

Conclusions

In the preceding chapters an attempt has been made to identify the religious profile of Taqī al-Dīn al-Hilālī (1894-1987). Despite the fact that Al-Hilālī is known as a ‘Salafī’ scholar, there are many features of his religious activities which are characteristic of him as a person. The study allows the conclusion that Al-Hilālī seems to have been a born polemicist to be drawn. Nevertheless, he could be fairly pragmatic when circumstances demanded that he be so. At times, because of these two contradictory features he revealed a certain degree of ambivalence and a number of inner struggles. In many cases, his opinions were certainly not in line with mainstream Salafism. This is nowhere more obvious than in his development of a new typology of monotheism consisting of four parts, apparently a discarding of the classical Salafī tripartite sub-division. Furthermore, unquestionably Al-Hilālī was a Salafī scholar who combined preaching with more far-reaching academic ambitions. His ambition and perseverance in teaching himself English allowed him to develop skills which provided him with new prospects and perspectives. Besides being an inveterate traveller, he was a poet and a successful writer.

1. Al-Hilālī’s Interest in Debates and Polemics With His Opponents, both Muslims and Non-Muslims. He Had Debates with Sufis, Shiites and Christians

The first feature which can be adduced which distinguishes Al-Hilālī from many other Salafī scholars is his readiness to hold frequent debates with his opponents. Al-Hilālī’s debates were both written and oral and these debates were held with different religious groups, both Muslim and non-Muslim. He challenged the Sufī brotherhoods, the Shia scholars and the Christians alike. In most cases, his debates originated with a request for a *fatwa* from a petitioner. In some cases the enquirer could even be a non-Muslim. In many cases, Al-Hilālī was not the initiator of the debate himself, but was answering a question or defending his faith and religious belief against what he had experienced as an attack.

One of Al-Hilālī’s first debates, on 12 November 1921, was with Muḥammad ibn al-‘Arabī al-‘Alawī and concerned the the Tijaniyya Brotherhood. The latter challenged Al-Hilālī to a theological debate (*munāzara*) on the soundness of his beliefs. Al-Hilālī later wrote that he felt he had to choose between adhering to his mystical brotherhood in ignorance and mindless imitation or taking up the gauntlet of the debate, thereby following the path of the great scholars who espoused dialectical reasoning. He chose the latter path. Actually, the

latter convinced the former that the doctrinal foundation of the Tijaniyya Order was nothing but a falsehood. Muhammad ibn al-‘Arabī al-‘Alawī challenged Al-Hilālī’ on the alleged fact that Aḥmad al-Tijānī, the founder of the order, had really met the Prophet and eventually convinced Al-Hilālī embraced the principles of the Salafiyya. Al-Hilālī also based his decision to turn his back on Sufism on a vision of the Prophet whom, he claimed, he had seen twice in his dreams. (Chapter 1)

Al-Hilālī ‘s most important written polemic with Al-Mahdī al-Qazwīnī (1855-1939) was on the veneration of graves in Shia Islam. It took place on 7 February 1927. Al-Hilālī compiled his answers to Al-Qazwīnī in the form of a booklet entitled *Al-Qāḍī al-‘adl fī ḥukm al-bina’ ‘ala al-qubūr*, which was published in Cairo in 1927 at the request of Rashīd Riḍā. (Chapter 2)

In Spanish Morocco in the years 1942-1947, he had many clashes with Moroccan religious scholars, among them Aḥmad Ibn al-Ṣiddīq (1902-1962). These conflicts arose from three main issues: his open rejection of the Malīkī School, his sharp criticism of Sufism and the *fatwa* he issued on the permissibility of shaving the beard. (Chapter 5)

In 1949 Al-Hilālī studied Western works and used them in his writings. His stated goal was to employ them as a tool in a ‘counter-attack’ against non-Muslims. For instance, some Moroccan students from the University of Granada in Spain, who complained about the insults about Islam and Moroccans they had to endure from their Christian professors, requested al-Hilālī to provide them with arguments to counter and confound them. Consequently, Al-Hilālī translated and commented on the booklet by the American populist and atheist Joseph McCabe (1867- 1955), *The Moorish Civilization in Spain*, a rather superficial pamphlet, replete with sweeping statements praising the Arab civilization in Spain and refuting Christianity. (Chapter 6)

At the end of the 1960s, Al-Hilālī’s religious activities, especially those in Meknes (Morocco), once again enmeshed him in controversy. Actually, on this occasion he found himself in trouble with numerous ordinary Muslims because of his vehement attacks on the Sufī orders. Nor was he in favour with the local authorities, because he was continuously challenging the official jurisprudential and theological schools of thought, namely the Malikite School and the Asharite Creed. (Chapter 7)

Al-Hilālī’s idea of producing proofs against Christianity, using the Christian Scriptures to support a proper Islamic perception, goes back as far as the year 1930. At Christmas 1930, Al-Hilālī engaged in a debate with a young American missionary whose

name was Fred William Smith, who happened to have some knowledge of the *Qur'ān* and strongly criticized it from a biblical perspective. This debate seems to have had two consequences: firstly, Al-Hilālī became aware of the importance of foreign languages in the pursuance of his goal, so he began learning English so as to read the Bible; secondly, Al-Hilālī wrote notes in Arabic on in the margins of the Gospel of Matthew. (Chapter 3). When preparing his later polemical treatise, *Al-Barāhīn al-injīliyya*, it is obvious that Al-Hilālī was aware of the famous polemical work *Izhār al-Ḥaqq* (The Truth Revealed) by Raḥmatullāh Ibn Khalīl al-Raḥmān Al-Kīrānwī (1818-1891). Al-Hilālī replicated many of Raḥmatullāh Al-Kīrānwī's arguments, without, however, citing this source. In, Saudi Arabia, Al-Hilālī's work *Al-Barāhīn* attracted wide attention after its publication in 1973. The Saudi *mufti* Ibn Bāz ordered the publication of 20,000 copies of Al-Hilālī's *Al-Barāhīn*. (Chapter 8)

2. Al-Hilālī's Pragmatism Was Always Circumscribed By Some Boundaries Which He Never Transgressed

Pragmatism and opportunism were two characteristics which loomed large in Al-Hilālī's personal profile. They are apparent in many of the choices he made during his lifetime and in the contents of his preaching. They were unequivocally present on the occasions on which he was ready to accommodate to rules and laws prevailing in the countries in which he happened to be residing. Be that as it may, this pragmatism never overstepped certain limits he had set for himself and these limits seem to have depended on the country in which he was residing.

For instance, if we take into account the fact that in 1921 when Aḥmad Ibn al-Hājj Al-Āyyāshī Skirij (1877-1944) helped Al-Hilālī, to obtain his passport to go to Egypt by sending a letter of recommendation to the official representative of France in Cairo, it might be inferred that he had not (yet) openly condemned the Tijaniyya Order, and that, in Morocco, he had remained discreet about his earlier conversion to Salafism. Therefore, when Al-Hilālī speaks about his 'conversion' immediately after the debate he had with Ibn al-Ārabī al-Ālawī, this should be understood as a private conversion, which he initially kept to himself. This assumption is also supported by the help he received from Tijaniyya disciples during the early period of his time in Egypt. (Chapter 1). In fact, he only began openly criticizing the Tijaniyya Brotherhood during his residence in Arabia, because combating Sufism is the chief preoccupation of this country. Certainly, Ibn Bāz urged him to write a book in which he would summarize the aberrations of the Tijaniyya Order. (Chapter 3).

In 1921, in Morocco the limits of his pragmatism and opportunism were visible in his serving the interests of France and falling under the influence of the imperial power. For

instance, he was offered a post as a judge by Aḥmad Skiriji, the chairman of the judges in the district of Oujda in the west of Morocco. However, Al-Hilālī protests that he refused the post because Aḥmad Skirij would have had to consult the French inspector (*mufattish/ murāqib*) before deciding on important Islamic issues which should be judged by *Shar'a*. Al-Hilālī had noticed that Aḥmad Skirij used to meet the French observer every Saturday to inform him about all the sessions which had been held at the tribunal and to seek his advice on everything. He grew convinced that both scholars and writers had to become either the voice of the colonizer in the country or be prepared to accept punishment. (Chapter 1)

Another point which can be adduced to show Al-Hilālī's pragmatism is the fact that he obviously used to adapt his preaching to the local situation of the countries in which he was residing. In 1927, when he proclaimed Riḍā the winner of the debate with Al-Mahdī al-Qazwīnī and Riḍā rewarded him by sending a letter to King Ibn Sa'ūd requesting that this ruler pay him special attention and, at the request of the local authorities, Al-Hilālī re-edited his anti-Shiite booklet, *Al-Qāḍī al-'adl fī ḥukm al-bina' 'ala al-qubūr*, which he completed on the 25 August 1927. The major difference between the first version, published in Egypt, and this second, published in Arabia, is that the language of the former is moderate (*layyina*), carefully respectful, whereas the language of the latter is rather harsher and more uncompromising (*khashina*). Another alteration is the free use of insinuations, accusations and polemics in the second version. By his own admission, in Arabia there was no need to worry about how the Shi'a in Iraq would react. The geographical aspect could certainly have played a role in the choice of the language and also the position he took in debates with Shia scholars. Simultaneously, it seems that Al-Hilālī was planning to inveigle himself closer to King 'Abd al-'Azīz to whom he even dedicated a eulogistic poem. He was probably well aware that that more uncompromising language and the use of offensive words and insults would also serve his personal cause very well in (fiercely anti-Shiite) Wahhabi circles. Unquestionably Al-Hilālī also praised Arabia, because he believed that there was no land freer of polytheism than the Najd. (Chapter 2, Chapter 9)

Another occasion on which Al-Hilālī proved to be pragmatic or opportunistic occurred in 1930, when he sought the help of the French embassy to leave Saudi Arabia. His objective was to use the diplomatic mission to convince King Ibn Sa'ūd to allow him leave the kingdom. (Chapter 2)

Al-Hilālī's opportunism was undoubtedly also reflected in Nazi Germany in the 1940s, when his commitment to the Palestinian cause led him to use extremely pejorative language

against the Jews. His contribution to Nazi propaganda is well attested in his programmes in Radio Berlin (Chapter 4). In his services to the Nazi regime, he apparently saw a beckoning opportunity to strengthen his position and, at the same time, preach Salafism worldwide. (Chapter 4). However, the limits of his pragmatism seem to have been reached in 1942 when he was prevented from criticizing France. After Germany had defeated France and taken control of it, the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs forbade Al-Hilālī to write anything hostile about French colonialism in Morocco or to criticize any high-ranking French representative in that country. Despite this restriction, Al-Hilālī claimed, the managing-director of Radio Berlin allowed him to say anything he liked about Britain. According to his own statement, Al-Hilālī replied that he would never again write and broadcast another article for Radio Berlin and immediately resigned. Al-Hilālī also insisted that after his resignation he never received the 12,000 Marks which Radio Berlin was supposed to pay him as his annual salary. (Chapter 5)

In 1957, Al-Hilālī's pragmatism also became apparent in Iraq, where, in order to keep his position as an *imam*, he used to make invocations for the king in Friday prayers. Al-Hilālī said that from a Salafī point of view to pray for the king was a kind of innovation, a view which he did not deny. However, he explained that if he did not pray for the king, he could not be an *imam* at Friday prayers, and neither a teacher nor preacher in the mosque. (Chapter 6)

One fact which shows Al-Hilālī's pragmatism in Saudi Arabia is that he took the context in which he was issuing his legal opinions into account. Al-Hilālī regretted that he had not been careful enough when he had re-published his article, *Ta'lim al-Banāt wa Tarbiyatuhunna* (The Teaching of Girls and Their Education) in Saudi Arabia in 1974. 'I should have changed some phrases and expressions when I decided to publish that article in the Islamic University Journal, because it is the context which defines the nature of the discourse that one has to make.' Now he said that all the arguments he had previously used in his *fatwa* on the veil should be limited to women living in countries which did not abide by the Islamic Law. Although he altered his view, Al-Hilālī never budged from his point of view opinion of the *niqāb* and on principle never agreed with the obligatory covering of women's faces. His views were so pungent that the chancellor, 'Abd al-Aziz Ibn Bāz, ordered all the pages of Al-Hilālī's article, be removed from the international Islamic University Journal of Al-Madina. (Chapter 8)

3. Al-Hilālī's Disagreements With Mainstream Salafism

Al- Hilālī did not always hold the same opinions as other Salafi scholars, who were his contemporaries. In many cases , his opinions did not tally with mainstream Salafism. It goes without saying that Salafism is a fierce opponent of everything which is not based on the religious scriptures, especially in matters related to seeking help and making invocations. Nevertheless, in 1930, when Al-Hilālī happened to fall sick, he decided to write some strange invocations on pieces of paper and almond shells and burn them. (Chapter 3)

Another example which shows that Al-Hilālī sometimes contradicted Salafi teachings was his belief that it is not obligatory for Muslims to follow the sayings of the Prophet concerning *ādāb* (decorum), especially in matters related to beard growth, dressing and eating. In fact, there are many *fatwas* in the unpublished collection *Al-Fatāwā Al-Hilālīyya* in which Al-Hilālī, in contrast to many other Salafi scholars, says he does not think that shaving the beard constitutes a major sin. (Chapter 2, Chapter 5). However, years later, on 12 April 1969, at his home in Al-Madīna, in Saudi Arabia, he stated that,

The aim of all the comments I have made on the issue of the beard was to combat the polytheists and repress them [the Sufi people]; however, my opinion is unsound. The right opinion is to follow the *Sunna* of the Prophet and to comply with his commands, be they in the articles of faith, the obligations, the morals or in the customs related to a person's innate state. Accordingly, I repudiate the comments I made a long time ago. I believe the truth must be accepted: a Muslim must let the beard grow, trim his moustache and make plain his distinction from disbelievers. (Chapter 9).

Once again it should be emphasized that his opinion about the *niqāb* was not in accordance with mainstream Salafism or Wahhabism, as he did not accept the more stringent Wahhabi opinion which obliged women to cover their face and hands.(Chapter 8)

Finally, a significant difference between Al-Hilālī and the Wahhabi scholars was the fact that he allowed Muslims to *live* in the non-Muslim world. In espousing this view, Al-Hilālī disagreed with most his Salafi scholars, notably with those with whom he had close contact such as Ibn Baz and Al-Uthaymīn. Al-Hilālī did not make a distinction between Western countries and most countries in which Islam was the dominant religion, whereas most Salafi scholars certainly did. In the eyes of Al-Hilālī the only Islamic country in which 'Authentic' Islam had been implemented was Saudi Arabia, which can be considered as quite a radical opinion. (Chapter 9)

4. Al-Hilālī's Ambivalence and Inner Contradictions

On some occasions, the position which Al-Hilālī chose to take could be marked by ambivalence and contradiction. After leaving Saudi Arabia in 1930, Al-Hilālī continued spreading the Salafiyya message in his travels in India, Afghanistan and Iraq, criticizing any belief which contradicted its principles. Nevertheless, he was not always consistent in abiding by the teachings of Salafism which he so vigorously promoted. For instance, when he went to Afghanistan in 1352/1934 and fell ill with malaria, he was so frantic that he decided to submit to a strange treatment which he said he had had to resort to in his 'Time of Ignorance' (before his conversion). He decided to write invocations on pieces of paper and almond shells and burn them. Surprisingly, his fever receded, something Al-Hilālī could not explain. Al-Hilālī states that he was obliged to use this method to ease the pain he was suffering. (Chapter 3).

Another example of his ambivalence is the fact that he mingled his anti-colonial feelings with Nazi propaganda, which even led him to deny the fact that Hitler also had a colonial and imperialistic agenda. Even when fighting colonial powers (France and Britain), he was supporting another colonial power. (Chapter 4).

During the war, the Spanish Governor-General in North Morocco assigned him, in Al-Hilālī's own words, a worthy position which could only be awarded to such senior scholars as Mudīr Khizānat Ma'had al-Bāḥithīn (Director of the Library of the Institute of Researchers), and gave him a salary of 300 Pesetas. Over and above this, Al-Hilālī also received a 500 Peseta salary from the Ministry of *Awqāf*. One does wonder how Al-Hilālī could accept such a salary from the official religious authorities, while he was an openly fierce opponent of the Mālikī School. (Chapter 5)

A final illustration of Al-Hilālī's ambivalence is the fact that he praised both King Muhammad V [1909-1961] and King Ḥasan II (1929-1999) for their Salafism and their support for the Qurān and the *Sunna*. This despite the fact that Hassan II was known to be a fierce and open defender of the Malikī doctrine and to encourage Sufi ceremonies, especially the commemoration of the birth of the Prophet, which Al-Hilālī considered heretical.

(Introduction)

5. A Forerunner of *Fiqh al-Aqaliyyāt* (*Fiqh of Muslim minorities*)?

Al-Hilālī's *fatwas* related to questions about Muslim minorities in Western Europe are very interesting sources in the light of the ongoing Islamic discussions about these minorities. Moreover, they also enable us to understand the development of Al-Hilālī's thought. It is highly likely that having lived in Germany for some time had had an impact on Al-Hilālī as

far as the issue of residence in the West was concerned. In 1938, during his time in Germany, Al-Hilālī clearly stated that staying in Europe was only permitted in Islam *out of necessity*. Nevertheless, in his *fatwas* from the sixties, he did permit Muslims to *live* in the non-Muslim world. He challenged those persons who claimed that it was not permissible to travel to and reside in non-Islamic countries to provide relevant proof of their assertions. Despite this lenience, he did not allow a Muslim to apply for the citizenship of non-Muslim countries by stating that: he who holds the nationality of a Muslim country which governs according to the *Sharia* and chooses to be naturalized in a country which does not govern according to *Sharia* law is indeed sinful. Al-Hilālī's reasoning was that when applying for citizenship of non-Muslim country, a Muslim would have to declare his loyalty to a non-Muslim country and abide by its laws. However, this naturalization did not automatically make him an infidel. (Chapter 9)

6. Al-Hilālī's Interest in Foreign Languages, Notably English

Al-Hilālī learned English from a Christian missionary in the Indian city of Lucknow where he lived until the end of 1933. It was during this period that his awareness of the necessity of learning foreign languages was raised. He argued that learning European languages was necessary to Muslims if they were to defend their religion. (Chapter 3) As a forerunner in the field of Muslim Minority *Fiqh*, Al-Hilālī argued that learning European languages was essential to Muslims for three reasons: first it was a means for the *umma* to serve God better in the modern age; second, it would allow Muslims to read the labels on their imported Western medicine, or to know the real content of imported food; third, it would put them in a position to defend Islam most effectively. (Chapter 6).

One aspect of the Qadyāni sect Al-Hilālī deeply admired was that they used different languages to spread their faith and to this they owed the success of their predication in both the East and the West. Al-Hilālī claimed that because of their good English, the Ahmadiya disciples were able to bring Islam to the attention of many Westerners who had previously known nothing about it. (Chapter 3)

7. Al-Hilālī's Doctoral Studies and His Academic Career

Al-Hilālī was a Salafī scholar who combined preaching with secular academic ambitions. His academic life was linked to his proselytism. He believed that by holding a degree from Europe he would be in a position to command authority in the Islamic world and to spread 'Authentic Islam'. So, with the help of Shakīb Arslān, Al-Hilālī went to study in Germany where he was awarded his PhD. While he was there, he had the chance to get close to some

great figures of German Orientalism such as Paul Khale. In fact, Al- Hilālī's academic life might be described as rich and particular. Its particularity derived from the fact that he was allowed to follow his post-graduate studies in Germany without even having obtained a BA degree, a circumstance in which Shakīb Arsalān played an important role. In fact, there is a possibility that he might even have been recruited to serve the Nazi propaganda in return for being able to complete his doctoral studies. (Chapter 4)

The richness of his academic career arose from the fact that he took up different academic positions throughout his life. In late 1927, Al-Hilālī was appointed a lecturer at the Prophet's Mosque in Medina. (Chapter 2). In September 1930, in India, he had even been appointed dean of the Arabic Literature Department (Chapter 3). In 1936 he was both a student and a lecturer at the University of Bonn. (Chapter 4) In 1954, Al-Hilālī was invited to be a guest lecturer at the University of Bonn. Besides these posts, he was Professor at to the Faculty of Education of Queen 'Alia University in Baghdad, where he remained professor until 1959. (Chapter 6) In 1959, Al-Hilālī lectured at Muḥammad V University, in Rabat. He taught Arabic language and Arabic literature and in 1964, the Minister of *Habous* and Islamic affairs, Aḥmad Bargash appointed Al-Hilālī professor of Quranic exegesis and *Hadith* at the newly founded *Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ḥasaniyya* in Rabat. (Chapter 7). From 1968 to 1974, Al-Hilālī served as professor of Islamic faith at the Islamic University in Medina. (Chapter 8)

8. Al-Hilālī as a Worldwide Traveller

One of the characteristics which makes Al-Hilālī a singular Salafī scholar was his willingness to travel worldwide. In many cases, his residence in the countries (Algeria , Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia ,India , Afghanistan, Germany and Spanish Morocco) in which he would decide to stay was relatively short. Frequently, the main reason for leaving the countries in which he was living was his disagreements with either the local authorities or the local scholars of the other schools of thought. (Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9)

9. Al-Hilālī as a Man of Letters

The religious life of Al-Hilālī and his continuous involvement in preaching did not prevent him from enjoying an interest-packed literary life. In fact, Al-Hilālī was both a poet and a writer.

Al-Hilālī was appointed the director of the Arabic journal *Al-Diyā'*, which was indeed a kind of symposium through which to communicate with other Muslims and make the *Nadwat al-'Ulamā'* better known to the Arab world. *Al-Diyā'* also became a channel through which Al-Hilālī could preach his Salafī ideas. Published from 1932 to 1935, the magazine

discussed the ideals of the Salafiyya. Al-Hilālī sent copies of the journal to his mentor, Rashīd Ridā, who reprinted its first edition in *Al-Manār*. (Chapter 3). During the period he lived in Germany he was strenuously engaged in propagating anti-colonial ideas and Salafism, among other methods through the Salafī journal *Al-Fath* of Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb (1886-1969). (Chapter 4)

During his time in Germany Al-Hilālī collaborated with Paul Kahle in the translation of *Kitāb al-Buldān (The countries' Book)* written by Al-Faqīh al-Baghdādī, and *Tayf al-Khayal* (Pleasant Fantasy), written by Muḥammad Ibn Dāniyāl al-Kaḥḥāl (1248 – 1311). (Chapter 4)

In 1946 he established the Salafī journal *Lisān al-Dīn* in the city of Tetouan. In it he used to publish political articles criticizing the British and the French colonial policies in the region (Chapter 5). During the post-Independence period from 1960 to 1968, he wrote numerous articles in the official Islamic magazine of Morocco, *Da'wat al-Haqq*. (Chapter 7)

In Al-Hilālī's family archive, there is an unpublished *Collection of Poems*, which he entitled *Minḥat al-Kabīr al-Muta'ālī fī Diwān Taqī al-Dīn Al-Hilālī* (The Gift of the Great and Transcendent [Allāh] in the *Diwan* of Taqī al-Dīn Al-Hilālī). In this unpublished collection of poems Al-Hilālī describes his travels to different countries and cities, and his suffering and patience in overcoming adversity, fired by his purpose of being able to guide people on the Straight Path. (Introduction , Chapter 9).

10. Al-Hilālī's Typology of Monotheism: Oneness of Observance

One of the subjects which clearly characterizes Al-Hilālī and distinguishes his doctrine from that of most other Salafīs is his conception of monotheism. He developed a new typology of monotheism consisting of four parts, instead of the classical Salafī tripartite sub-division: *Tawḥīd al-Rubūbiyya* (the Oneness of Lordship), *Tawḥīd al-Ulūhiyya* also known as *Tawḥīd al-'Ubudiyya* (the Oneness of Worship) and *Tawḥīd al-Ṣifāt* (the Oneness of Attributes). To these three, Al-Hilālī added *Tawḥīd al-Ittibā'* (the Oneness of Observance). With the *first* type: the Oneness of Lordship, Al Hilālī meant that one must strongly believe in Allāh as the Creator of the Heavens and the Earth and, the movement as well as the stillness they contain. Al Hilālī went on to mention that whoever believes that somebody else can create something whose weight equals that of one atom, or less is a disbeliever. With the *second* type Al Hilālī indicated that a servant of Allāh must not turn away from Him, be it in his worship or in his supplication, in his appeals for help, when he seeks refuge with Him, in his secret fear, in asking people to help him do things that only Allāh can do, in his hope, or in his trust. The

third type, meant for Al-Hilālī that a Muslim should describe his Lord only by using the Attributes God has given to Himself in His Book, or the Attributes His Messenger has used to describe Him in his *ḥadīth*. The *fourth* type: the Oneness of Observance, meant that in his religion a Muslim should follow none but the revelation, namely the *Qur'ān* and the *Sunna* of the Prophet and his Companions, and the scholars who came after them, because they are transmitters and not lawmakers. Al-Hilālī pointed out that making laws is specific to Allāh, whereas the mission of his Messenger is to convey Allāh's Message. The Prophet's companions and the reliable scholars who succeeded them have conveyed His teachings to us. However, nothing is admitted in religion without evidence from either the *Qur'ān* or the *Sunna*, whereby matters which comply with them will be accepted, and matters which do not comply with them will be refuted. (Chapter 8 and Chapter 9).