان رضي الله عنه يقول، "هذا الشطر فيه
انتقد وأحب أن أجد من ينتقده"— يعني كونه
جعل مظهر الكمال كاتنا من غير مظهر
الجلال والجمال، وهذا لا يصح، فما كان
مظهرًا إلا بهما، فولاهما لما كان، ولثال هذا
كما نقول في الآن الدائم، فمن قال إنه من
غير الليل والنهار فقد أخطأ لأنه مكون
منهما، وقل من يفهم الآن الدائم لقربه وخفائه
في الليل والنهار، وكذلك مظهر الكمال أن
يظهر على حقيقته كامل، فقد احتسب بالاسم
والصفة كما احتسب الآن الدائم بالليل
والنهار.
put the madhhar of perfection as separate from the madhhar of might and beauty, which is not correct. This is because it is only a madhhar by means of the other two, so were it not for the other two, it would not be. A metaphor for this is the ever-present now, as we say: whoever says that it is something other than night and day is mistaken, since it consists of both of them, and how few really understand the ever-present now, because of its proximity to and its being hidden within night and day. Similarly, the madhhar of perfection seems complete when it appears in its true reality, for it is disguised by the Name and the Attribute just as the ever-present now is disguised by the night and the day.

These three madhhars are the root and hidden reality of all things, from the first manifestations to the last. The Truth indicates this in His (t.w.t.) saying, “O humankind, We have created you from a male and a female” (Qur’an 49:13)—the “male” is in reality the Name, and the “female” is in reality the Attribute, and if you were to say that the third is yet to be mentioned, I would say that the third is the male and female together, because in terms of Name it is male, and in terms of Attribute it is female. A similar passage is, “It comes out from between the loins and the ribs” (Qur’an 86:7): from between the loins of the Name and the ribs of the Attribute, just like the previous example. There is also an indication of this set in terms of earthly forms: Allah created Adam without father or mother, like Muhammadiah; He created Hawa’ from a father but not a mother, like Ahmadiyyah; and He created Isa without a father, like the Khalifah. And regardless of these stages of descent, the slave was supplied with hamd.

Making a riddle from the first and second of these hadrahs, my father (r.a.a.) said, “What are two ancient, new attributes whose madhhar is the Dunya and the Akhirah?” He would disguise his words for the generality of people by saying to them, “I mean night and day”—that is what he would say. These two hadrahs are the true reality of night and day, and they are the origin of every pair: “And We have created pairs from everything, so that you might remember. So flee to Allah—truly I am for you a clear warner from Him. Do not set beside Allah another
god—truly I am for you a clear warner from Him” (Qur’an 51:49-51). Allah, the Immense, has spoken the truth.

I was speaking one day with Sidi Muhammad al-Hafiz b. Feten and reviewing with him my understanding of Allah’s speech, when he said to me that my father (r.a.a.) had said to him that he was able to extract all the meanings of the Qur’an from His (t.) words, “Two men said” (Qur’an 5:23). Then I said to him that I was able to do that with His (t.) words, “And one man said” (Qur’an 40:28). Regarding what my father had said, I explained that he meant the “two men” who are the madhhar of the two attributes that he used to allude to in that riddle, namely the madhhar of beauty and of might; then I added that those two have a third—the madhhar of perfection—which I explained clearly to him. It is along these lines that Shaykh Ibrahim (r.a.a.) says:

*I got lost with him one day, then another day, then a third*

Negligently nor intentionally, to neither Zayd nor Umar

The way he expresses this—by saying “a third”—contains the utmost of adab, concealment, and perfection. In terms of adab: he did not describe this last haqiqah like he did the two before it, out of adab with it. In terms of concealment: the expression he used for it was neither “day” nor “night” nor “ever-present now,” so that the matter remain concealed and everyone who has a maqam take from it what is suitable for his or her maqam—so the one who sees it as a day will make “a third” a reference to a day, and so on; there are so many meanings that, were we to follow all of them, it would take us far off topic. From the perspective of perfection: he refers to this martabah as neither day, nor night, nor name, nor attribute, and “a third” is the complete phrase that indicates its perfection, even if it had no need for an indication:

“And how could anything have a firm hold in the mind

When daylight is in need of a proof?

And there is nothing in these three madhhars except the Master of Existence (s.a.w.s.), for he is the all from whence all comes: the first is the martabah of his manifestness, the second is the martabah of his hiddenness, and the other one is the martabah...
of the hiddenness of his hiddenness. All the words of Shaykh Tijani contain mention of these three, as attributes for Allah’s Messenger (s.a.w.s.); Shaykh Tijani’s words have come for no other reason than to translate for us who the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) is, and to acquaint us with his maqam. For this reason, you do not see in his words anything except indications of the Master of Existence or one of his martabahs. I shall start with Salatul-Fatihi: “O Allah, send salah upon Sayyiduna Muhammad, the Opener…, the Seal…, the Guide…” All of these are descriptions for him (s.a.w.s.); his descriptions in the outward correspond to how he is, his descriptions in the inward correspond to his inwardness, his descriptions in the inward of the inward correspond to the inwardness of his inwardness, and that is all there is. Secondly, I refer to Jawharat al-Kamal, which proceeds in the same way: “O Allah, send salah upon the wellspring of mercy…O Allah, send salah upon the wellspring of Truth…O Allah, send salah upon the emergence of the Truth by the Truth…”—it follows exactly in the footsteps of Salatul-Fatihi, understood?…The list of examples could go on and on—it would never be exhausted, nor fully written on pages, nor seen by eyes.

No matter how much we mention out of gratitude, we still have knowledges too exalted to ever be confined by paper. Therefore, given everything aforementioned, any thought of a fifth haqiqah has proven to be false from every angle. Success is through Allah alone, and He is the One Who guides to the straight path out of His generosity. O Allah, show us Truth as truth and allow us to follow it, and show us falsehood as falsehood and allow us to avoid it.

Were I to go on about everything I have to say about how there can be no fifth haqiqah, I would need volumes. This is what time has permitted.

**Question 16:** What is the meaning of Shaykh Tijani’s words, “A man from the group who is not known in the Dunya, nor in the Akhirah”?

**Answer:** I say that something Shaykh Tijani kept hidden is best kept hidden. By concealing it, it is understood that he means the owner of concealedness.
As for this man’s not being known in the Dunya nor in the Akhirah, it means that his reality is not known, because it is a locus of bewilderment. That means that journeying in the Names proceeds in a certain manner, and journeying in the Attributes proceeds similarly, while the Khalifah is merely a locus of bewilderment. That is because if you were to journey in him through the Name and the Attribute, you would have journeyed in him through the Name and the Attribute, not through him himself; and if you looked at him while disregarding the stages of descent, you would have journeyed in the Essence through the Essence, not through him. As for journeying in him through him alone, forget it—as Shaykh Tijani (r.a.a.) indicated in his words—and in regards to this question I do not have anything except mere indication, that’s all. Bewilderment is the last thing that the one witnessing sees, just as Shaykh Tijani (r.a.a.) says, “O Allah, increase me in bewilderment regarding You.” Shaykh Ibrahim also indicated this meaning when he said:

Then where is Ibrahim and what is Ibrahim?

Until they reached fana’ in him and lost themselves

Now I have said something whose meaning is distant, and Allah knows best where Ibrahim is and what Ibrahim is...The one being asked about it has no more knowledge than the one asking, nor is he like him, nor close to him, nor with him in any da’irah. “He creates what you know not” (Qur’an 16:8), “It rests on Allah to show the right way” (Qur’an 16:9)...O Allah, “Guide us to the straight path” (Qur’an 1:6).

**Question 17: Do arifs have a unique understanding of Allah’s (t.) speech?**

**Answer:** Yes. Allah’s speech is an attribute of Allah’s (t.w.t.), it descended into every hadrah, and it has an outward and an inward: its outward is the foundation of the shari’ah, and its inward is the
foundation of the haqiqah. Regarding its outward, i.e. the foundation of the shari’ah, arifs have no room to play with it, since all they have in it is what has been established by the shari’ah and what scholarly consensus has arrived at. After Allah (t.) said, “Today I have perfected your deen for you, I have completed My blessing upon you, and I am pleased for you to have Islam as your deen” (Qur’an 5:3), the immaculate shari’ah was sealed—no one was to add or subtract anything from it. The utmost that each perfected wali can do in this area is to return people to it as it was at the time of Allah’s Messenger (s.a.w.s.)—and that is the role of the mujaddid. What it means to be a mujaddid—is not to renew the shari’ah, but to renew others’ return to the shari’ah as it is, disregarding newly invented matters, innovations, and the fanaticism that corrupt scholars have for the opinions of those they blindly imitate. This kind of mujaddid is what the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) meant when he said, “The scholars of my ummah are like the prophets of the children of Israel.” It is thus that they become the “inheritors of the prophets.”

As for the inward of the Qur’an, which is the foundation of the haqiqah, constant renewal happens in regards to how its meanings become manifest. This does not mean that its meanings themselves are renewed—no, the Qur’an, its meanings, and whatever secrets, lights and effulgences it contains are all as ancient as the Attribute itself—rather, what is renewed is the manifestation of what the Qur’an has served to translate, so that we can know that this thing at hand is what was described in the Qur’an. Or, in other words, this thing has existed, and is newly understood according to the renewal of how Allah’s speech is understood.

Every time there is a renewal of experiential tasting, ma’rifah, or witnessing, there is necessarily a renewal of how the Qur’an is understood as well, which occurs in accordance with the renewal of hals. Just as there is no end to the meanings of Allah’s speech, there is no end to the renewal of how the meanings of His speech are understood, and every people with a maqam understand it according to their maqam. I shall give you an example of this using His (t.) speech, “He is the First, the Last, the...
Manifest, and the Hidden” (Qur’an 57:3). Those who have fana’ in the Essence see that there is nothing first, last, manifest, or hidden except the Essence itself, and they do not witness the Names. Once they have had fana’ away from their own firstness, lastness, manifestness, and hiddenness, they reach fana’ in the Essence, and when that happens, all names and named things vanish from them. The former is fana’, while the latter is fana’ away from fana’. When those who have fana’ move on to the hadrah of the Attribute, they see the ayah in front of them, and from it understand about the Attribute what they had understood about the Essence, and so on. When jadhb is complete and they travel the path of suluk, they see the ayah in front of them indicating suluk, the multiplicity of haqa’iq, the distinction of nisbahs, and dispersion. For each new maqam the saliks reach in any hadrah, they find the ayah ahead of them translating for them what they are currently experiencing, no matter how far they go; every increase in understanding of Allah is accompanied by an increase in understanding of the ayah, and neither of the two understandings has an end.

Each people of a certain haqiqah have their own unique understanding of the Qur’an, which can only be understood by those who understand that haqiqah, known by those who know that haqiqah, and witnessed by those who witness that haqiqah—they receive such understanding according to their fana’ away from themselves, their baqa’ in Allah, and their knowledge of the fruits of His descent and the secret of His Names and Attributes. For every increase in perfection the heart experiences, its madad and ma’rifah widen, and that has no end. May Allah make us and all of you from the people of perfection, which has no end, for surely He is to be entrusted with such a request, and is able to fulfil it.

**Question 18: What is the meaning of Allah’s (t.) speech, “O Prophet, have taqwa of Allah” (Qur’an 33:1)?**

**Answer:** Allah is the one who gives us success to reach what is correct. Taqwa has three levels:
1. The taqwa of the generality of people, which is protecting oneself from sharing partners with Allah, and it is what is meant by His (t.) saying “O humankind, have taqwa of your Lord” (Qur'an 4:1, 22:1, 31:33).

2. The taqwa of the elite, which is protecting oneself from the haram, i.e. carrying out what Allah (t.w.t.) has commanded and avoiding what He has forbidden, and it is what is meant by His (t.) saying “Have taqwa of Allah according to your ability” (Qur'an 64:16).

3. The taqwa of the elite of the elite, which is protecting oneself from anything other than Allah ever coming to mind, and it is what is meant by His (t.) saying “Have full and complete taqwa of Allah” (Qur'an 3:102) and “Have taqwa of Me, O you who have deep hearts” (Qur'an 2:197).

It is known that the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) never shared partners with Allah, that he is divinely protected from ever going against Allah's orders, and that he is focused on Allah at all times, so the only possibility that is left for us to understand from His saying (t.w.t.) “O Prophet, have taqwa of Allah”—after addressing him by his prophethood and ordering him to have taqwa—is that this taqwa is a kind unique to the Prophet's (s.a.w.s.) maqam and not known to anyone else. We also understand from His (t.w.t.) saying “That is part of taqwa of the heart” (Qur'an 2:197) that the kind of taqwa referred to there is the utmost extent of taqwa, which cannot be encompassed, as shown by the use of من meaning “part of.”

Therefore, when He (t.) says, “Have taqwa of Me, O you who have deep hearts,” this is a command to have part of “taqwa of the heart,” while when He (t.) says, “O Prophet, have taqwa of Allah,” this is a command to have taqwa of the heart in all of its various modes, and no one can be described as having all of such taqwa except the Master of Existence (s.a.w.s.).

Also know that “those who have deep hearts” are in reality the qutbs, since no one but them deserves to be described in this way. Its meaning is as follows: the madhhars are three in number: one of them corresponds to the ruh, one to the physical
form, and one to the heart—this has been spoken about in detail above. Every madhhar has an outward, an inward, and an inward of the inward, which makes nine levels total. Then every hadrah has an even and an odd: the even in every hadrah is what meets the ruh and what meets the physical form, while the odd in every hadrah is what meets the deep heart, and the only one to ever reach it is the one who has gone past the two before it, i.e. gone past them in regards to how they themselves appear outwardly, and gone past them in regards to the deeper meaning—so in going past them in regards to the outward appearance, he or she gains a deep heart in the outer appearance of the matter, while in going past them in regards to the deeper meaning, he or she gains the experience of “and no one takes heed except those who have deep hearts” (Qur'an 2:269, 3:7).

So there is a relationship between His (t.) saying “Have taqwa of Me, O you who have deep hearts” and “O Prophet, have taqwa of Allah,” which is that both of them fall under the category of “taqwa of the heart.” However, the starting point of true taqwa of Allah is the qutbs’ endpoint, and the qutbs’ endpoint is the maqam of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.). May Allah make us and all of you from among those who believe in him and gather with him in the Dunya and the Akhirah.

**Question 19:** For the people of haqiqah, what is subtly indicated by His speech, “by Asr” (Qur'an 103:1)?

**Answer:** Shaykh Ibrahim has spoken about this ayah, and one of the things he has said about it is that “by Asr”—which could be understood as “by time”—is an oath taken on the life of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.), i.e. his time, or an oath taken on all of time. For the people of haqiqah, the meaning of both possibilities is the same, because for them all of time is just one part of his (s.a.w.s.) life, since he is the fruit of all the worlds. The fact that the Truth (majestic and exalted be He) has sworn an oath on the life of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) indicates that, according to Allah, he has the highest rank of all creation.

أنواعه إلا سيد الوجود صلى الله عليه وسلم واعلم أن أولى الألفاظ حقيقة هم الأقطاب، إذ لا يستحق أن يوصف بهذا الوصف غيرهم ومعناه أن المظاهر ثلاثة منها ما يناسب الروح، ومنها ما يناسب الشيخ، ومنها ما يناسب القلب، وقد تقدم الكلام عليها مفصلاً، ولكن مظهر ظاهر وباطن وباطن باتن فصارت المنازل تسعة، فكل حضرة لها شفع ووتر، والشعف في كل حضرة ما يقابل الروح وما يقابل الشيخ والوتر في كل حضرة ما يقابلقلب، ولن يصل إليها إلا من تجاوز اللتين قبلها مطلقًا أي تجاوزها من حيث نفسه وتجاوزها من حيث قدسها فيكون تجاوزها في نفسه ليا في نفسه ويكون تجاوزها لها في قدسه وما يذكر إلا أولوا الألفاظ، فإن قوله تعالى: «وأقون يا أولى الألفاظ» وقوله «يا أبا البيت! أثت الله» ببينهما مناسبة وهي كون الجميع داخلاً في نطاق تقوى القلوب، إلا أن بداية تقوى الله من حيث هو هي نهاية الأقطاب ونهائيته هي مقامه عليه الصلاة وسلم جعلنا الله وإياكم ممن آمن به واجتمع معه في الدنيا والآخرة.

السؤال التاسع عشر: ما الإشارة لقوله تعالى: (وَعَلِيْمٌ) عند أهل الحقيقة؟

الجواب: الآية تتكلم الشيخ فيها، ومما قال فيها أن والعصر قسم بحياة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أي عصره، أو إنه قسم بالدهر، وهذا وذلك بمعنى واحد عند أهل الحقيقة، لأن الReminder عندهم بعض من حياته عليه السلام، إذ هو الثمرة من جميع العوالم، وكون
Another thing that Shaykh Ibrahim has said is: “Know that when someone of high status says something, even without taking an oath upon it, it must be true, and so especially if that person of high status is Allah (t.w.t.), and if He has taken an oath upon what He said.” Allah has sworn that there is no safety from losing except by four things: Iman in Allah, doing righteous actions, exhorting each other to Truth, and exhorting each other to patience. So it is impossible for anyone who does not cling to these four matters to find safety, as Allah (t.w.t.) has said.

I have also said that this ayah has something special for this ummah of ours: just as the daytime clearly consists of three parts—or, in other words, three distinct times—the ummah consists of three parts. This is the number of madhhars, and every madhhar corresponds to a time: the morning is Muhammadiyah, for Muhammadiyah is the dawn of Islam; noontime is Sealhood, for that is the noon-time of Islam; and the same with Asr. Even if Asr can mean “time” in general and therefore be used to refer to the whole, it is also specific to the last part of the day. The blessed ayah also has another subtle indication, in that it proceeds along four segments: first “those who believe,” second “do righteous actions,” third “exhort each other to Truth,” and fourth “exhort each other to patience”—so correspondence occurs between Asr, which is the last part of the day, and patience, which is the last of these stages. May Allah make us and all of you amongst those who believe, do righteous actions, exhort each other to Truth, and exhort each other to patience.

**Question 20:** What is the wisdom behind the extraction of mineral wealth and the many peculiar kinds of engineering?

**Answer:** I say that it is a sign of the Hour approaching, as is to be found in His (t.) speech: “When the earth is entirely shaken with her quaking, and the earth expels her burdens” (Qur’an 99:1-2) and “Until when the earth puts on her decorations and adorns herself, and her people think that they have power over it, then Our command will come upon her…” (Qur’an 10:24). It should be clear that the
closer the Hour gets, the more its glimmers appear—just like when the rain approaches, indications of it appear, or when the night approaches, the light of day begins to disappear bit by bit and the darkness increases bit by bit, as is the case with the approach of the day. Therefore, if you take a look, you will see that for everything there is a glimmer of its beginning in the end of whatever comes before it.

The wisdom behind all of this is “so that those who have Iman will be increased in their Iman…” (Qur’an 74:31): it increases the people of Allah in their desire and hope in Him, and in their fear and humility before Him, since every time a sign appears, it increases their certainty in the Akhirah and their renunciation of the Dunya, because of how it indicates the approach of the Akhirah and the retreat of the Dunya, lest they find solace in a Dunya that retreats day after day rather than an Akhirah that approaches day after day. The Akhirah appears to them in the form of the Dunya in order for them to find solace in the Akhirah and to see their current level of Iman increase even more, while the people of the Dunya increase in their Iman in their Dunya and thereby desire it more. Just as the Dunya at its foundations is a painful punishment for one group and forgiveness and satisfaction from Allah for another, similarly Allah made this age of ours—with the progress of the state of the Dunya, its flourishing, its luxury, and its beautiful scenery—in order for the people of evil to increase in evil and for the people of good to increase in good.

From another perspective, just as the earth of haqiqah has expelled its burdens, so the physical form of the earth must manifest its hidden elements. We ask Allah (t.w.t) to grant us solace and keep us busy with His hidden elements away from anything other than Him. “And the last of their supplication will be, ‘al-Hamdu Lillah, Rabbil-Alamin’ ” (Qur’an 10:10).
The original title of the work is literally “Hand Grenades in Defense of the Spiritual Path of the Sufis,” by which Mishri (r.a.) is alluding to the force and power of his words. Although it would be evidently clear to anyone who gives a cursory glance throughout the work that the material under discussion pertains to deeply spiritual matters and has absolutely nothing to do with violence, we are indeed living in a political context that involves a widespread, misguided association between Islam and violence, and hence the first two words have been left out of the translated title on the front page.