

﴿You did not throw when you threw but it was Allah who threw.﴾  
(al-Anfāl: 17)

Uncovering the facts surrounding all of this, it is said: all of the Umma, with the exception of the Qadariyya (sect), believe that the actions of the slaves are created by Allah, the Exalted: ﴿Allah created you and that which you do.﴾ And He said: ﴿You did not throw when you threw but it was Allah who threw.﴾ This is the case, even if it is allowed for the servant to be described with such actions in another type of linkage, expressed as “acquisition” [*kasb*], as is found in the statement of the Exalted: ﴿He gets reward for that (good) which he has earned, and he is punished for that (evil) which he has earned.﴾ (al-Baqara: 287) The Exalted also said: ﴿Due to what their hands have earned.﴾ There are many other verses which are explicit in attributing acquisition to the slave. It is not necessary that the linkage of power to the one enabled (with the act) be through independent creation [*ikhtirā'*] only, for the power of Allah is pre-eternally linked to the world (all things but Him) before it was created by Him. When He created the world, it was linked to Him with another type of linkage.

## THE REALITY OF ASCRIBING ACTIONS TO THE SERVANTS

From this it becomes clear that the linkage of power [*qudra*] is not restricted to the obtainment of that which is decreed. The actions of the servants are ascribed to them by way of acquisition and *not* independent creation. Allah is the One who creates them, decrees them, and wills them. It is impossible for someone to object and say: “How can He desire that which He prohibits?” This is because the command is distinct from the will, as is proven by the fact that He commanded all people to have faith while (at the same time) He did not will it from the majority of them, as He said: ﴿Most of the people will not believe even if you were covetous of that.﴾ (Yūsuf: 103)

Ascribing the actions to the servants is ascribing the thing “caused” to the cause or the intermediary, and there is no contradiction in that. The One who brings about the causes is the One who created the intermediary and created within it, the meaning of ‘intermediary’. If it were not for that which Allah has

placed in it, it would not be fitting to be an intermediary, whether it is something that has not been given intellect, such as solid objects, constellations, rain, and fire, or something that does have intellect such as an Angel, human, or Jinn.

### THE DIFFERENCES OF MEANING BASED ON THE DIFFERENT ASCRIPTIONS

Perhaps you will retort: “But ascribing one single action to two different doers does not make sense, because it is impossible to join between two actors upon one action.” We say (in response): Yes. It is as you have said, however, that is only the case if the meaning of the word “doer” has only one meaning that is used. If, on the other hand, it has two meanings, then the word is general, being used to express both ascriptions.

If this is the case, then it is possible that it may be expressed in a general context, as is well known in the usage of homonyms, or in literal and figurative speech. This is just as it is said: “The emir (leader) killed so-and-so” and “The executioner killed him.” So, the meaning of the word “kill” with respect to the emir means something entirely different than its meaning with respect to the executioner. When we say: “Allah, the Exalted, is the Doer,” it means that He is the One who creates and brings into being, and when we say: “The created being is the doer,” it means that he is the locus in which Allah, the Exalted, created the ability after having created the will and knowledge (in that being). Linking ability with will, and linking movement with will, is (called) the linking of the caused with the cause, and linking the created thing with the created thing.

This is if the locus is one that is living, otherwise, if it is not, then it is from the category of arrangement of causes upon their means. So, it is correct to call everything which has a link with ability “a doer” however the link may be. Similarly, it is correct to call the executioner a killer in one respect, and the emir in another respect. This is because killing has been linked to the both of them. Even if this linkage is in two different respects, it is still allowed to call both of them “doers.” This is like considering the decreed matters with two abilities.