

An Exposition of the Attempts of the Qutbiyyah, Takfiriyyah, Ḥaddādiyyah [and Ḥajāwirah] to Ascribe Irjā' to Shaykh Rabī', the Salafī Scholars of the Past and Present and the Du'āt of Ahl al-Sunnah in Various Lands

Shaykh Rabī' bin Hādī: And today, the Ḥaddādiyyah, they are from the offshoots (secretions) of the Ikhwān and the Qutbiyyah, they carry the flag of war against Ahl al-Sunnah and they render them Murji'ah and Hizbiyyīn... The conniving, misguided Ḥaddādī faction has been devised in order to kindle tribulation between Ahl al-Sunnah and for them to strike one another! And they are (in reality) concealed Takfiris, and they have other calamities possibly besides takfīr. They use the vilest form of deception (taqiyyah) as a veil for their vile methodology and their corrupt goals!

A new wave of Ḥaddādiyyah has appeared and become vocal over the past year or so. Amongst this faction are those who are sympathetic towards the Terrorist Khārijites of ISIS. They are reviving the two-decade old effort of Safar al-Ḥawālī and the Qutbiyyah of that era to ascribe Irjā' to Ahl al-Sunnah. Except that it is not restricted to Imām al-Albānī this time but to the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah in general. They try to conceal themselves behind the Scholars of Najd and the Scholars of the da'wah of Tawḥīd, whereas in reality, their extremist views demand them to accuse even those scholars with Irjā'. As for the Ḥājūrites, after the tabdī of Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī by numerous Scholars, some of them are now using the tribulation being stirred by this wave of Ḥaddādīs (such as 'Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Juhanī and Abdullāh bin Ṣawwān al-Ghāmidī and others) against Shaykh Rabī' as a means of seeking revenge for the sake of their Ḥaddādī leader and mentor, Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī. Likewise, some of these Ḥājūrites are displaying sympathy for the Terrorist Khārijites of ISIS with the argument that they deserve allegiance due to their opposition to the Shī'ah. So it is necessary for Ahl al-Sunnah, the followers of the Salaf to recognize their falsehood and beware of the evil these Ḥaddādī extremists conceal. This detailed document will aid the reader - inshā'Allāh - in seeing through their sophistry, lies and deception.

Version 2.0 [24th Shawwāl 1435H/20th August 2014]

CONTENTS

Historical Background of the Ikhwānīs, Takfīrīs and Ḥaddādīs.....	3
Defining the Issue Relating to Prayer and Outward Actions	12
Statements of the Scholars Regarding Prayer and Outward Actions	15
Understanding the Two Views of Ahl al-Sunnah	21
The Difference Between Ahl al-Sunnah and the Murji'ah	23
The Core Foundation of the Murji'ah	27
What is the Reality of the Bid'ah of the Murji'ah?	28
The Narration of 'Abdullāh bin Shaqīq Regarding Prayer	32
The Ḥadīths of Shafā'ah.....	33
It is Not Possible to Make Ta'wīl of These Ḥadīths	35
Ahl al-Sunnah Believe in the Ḥadīths of Intercession	36
The Kharijites, Mu'tazilah and Murji'ah Deny the Ḥadīths of Intercession	38
The Ḥajāwirah Are an Evil People Who Lack Principles	39
The Ḥajūrites, the Previous Ḥaddādīs (Such as Fawzī al-Baḥraynī) and the Accusation of Irjā Against Shaykh Rabī and Ahl al-Sunnah.....	39
The Use of Innovated Terms in the Definition of Īmān Such as <i>Jins al-'Amal</i>	40
The Statements of the Imāms of the Sunnah That Īmān Has a Foundation and a Branch.....	47
The Excuse of Ignorance and Establishing the Proof in Matters of Kufr and Shirk	50
Between the Conveyance (Bulūgh) and Understanding (Fahm) of the Proof	61
A Glimpse of the New Extremist Ḥaddādiyyah.....	63
The Issue of Action and the Terms Sharṭ Ṣiḥḥah and Sharṭ Kamāl	66
The Stance of Shaykh Rabī in the Face of the Fabrications of the Ḥaddādiyyah	67
The Usage of These Phrases by the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah.....	68
Ambiguity in Definitions	72
Insight From Shaykh Muḥammad al-'Aqīl.....	74
Shaykh Rabī Hitting the Nail on the Head Once More.....	74
Appendix 1: The Ḥadīth of Shafā'ah Between its Dhāhir and Its Ta'wīl	78
Appendix 2: The Various Groups and Sayings of the Murji'ah	83
Appendix 3: Bayān Talbīs al-Ḥajāwirah	87
Appendix 4: Yahyā al-Ḥajūrī is a Muḥtadī' (Innovator) on Just One Issue Alone, We do not Need Tens or Hundreds!	90
Verdicts of the Scholars that Convict al-Ḥajūrī and His Followers as Misguided Innovators Who Desire to Make Tabdī' of 'Uthmān and Revile the Companions	99
Appendix 5: How to Silence a Ḥajūrite (or Tens, Hundreds and Thousands of them), Force them to Flee on Their Heels and Prove They are Upon Bid'ah and Dalālah Without Argument or Debate	104

الحمد لله رب العالمين والصلاة والسلام على رسول الله وعلى آله وصحبه وبعد

Historical Background of the Ikhwānīs, Takfīrīs and Ḥaddādīs

Between the late 1980s and early 1990s **Imām al-Albānī** (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) spoke against some of the deviations of **Sayyid Quṭb** in 'aqīdah. As a result, the leadership of al-Ikhwān al-Muslimīn sanctioned an organization-wide boycott against him. The Shaykh also spoke against the methodologies of the political jamā'āt derived from al-Ikhwān al-Muslimīn who in turn had taken them from the non-Muslims (such as the Socialists, Marxists, Leninists). Shortly after, in the mid-90s, **Safar al-Ḥawālī**, under the direction of Sayyid Quṭb's brother, **Muḥammad Quṭb**, initiated an ideological attack against Imām al-Albānī by reviving a claim of one of the sects of the Khārijites of old, the **Manṣūriyyah**, who said that not making takfīr of the one who abandons prayer is Irjā'.¹ The agenda behind this was to lay the foundations for ascribing Irjā' to those who do not make takfīr of the rulers without exception and without tafṣīl (detail).²

This was part of countering the methodology of taṣfiyah and tarbiyah, the methodology of the Prophets in rectifying the servant and the land which Imām al-Albānī had revived over the prior decades, a direct threat to the methodology of the Ikhwān (**Sayyid Quṭb**, **Ḥasan al-Bannā**) and political party revolutionaries such as **Abu A'lā Mawdūdī** and **Taqī al-Dīn al-Nabahānī** who had adopted the practical methodologies of the Communists and Marxists (party-politics, revolution). The Shaykh had also been outspoken against the political jamā'āt who were calling the masses to demonstrations, rallies, political agitation and incitement, entry into parliaments and the likes, just as he had been outspoken about the Khārijites and Takfīrīs and their various splinter groups who had become more vocal after the 1991 Gulf War.

Two broad calls were clearly distinguishable. First, the da'wah of the political activists coming from an Ash'arī, Māturīdī, Sūfī background who proceeded upon the methodologies of the non-Muslims (social justice, revolution, party-politics) that were built upon European materialist philosophies (Communism, Marxism, Socialism). Second, the da'wah

¹ Abu al-Faḍl 'Abbās Ibn Manṣūr as-Saksakī (683H), said, "The Manṣūriyyah (a sect of the Khawārij), and they are the associates of 'Abdullāh Ibn Zayd, labelled them as Murji'ah due to their saying that the one who abandons the prayer, without rejecting its obligation, is a Muslim based upon the correct view in the madhhab. And they (the Manṣūriyyah) say that this saying of theirs (i.e. that of Ahl us-Sunnah) leads to the saying that Imān is speech without action. Yet all of this is incorrect regarding them." *Al-Burhān Fee Ma'rifat Aqaa'id Ahl il-Adyān* (pp.65-66).

² Shaykh Muḥammad Amān al-Jāmī scolded Safar al-Ḥawālī openly and challenged him to an open debate in the famous cassette "Naṣiḥah ilā Safar al-Ḥawālī", in which he said openly to al-Hawaali, "What is all this tumult about the Salafi Aqidah?!... You preach the Salafi doctrine in theory and then you call to the doctrine of the Khawaarij practically?!"

to a return to the way of the Salaf, to taṣfiyah and tarbiyah, a call to the way of the Prophets and Messengers in ‘aqīdah, da‘wah and rectification. The controversies that arose in matters of methodology following the Gulf War of 1991 are in fact between these two orientations, and these controversies are used by the partisans and innovators to undermine the callers to the Prophetic methodology so that they can amass the huge followers they need for their methodologies to be successful.

Though Imām al-Albānī was targeted first by Muḥammad Quṭb, his stooge Safar al-Ḥawālī and other Takfīrīs,³ the accusation was expanded to include others as the years passed.⁴ **Shaykh Rabī‘ bin Hādī** was specifically targeted by these people with the same accusation due to his defence of the methodology of the Prophets in da‘wah to Allāh and because he refuted the main theoreticians and figureheads of this movement, such as Sayyid Quṭb, Abu A‘lā Mawdūdī and those poisoned by them. This was an ideological assault from the direction of the Takfīriyyah Quṭbiyyah and Surūriyyah and it was carried by the likes of ‘Abd al-Raḥman ‘Abd al-Khālīq, **Muhammad Surūr**, **Muhammad Quṭb** and others.

Some Takfīrīs such as **Maḥmūd al-Ḥaddād** who were former Quṭbīs, with al-Ikhwān al-Muslimīn, appeared on the scene in the mid-90s, made an outward display of Salafiyyah, and utilized these issues to attack the Salafi Scholars and accuse them with Irjā‘. People like **Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī** kept company with the followers of Maḥmūd al-Ḥaddād, the effects of which became visible after many long years and he too eventually carried the accusation of Irjā‘ after his extremism was refuted by Shaykh Rabī‘ as did **Fawzī al-Baḥraynī**, and numerous others. They specifically targeted Shaykh Rabī‘ from 2004 onwards.

³ Imām al-Albānī was asked concerning the book of Safar al-Ḥawālī, "Dhāhirat al-Irjā‘ fil-Fikr al-Islāmī" of Safar al-Hawali, and in this book takfir is performed on account of certain sins! He replied, "I gave my viewpoint on a matter about thirty or so years ago when I used to be in the [Islamic] University (of Madīnah) and I was asked in a gathering about my opinion on Jamā‘at al-Tablīgh. So I said on that day, 'They are the Sūfis of this era.' And now it has occurred to me that I should say about this Jamaā‘h who have emerged in the present times and who have opposed the Salaf, I say here, in accordance with the statement of al-Hāfidh adh-Dhahabī: They have opposed the Salaf in much of the issues of manhaj, and it is befitting that I label them the Khawārij of the era. And this resembles their emergence at the current time – in which we read their statements – because they, in reality, their words take the direction and objective of that of the Khawārij in performing takfīr of the one who commits major sins. And perhaps I should say, this is either due to ignorance on their behalf or due to devised plot!!" The Cassette: The Surooriyyah are the Khawarij of the Era, end of the first side). Dated 17th Dhul-Ḥijjah 1417H. Imām al-Albānī also stated, in one of his last books published, "And Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah has explained the perspective from which faith, īmān, consists of actions, and that it increases and decreases - [his discussion] needing no further elaboration - in his book 'al-Imān'. So the one who requires more detail can refer back to it. I say: This is what I used to write for more than twenty years, affirming the madhhab of the Salaf and the ‘aqīdah of Ahl us-Sunnah - and all praise is due to Allaah - in the issues pertaining to īmān, and then there come - in the present times - reckless ignoramus, who are but young newcomers accusing us of Irjā‘!! To Allāh is the complaint of the evil that they are upon, of ignorance, misguidance and scum..." Adh-Dhabb al-Aḥmad an Musnad al-Imām Aḥmad, p.33 (1420H).

⁴ Shaykh Ibn Bāz and Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn were not spared accusations of Irjā‘ from some of the more extreme amongst the Khārijites and Takfīrīs.

More recently, a new wave of Ḥaddādiyyah⁵ have appeared within Saudī Arabia (and elsewhere) and some of them have connections or sympathies towards the Takfīrī Kharijites of ISIS.⁶ They have gone further than those before them and have started to openly express their criticism of well-known Salafī Scholars, past and present, until even Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn ‘Uthaymīn, Ibn Bāz, ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-‘Afīfī and others have not been safe from their tongues because all of these scholars hold positions that clash with the exaggerated views of these Ḥaddādiyyah.

The issues around which these accusations are being constructed include: **a)** the ruling on abandonment of prayer **b)** the excuse of ignorance (*al-‘udhru bil-jahl*) in matters of kufr and shirk **c)** statements used by some of Ahl al-Sunnah such as *sharṭ sihhah* and *sharṭ kamāl* in their discussion of matters pertaining to īmān **d)** insisting on the use of innovated phrases in the definition of īmān such as *jins al-‘amal* **e)** trying to portray statements used by the Salaf regarding īmān (such as īmān having a foundation and branch) as expressions of Irjā’.

Whilst Shaykh Rabī was refuting the falsehood of the Ḥaddādiyyah, their false principles, their ghuluww (exaggeration) in the status of their ideological leaders and their unjust tabdīl of others (during the 1990s and 2000s), a similar trait began to appear from **Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī** from around 2007 onwards. This included a severe type of harshness against others from Ahl al-Sunnah, the use of foul language, unjust and unfounded accusations of ḥizbiyyah against other Shaykhs in Yemen, causing disturbance in the da‘wah, initiating splits and what is similar to these types of activities. In addition, there were many expressions of exaggeration from his students and poets regarding his status, When al-Ḥajūrī lifted the cover (‘awrah) of others in this manner, his own cover was lifted and many of his calamities in ‘aqīdah and uṣūl were brought to light for which he was refuted.

The issues escalated until many of the other Shaykhs got involved, and in the process, after the entire fitnah, **Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī was declared an innovator (mubtadi‘) for his views and activities.** Shaykh Rabī declared him a Ḥaddādī in 2011. Some time after this disparagement was conveyed and propagated by the Salafīs, the followers of Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī took the way of the Quṭbī, Takfīrī Ḥaddādiyyah in making accusations of Irjā’ against the Salafīs through some of the same issues mentioned.⁷ In the meanwhile, some of the Ḥaddādiyyah in Saudi

⁵ From them, ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Juhanī, Badr al-Dīn al-Munāṣarah, ‘Abdallāh al-Jarbū, Aḥmad al-Ḥāzimī, ‘Abdallāh Ṣawwān al-Ghāmīdī, ‘Imād Farāj, Abu ‘Abdallāh Yūsuf al-Zākūrī al-Maghribī. It appears that some of these people are using their attachment to the Mashāyikh of the da‘wah of Tawḥīd (Muhammad bin ‘Abd al-Waḥḥāb and his offspring) as a shield, with their real intent to lend ideological support to the Takfīrīs and Khārijites towards whom the hearts of some of them are inclined, if not sympathetic.

⁶ The accusation of Irjā’ against the Salafi scholars appeared after the Gulf War in 1991, which saw the emergence of the Khārijites and their activities, and likewise the accusations of this new wave of Ḥaddādiyyah coincide with the emergence of the Takfīrī Khārijites in Iraq and Syria (ISIS).

⁷ In early 2012 some of these ignorant and misguided Ḥaddādīs such as Abu Fujūr ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ al-Sumālī and Mūsā Millington al-Trinidādī tried to tarnish some of the Salafīs based on these issues. Refer to <http://www.salafitalk.com/threads/977> for details.

Arabia (such as ‘Abdallāh al-Ghāmīdī) have been following the way of the Takfīriyyah Qutbiyyah of the 1990s by using deception and lies in trying to engineer statements from the Major Scholars against Shaykh Rabī.⁸

No sooner had they got some speech from some of those scholars like Shaykh al-Fawzān and the Muftī, ‘Abd al-Azīz except that the Ḥaddādī Hajūrites began to spread shubuhāt and started accusing Shaykh Rabī of Irjā’ - a sign of their great dishonesty. There is no reason for this except to seek revenge for the sake of Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī. This is now taking place openly in their forums such as the forum run by the Ḥaddādī, **Khālīd al-Gharbānī**⁹ and similar things are being witnessed from the Hajūrites in the Netherlands and other places, and in turn they have started accusing some of the Salafi callers with Irjā’ using the same issues used by the Ḥaddādiyyah who preceded them. Further, some of these Hajūrites are displaying their allegiance and sympathies towards the Takfīrī Khārijites of ISIS claiming that because they oppose the Rāfiḍah, they deserve loyalty¹⁰, even if their actions are

⁸ Allāh knows best how many attempts the Qutbiyyah, Surūriyyah made in trying to get speech from the Major Scholars against Shaykh Rabī during the 1990s in order to defend Sayyid Qutb and the Khawārij (Salmān al-Awdah, Safar al-Ḥawālī and others). In the end they all failed, because these were insincere, corrupt attempts to defend bātil, bid‘ah, ḍalālāh and its people.

⁹ Shaykh Rabī said about him that he is "a Ḥaddādī, Ikhwānī, an infiltrator, a liar." Refer to the following article for clear proof that al-Gharbānī is a liar: <http://alhajuri.com/?epefxud>.

¹⁰ In his book *Tartīb al-Madārik wa Taqrīb al-Masālik*, Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ (رحمته الله) mentions the slaughtering of notable Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah when they got caught up in the revolt of a **Kharijite** against the **‘Ubaydī Bāṭiniyyah Shī‘ah** in al-Qayrawān during the 4th century hijrah. These Bāṭiniyyah would openly revile the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and the Companions (رضي الله عنهم) on the streets and Ahl al-Sunnah were severely oppressed. There was a **Kharijite** by the name of **Abū Yazīd Mukhallad bin Kaydān**, he was much given to devotion and worship and was obeyed by his people. He revolted against the Banī ‘Ubayd, incited the people against them, and had many victories, taking many cities. **Many of Ahl al-Sunnah thought that it was a duty upon them to revolt due to the kufr of Banī ‘Ubayd and so they joined with Abū Yazīd, without intending to come under his obedience.** Those who joined him were Abu al-Faḍl al-Mumsee, Rabī bin Sulaymān al-Qaṭṭān, Ibrāhīm bin Muḥammad al-Ḥanafī, ‘Abd al-Malik bin Marwān, from the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah as well as a group of civilians. They decided, after consultation, to fight against "a cursed mubaddil (alterer) of the religion (the ‘Ubaydī ruler) " and they saw it as a means of expiation for their sins. As they proceeded on their way they incited the people to jihād, making takbīr, tahlīl and the likes through the streets and sending salāt upon the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and asking for mercy upon his family and companions and reciting verses from the Qur’ān, **"And fight against the heads of kufr" and "Fight them, Allāh will punish them through your hands"** and what is like that. A powerful jumū‘ah khuṭbah was given by Aḥmad bin Abī al-Walīd, inciting the people to jihād, and reviling the Banī ‘Ubayd. So the next morning the people went out with Abū Yazīd (al-Khārijī) for their jihād. They surrounded the ‘Ubaydiyyah in the city of al-Mahdiyyah, and when Abū Yazīd saw this, and was certain of victory, **he manifested what he concealed of his Khārijite doctrine and he said to his associates, when you meet those people (the enemy) then expose the Scholars of al-Qayrawān (leaving them vulnerable) so that their enemies can subdue them.** So then those whom Allāh willed (from Ahl al-Sunnah) were killed by the ‘Ubaydiyyah Rāfiḍah Bāṭiniyyah and they included 35 people from the jurists and righteous. This was in the month of Rajab 333H. In this is a great and mighty lesson for those who are deceived today by the revolt of a Takfiri Kharijite (Abu Bakr al-Baghdādī) against the Shī‘ite government of Irāq and his alleged khilāfah (ISIS). This criminal has much Sunni blood on his hands due to his bombings of civilians in the streets of Baghdad since 2010. Further, these extremists terrorists believe that the Rāfiḍah Shī‘ah whom they consider as

disagreeable. So their hearts are inclined towards each other and it is clear that the Ḥajūrites are drinking from the same cup as their Ḥaddādī extremist brethren, the likes of ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Juhanī¹¹ and other corrupt and ignorant individuals.

In this article we aim to address some of these shubuhāt, in particular the accusation of Irjā’ against the Salafī scholars and their students which is centered around the issues of abandonment of prayer, the neglect and abandonment of the outward obligations, dubious phrases such as *jins al-‘amal* or *sharṭ kamāl* and *sharṭ ṣiḥḥah*, the ḥadīths of intercession (shafā‘ah), the excuse of ignorance and others.

It is crucial to keep in mind, as you read through this article, the key issue around which everything revolves. The Quṭbiyyah, Takfīriyyah, Khārijīyyah and Ḥaddādiyyah have one primary and central matter they have to prove on the basis of which everything else that they intend to accuse Ahl al-Sunnah with will logically and rationally follow. **This is to establish that not making takfīr of the one who abandons prayer is equivalent to saying actions are not from īmān, upon which the accusation of Irjā’ can be constructed.** This is ultimately, what the entire debate comes down to, and this is why Quṭbī Kharijites like Safar al-Ḥawālī revived these claims two decades ago, recognizing the centrality of this issue to their agenda. The origins of this claim lie with a sect of the Khārijites called the Manṣūriyyah as has preceded in the quote from Abu al-Faḍl al-Saksakī (d. 683H).

Abu al-Faḍl ‘Abbās Ibn Manṣūr as-Saksakī (683H), said, "The Manṣūriyyah (a sect of the Khawārij), and they are the associates of ‘Abdullāh Ibn Zayd, labelled them as Murji’ah due to their saying that the one who abandons the prayer, without rejecting its obligation, is a Muslim based upon the correct view in the madhhab. And they (the Manṣūriyyah) say that

non-Muslims to begin with, are less harmful and not worse (in disbelief) than those they consider to be apostates from the People of Tawḥīd and Sunnah. They consider the "apostates" more worthy of being fought and killed. One should not be deceived by these people under any circumstances. This indicates that **the Ḥaddādī Ḥajūrites of Netherlands** who have started showing support for the Takfīrī Ḥaddādīs like ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Juhanī and others, it shows their ignorance and their following of desires. This indicates a type of punishment in that when they rejected guidance (in the matter of al-Ḥajūri and his bid‘ahs with respect to the Companions) and followed desires, it is as if a faction of them are being led to further misguidance and blindness through their inclination towards this **new wave of Ḥaddādīs** and sympathies for the **Khārijite Dogs of Hellfire** who are claiming a khilāfah in Irāq and Syria.

¹¹ ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Juhanī is an ignoramus pretender who used to be a Salafī. He has many writings in the past in which he defends Imām al-Albānī from the accusation of Irjā’, defends Shaykh Rabī from the claims of the deviants, and affirms that the abandonment of prayer is a legitimate difference of opinion and that the one who does not make takfīr through abandonment of prayer is not a Murji’. This indicates the great danger of mixing with the Ḥizbiyyīn and Ahl al-Bid‘ah and debating with them and engaging with them. It corrupts the heart, entering doubts into it, and then stripping away the intellect, until one no longer recognizes the truth that he was upon previously, seeing it as munkar and seeing the bid‘ah he entered into as ma‘rūf, and this is true misguidance as was said by Ḥudhayfah bin al-Yamān (رضي الله عنه), "True misguidance it certainly is, that you reject what you once knew and you affirm what you once rejected." Related by al-Lālikāī (no. 120).

this saying of their's (that of Ahl us-Sunnah) leads to the saying that Imān is speech without action. Yet all of this is incorrect regarding them."¹²

There is also a second key issue used by the extremist Ḥaddādīs. **This is their attempt to claim that a Muslim who falls into major shirk is automatically judged a mushrik, kāfir irrespective of whether he was ignorant or not, and affirming Islām for him on account of the excuse of ignorance and negating Islām from him only after he has been made to understand the proof and his rejection of it is from the extreme Irjā' of Jahm bin Ṣafwān.** This is what is being claimed by the likes of 'Abdullāh al-Jarbū'.

It is also important to keep in mind that Shaykh Rabī' considers the one who abandons prayer to be a disbeliever, and likewise the one who persists in abandoning the outward deeds for his entire life to be a disbeliever, should such a person be found. And the Shaykh affirms that there is a difference of understanding and application in the topic of the excuse of ignorance, though he himself grants the excuse of ignorance in principle in matters of major shirk, following the likes of Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim and others. What the Shaykh has been doing for almost two decades is to defend those from Ahl al-Sunnah who do not make takfīr of the one who abandons prayer and likewise those who grant the excuse of ignorance from being accused with Irjā'.

So in the process of defending a faction of the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah, the Shaykh has been lied upon, slandered and accused with what he is free and innocent of. This is because these deviants have bigotry towards ideas that have settled in their hearts and minds, partisanship for their extremist leaders from the Ḥaddādīs and Takfīrīs and desires in their souls which hinder them from accepting the truth and displaying justice.

It is important that I explain my own position here so that the Ḥaddādī Ḥājurites are not able hold on to any loose ends in the document and ascribe to me what I am free of, as they are known to rush to Scholars who are sympathetic and supportive of the Quṭbiyyah, Ikhwāniyyah in order to elicit judgements. I believe that in a land where Islām is strong and the symbols of Islām such as the jamā'ah, the jumu'ah are present and the masājid are widespread, the adhān is called and Tawḥīd is established and scholars are present in abundance, it is not possible for a person to exist who has not done a single good deed in his whole life except that he is a hypocrite, disbeliever. **Should such a one be found**, he is a disbeliever, heretic and he does not have īmān (action) in his heart, such as inqiyād, maḥabbah and what is like that, since it is not possible in such an environment for a person not to have a single good deed except that the actions of the heart are non-existent or have expired.¹³ Because the environment is such that it forces a person to do good. In the

¹² *Al-Burhān Fee Ma'rifat Aqaa'id Ahl il-Adyān* (pp.65-66).

¹³ Ibn Taymiyyah said, "Disbelief (kufr) is the absence of faith (īmān), whether he has with him rejection (takdhīb), or arrogance (istikbār) or stubborn refusal (ibā') or turning away (i'rāḍ). Thus he in whose heart taṣdīq (assent) and inqiyād (compliance) **were not attained** is a disbeliever." Majmū' al-Fatāwā (7/639). This quote and many others from Ibn Taymiyyah indicate that īmān is not mere taṣdīq alone, but also inqiyād (inward compliance). The fact that a person can live a whole lifetime

presence of so many factors that strongly invite and encourage a person to do good, it is not possible for him never to do any good except that the actions of the heart are absent and thus this person is a disbeliever. However, speaking theoretically and conceptually in this topic is different to making an actual judgement of takfīr upon a real and specific person.

Likewise it is **extremely difficult**¹⁴ to grant the excuse of ignorance in matters of major kufr and shirk for such a person where Tawḥīd is spread and disseminated and is explained in the mosques and through writings and publications and media in abundance. In any case, such a person would be asked to repent after the proof is established upon him **through due process**.¹⁵

As for times and places where Tawḥīd and the practice of the outward symbols of Islām are not strong, then the situation would be looked at differently. There is greater scope for the excuse of ignorance due to lack of promulgation of knowledge and scarcity of scholars. And because the environment is weak with respect to īmān and righteousness, the factors which invite, motivate and pressure a person to do good are also weak, and thus a person neglectful of the outward obligations in such an environment is not as evil and deficient in īmān (or devoid of it) as the one who neglects the outward obligations in the type of land described earlier.

Thus it is plausible that in one land a person called ‘Abdullāh can have the foundation (aṣl) of faith in the heart and make outward affirmation with sincerity and then leave the obligations and fall into sin yet die as a Muslim, as a major sinner who will be punished in the Hellfire, unless Allāh forgives him, and who will be removed, if not by intercession,

in such an environment that invites, incites, encourages and pressures a person to good, yet not a single good deed emanates from him, is a proof that the compliance (inqiyād) is not present, that the action of the heart has expired and all that remains is pure taṣdīq (which does not amount to īmān), unless this individual was actually a hypocrite, devoid of taṣdīq or harbouring hatred in his heart. Despite all those strong factors inviting to good, a person can only fail to do good if there was resistance in his heart - indicating the absence of inqiyād.

¹⁴ Though not impossible, as there can exist certain scenarios involving language barriers whereby a person can still remain ignorant in such a land and this does occur in practice amongst expat workers in some of the Gulf countries. Tawḥīd has not been sufficiently explained to them such that they come to know of the opposition of what they are doing to what the Messengers brought, despite their utterance of the shahādah and performance of the outward obligations.

¹⁵ Which really means that all this commotion and incitement by the Ḥaddādiyyah is only to stir up trials and tribulations for Ahl al-Sunnah. Because, let's say someone in Saudi Arabia falls into an action of major shirk. He would be taken to the judges and scholars and he would be asked to repent and it would be explained to him that what he did was major shirk, and so really, it is inevitable that the proof is established upon him through due process, whether he was ignorant or not. He would not be marched into the court and immediately executed without being offered the chance to repent. And with this in mind, the objectives of these Ḥaddādīs in raising these issues have to be questioned. Allāh knows best, but these views they hold and propagate serve as an ideological justification for the activities of the Kharijite Terrorists of ISIS and their likes, whether they intend that or not, but their stirring up these issues serves no practical purpose in reality except to justify the killing of ignorant Muslims.

then by Allāh's mercy, because there remains a speck of īmān in his heart, which is taṣdīq, and something of inqiyāḍ and ikhlāṣ (alongside his outward affirmation). And another person, Zayd, in another better and stronger land who brought the same as ‘Abdullāh but who would be a disbeliever, **because the absence of a single good deed in such a positive and strong environment can only be due the resistance in his heart to all the inviting and motivating factors for doing good**, and this proves the absence of the actions of the heart (inqiyāḍ, maḥabbah) in a way that cannot be said for certainty about ‘Abdullāh.

Finally, the reader should be aware of what is taking place in the field and how the Ḥaddādīs are operating. One of their chief architects, ‘Abdullāh al-Jarbū¹⁶ in a telephone conversation (06/12/1433H) whose transcript is published by one of his followers (Yūsuf al-Zākūrī) when the questioner complains about some of the Shaykhs of Saudi - [who have been refuting the slanders of the Ḥaddādīs such as Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī, Fawzī al-Baḥraynī and others] - and they intend here Shaykh Rabī, he says to them, "These, these have severe partisanship to the errors of Shaykh al-Albānī... by Allāh, I say, in reality, I advise you that you mention the names of these who spread these affairs, write them, write their statements and send them to the respected Muftī and explain to him that the thought of these (people) has spread..." Over the past year or so, statements from these Shaykhs which have been elicited through carefully formulated questions and selective quoting have begun to filter out which reveal that these Ḥaddādīs - after having been refuted through ḥujjah and bayān - are employing these unscrupulous tactics.

They have been refuted by Shaykh Rabī along the following lines: You [Takfīrīs, Ḥaddādīs] have no right or justification for accusing those from Ahl al-Sunnah who affirm actions are from īmān, part of it and necessary to it and **a)** do not make takfīr of the one who abandons the prayer or other obligations **b)** or grant the excuse of ignorance to those who fall into Shirk from those who utter the shahādah, pray and fast, **c)** or refuse to employ innovated definitions in īmān such as '*tārik jins al-‘amal kāfir*' and what is like that. You [Takfīrīs, Ḥaddādīs] have no right to accuse them of Irjā’, and your use of these issues to stir tribulations indicates that you have evil designs and you desire to harm Ahl al-Sunnah. The Shaykh vigorously defends the Scholars from the time of the Salaf to this day of ours from the evil insinuations of these Ḥaddādīs. Unable to answer the Shaykh's calls for justice and fairness, they are resorting to these evil tactics and accusing the Shaykh with what he is free of. Just like the Takfīrīs, when they were annihilated in debates by Imām al-Albānī and were left dumbstruck, they brought out the accusation of Irjā’ as the weapon.

This is what the Quṭbiyyah, Surūriyyah were doing in the 1990s, when they would run to Shaykh Ibn Bāz and Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn trying to get verdicts from them against the

¹⁶ This extremist Ḥaddādī claims that those who grant the excuse of ignorance to those who fall into major shirk and do not make takfīr or negate the label of Islām from them until after the establishment of the proof, after they have been made to understand that they are in opposition to the Messengers, that they are more vile in their Irjā’ than Jahm bin Ṣafwān! He has included within this judgement Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn, al-Albānī and even al-Fawzān in whose verdicts one can find the excuse of ignorance for the common Rāfīdah.

Shaykhs of Madīnah, at the head of them Shaykh Rabī, who had exposed them, their evil plots and their Khārijite manhaj. So the reader must be aware that these people intend tribulations and they intend to split the Scholars and they intend harm for Ahl al-Sunnah as a whole, despite their attachment to some of those Scholars.

Abu ‘Iyāḍ Amjad Rafīq
10th Shawwāl 1435H / 6th August 2014¹⁷

¹⁷ I have been informed (13th Shawwāl 1435H) that the vengeful and hateful Ḥaddādīs (from Netherlands) are in the process of writing a refutation by drawing upon "*the Ḥalabī card*." This is the way of the Ḥaddādiyyah, unable to refute the proofs and scholarly statements which establish they are people of innovation who ascribe bid‘ah and ḍalālāh to the Companions, they conspire to gang upon the one who conveys the judgement of the Scholars such as Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn, Shaykh al-Fawzān, Shaykh Rabī upon them and their bid‘ah and they employ diversionary tactics, away from an actual knowledge based discussion of the issues thus presented. All in order to conceal what is plain and apparent to all reasonable people, that they have been exposed and their bid‘ah is apparent and clear, and just one issue alone is sufficient to render them innovators and people of desires, due to their persistence upon it after the ḥujjah has been established upon them by the Scholars. **Refer to the Appendix at the end dealing with the adhān of ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه).** Their new tactic is that instead of ascribing Irjā’ to Shaykh Rabī directly who has presented a defence of a faction from Ahl al-Sunnah (who hold a particular view based on evidences from the Qur’an and Sunnah) against a new and evil Ḥaddādī Takfirī faction that has appeared recently with sympathies to the terrorists of ISIS (such as al-Juhanī, al-Zākūrī, al-Ghāmidī and al-Munāṣarah and others), they have decided to target the conveyer. Having said this, many on the Ḥaddādī Oloom forums are already being very open in making such accusations against Shaykh Rabī due to the activities and mischief being created by this new wave of extremist Ḥaddādīs (al-Ghāmidī, al-Juhanī).

Defining the Issue Relating to Prayer and Outward Actions

With respect to your questions¹⁸ regarding the Ḥajāwirah Ḥaddādiyyah in the Netherlands and their accusation of Irjā' against the brother Abū 'Abdullāh Bouchta (hafidhahullāh) on the basis that he held the view that the one who dies without performing his obligations and was neglectful of action is a sinful Muslim (and not a disbeliever):

Then this matter is looked at from **two different considerations**. From the angle of illustrating the conceptual reality of īmān and from the angle of when can takfīr of a Muslim be made through neglect of action. The first is **a theoretical matter**¹⁹ and the second is **a practical matter**. Both are explained in more detail as follows:

1. **Describing the reality of eemaan and the connection (irtibāṭ) and binding nature (talāzum) between the bāṭin (inward) and the dhāhir (outward). This is inward īmān (taṣdīq of the heart and 'amal of the heart) and outward īmān (qawl of the tongue [shahādah] and the action of tongue and limbs).** This was discussed in detail by the likes of Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah who highlighted the errors of groups of the Murji'ah in their views that: a) īmān is ma'rifah²⁰ or taṣdīq only, b) a person can revile the Messenger, fight against him and still be a believer inwardly due to taṣdīq or ma'rifah in the heart, c) complete and perfect īmān can exist in the heart without any outward action or in the presence of the calamitous major sins and other such erroneous presumptions.²¹

These groups did not include the **actions of heart into īmān** (inqiyād, maḥabbah and what follows them) as a result of which they presumed these false views.²² From here, the issue is raised about a person who has taṣdīq in his heart and has the basis

¹⁸ This article was originally written (6th Shawwāl 1435/2nd August 2014) in response to a question from the Netherlands (3rd Shawwāl 1435/30th July 2014) regarding the attacks of the Hājurites against some of the Salafī students of knowledge, accusing them of Irjā'.

¹⁹ By *theoretical matter*, we are referring to the discussions involved whereby the conceptual errors of the groups of the Murji'ah are illustrated through terms and expressions - such as what is found in abundance in the writings of Ibn Taymiyyah in Kitāb al-Īmān, and more specifically to a imaginary, theoretical matter (jins al-'amal) which has given rise to much debate and controversy.

²⁰ This is the view of the Jahmiyyah who expelled the actions of the heart from īmān and he was followed in this by al-Ash'arī who held īmān was taṣdīq only (without the actions of the heart). See Majmū' al-Fatāwā (7/195).

²¹ Refer to Appendix 2 for more detail on the claims of the Murji'ah.

²² Many of the groups of Murji'ah did include the actions of the heart, however, that entered them into contradiction, because if they entered actions of the heart in the īmān, it was binding upon them to also enter the outward actions into īmān as well. So either they include the outward actions, and hence agree with Ahl al-Sunnah, or expel the inward actions of the heart and thus agree with Jahm bin Ṣafwān and others.

of the actions of the heart (inqiyād). Is it conceivable that nothing outward²³ should come from him at all? We find Imām al-Albānī (رحمته الله) and Shaykh Rabī affirming, that it is not possible for a person to spend a lifetime without any outward display of īmān, and that in reality, such a person cannot be a Muslim, but a hypocrite in whose heart īmān never entered²⁴ - and this scenario is used to illustrate the link anbetween taṣdīq of the heart and its ‘amal (action) and between the ‘amal of the

²³ The outward (dhāhir) includes the speech of the tongue and the action of the limbs, Ibn Taymiyyah (رحمته الله) said, "The fourth: The presumption of the one who thought that there is nothing in the heart except taṣdīq and that the dhāhir (outward) is nothing but action of the limbs. What is correct is that the heart has action alongside taṣdīq and the outward (dhāhir) is (both) outward speech (of the tongue) and outward action and both of them are necessary consequences of what is internal..." (Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā 7/554) and a page earlier Ibn Taymiyyah said, "And from this we know that whoever's heart believed with a firm, resolute faith, **it is impossible for him not to speak with the two testimonials (of faith) whilst having the ability to do so.** For not uttering the two testimonials whilst having the ability necessitates the absence of the complete faith of the heart. And through this, the error of Jahm (bin Ṣafwān) and whoever followed him in their claim that pure faith (in the heart alone) **without the outward īmān** will benefit in the Hereafter, becomes clear, because this is impossible." (Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā 7/553). From these two quotes and others it is clear that the expression of the tongue is considered from the dhāhir (outward) and from the outward īmān. And Abu al-Ḥusayn Ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Malṭīyy (d. 337H) in his famous book Al-Tanbīh wal-Radd ‘alā Ahl al-Ahwā’ wal-Bida’, describes the claim of one of the factions of the Murji’ah, "Amongst them are a faction who claim that īmān is just the knowledge (ma’rifah) of the heart **and is not an action (fi’l) of the tongue** and nor action (‘amal) with the body and that whoever knew Allāh with this heart then he is a believer..." (Cairo, 1413H, p. 108). This again illustrates that the dhāhir (outward) includes the action of the tongue and is not just the action of the limbs. Ibn Taymiyyah said, "So when he mentioned īmān alongside Islām, he made Islām to be the outward actions: **the two testimonials**, the prayer, the zakāh, fasting and the Ḥajj. And he made īmān to be what is in the heart of faith in Allāh, His Angels, His books, His Messengers and the Last Day." (Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā 7/14). Ibn Taymiyyah also said, "That which the Salaf, the Imāms and the majority of the people are upon is that the binding requirement of that (inward īmān) must manifest on the limbs. Whoever said that he believes the Messenger, loves him and venerates him with his heart **but never spoke with the kalimah of Islām and nor performed any of its obligations without any fear (in doing that)**, this one cannot be a believer inwardly, rather he is a disbeliever. Jahm and whoever agreed with him claimed that he is a believer inwardly and that the mere knowledge (ma’rifah) and assent (taṣdīq) in the heart is what brings about the īmān that necessitates reward on the Day of Judgement **without any outward speech or action.** And this is futile in both reason and legislation as has been discussed in detail in other than this place." (Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā 14/120).

²⁴ Imām al-Albānī said, "īmān without (outward) action will not benefit, for Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ), when He mentions īmān, He mentions it in connection to righteous action, since we cannot conceive of īmān without righteous action, unless we view it through imagination. [A man] believes right here, he says, "I testify none has the right to be worshipped but Allāh and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh" and then he dies right here. This we can imagine. However, a man who says "There is none worthy of worship but Allāh and Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh" and lives his entire lifespan - as Allāh wills - without doing a righteous action, [then in such a situation], the absence of his righteous action is an evidence that he speaks with his tongue whilst īmān has not actually entered his heart. Thus, the mention of righteous deeds after īmān indicates that the beneficial īmān is the one that is connected to righteous action." Sharḥ Adab al-Mufrad, sixth cassette, second side. Pay attention here, that those who do not make takfīr of the one who abandons prayer and likewise of the one who dies as a great sinner, having neglected all the obligations, they affirm and corroborate the connection between the bātin and the dhāhir.

heart and the tongue and limbs. However, as they explain, this is a **theoretical matter**, and we are only speaking of what the mind imagines of such a scenario, since to find a person like this *in real life*, such that we can judge him a *kāfir* by making the accusation "*You have not done any good deed whatsoever, therefore you are a kāfir*" and then applying the ḥadd of riddah (apostasy) to him, that is not possible. Shaykh Rabī explained, "It is not permissible for a Muslim to hesitate in making takfīr of this person should he be found. However, at the same time, **this is a theoretical scenario that does not occur in reality or practically**, since its occurrence cannot be imagined from a Muslim and the Sharī'ah rulings are not based upon rare occurrences as Ibn al-Qayyim (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said."²⁵ Shaykh Rabī also said, "[The concept of] *jins al-‘amal* is **imaginary, hypothetical**, we do not enter into these mazes (of confusion). We say that īmān is speech, action and belief, and it is vital for there to be action. The one who says action is not from īmān is a Murjī', misguided."²⁶ And this is where we are led to the second consideration:

2. **When do we make takfīr of a Muslim who has correctly entered into Islam but is sinful and neglects his obligatory duties?** Here we are dealing with a judgement of takfīr upon an actual person and so the issue we are dealing with is a practical matter. When can we judge a Muslim who has entered into Islām to be a disbeliever? If he brings a *nāqīḍ*, nullifier of Islām, he knowingly commits major shirk or major kufr, then this is clear. But we are not talking about this, we are talking about **abandoning righteous actions**. The greatest of them is the ṣalāh (prayer). In the takfīr of the one who abandons ṣalāh there is the well known difference of opinion from the Salaf to this time of ours.²⁷ And if abandoning the ṣalāh does not take a person out of Islām, upon one of the two views, then abandoning the other actions individually will not take him out of Islām either. This then leads to the question of a person who abandons the obligations.

And it is here now that we come to the situation under contention:

Can it be possible for a person to affirm both of these matters together? Meaning, to affirm that the inward is tied to the outward and at the same time not make takfīr of the one who has the basis of īmān in his heart (*taṣḍīq* and *inqiyāḍ*), has uttered the shahādah, but is extremely sinful, does not perform his obligations and falls into the prohibitions and dies without praying or bringing the rest of the obligations or righteous deeds?

²⁵ Refer to *Ittiḥāf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-‘Urfān*, pp. 253-254.

²⁶ From a telephone recording which took place on 09/03/1421H and which was subsequently published, along with a telephone conversation with Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn, in a cassette entitled, "*Difā‘an an il-Albānī*" (In Defence of al-Albānī) by Mu‘assah Majālis al-Hudā in Algeria.

²⁷ The Ḥaddādiyyah ignore that this difference has existed from the Salaf, from the time of tābi‘īn such as Imām al-Zuhrī (d. 124H) and those after him such as Imām Mālik, Ḥammād bin Zayd, Imām al-Shāfi‘ī and others.

Statements of the Scholars Regarding Prayer and Outward Actions

This is a view found amongst a faction of Ahl al-Sunnah past and present²⁸ and it is held in light of Sharī'ah texts.²⁹ Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī, in his commentary on the ḥadīth, "*Islām is founded on five...*" related by al-Bukhārī in Kitāb al-Īmān, he said, "And the meaning of his statement (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), "*Islām is built upon five...*" is that the likeness of Islām is that of a building and these five are the supporting pillars of the building upon which the building is established... And when these are the foundations and pillars of the building, the remaining qualities of Islām are like the remaining parts of building. If anything of these other qualities which enter into the obligatory meaning (part) of īmān are lost, the building will be deficient but will not be demolished by its absence. And as for these five, when all of them cease then the building will fall and will not remain established after its cessation. Likewise (the building will fall), if the greatest pillar ceases, which is the two testifications (shahādātān). Its cessation occurs by bringing that which invalidates it [in belief, speech and action] and cannot be reconciled it. **As for when then remaining four cease, the scholars have differed.** Does the label (of īmān, islām) cease when they cease, or when any one of them ceases or does it not cease? Is it to be distinguished between prayer and other (pillars) such that it ceases by [abandonment] of prayer but not others? Or is the cessation of Islām by the abandonment of prayer and zakāh specifically? In all of this there is the well-known difference (between the Scholars). And all of these statements have been cited from Imām Aḥmad...³⁰ **And as for the remaining qualities of Islām and īmān, then a servant does not exit from Islām through their abandonment in the view of Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah.** It is the Khārijites and their likes from Ahl al-Bid'ah who opposed in this matter. Thus, all of the additional qualities of Islām beyond its five pillars and its (five) foundations, when anything from them ceases, the building will become deficient, but the foundation of the building will not be destroyed through that deficiency."³¹

Since there is no agreement or consensus on the abandonment of the remaining four pillars,³² then abandonment of the outward obligations not amounting to kufr is a view that

²⁸ Shaykh Rabī' is writing against the Ḥaddādiyyah to defend these Scholars from being accused with Irjā' and he is explaining that their view is not a view that is outside of Ahl al-Sunnah but has a basis in authentic ḥadīths that cannot be subject to ta'wīl.

²⁹ And their view is different to that of the Murji'ah who say abandoning prayer is not disbelief, because prayer is an outward action and outward actions are not from īmān. Rather, this faction of Ahl al-Sunnah say, prayer is from īmān as are all outward actions, but evidence from the Book and the Sunnah indicate that the one who abandons it is not a disbeliever but one who is very sinful and deficient in īmān.

³⁰ Here Ibn Rajab cites the various opinions from the Companions and the Salaf regarding the abandonment of the four pillars.

³¹ In his Faṭḥ al-Bārī (Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 1/20 onwards).

³² Shaykh Muḥammad bin 'Abd al-Wahhāb said, "The five pillars of Islam. The first of them [by which he disbelieves] is the two testimonies of faith. And then the remaining four pillars. **However, if he affirms their obligation but abandons them out of neglect, then even though we fight him in order to make him act upon them, we do not declare him a disbeliever by mere abandonment of them.** The scholars have differed about the disbelief of the one who abandoned the prayer out of

is held and spoken by factions of Ahl al-Sunnah, and they are not from the Murji'ah as they hold actions are part of īmān and īmān increases and decreases and that the one who neglects his obligations is a disobedient sinner, deficient in īmān.

Imām Ibn Bāz was asked the question "Are the scholars who speak with the absence of takfir of the one who leaves all of the actions of the limbs while at the same time professing the two testimonies with his tongue and having the basis of īmān present in his heart from amongst the Murji'ah?" And he answered, "No. This one is from Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah. Whoever speaks with the absence of takfir of the one who leaves fasting or zakāh or Ḥajj – this one (i.e. the one who leaves these matters) is not a kāfir. However, he has committed a great sin. In the view of some scholars he is a kāfir, however the correct view is that he does not become a disbeliever with the major kufr. As for the one who leaves the prayer then **the most correct view (al-arjah)** is that this is major kufr when it is abandoned deliberately..."³³

The Permanent Committee for Research and Verdicts was asked, "A man says '*There is none worthy of worship but Allāh alone and Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh*' but he does not perform the four pillars of prayer, zakāh, fasting and Ḥajj and he does not perform the other actions requested in the Sharī'ah. Does this person deserve the intercession of the Prophet (ﷺ) on the Day of Judgement so that he will not enter the Fire even for a limited period? And they answered, "Whoever said '*There is none worthy of worship but Allāh alone and Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh*' and abandoned the prayer, zakāh and Ḥajj whilst rejecting the obligation of these four pillars, or one of them, after (the proof has) reached him, he is an apostate from Islām, his repentance is to be sought and if he repents, his repentance is accepted and will be worthy of (receiving) intercession on the Day of Judgement if he died upon faith. But if he persisted in his rejection the ruler would kill him due to his disbelief and apostasy, and he will have no share of the intercession of the Prophet (ﷺ) or other than him on the Day of Judgement. And if he abandoned prayer alone out of laziness and laxity, then his a disbeliever with a disbelief through which he exits from the religion of Islām in the most correct of the two sayings of the Scholars. How then when he combines the abandonment of zakāh, fasting and pilgrimage to Allāh's Sanctified House alongside it?! So upon this, he will not be deserving of the intercession of the Prophet (ﷺ) or others if he died upon this state. **And those from the scholars who said that by abandoning these pillars he is a disbeliever only through the disbelief of action which does not expel him from the fold Islām, they hold that he will be deserving of receiving intercession, even if he was committing what are major sins, if he died as a**

laziness, without wilful denial, juhood. So we do not perform takfir on account of anything except what the all of the scholars are united upon, **and that is the two testimonies of faith.**" al-Durar al-Saniyyah (1/70). Meaning that they make takfir of anyone who violates the two testimonies through committing that which is unanimously agreed upon to be major kufr and shirk (in belief, speech or deed) and abandonment of prayer is not agreed upon.

³³ Hiwaar Hawla Masaa'il it-Takfeer Ma'a Allaamah ash-Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Ibn Baaz and it is found also in al-Furqaan Magazine (no. 94). Shaykh Ibn Bāz did not consider the view presented in the question to be Irjā' even though he holds the view of takfir of whoever abandons the prayer.

believer."³⁴ Signed by ‘Abdullāh bin Qu‘ūd, ‘Abdullāh bin Ghudayān, ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-‘Afīfī, and ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Bin Bāz.

Ibn al-Bannā’ al-Ḥanbalī (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) (d. 471H) said, "**Chapter:** And [belief in] the intercession of our Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) for the people of major sins from his ummah, in opposition to the Qadariyyah [Mu‘tazilah] in their saying, "There is no intercession for him." And whoever entered the Hellfire for punishment will exit from it in our view due to his (the Prophet's) intercession and the intercession of others besides him and also due to the mercy of Allāh (عَزَّ وَجَلَّ), until there does not remain anyone in the Fire who said only once in the life of the world, 'Lā ilāha illallāh' out of sincerity, and believed in it, even if he did not perform the acts of obedience after that."³⁵

Ibn Taymiyyah (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said, "The Muslims are unanimously agreed that whoever does not bring the two testimonials (of faith) is a disbeliever. As for the four deeds (pillars), then they have differed regarding takfīr of the one who abandoned them. And when we say that Ahl al-Sunnah are agreed that a person does not disbelieve on account of sin, then we mean the acts of disobedience such as fornication and drinking. As for these four pillars, then there is the well known dispute regarding takfīr of the one who abandons them. And there are varied statements³⁶ related from Aḥmad regarding that, and the first of those narrations is that the one who abandons any one of (the four) becomes a disbeliever. This is the preference of Abu Bakr and a faction of the associates of Imām Mālik such as Ibn Ḥabīb. And a second narration from him is that he disbelieves only through abandonment of prayer and zakāh. And a third narration is that he does not disbelieve except through abandoning prayer and zakāh when the imām (leader) fights him over the [performance] of these two (obligations). And the fourth is that he does not disbelieve except through abandonment of prayer. **And the fifth is that he does not disbelieve through the abandonment of any of them. And these (different) statements are known to the Salaf.**"³⁷

³⁴ Majmū‘ Fatāwā al-Lajnah al-Dā‘imah (2/39-40). Note that those who hold this view are not accused of Irjā’.

³⁵ Al-Radd ‘alā al-Mubtadi‘ah (p. 195) as cited by Shaykh Rabī in his article *al-Ḥaddādiyyah Tatasaaqqat al-Āthār al-Wāhiyah wal-Uṣūl al-Fāsīdah* and he commented upon it by saying, "He has based this upon the ḥadīths of intercession and upon the excellence of Tawḥīd, and this is with the condition that he remains established upon Tawḥīd until he dies upon it and does not bring anything of shirk and kufr that invalidates it, and nor anything that removes ikhlāṣ (sincerity). I hold that there is some laxity in his saying 'who said only once in the life of the world'."

³⁶ Meaning that these are statements related from Imām Aḥmad and that this was a subject of discussion and debate in that Aḥmad changed his views at different times based on evidences.

³⁷ Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (7/302). One can appreciate the significance of the warnings of Shaykh Rabī bin Hādī against this sect since their appearance in the mid-1990s, close to 20 years ago. They came from the remnants of al-Ikhwān and the Takfīrī groups. Today, these Ḥaddādī extremists have appeared pushing views which grant ideological support to those **Dogs of Hellfire** who are claiming a khilāfah in Syria and ‘Irāq (ISIS) who have slaughtered Sunnī Muslims and continue to do so. These Ḥaddādīs are more or less explicitly making takfīr of the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah and even the likes of Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Abd al-Wahhāb are not immune from and safe from their tongues. From these extremist, oppressive vile Ḥaddādīs is one named Abu ‘Abdullāh Yūsuf al-Zākūrī. This individual has accused the Salafī Scholars of "arguing in favour of the ignorant amongst the mushriks and showing

Muḥammad bin Naṣr al-Marwazī (رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) said, "We have quoted the statement of those who declare the one who abandons prayer deliberately to be a disbeliever and we have cited the sum of what they have used as proof, and this is the madhhab of the majority of Ahl al-Ḥadīth. But another group has opposed them from the Aṣ-ḥāb al-Ḥadīth, and they refused to make takfīr of the one who abandons prayer unless he abandoned it whilst rejecting (its obligation), arrogant refusal, belittlement, and stubborn, wilful rejection. Only then is takfīr made of him. **And some of them said that abandoning prayer is like the abandonment of all the other obligations (farā'id), such as zakāh, fasting in Ramaḍān and Ḥajj.** And they said: The narrations which have come regarding the negation of faith (ikfār) through abandonment of prayer are like the narrations which negate faith through all the (various) sins." ³⁸

Imām Ibn Baz (رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) within his response to the question, "Is īmān with the heart sufficient such that a Muslim person is far away from (performing) prayer, fasting and zakāh?" - after clarifying that outward actions are necessary along with inward īmān, and discussing the ruling on the abandoning the four pillars, he said: "As for the two testifications, when he testifies that Allāh is the Lord of all (things), the deity of all things and that there is no deity besides Him, meaning no ma'būd (deity) that is worshipped in truth besides Him, and the testification that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh, then these two testifications are the foundation (aṣl) of the religion, they are the foundation (asās) of the religion. **Thus, a group of the people of knowledge have adopted the view, and it is the saying of the majority of the Jurists, that he becomes a Muslim by way of this, even if he does not pray, so long as he believes in the obligation of the prayer, fasting and Ḥajj and so on. However, he does not perform them, he is lazy. Then the majority of the Jurists (are of the view) that he is not a disbeliever with the major disbelief, when he abandons that. He remains a sinful**

*friendliness with their scholars" and that their da'wah is "only to obliterate the signposts of Tawḥīd and to revive the religion of 'Amr bin Luḥay [pre-Islāmic mushrik] in the garment of Salafiyyah" and that "they portray themselves to the common-folk that they are the guardians of Tawḥīd and its callers whereas in reality they are its enemies to it and haters of it." He says about them, "their call is only one, to argue on behalf of the mushriks in general and to venerate them whilst deceiving the people through ascription to Salafiyyah and the call to Tawḥīd" and he says immediately thereafter, "so does anyone doubt today that they are more dangerous than the mushriks themselves, because they conceal themselves with Tawḥīd, yet aid its opposite and they claim to make war against Shirk yet defend its people and love them." With all of these grave and mighty oppressions, he accuses the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah of being the "Contemporary institute of Irjā". And the basis upon which he makes these clear statements of takfīr is that those scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah **do not make takfīr of the one who abandons the outward obligations** and that **they grant the excuse of ignorance to a Muslim who has fallen into matters of kufr or shirk as part of establishing the proof.** Whoever reflects upon all of this will realize that not even Imām Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, nor the Scholars of Najd or the contemporary scholars such as Ibn al-'Uthaymīn and even al-Fawzān are immune from these people in reality, despite their display of an attachment to them and their attempts at soliciting verdicts from them against other Scholars. Refer to: <http://www.sahab.net/forums/index.php?showtopic=146095>.*

³⁸ Ta'dhīm Qadar al-Ṣalāt (2/936). Meaning, that those texts which attribute kufr to the one who abandons the prayer are similar to other texts that attribute lesser kufr to those who fall into major sins, that the kufr being referred to is the lesser kufr, not the kufr that expels from Islām.

Muslim who is in danger of entering the Fire and he will not disbelieve through that. And a group of the people of knowledge have adopted the view that abandonment of the prayer is major kufr and this is the stronger view as has preceded and it is the most correct...³⁹

Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān was asked, "Is the one who does not declare the abandoner of prayer to be a disbeliever from the Murji'ah?" to which he replied, "Yes, he has a type of Irjā', this is a type of Irjā' if he believes that action is not from īmān, and from (this action) is the prayer, then yes, this one is a Murji'. **But as for when he believes that action is from īmān but he said the one who abandons prayer does not disbelieve, just like all the other actions (the abandonment of which) causes īmān to decrease, then this one has taken the statement (position) of some of the Scholars.**"⁴⁰ And they have doubts, they have doubts (for their position), they are not considered Murji'ah. If he depends upon a saying (of scholars) and upon doubts he uses as evidence, it is not said that he is a Murji'. It is said that he is errant, it is said that he is errant, yes."⁴¹

Shaykh 'Abd al-Laṭīf bin 'Abd al-Raḥmān bin Ḥasan 'Āl al-Shaykh (رحمته الله) said, "**The third foundation:** That īmān is composed of (both) speech and action. Speech is of two types, the speech of the heart, which is its belief, and speech of the tongue, which is to speak with the word of Islām [the kalimah]. And action is of two types, the action of the heart, which is its intent (qaṣd), choice (ikhtiyār), love (maḥabbah), pleasure (riḍā) and its assent (taṣdīq). And (the second type), the actions of the limbs such as prayer, zakāh, ḥajj, jihād and what is like them from the outward actions. Now when the taṣdīq (assent) of the heart ceases, and its pleasure, love for Allāh, its truthfulness, then īmān in its entirety, ceases (to exist). And when any of the actions cease, such as prayer, Ḥajj, jihād, whilst the assent (taṣdīq) and acceptance (qābūl) of the heart remains, then this is a point of difference. Does īmān cease in its entirety when he leaves any of the Islāmic pillars such as prayer, Ḥajj, zakāh and fasting? Or does it not cease? And does the one who abandons it or not? And is it distinguished between prayer and other than it or not? Ahl al-Sunnah are agreed that there must be action of the heart which is its love, pleasure, compliance (inqiyāḍ) and the Murji'ah say assent (taṣdīq) is sufficient alone, and through that he becomes a believer. **But [after we enter the actions of the heart into īmān] the difference over the actions of the limbs, does he become a disbeliever or not (through their abandonment) is present between Ahl al-Sunnah.** That which is known from the Salaf is takfīr of the one who

³⁹ Fatāwā Nūr 'alā al-Darb, refer to: <http://www.binbaz.org.sa/mat/10279>.

⁴⁰ There is a difference between those who are Murji'ah, fundamentally, like the Mātūrīdī Ḥanafīs, and who on the basis of their doctrine, say that the one who abandons prayer is not a disbeliever (because outward actions are not from īmān), and between those from Ahl al-Sunnah who say actions are from the reality of īmān, part of it, and then due to evidences they provide, hold that the one who abandons prayer is not a disbeliever. And this also indicates that not making takfīr on the basis of abandoning an outward action does not mean that a person has expelled that outward action from īmān. Rather, when a person holds that īmān decreases through abandonment of outward action, then it is not possible for that person to be upon Irjā'.

⁴¹ Refer to <http://www.alfawzan.af.org.sa/node/5059> for audio. Local copy saved.

abandoned any one of the Islāmic pillars such as prayer, zakāh, fasting and Ḥajj. **And the second saying is that no one disbelieves except the one who rejects [their obligation].**"⁴²

In his commentary on the remark of Ibn Abī al-ʿIzz's (in his explanation of al-Ṭahāwī's creed), *"And they are in agreement that if he believed with his heart, affirmed with his tongue but withheld from acting with his limbs, he is disobedient to Allāh and His Messenger, deserving of punishment"*, **Imām Ibn Bāz** (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said, "If this agreement (consensus) is authentic from the Murji'ah, then what the explainer (Ibn Abī al-ʿIzz) has stated, in that the difference between Ahl al-Sunnah and the Murji'ah is only a matter of wording, it would be close (to the truth), if they (the Murji'ah) were in agreement that whoever believed with his heart, and assented with his tongue but did not comply in his action, he did not pray or fast, that he is deserving of punishment or entry into the Hellfire, then this is the saying of Ahl al-Sunnah."⁴³ However, we then read their statement that he is a perfect in faith (kāmil al-īmān), due to the faith of his heart and tongue (alone). When he says (about such a one) that he is perfect in faith, how can this be a consensus?! When he is perfect in faith, how can he be subject to a threat (of punishment)?⁴⁴ So citing a consensus alongside the statement of the Murji'ah that actions are not from īmān requires some inspection." The Shaykh was then asked, "The one who believes with his heart and tongue and does not act with his limbs?" to which he responded, **"This is a point of difference between the Scholars.** Whoever said abandonment of prayer is (major) disbelief says that he will remain eternally in the Fire. **And whoever said it is minor disbelief, then his ruling is the ruling upon all of the major sins, he is under the will (of Allāh).**"⁴⁵

From what has preceded, those who hold abandonment of prayer to be kufr, then they will not consider such a person to be a believer and will hold that his abandonment of prayer invalidates his īmān, showing the **absence** of it. And those who hold otherwise say his īmān will be severely deficient and **weak**, earning a person great punishment in the Hereafter. In both of these views, the principle of the link between the inward and the outward is maintained. This principle would only be violated if one said that abandoning prayer, (or other obligations) does not decrease īmān, rather īmān always remains intact and that the one who abandons the obligations is perfect in his īmān. This is the actual saying of the Murji'ah.⁴⁶

⁴² Al-Durar al-Saniyyah (1/479).

⁴³ Shaykh Ibn Bāz is pointing out here if this is in reality what they believe, then it can said in fairness, the difference between them and Ahl al-Sunnah is one of wording only, whilst they agree in reality. However that is not the case, because the Murji'ah also say at the same time that the one who did not comply in his action is perfect in faith. How can a person be perfect and complete in faith without bringing any action? So when the Murji'ah also have this statement, it shows that the difference with them is not in wording only, but in reality. Since, through this statement, they have expelled actions from īmān.

⁴⁴ In other words, this is a contradiction. He cannot be both subject to the threat of punishment for neglectation of his obligations and also be perfect, complete in faith!

⁴⁵ Al-Ta'liqāt al-Bāziyyah 'alā Sharḥ al-Ṭahāwiyyah (Dār Ibn al-Athīr, 2/751-752).

⁴⁶ Shaykh Rabī bin Hādī is writing to defend the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah from the time of the Salaf to this day of ours of being accused with Irjā' on this issue of abandonment of prayer and other

Understanding the Two Views of Ahl al-Sunnah

We can appreciate these two views in relation to īmān and the presence and absence of takfīr on the basis of abandoning the four obligations through the speech of Ibn Taymiyyah (رحمته الله) who said, "The basis of īmān is in the heart, and this is the speech and action of the heart, and this is its affirmation (iqrār) and assent (taṣdīq) and its love (ḥubb) and compliance (inqiyād). **And whatever is in the heart then what it necessitates and requires must appear upon the limbs. And when (a person) does not act upon what it necessitates and requires (of the external actions) this indicates its absence or its weakness. And for this reason, the outward actions are from the obligatory requirement of the īmān of the heart and they are necessarily required by it, and they [the actions] constitute an affirmation (taṣdīq) of what is in the heart, giving evidence (dalīl) to it, being a witness (shāhid) over it. And they [the actions] constitute a branch from the totality of absolute īmān, forming a part of it. However, whatever is in the heart is the foundation (asl) of what emanates from the limbs.**"⁴⁷

From this statement of Ibn Taymiyyah "*this indicates its absence or its weakness*", there are two situations alluded to. The first situation is that a person does not bring any external actions because he is devoid of the taṣdīq or actions of the heart (inqiyād) and is in reality a hypocrite, disbeliever whose apparent entry into Islām is not valid because either the taṣdīq of the heart or its action (inqiyād and what follows it) is absent. This includes the person who has taṣdīq in his heart, knows and affirms that none has the right to be worshipped but Allāh and that Muḥammad is His Messenger, but refuses to pray, fast, give zakāh, persisting in their abandonment. This indicates the absence of the action of the heart (inqiyād) even though the taṣdīq of the heart is present and indicates a type of 'inād (wilful, stubborn refusal) which is kufr in itself.⁴⁸

obligations. And one can see that he is more than justified in doing that, and this is a noble endeavour. The Ḥaddādiyyah unable to respond are using the tactics of their predecessors, from the Qutbiyyah, Surūriyyah, who, being bankrupt in terms of evidences to support their deviant activities, were running to the Major Scholars of the time to solicit speech against Shaykh Rabī' and the Shaykhs of Madīnah who were exposing their evil. This is what the Ḥaddādiyyah are doing now by misrepresenting the views and positions of Shaykh Rabī' and trying to get speech from the Muftī, or Shaykh al-Fawzān and others.

⁴⁷ Majmū' al-Fatāwā (7/644).

⁴⁸ The Murji'ah claimed that Paradise is obligatory for such a person! There is a difference between **a)** the one who has taṣdīq and then intends not to perform any obligations or deeds, out of stubborn, wilful opposition ('inād). Such a person is a kāfir because of the absence of the action of the heart. And then **b)** the one who has taṣdīq and has the foundation of the actions of the heart, inqiyād and makes iqrār outwardly (with the shahādah) and knows he must fulfil obligations and act, and acknowledges that through his inqiyād, but is extremely weak and neglects the obligations, then this is a different situation, and Ahl al-Sunnah consider such a one as an evil sinner who will be punished. With respect to the first person, the Murji'ah say that person is a perfect believer upon whom Paradise is obligatory! And with respect to the second, it is a view expressed by factions of Ahl al-Sunnah.

The second situation is an extremely sinful Muslim, whose īmān is in fact present (taṣdīq along with inqiyād), his īmān has manifested outwardly by his affirmation (iqrār) through the shahādah, but this īmān is so weak and so miniscule that aside from the shahādah, it did not push him to do any action and did not prevent him from falling into sin, despite his ability to do action. So all he has is the shahādah. He did not fall into any act of shirk and kufr⁴⁹, but he abandoned the obligations and fell into sin. This person is an evil sinner with a weak, deficient, tiny amount of īmān who will be subject to great punishment in the Hereafter.⁵⁰

This view is found amongst a faction of the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah. They hold that a person who pronounced the two shahādahs with the belief of the heart, did not pray, fast or perform other good deeds, that he is a sinner, deficient in his īmān, that he deserves severe punishment in the Fire, but is not a disbeliever. This does not invalidate the principle of the connection between the inward and the outward. If we are able to accept that whoever does not make takfīr of the one who abandons prayer has not expelled prayer from īmān, then the same can be said about other branches of īmān that are less than the prayer.⁵¹ What it indicates is the severe weakness of īmān (for those who do not make takfīr), or its absence (for those who do make takfīr).

⁴⁹ Upon the view of those that leaving prayer is not major kufr.

⁵⁰ The Murji'ah would claim this one is a believer, **having the rank and status of īmān**, above and beyond Islām. This is a mistake and an error, and a refutation of this is found in statements of the Salaf - and this is also connected to the issue of the difference between Islām and īmān which the Salaf discussed as part of their refutations of the Murji'ah.

⁵¹ It is here wherein lies the greatest problem for the Ḥaddādiyyah - everything hinges around the ṣalāh, the prayer. In order to build their accusation of Irjā' they have to insist that the position of not making takfīr of the one who abandons prayer is Irjā' and that only the Murji'ah hold this view or those affected by them. These people have known for a few decades that everything revolves around this one crucial issue. This is why Safar al-Ḥawālī stated **"And no one says that the one who abandons it (the prayer) is not a kāfir except one who has been affected by the (thought of) al-Irjā', whether he realises it or not."**!! (Dhāhirat ul-Irjā' 2/650-651). And this is what the Ḥaddādiyyah today are saying, they know this is the crucial issue. The explanation for this is that if we accept the absence of takfīr of the one who abandons prayer is a legitimate view, then we have to accept that not making takfīr due to abandonment of the prayer does not mean you have said the prayer is **not** from īmān. Thus, when you say, "*Leaving prayer is not kufr*", that does not mean you have said "*Prayer is not from īmān*" and likewise, "*Not fasting is not kufr*", that does not mean you have said, "*Fasting is not from īmān*" and likewise, when you say, "*Not praying, fasting, and giving zakah (whilst believing in their obligation) is not kufr*" this does not mean you have said, "*Prayer, fasting and zakāh are not from īmān*" and so on. The Ḥaddādiyyah Khārijīyyah know that this argument is sound and cannot be refuted and this is why in order to successfully construct their accusation of Irjā' against Ahl al-Sunnah, they have to focus on the prayer (ṣalāh), the intelligent ones amongst them know this very well. **They have to establish that not making takfīr of the one who abandons prayer is tantamount to saying actions are not from īmān.** However, they cannot rely just on the issue of prayer, because of the difficulty they know they will encounter (due to the accepted difference of opinion in this issue), so they bring other issues to make them numerous so that collectively, they can make their accusation stronger. Thus, the issue of **the excuse of ignorance** (al-udhru bil-jahl) and likewise trying to insist **that jins al-'amal is a pillar in the definition of īmān** when none of the Salaf spoke of it as such and so on.

The Difference Between Ahl al-Sunnah and the Murji'ah

In further, explanation of this, when we have a person who has taṣdīq in his heart (speech of the heart) and also the inqiyāḍ of the heart (its action) and then he utters the shahādah, **he has brought something of outward īmān**, here we have affirmed the binding link between what is inward and outward, this principle has not been violated, since the speech of the tongue is from the dhāhir (what is outward).⁵² As for what comes thereafter, of the other pillars, the obligations, then their performance depends on the strength or weakness of what is in the heart of the foundation of īmān.

The Murji'ah at this point say this person has completed īmān and his īmān does not increase or decrease and whatever he brings on top of this is a by-product of īmān and not from īmān itself. Thus, praying, fasting, zakāh, righteousness to parents and bringing other obligations, and abandoning major and minor sins **will not increase a person's īmān** as it is already perfect and complete in their view and neglecting the obligations and committing sins **will not harm or decrease a person's īmān** in their view.

At this juncture, before we contrast the above views of the Murji'ah with the views of Ahl al-Sunnah, **there are two important statements** of Ibn Taymiyyah (رحمته الله) that are vital here and they should be read and understood with the previous quote about the **absence or weakness** of īmān in the heart. In explanation of the errors of the Murji'ah, he said, "The third [of their errors]: Their presumption that the īmān that is in the heart can be complete (tām) without anything of the actions. For this reason they make the actions to be a fruit (thamrah) of īmān and a requirement (muqtaḍā) of it, at the same level of a cause with its effect, and they do not make [the actions] binding (lāzimah) to it. **That which is correct is that complete īmān in the heart requires outward action that is in accordance with it, no doubt.** And it is impossible for there to be **complete īmān** established in the heart without any outward action. For this reason, they began to estimate issues whose occurrence is impossible due to the absence of establishing the connection between the body and the heart. For example, that they say 'A man in whose heart there is īmān the likes of which is in the heart of Abū Bakr and 'Umar, yet he does not make a single prostration to Allāh, does not fast Ramaḍān, fornicates with his mother and sister, drinks intoxicants during the days of Ramaḍān.' They say, 'This is a believer complete in īmān.' And all believers show the severest of rejection against this (saying)."⁵³ And the second statement is his saying, "Thus, it cannot be imagined that alongside the obligatory perfection of īmān (**kamāl al-īmān al-wājib**) that is in the heart, the outward obligatory actions (**al-a'māl al-dhāhirah al-wājibah**)

⁵² Ibn Taymiyyah said, "And from this we know that whoever's heart believed with a firm, resolute faith, it is impossible for him not to speak with the two testimonials (of faith) whilst having the ability to do so. For not uttering the two testimonials whilst having the ability necessitates the absence of the complete faith of the heart. And through this, the error of Jahm (bin Ṣafwān) and whoever followed him in their claim that pure faith (in the heart alone) without the outward īmān will benefit in the Hereafter, becomes clear, because this is impossible." (Majmū' al-Fatāwā 7/553). The expression of the tongue is considered from the dhāhir (outward), from the outward īmān.

⁵³ Majmū' al-Fatāwā (7/204). This is a clear contradiction.

should be absent. Rather, it is necessarily binding from the existence of this (the inward obligatory īmān in the heart) in a perfect way, the existence of this (the outward obligatory actions) in a perfect way. Just as it is necessarily binding from the deficiency (naqṣ) in this (the inward obligatory īmān), the deficiency in this (the outward obligatory actions), since the consideration of **complete īmān** in the heart without any outward **speech or action**, is like the consideration of a complete mūjib (that which requires by necessity) without its mūjab (the necessary requirement), and a complete cause (‘illāh) without its effect (ma‘lūl), and this is impossible."⁵⁴

One can see the error of the Murji'ah who said there can exist **complete, perfect īmān** in the heart without any outward action that is in accordance to it. Complete and perfect īmān in the heart should manifest actions that reflect that completion and perfection of īmān in the heart, there should be a respective completion outwardly. Thus, the īmān in the heart of Abū Bakr (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) produced the outward actions (of īmān) of Abū Bakr. The Murji'ah claimed an impossible situation of there being complete, perfect faith in the heart in the presence of the greatest of major sins such as drinking and fornication and the abandonment of the great obligations such as prayer and fasting. Ahl al-Sunnah do not speak with this. Those who do not make takfīr of the one who abandons prayer and hold the view that he who neglects the outward obligations and falls into major sins is a sinner, **they do not say he has complete īmān in the heart, unlike the Murji'ah**. Rather, they say he has the lowest, the weakest, the most miniscule of īmān, until it can reach less than an atom's weight. The Murji'ah do not believe īmān can decrease. The principle being alluded to here is that weak īmān in the heart will produce weak outward action and strong īmān in the heart will produce strong outward action and this is the nature of the link between the heart and the body. Those from Ahl al-Sunnah who hold this position (of the one with no righteous deeds being removed from the Hellfire) affirm the link between the heart and body and say that the severe weakness in the īmān of such a person did not lead him to perform any righteous deeds, after his outward iqrār (affirmation of the shahādah with sincerity and acceptance).

In contrast to the Murji'ah whose views have preceded, it is the view of the Salaf, as explained by Ibn Taymiyyah in Kitāb al-Īmān, that if (after his outward affirmation of the

⁵⁴ Majmū' al-Fatāwā (7/582). You have to carefully ponder over this very carefully and make sure you do not miss how this uncovers the baseless accusation of Irjā' made by the Quṭbiyyah, Takfīriyyah, Ḥaddādiyyah, and the key to it lies in the fact that what is being spoken of here is **complete, perfect īmān** (*al-īmān al-tām, al-īmān al-kāmil*) in the heart, that this must bring about outward speech and action by necessity, and this is agreed by everyone, even those who say abandoning the outward obligations is not disbelief. The scenario that is the point of contention and for which the ḥadīths of shafā'ah are an evidence for a faction of Ahl al-Sunnah is that there is a level of īmān in the heart that reaches even lower than an atom's weight. And this amount of īmān can only produce an outward īmān that corresponds to that, like for like, which aside from the shahādah that was expressed with sincerity, can amount to very little if anything. And that's why in the ḥadīth it states that such people *never did any good whatsoever* and were punished severely for that in the Fire. This in no way means that this faction from Ahl al-Sunnah have expelled actions from īmān, as is clear.

shahādah) he brings the pillars (arkān) and remaining obligations (wājibāt) he has brought the perfection of īmān that is obligatory upon him (kamāl al-īmān al-wājib) and he is from the muqtasidīn, the people of the right hand. Here we say that he has the obligatory perfection of īmān in his heart and likewise he has brought the obligatory īmān in his outward actions, like for like, all of which is due specifically upon him in his personal situation and circumstances.⁵⁵ And if he adds the recommendations (mustahabbāt), he has brought the recommended perfection of īmān (kamāl al-īmān al-mustahabb) he is from the foremost in good deeds (al-sābiqīn). And if he neglects the obligations he is a wrongdoer (dhālim), deficient in īmān and subject to punishment in the Fire and his outward neglect and oppression is an indication of the weakness and deficiency of what is in his heart of īmān. This categorization of the people is indicated in the Book of Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) where the believers are divided into the three categories just mentioned:

ثُمَّ أَوْثَرْنَا الَّذِينَ أَصْطَفَيْنَا مِنْ عِبَادِنَا فَمِنْهُمْ ظَالِمٌ لِنَفْسِهِ وَمِنْهُمْ مُقْتَصِدٌ وَمِنْهُمْ سَابِقٌ

بِالْخَيْرَاتِ يَأْذِنُ اللَّهُ ذَلِكَ هُوَ الْفَضْلُ الْكَبِيرُ ﴿٣٢﴾

Then we caused to inherit the Book those We have chosen of Our servants; and among them is he who wrongs himself, and among them is he who is moderate, and among them is he who is foremost in good deeds by permission of Allah . That [inheritance] is what is the great bounty. (35:32).

As for the Murji'ah they do not accept īmān increases or decreases or that the Believers vary in their īmān⁵⁶ and the Extremists amongst the Murji'ah hold that it is not possible for

⁵⁵ This is because **the obligatory amount of īmān required** varies from person to person in accordance with circumstances as Ibn Taymiyyah explains elsewhere, this being another rebuttal of one of the errors of the Murji'ah. Ibn Taymiyyah said, "And they (the Murji'ah) erred from numerous angles. The first of them: Their presumption that the īmān that Allāh has obligated upon the servants is equivalent with respect to all the servants and that the like of īmān that is obligatory upon one person is equally obligatory every person, but the affair is not like that. For Allāh obligated upon the followers of the preceding Prophets such faith which he did not obligate upon the ummah of Muhammad (ﷺ) and he obligated upon the ummah of Muḥammad (ﷺ) what he did not obligate upon other than them. And the īmān that used to be obligatory before the revelation of the entire Qur'an was not like the īmān that was obligatory after the revelation of the (entire) Qur'an. And the īmān that is obligatory upon the one who knew what the Messenger (ﷺ) informed of in detail is not like the īmān that is obligatory upon the one who knew what he informed about only generally..." Refer to Majmū' al-Fatāwā (7/196 onwards for the full discussion of this point).

⁵⁶ If you believe īmān increases and decreases, you have **automatically affirmed actions are from īmān**, since its increase and decrease can only be on the basis that actions are from īmān. Ismā'il bin Sa'īd said: I asked Aḥmad about the one who said, "īmān increases and decreases" so he said, "This one is free of al-Irjā'." Al-Sunnah of al-Khallāl (3/582). And Imām al-Barbahārī said, "Whoever says that īmān is speech and action and increases and decreases then he has exited from Irjā', its beginning and its end." Sharh al-Sunnah (p. 123). The one who says abandoning prayer is not kufr, but a person's īmān is severely deficient, this person cannot be from the Murji'ah - despite all the

a person who utters the shahādah to enter the Fire to begin with⁵⁷ and amongst them are those who presume matters which are impossible, such as the claim of the existence of **complete, perfect īmān in the heart** alongside calamitous sins and neglect of the greatest of obligations.

In light of the above, it is possible for a person from Ahl al-Sunnah to hold the view that abandoning prayer is not kufr (disbelief), to affirm that the īmān is taṣdīq and inqiyād (what is inward in the heart) as well as the speech of the tongue (which is outward) that outward actions are from the reality of īmān, that what is inward must show outwardly, that the heart is connected to the body, and that if a person neglects the obligations and falls into major sins, that his īmān is extremely weak (and can diminish to an atom's weight) and that he will be punished⁵⁸ - a person can believe all of this without it necessitating that he has expelled actions from īmān or agreed with the Murji'ah. From the evidences of those who speak with this view is the ḥadīth of 'Ubādah bin al-Ṣāmit (رضي الله عنه) who said that the Messenger of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, *"There are five prayers which Allāh has prescribed upon the servants. Whoever performed them, without neglecting anything from them belittling their due right thereby, then he has a covenant with Allāh that He will enter him into*

noise being made by the Ḥaddādiyyah who are desperate to make their false accusation of Irjā' to stick upon Ahl al-Sunnah. If a person says that a person's īmān is severely deficient, weak due to not praying and that he will be punished, then by this very statement he has affirmed prayer is from īmān (otherwise the person's īmān would not have decreased). Likewise, not making takfīr of person through neglect of righteous actions, whilst saying that such a person is a great sinner and severely deficient in his īmān and will be punished, this means that the person holding this view affirms actions are from īmān (otherwise the īmān of such a person would not be said to be weak or deficient). From here we see the false basis of the slander of Irjā' against those who do not make takfīr of the one who abandons prayer or those who declare the one who neglected righteous actions to be a sinful believer. If however, they said, the one who abandons prayer is complete in īmān or the one who abandons the obligations or righteous actions is complete in īmān, and that his īmān has not decreased or that he will not be punished by the Fire, then this is Irjā' as it necessitates expelling actions from īmān and claiming that righteous actions are not from the reality of īmān.

⁵⁷ Ibn Taymiyyah said, "And likewise the saying of the one who withheld about the people of major sins from the Extremist Murji'ah and said, 'I do not know that anyone from them will enter the Fire', this is also from the sayings of the Innovators. Rather, the Salaf and the Imāms are agreed upon that which the texts have come with overwhelming transmission (tawātur), that some from the people of the qiblah must enter the Fire and then exit from it." Majmū' al-Fatāwā (7/501). And Ibn al-Qayyim said, "As for the Kharijites they did not believe the Ṣaḥābah explicitly [meaning, they did not accept the aḥādīth of intercession as related by them] and as for the Murji'ah they permit that no one from the people of Tawḥīd will enter the Fire at all. And this is opposed to what is known through overwhelming transmission from the texts of the Sunnah of the entry of some of the people of major sins into the Fire and then their exit by way of intercession..." Tarīq al-Hijratayn (p. 386).

⁵⁸ In the context of this entire article, we are speaking specifically about those who are textually stated to be subject to punishment in the Hellfire, who had not been forgiven prior to entering the Hellfire and who did not receive intercession. However, in general, those who die upon neglect of obligations and falling into major sins can be forgiven by Allāh's mercy and avoid punishment.

Paradise. And whoever did perform them, then he does not have a covenant with Allāh. If He wills, He will punish him and if He wills, He will enter him into Paradise."⁵⁹

The Core Foundation of the Murji'ah

This is different from the Murji'ah who say: Hellfire is prohibited for the one who says the shahādah sincerely and Paradise becomes obligatory for him, even if he violated the sanctities of Allāh (the prohibitions), committed sins and shameful deeds, and was neglectful in the farā'id (most important obligations) and lesser obligations, **that these crimes will not harm his īmān, that he is perfect in his īmān, that there is complete, perfect īmān in his heart, and he will not enter the Fire at all (according to the Extremists amongst them) because it is prohibited to him.**

Abu al-Ḥusayn Ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Maṭīyy (d. 337H) said, "**Chapter: Mention of the Murji'ah.** I have mentioned the Murji'ah in this book of ours at the beginning and end, since their saying is outside of what is common knowledge and reason. Do you not see that amongst them is one who says: Whoever says '*There is none who has the right to be worshipped but Allāh and Muḥammad is His Messenger*', and treats as unlawful what Allāh made unlawful and treats as lawful what Allāh made lawful, will enter Paradise when he dies, even if he fornicates, steals, kills, drinks alcohol and falsely accuses chaste women, abandons the prayer, zakāh and fasting so long as he affirms (the obligation of these actions), and he delays repentance. **That his falling into major sins, his abandonment of the emphasized obligations and his commission of shameful deeds will not harm him.** And if he did any of that whilst declaring them lawful he is a disbeliever in Allāh, a polytheist and will exit from his faith and become from the inhabitants of the Fire, and **that faith does not increase or decrease** and that the faith of the Angels, Prophets, all the nations and the Scholars of the people and the ignorant ones **is all one (and the same) [the faith of] none of them excels over [that of] another, fundamentally.**"⁶⁰ And he said at the end of the book, "And the Murji'ah are twelve sects. A faction amongst them claimed that whoever bore witness with the testimonial of truth will enter Paradise no matter what his actions, just as no good deed will benefit alongside shirk.⁶¹ **Likewise, that alongside Tawḥīd, no evil deed will harm (faith), and they claim that such a one will not enter the Fire at all,** even if he commits the calamitous deeds (adhā'im)⁶², abandons the obligations and commits the major sins."⁶³

⁵⁹ This ḥadīth is **ṣaḥīḥ** and is related by Mālik in al-Muwatta', 'Abd al-Razzāq in his Muṣannaf, al-Ḥumaydī, Ibn Abī Shaybah, Aḥmad in his Musnad, al-Dārimī, Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasā'ī and Ibn Ḥibbān. Refer to Ṣaḥīḥ al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaghir of al-Albānī (no. 3243).

⁶⁰ Al-Tanbīh wal-Radd 'alā Ahl al-Ahwā' wal-Bida' (Maktabah Madbulī, Cairo, 1413H, p. 35).

⁶¹ Meaning to say that just like no good deed will benefit alongside Shirk, then conversely, no sin will harm in the presence of īmān and a person must enter Paradise.

⁶² Alluding to acts of kufr and shirk.

⁶³ Al-Tanbīh wal-Radd (p. 105). From these two quotes it is clear that the Murji'ah believe: **a)** sins do no harm and decrease a person's īmān, **b)** īmān does not increase and decrease, **c)** īmān is just a single thing in all people, faith in one person is not greater and excel over the faith in another

From the above we see the difference between the Murji'ah and this view of a faction from Ahl al-Sunnah which has strong support from the ḥadīths of shafā'ah.⁶⁴ Before we look at the ḥadīth of intercession, it is important to make a note about the claimed consensus amongst the Companions of the takfīr of the one who abandons the prayer.

What is the Reality of the Bid'ah of the Murji'ah?

Ibn Taymiyyah explains this when he says, "Whoever said: That the obligatory īmān (al-īmān al-wājib) is attained without doing anything of the obligatory deeds - irrespective of whether he made those obligatory deeds to be necessary to īmān (lāzim lahū) or a part of it (juz'), as this is only a difference in wording - then he is in plain manifest error and this is the bid'ah of Irjā' about whose proponents the Salaf and the Imāms spoke severely against, and they said very harsh statements about it which are well-known. And the prayer is, the greatest, the broadest, the first and the loftiest of them (the obligations)."⁶⁵

In the above quote, Ibn Taymiyyah states that whether you say outward actions are necessary to īmān or a part of it - **so this includes those who affirm actions are from and necessary to īmān** - if you claim alongside this affirmation that a person can have the obligatory īmān established in his heart without bringing any of the obligatory deeds, then this is the bid'ah of Irjā'. In other words, you can still be guilty of Irjā', even if you affirm actions are from īmān, when you say that a person's īmān is complete in his heart (having attained the obligatory) īmān, despite not having brought any of the obligatory actions.

person, **d**) alongside Tawḥīd a person will never enter the Fire. Refer to Appendix 2 for a list of the 12 groups mentioned by al-Maṭṭiyy.

⁶⁴ It is important to note the following three different situations: **The first** relates to those who uttered the shahādah during the early part of Islām, with taṣdīq and inqiyād and no obligations had been revealed during this period. Such people will enter Paradise through their shahādah, and there are numerous aḥadīth which relate to such people for whom Paradise is guaranteed such as "*There is no servant who said none has the right to be worshipped but Allāh and died upon that except that he will enter Paradise*". **The second** relates to those after the obligations were revealed, they expressed the shahādah with taṣdīq and inqiyād but were neglectful of the obligations and fell into major sins and died without repentance. Such people, if not forgiven by Allāh will be punished, to the degree of their disobedience and weakness of īmān, and then will be removed through intercession or the mercy and bounty of Allāh. The Khawārij, Mu'tazilah and Extremist Murji'ah deny this. **The third** relates to those who are said to enter Paradise because they expressed the shahādah out of truthfulness and sincerity, that Hellfire is forbidden to them, even if they violate the sanctities of Allāh, commit sins and shameful deeds, and neglect the emphasized and other obligations, that they are perfect in īmān, that their īmān has not decreased or been harmed by those sins, and they will not enter the Fire at all (in the view of the Extremists amongst them). This is the view of the Murji'ah. Now there are certain texts used by the Murji'ah to argue for this third category, but those texts relate to the first group above, and these are statements made in the early part of Islām, before the obligations were revealed, statements such as "*Whoever testifies that none has the right to be worshipped but Allāh, Hellfire is forbidden upon him*" and "*There is no servant who said none has the right to be worshipped but Allāh and died upon that except that he will enter Paradise*" and what is similar to them in the authentic ḥadīths.

⁶⁵ Majmū' al-Fatāwā (7/621).

In opposition to the Murji'ah, all of Ahl al-Sunnah, those who make takfīr of the one who abandons prayer and those who do not, those who make takfīr of the one who abandons any or all of the four pillars (prayer, fasting, zakāh, Ḥajj) and those who do not, those who make takfīr upon the abandonment of the outward obligations and those who do not, all of them are agreed that a person who does not bring the obligatory īmān (al-īmān al-wājib) has not attained the obligatory īmān (in the heart), his heart cannot have the obligatory īmān, because if it did, then he would have produced those outward obligations by necessity. **So all of Ahl al-Sunnah deny that such a person has attained obligatory īmān inwardly or outwardly.** This clashes with the bid'ah of al-Irjā'. Then amongst them are those who make takfīr of such a person, negating his īmān entirely (because they hold leaving the prayer, or fasting is major kufr), and amongst them are those who say his īmān is weak, deficient and he will be punished - based on the differences that have already been affirmed by the Scholars on the subject of abandonment of the outward obligations.

Ibn Taymiyyah said, "And the Murji'ah appeared and most of them were from the people of Kūfah. The companions of 'Abdullāh were not from the Murji'ah, and nor was Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī and his likes. They (the Murji'ah) became opposed (naqīd) to the Khārijites and the Mu'tazilah and said, 'Actions are not from īmān.' And this innovation was the lightest of innovations because much of the dispute therein is a dispute about the label as opposed to the ruling (upon a person). The jurists to whom this saying has been ascribed (that actions are not from īmān) like Ḥammād bin Abī Sulaymān, Abū Ḥanīfah and others besides them, they are in agreement with all of Ahl al-Sunnah that Allāh will punish whomever He will punish with the Fire from the people of major sins and then remove him by way of intercession, as has come in the authentic ḥadīths, and that it is a necessity regarding īmān that he express it with his tongue, that the farḍ actions are obligatory and that their abandoners deserve blame and punishment. Thus, the dispute about actions being from īmān and making the exception (istithnā') and what is like that is merely a dispute in wording (only)..."⁶⁶

bn Taymiyyah said, "As for Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah, the Companions, those following them in goodness (the Tābī'ūn), and all of the factions of the Muslims from Ahl al-Ḥadīth, the Jurists (al-Fuqahā'), the Ahl al-Kalām from the Murji'ah, the Karrāmiyyah, the Kullābiyyah, the Ash'ariyyah and the Shī'ah, the Murji'ah amongst them and other than the Murji'ah, they all say, 'Allāh may punish a person with the Fire and then enter him into Paradise,' as has been spoken about in the authentic ḥadīths. And this person who has evil deeds will be punished for them and he also has good deeds through which he will enter Paradise. He has both disobedience and obedience by agreement. **And all of these factions did not dispute about the ruling (on this person in the Hereafter) but they disputed about the label (applied to him) [in this world].** Thus, the Murji'ah, both the Jahmites and other than the Jahmites from them, they said, 'He is a believer, perfect in īmān.' And Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah said, 'He is a believer, deficient in īman' and had this not been the

⁶⁶ Majmū' al-Fatāwā (13/38-39).

case, he would not have been punished, just as he is a deficient in righteousness and piety by agreement of all the Muslims."⁶⁷

This statement of Ibn Taymiyyah makes clear the separating point between the saying of the Murji'ites and the saying of Ahl al-Sunnah, in that the Murji'ah applied the label of perfect or complete īmān (al-īmān al-kāmil, al-īmān al-tāmm) for a person who never actually brought the obligatory imān (al-īmān al-wājib) and who fell into sin and disobedience. Whereas Ahl al-Sunnah say **he is a deficient believer, lacking in īmān**. This difference arises due to the Murji'ah expelling actions from īmān and saying that the label of īmān is not applied to actions.

And in another statement from **Ibn Taymiyyah**, "And that which is desirable to be known is that most of the dispute between Ahl al-Sunnah in this issue is a dispute in wording (only). Otherwise, those from the Jurists who say that īmān is (only) speech (along with taṣdīq) - such as Ḥammād bin Abī Sulaymān, and he was the first to say that, and whoever followed him from the people of Kūfah and others - they are in agreement with all of the Scholars of the Sunnah that the people of sin come under rebuke and the threat (of punishment), even if they said (alongside that), 'Their īmān is perfect, like the īmān of Jibrīl.' For they say that īmān without the obligatory action and with the commission of what is unlawful makes a person deserving of blame and punishment, as is said by the jamā'ah (meaning Ahl al-Sunnah). And they (those Jurists) also say that from the major sinners are those who will enter the Fire, as is said by the jamā'ah. And those from Ahl al-Sunnah who negate the label of īmān from the sinner (fāsiq) are agreed that he will not remain eternally in the Fire. Thus, there is not any dispute between the jurists of the religion regarding the people of sin when they affirm both inwardly and outwardly what the Messenger came with and what is widely transmitted from him that they (the sinners) are subject to the threat (of punishment), and that those whom Allāh and His Messenger informed would enter the Fire will enter the Fire, but that none of them will remain therein forever, and that they are not apostates whose blood is lawful. But the deviant statements are: The saying of the one who said that they will remain eternally in the Fire such as the Khawārij and the Mu'tazilah. And the saying of the Extremist Murji'ah who say, 'We do not know that any of them (the sinners) will enter the Fire, rather we withhold from all of this.' And a firm general negation (in this regard) has been quoted from some of the Extremist Murji'ah."⁶⁸

In this analysis of Ibn Taymiyyah, he points out that the Murji'at al-Fuqhā' are largely in agreement with Ahl al-Sunnah in central issues such as outward actions being requested by the Sharī'ah, that the people of sin are blameworthy and threatened with punishment, that from them are those who will enter the Fire, and will be removed. Where they differ is the label they apply to such sinful people in the life of this world. So those who expelled actions from īmān said they are believers, perfect in īmān (since īmān is only taṣdīq and iqrār) whereas Ahl al-Sunnah said they are sinful believers, deficient in imān (since actions are

⁶⁷ Majmū' al-Fatāwā (7/354).

⁶⁸ Majmū' al-Fatāwā (7/297).

part of īmān). Despite this disputation and difference in wording, they are generally in agreement otherwise. From this perspective, many of the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah (and Ibn Taymiyyah is amongst them) consider the difference between Ahl al-Sunnah and the Murji'at al-Fuquhā' to be one of wording only.⁶⁹

From the above, one can see the great injustice of the Ḥaddādiyyah who have kindled tribulations in their attempts to ascribe Irjā' to leading scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah such as Imām al-Albānī and Shaykh Rabī'.

Shaykh Rabī' said, in his refutation of Fawzī al-Baḥraynī many years ago, "If prohibiting from (using the phrase) *jins al-'amal* amounts to expelling action from īmān, then the one who does not make takfīr of the one who abandons prayer also expels this great action from īmān! And the one who does not make takfīr of the one who abandons zakāh and fasting has also expelled these great actions from īmān. They are more worthy of being accused of Irjā'. Because upon the manhaj of the Ḥaddādites, they expel these noble actions and mighty pillars of Islām from īmān. And we seek refuge in Allāh from their methodology and their laying down of false principles which return back with evils, making tabdī' and tribulations upon Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah and their major scholars. And likewise (according to the Ḥaddādites), the one who relates the ḥadīths of intercession - and within them is that the one who says '*Lā ilāha illallāh*' whilst having less than, less than, less than an atom's weight of īmān - that he is a Murji' who has expelled actions from īmān, because he does not make takfīr of the one who abandons all of the actions except this tiny amount of faith and action!"⁷⁰

Not believing the abandonment of the outward obligations to be kufr **does not** amount to the saying that actions are not part of īmān. However, this is the basis upon which the Ḥaddādiyyah are trying to ascribe Irjā' to the likes of Imām al-Albānī, Shaykh Rabī' and others, keeping in mind that Shaykh Rabī' does not hold that view, but is merely defending those who hold that view from being accused with Irjā'. The one who believes that the abandonment of the outward obligations harms and decreases īmān and makes a person a sinner, deficient in īmān is free of the Extremist Murji'ah (Jahmiyyah and Ash'ariyyah) and is also free of the saying of the Murji'at al-Fuquhā' as is clear.

⁶⁹ Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān was asked, "Does the difference with the Murji'at al-Fuquhā' expel from the label of Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah and what is the reality of the difference with them?" He replied, "No, it does not expel them from Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah, and for this reason, they label them as *Murji'ah of the Sunnah* or *Murji'ah of Ahl al-Sunnah*. This does not expel them from the fold of Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah. However, they are upon error in [the subject] of īmān, because they say action does not enter into īmān. This is the reason for them being Murji'ah, they delayed action, meaning they expelled action from the meaning of īmān. This is an error no doubt. Yes." Refer to <http://www.alfawzan.af.org.sa/node/9524>. Local copy saved.

⁷⁰ In his treatise, *Kashf Akadhīb wa Tahریفāt wa Khiyānāt Fawzī al-Baḥraynī al-Mawṣūf Zūran bil-Atharī*, which can be found on www.rabee.net.

The Narration of ‘Abdullāh bin Shaqīq Regarding Prayer

One of the main proofs relied upon by those who make takfīr of the one who abandons the prayer is the narration from the tabi‘ī, ‘Abdullāh bin Shaqīq who is reported to have said, "The Companions of the Prophet (ﷺ) never used to consider the abandonment of any of the actions to be disbelief except the prayer." Shaykh Rabī has established that this particular narration is not authentic from ‘Abdullāh bin Shaqīq due to weakness in its chain and also because ‘Abdullāh only narrated from a dozen or so of the Companions and the claimed consensus cannot be ascertained through just this narration alone.

However, what is closer to authenticity is another narration related by al-Khallāl in al-Sunnah (4/144), who narrates which his chain from ‘Abdullāh bin Shaqīq who said, "We have not known any of the actions about which it has been said that its abandonment is kufr except the prayer." Shaykh Rabī says that there is no problem with this statement because there is no claim of consensus within it. Shaykh Rabī also says that when one looks at the books mentioning matters of consensus, such as *Marātib al-Ijmā‘* of Ibn Ḥazm, *Naqd Marātib al-Ijmā‘* of Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Iqnā‘ Fī Masā’il al-Ijmā‘* of Ibn al-Qaṭṭān, there is no mention of this alleged consensus about the abandonment of prayer. Likewise it is not found in the work of Ibn al-Mundhir, *al-Ijmā‘*, who actually says regarding this matter, "I did not find any consensus regarding the (two matters)" referring to the issue of the prayer and presence or absence of the kufr of the one who abandons it.⁷¹

What also proves that this narration used to claim a consensus is not correct is that **it is factually incorrect**. This is because it is firmly established that many of the Companions made takfīr on the basis of other pillars. It is related that ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb considered the one who did not make Ḥajj, despite being able, to be a disbeliever. Likewise, it is related from Ibn ‘Abbās that whoever abandoned fasting was a disbeliever and similarly the one who had plenty of wealth but did not give zakāh or perform Ḥajj. It is also related from ‘Abdullāh bin ‘Umar that the one who did not perform Ḥajj, despite wealth and health, is a disbeliever. And similarly, it is related from ‘Abdullāh bin Mas‘ūd that the one who abandons zakāh is not a Muslim. Similarly how can this narration of ‘Abdullāh bin Shaqīq be reconciled with the disbelief of those who withheld the zakāh and were fought and killed for it. Abū Ya‘lā cites the consensus that kufr was ascribed to them and they were fought for withholding the zakāh, despite their affirmation of its obligation.⁷²

The above considerations show that the narration of ‘Abdullāh bin Shaqīq in which a consensus is claimed is not established as being authentic firstly, and then its contents are in conflict with what is established through other routes that indeed the Companions would make takfīr of those who abandoned other pillars besides the prayer. This alleged consensus is from the strongest of evidences used by those who make takfīr of the one who

⁷¹ Refer to *al-Maqālāt al-Athariyyah* (p. 51 onwards).

⁷² Refer to Fath al-Bārī of Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī (1/21 onwards) for a discussion of different views amongst the Salaf and also here <http://www.sahab.net/forums/index.php?showtopic=146124>.

abandons prayer, and its problems are clear to see. This now leads us to a discussion of the ḥadīths of intercession which are a proof for those who hold abandonment of prayer is not major kufr.

The Ḥadīths of Shafā'ah

This view is argued by some Scholars from a **foundational text in the Sunnah** which cannot be subject to any ta'wīl, which shows that there can be a situation where a person's īmān is so weak that its outward manifestation, aside from the shahādah, does not appear (in terms of performing the obligations and abandoning the prohibitions).

This is the ḥadīth of Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī (رضي الله عنه) who narrates that the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: "... until when the Believers have been delivered from the Fire, then by Him in whose hand is my soul, there is none amongst you who are greater in imploring Allāh than the Believers in Allāh on the Day of Judgement when they inquire about the right of their brothers who are in the Hellfire. They say, 'Our Lord, they used to fast, pray and perform Hajj with us.' It will be said to them, 'Remove (from the Fire) those whom you recognize.'⁷³ Their forms will then be prohibited for the Fire (to consume) and a great portion (of them) will be taken out, those who had been taken by the Fire to half their shins or their knees. Then they will say, 'There does not remain anyone (in the Fire) from those You ordered us (to take out).'

Then He will say, 'Return again and take out anyone you find who has the weight of a dīnār of goodness.' So they will take out a great portion (of them) and then they will say, "O our Lord, we have not left anyone in (the Fire) from those whom you ordered us (to take out).'

Then He will say, "Return again and take out anyone you find who has the weight of a half a dīnār of goodness.' So they will take out a great portion (of them) and then they will say, "O our Lord, we have not left anyone in (the Fire) from those whom you ordered us (to take out).'

Then He will say, "Return again and take out anyone you find who has the weight of a speck (atom).'

So they will take out a great portion (of them) and then they will say, "O our Lord, we have not left anyone in (the Fire) from those whom you ordered us (to take out).'

And Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī used to say, 'If you do not believe me about this ḥadīth, then recite if you wish, "**Verily, Allāh does not wrong even the weight of an atom, if it was goodness, He will multiply it and bring a mighty reward from Himself.**" (4:40). Then Allāh, the Mighty and Majestic will say, 'The Angels have interceded, the Prophets have interceded, the Believers have interceded, and none remains but the most-merciful of those who show mercy.' Then a handful will be taken from the Fire, and a people will exit (the Fire) **who had not done any good whatsoever.**⁷⁴ They will have become like burnt coals and He will throw them into a river by the entrances of

⁷³ These people will be recognized by the traces of prostration on their bodies and those interceding will take all of these people out until they find no more.

⁷⁴ Ibn al-Qayyim mentions in *as-Salāh wa Ḥukm Tārikihā* (p. 21) that amongst those who used this wording in this ḥadīth as a proof for their view that the one who leaves prayer is not a kāfir are Imām Mālik, Imām al-Shāfi'ī, Ibn Baṭṭah and others.

Paradise which is called "the River of Life" ... to the end of the ḥadīth, related by Imām Muslim in his Ṣaḥīḥ.⁷⁵

Shaykh Rabī, whilst refuting the Ḥaddādiyyah, explains that the Khārijites do not look to this ḥadīth and others from the ḥadīths pertaining to intercession, or they interpret it in accordance with their desires. The Shaykh explains numerous categories of people to whom this ḥadīth applies: **The first type** [to be removed]: A people who were the people of prayer, fasting and zakāh and other such outward righteous actions. But their sins caused them to land in the Hellfire. If this is the case with people who prayed and fasted, then those who do not perform these obligations will be even more severely punished. They will be recognized by the interceders through the effects of prostration on their bodies and all of them will be removed until none are left. **The second type**: Those not known for the major outward obligatory actions and who entered the Fire because of their neglect of these actions. Allāh, the Sublime, the Mighty and Majestic informed the Believers of what is in these people's hearts of the basis (aṣl) of faith and they will intercede for them by Allāh's permission, the Most High, and He will take them out of the Fire. This is for the one who had a dinār's weight (of īmān), then half a dinār. **The third type**: He who has a speck's (atom's) weight of īmān in his heart, and this is īmān along with ikhlās (sincerity) in this īmān. **The fourth type**: Some people will remain in the Fire having less than an atom's weight of īmān and no one will know about them except Allāh and they do not have anything but the basis, foundation (aṣl) of faith (taṣdīq, ikhlās and the shahādah), and they did not have any amount above that foundation, and they are the ones who did not go any good whatsoever, and they will be removed from the Hellfire without any action they performed and without any goodness they put forth. They will have turned to coal⁷⁶ and Allāh will remove them by His mercy, bounty, generosity and benevolence, and they are referred to as *the People of Paradise Freed by Allāh*. This group will be removed not by the intercession of anyone but by Allāh's might and grandeur and His mercy and bounty and they had the furthest limit of weakness in their īmān.⁷⁷

Then a faction of the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah - on the basis of this ḥadīth and others⁷⁸ - have affirmed that a people will leave the Fire who did not do any good, after being

⁷⁵ Refer to Appendix 1 for an important note about this ḥadīth and the conflict in its interpretation.

⁷⁶ This means that the Fire had consumed all their bodies unlike those who prayed, since the places of prostration on their bodies will not be consumed and will be visible to the interceders who take them out of the Fire after their intercession is granted.

⁷⁷ Refer to al-Maqālāt al-Athariyyah of Shaykh Rabī (pp. 64-67 and also pp. 68-69). And Ibn Wazīr al-Ṣanʿānī said, "The ḥadīth of intercession indicates that those removed from the Fire through intercession are three groups, and that after them, Allāh will remove after them, through His mercy, not by intercession, a fourth group who had not done any good whatsoever, and in whose hearts there was no goodness at all, from those who said, 'Lā ilāha illallāh', they will be called the People of Paradise, the Freed Ones of Allāh From the Fire." al-Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim (p. 102).

⁷⁸ In the ḥadīth of Anas bin Mālik (رضي الله عنه) related by al-Bukhārī and Muslim, the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) makes repeated intercessions - after praising and glorifying Allāh, being granted permission by Allāh to intercede each time for a) those who have the weight of a seed (ḥabbah) or bead (shaʿīrah) of īmān, b) those who have a mustard seed's weight of īmān, c) those who have less

punished severely for their sins and disobedience, and just by way of example, the statement of Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī (رحمته الله), "And this indicates that those whom Allāh will remove (from the Fire) by His mercy, without the intercession of any created being, are the people of the statement of Tawḥīd who did not do any good whatsoever with their limbs."⁷⁹

Shaykh Rabī said, "The ḥadīths of intercession show two things: The first of them is an explanation of the punishment of Allāh of the people of major sins with the Fire, especially those who abandoned the obligations (farā'id). The second of them is the explanation of the excellence of Tawḥīd and that it is the cause of the inhabitants of Jahannam of being taken out of the Fire. So whoever rejects the contents of these ḥadīths and accuses the one who believes in them and speaks with what they indicate with Irjā', then he does not hold this mighty position for Tawḥīd (in the sight of) Allāh, His Messenger and the Believers."⁸⁰

It is Not Possible to Make Ta'wīl of These Ḥadīths

Shaykh Rabī and Shaykh al-Albānī have criticised those who try to explain away the ḥadīth of intercession by making ta'wīl of its apparent meaning.⁸¹ Shaykh Rabī said, "I have not seen anyone from the Imāms of Islam oppose these ḥadīths or make ta'wīl of his saying (صلى الله عليه وسلم) "...who had not done any good whatsoever..." to mean that they are excused because they were unable to perform action (due to a valid excuse). But if they were excused and were not able to do any action, then how can Allāh enter them into the Fire and punish them with severe punishment, whilst He, the Majestic and Exalted says, "**Allāh does not burden a soul more than it can bear**" (2:286) and Allāh is compassionate, merciful, He teaches His servants to say, "**O Our Lord do not place upon us a burden like you placed on those before us**" (2:286) and our Lord - the most-merciful of those who show mercy - teaches His servants to say, "**And do not burden us with what for which we do not have the ability**" (2:286). Those who did not do any good at all are from the most severe of criminals, Allāh punished them for their persistent crime with severe punishment, because they were able to perform action, they were able for the duration of their lives. I hope that whoever made this ta'wīl announces his repentance from it, because it opposes the Qur'an and the Sunnah."⁸²

than, less than less than a mustard seed's weight of īmān in their heart (*adnā, adnā, adnā min mithqāl ḥabbatin min khardalin min īmān*), d) anyone who said *Lā ilāha illāllā* - but here it will be said by Allāh, "This is not for you, but by my mightiness, grandeur, greatness and pride, I shall certainly remove whoever said *Lā ilāha illāllā*."

⁷⁹ Faṭḥ al-Bārī of Ibn Rajab (1/285) and refer to al-Takhweef min al-Nār (p. 187).

⁸⁰ Al-Maḳālāt al-Athariyyah of Shaykh Rabī (p.88).

⁸¹ Note that those who make takfīr of the one who abandons prayer say that those who are removed from the Fire are only those who prayed. However, the ḥadīth itself does not admit to this interpretation because there are three or four different categories which are mentioned in these ḥadīths starting with those who prayed but had sins, and moving down to those who had less than an atom's weight of īmān and never did any good at all (except their utterance of the shāhādah).

⁸² In the Shaykh's article, *Maḍāmīn al-Maḳālāt al-Athariyyah* posted on Sahab.Net. See Appendix 1 for an illustration of the weakness and contradiction inherent in this interpretation of the ḥadīth being criticized by Shaykh Rabī.

In fact, even in the speech of Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān we see an admission of this point. When the Shaykh was asked, "What is your reply to those who say that there is not found any clear evidence that the ḥadīths of intercession apply to those who were unable to perform action, and that speaking with this (interpretation) is from the angle of ta'wīl." The Shaykh's reply was, "Those who entered into Islām and were not able to perform action and who died, they are not in need of intercession, they are not in need of intercession, because they are not punished for abandoning action because they did not have the ability for it. They are not in need of intercession. Intercession is for the one who abandoned something from the actions which are less than kufr, less than shirk, and he deserved punishment. Intercession will benefit this person by Allāh's permission. Because he is a Muslim who has sin with him, he deserves punishment, and the intercession of those who intercede will benefit him, when Allāh grants permission for that, yes. As for when he is **not able** to perform action, he speaks with the two testimonials as a believer, being truthful (in that) and then was not able to perform action, this person does not require intercession."⁸³ In this statement, Shaykh al-Fawzān has affirmed that those who were unable to perform righteous deeds (due to a legitimate excuse) **will not** need intercession, and that intercession is only for those who were able but were neglectful in their actions.

Ahl al-Sunnah Believe in the Ḥadīths of Intercession

The ḥadīths of intercession establish many aspects of the aqīdah of Ahl al-Sunnah in opposition to the aqīdah of the Murji'ah. From them: **a)** That īmān increases and decreases, **b)** that the believers vary in their īmān, some excelling over others, **c)** that sins harm a persons īmāns and make him subject to punishment, **d)** that there is variation in the actions of the heart between the believers, some excelling over others, **e)** the binding connection between the outward and the inward, in the sense that those with the least amount of īmān in their hearts are most severely punished and only removed at the very end by the pure mercy of Allāh **f)** that the īmān of the sinners is weak, deficient and not perfect, complete, as is asserted by the Murji'ah, **g)** that the disobedient sinners who used to pray, the Fire will not consume their faces or places of prostration (on their bodies), **h)** those who brought no good deeds, they will be turned to coal, but will be removed due to what they had of the basis of īmān and tawḥīd.

So from the above discussion, it is clear that there are from Ahl al-Sunnah those who affirm all of the following:

- īmān is speech and **action** (unlike the Murji'ah).
- īmān **increases and decreases** (unlike the Murji'ah).
- **Actions of the limbs enter into the essential meaning (musammā) of īmān** and not merely a by-product (a fruit) of īmān (unlike the Murji'ah).

⁸³ Published here <http://saif.af.org.sa/ar/node/1690> and saved as local copy.

- That **people vary in their īmān**, some believers are superior than others with respect to inward taṣḍīq, the actions of the heart and the outward actions (unlike the Murji'ah).
- That īmān is not a single, indivisible entity, rather **īmān consists of parts and branches** (unlike the Murji'ah).
- That **it is permissible to make istithnā' in one's īmān**⁸⁴ without this necessitating doubt in one's īmān (unlike the Murji'ah who claim this amounts to doubt in the foundation of one's īmān).
- That mere knowledge (ma'rifah) or assent (taṣḍīq) in the heart alone is not īmān (unlike the extreme Murji'ah from the Jahmiyyah and Ash'ariyyah).
- That **mere speech (of the tongue) alone without belief is not īmān** and that **mere taṣḍīq of the heart alone without affirmation of the tongue** is not īmān (unlike the Murji'ah).
- That **sins harm and decrease a persons īmān** (unlike the Murji'ah).
- That **kufr occurs through belief, speech and action** (unlike the Murji'ah).
- The kufr is not restricted to absence of taṣḍīq, but also the absence of the actions of the heart, and that **from the outward actions are those which nullify īmān completely, without istiḥlāl or juḥūd** (unlike the Murji'ah).

Alongside all of this, they believe that a person who dies with the foundation of īmān (taṣḍīq, ikhlās, inqiyād in the heart) and iqrār (affirmation) with the tongue, having done no deeds (despite having the ability), due to the weakness of his īmān, will enter the Fire, be punished for a period, be burnt to a coal due to the greatness of his sins and evils, and will then be removed by the pure mercy and bounty of Allāh, the Mighty and Majestic, after the Angels, Prophets and Believers have already interceded for others from the sinful believers. And this is due to the foundation of īmān being found with such a person, [taṣḍīq, ikhlās and inqiyād] and it being expressed outwardly [his expression of the kalimah of Tawḥīd with sincerity] but the severe weakness of his īmān did not lead him to perform the obligations and avoid prohibitions despite him having the ability to do so.⁸⁵

⁸⁴ Meaning, that it is permissible to say, "*I am a believer, if Allāh wills*" where there are two objectives. The first is to avoid self-praise by negating the perfection of īmān from oneself, and leaving that to the will of Allāh. The second is in relation to what is yet to come of a person's actions, since only Allāh knows what is decreed for a person. Thus, he consigns his īmān to the will of Allāh. And none of this necessitates that a person has doubts in the basis of his īmān. Refer to al-Ibānah al-Kubrā of Ibn Baṭṭah (2/862-876).

⁸⁵ This is different to the one who has taṣḍīq, he accepts the Messenger is truthful and that he has been revealed to by Allāh with revelation, and who outwardly affirms he is the Messenger of Allāh, may even utter the shahādah (knowing and believing that it is the truth), but then he is determined not to pray, not to fast, not to withhold from the prohibitions and so on. This person is actually devoid of the actions of the heart (inqiyād, maḥabbah) and possesses a type of stubborn, wilful opposition (ʿinād), which is kufr in itself, so this person is not a believer at all, rather he is a kāfir, zindīq. The Murji'ah would consider this person to be a person of Paradise who is complete in īmān and prohibited from the Hellfire!

Thus, the view that brother Abū ‘Abdullāh Bouchta held and spoke of in what you quoted from his speech is an acceptable view and it is expressed by Scholars past and present such as Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī and Imām al-Albānī and others and there is no basis for the accusation of Irjā’ upon this view, as there is very strong textual evidence for this view which is very hard to refute. This saying does not in any way negate one's view that īmān is belief in the heart, actions of the limb and saying of the tongue. As for the claim of the Ḥajāwirah Ḥaddādiyyah that this view is severe misguidance, then they should refute the ḥadīth of the Messenger (ﷺ) in regard to the evil sinners who did no good at all (despite having the ability) and will be removed by intercession, without resorting to erroneous ta’wīls and rejecting the dhāhir of the ḥadīth. They will not do so except by relying upon a ta’wīl similar to those made by the Ash‘arites for the ḥadīths of the Attributes. They should also refute the many Scholars, past and present, in whose statements this meaning can be found, and Shaykh Rabī has listed many of them in his various articles in refutation of the Ḥaddādiyyah.

The Kharijites, Mu‘tazilah and Murji’ah Deny the Ḥadīths of Intercession

This is while we keep in mind that **both** the Kharijites and **the Murji’ah** (the Extremists) are the ones who deny the ḥadīths of intercession as mentioned by Ibn Khuzaymah (رحمته الله). It is not just the Khārijites and Mu‘tazilah who deny the ḥadīths of intercession. Ibn Khuzaymah said, "We have narrated reports from the Prophet (ﷺ), in opposition to which many of the people of ignorance and obstinacy (hold views), despite these reports which we have mentioned concerning intercession being plentiful in number, whose chains of narration are sound and their narrators trustworthy. And the removal of some of the people of Tawḥīd after they had entered it due to sins and disobedience does not oppose those narrations in our view, by Allāh's praise and His bounty. And the people of ignorance we have mentioned in this topic are two factions: **A faction:** From them are the Khārijites and Mu‘tazilah, they denied the removal of anyone from the Fire from those who entered the Fire, and they denied these reports which we have mentioned regarding the intercession. **The second faction:** The extremists from the Murji’ah who claim that the Fire is prohibited (in principle) for the one who says, "Lā ilāha illallāh" and they make ta’wīl of these reports which are related from the Prophet (ﷺ) regarding this word upon a way that opposes their (correct) interpretation."⁸⁶

As for the person who believes that the sinner who has the basis of īmān in his heart (taṣdīq and inqiyād), has uttered the shaḥadah, and who abandons the obligations and righteous

⁸⁶ Kitāb al-Tawḥīd, Dār al-Rushd (2/769-770). And Ibn Taymiyyah said, after mentioning the ḥadīths of intercession, "And within them is a refutation of two factions: Against the Khārijites and the Mu‘tazilah, those who say, 'The people of Tawḥīd will remain therein forever' and this verse (87:13) is a proof against them. And likewise against he from the Extremist Murji’ah from whom it is narrated that none of the people of Tawḥīd will enter the Fire (at all). For his [the Prophet's] informing of the people of Tawḥīd exiting from it after entering renders both these and those as liars." Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (16/196).

deeds, **that he is the most sinful of the believers, will enter the Fire, be punished severely,** and due to his Tawhīd will eventually be removed from the Fire, then he is neither from these (Kharijites, Mu'tazilah) nor from those (Murji'ah). The Kharijites deny the ḥadīths of intercession because they believe no one who enters the Fire will come out of it. And from the Murji'ah are those who deny the ḥadīths of intercession because they do not hold that a believer will enter the Fire to begin with, as has preceded.

The Ḥajāwirah Are an Evil People Who Lack Principles

The Ḥajāwirah are driven - not by the uṣūl of the salafī manhaj - but by revenge for the sake of Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī. The Ḥajāwirah who are displaying these characteristics are very dishonest and evil people. The only reason they are now spreading these shubuhāt (doubts) is because Shaykh Rabī disparaged their leader in Ḥaddādiyyah, Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī.⁸⁷ They were not spreading these doubts until the past two months or so. Before this, Shaykh Rabī was refuting the likes of Maḥmud al-Ḥaddād, Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī, Fawzī al-Baḥrainī and others on these issues for many years and they (the Ḥajāwirah) knew nothing of these matters. However, because these Ḥaddādiyyah (who are carrying the same flag as Safar al-Ḥawālī from twenty years ago) are now trying to cause tribulations by getting some speech from the Muftī, 'Abd al-'Azīz Āl al-Shaykh and Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān⁸⁸ against Shaykh Rabī, using deception and great conniving, out of the evilness of their hearts, the Ḥajāwirah have seen this to be of benefit to themselves in their hatred towards Shaykh Rabī - and they are happy to drink the bāṭil of the Ḥaddādiyyah into their hearts, in order to seek revenge for the sake of al-Ḥajūrī against Shaykh Rabī, the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah and whoever is with them from the students of knowledge in Europe, the US, the Gulf countries, the Far East and other places. May Allaḥ, the Most High, protect Ahl al-Sunnah from the evil of all these factions of Ḥaddādiyyah, in all places, āmīn.

The Ḥajūrītes, the Previous Ḥaddādīs (Such as Fawzī al-Baḥraynī) and the Accusation of Irjā Against Shaykh Rabī and Ahl al-Sunnah

In his refutation against Fawzī al-Baḥraynī who accused Shaykh Rabī of speaking with the saying of the Murji'ah in that īmān is valid (sound) alongside the abandonment of action, because action to them is *a condition for the perfection of īmān*, Shaykh Rabī said (after establishing the slanderous nature of this accusation), "For argument's sake, if Rabī had said what you claim he said and through which you spread calumnies against him and his brothers, then mention to me the statements of Ahl al-Sunnah (of old) and those after them in labelling those who do not make takfīr of the one who abandons all action as Murji'ah **and**

⁸⁷ The actions of the Ḥaddādīs are no different to those of the Qutbiyyah and Surūriyyah in the 1990s who sought revenge against Shaykh Rabī because he refuted their extremism and because he had spoken against their figureheads, Sayyid Qutb, Muḥammad Surūr and others.

⁸⁸ The Ḥajāwirah are great liars and insincere in their claim that they respect and follow the Scholars such as Shaykh al-Fawzān, and they know, just as we know, that the only reason they are spreading these shubuhāt to undermine Shaykh Rabī and accuse him with innovation is because their leader in Ḥaddādiyyah was disparaged by Shaykh Rabī.

mention their evidences for that.⁸⁹ Otherwise you are a Khārijite, an opposer to Ahl al-Sunnah. Ahl al-Sunnah do not make takfīr of the one who has less than, less than an atom's weight of īmān and they have evidences from the Book and the Sunnah, and the Khārijites opposed them in that, and it is correct to refer to this group (referred to in the texts) as "*abandoners of action*" in the Arabic language. So what degree of difference is there between them⁹⁰ and between those who abandon all actions entirely?⁹¹ [The difference] is less than, less than, less than an atom's weight. So let the Ḥaddādiyyah accuse Ahl al-Sunnah with Irjā', and let them refute their evidences for the removal of the sinners from the Hellfire due to (only) this amount of īmān."⁹²

The Use of Innovated Terms in the Definition of Īmān Such as *Jins al-'Amal*

The Ḥaddādiyyah insist on new definitions pertaining to īmān that the Salaf never expressed in order to construct the accusation of Irjā' against Ahl al-Sunnah. From them is their claim that the statement *the one who abandons jins al-'amal is a kāfir* is fundamental to the definition of īmān. They have other statements too such as *īmān decreases until nothing from it is left*⁹³ and they insist unless you speak with and corroborate these phrases in the definition of īmān, you are guilty of Irjā'. In addition they treat phrases which are stated by many of the Salaf, including Ibn Taymiyyah, to be Irjā' such as īmān having a foundation (aṣl) and a branch (far') and that the branch is a perfection of the foundation. What follows are clarifications from Shaykh Rabī that expose the evil nature of the Ḥaddādiyyah and likewise that of the Ḥājūrītes, some of whom are now spreading these shubuhāt against Shaykh Rabī as a means of venting their anger and seeking revenge for the sake of their Ḥaddādī master, al-Ḥājūrī.

As for the term *jins al-'amal*, the Ḥaddādiyyah, Takfīriyyah are not united upon what they intend by this term. Some of them intend any outward righteous action. Others intend any of the outward obligations only. Others intend both the outward obligations and abandonment of prohibitions. Others say *jins al-'amal* is encompassed in the prayer only. And others say it is the four pillars after the shahādah. Others say it is any outward action including that of the tongue, and yet others also include the actions of the heart. So the

⁸⁹ Note the demand by Shaykh Rabī for them to bring evidences from the Book and the Sunnah.

⁹⁰ Meaning those mentioned in the texts.

⁹¹ Meaning those whose affair is under debate, the abandoners of action, in the debate with these Ḥaddādīs.

⁹² Refer to *Ittiḥāf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-'Urfān* (p. 224-225). Thus, the affair comes back down to the evidences of those who speak with this saying, which returns to the ḥādīths of shafā'ah.

⁹³ That which is related overwhelmingly from the Salaf is their statement, "*īmān decreases until nothing remains of it but a speck's (atom's) weight.*" However, the Ḥaddādiyyah insist that a person must say "*īmān decreases until nothing of it remains*" (because there perhaps one or two statements from the Salaf that state this) and if he does not affirm this, he is guilty of Irjā'. So they leave that which is the known statement of the Salaf in general, and go towards that which is obscure and opposes what the majority said. Then they turn them into principles which a person must affirm, and if not they will accuse him of Irjā'.

term is ambiguous in the way that it is used. However, when one looks at the various statements of Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, it is clear that what these Ḥaddādīs and Takfīrīs refer to as *jins al-‘amal* (the genus of action) includes **the outward speech** of the tongue as well as the action of the limbs.⁹⁴ This means that whoever speaks with the shahādah has brought the *jins al-‘amal* that these Ḥaddādī Takfīrīs are constantly revolving around and so long as he does not bring any nullifier of Islām he will not exit from Islām, even if he abandons the outward obligations, since he has brought the genus of outward īmān which includes the speech of the tongue. If they had grasped this, they would have displayed the fear of Allāh in withholding from making baseless accusations of Irjā’ against the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah. However, they cling to the ambiguity in this term, intending tribulations for Ahl al-Sunnah.

Shaykh Rabīʿ said, "[The concept of] *jins al-‘amal* is imaginary, hypothetical, we do not enter into these mazes (of confusion). We say that īmān is speech, action and belief, and it is vital for there to be action. The one who says action is not from īmān is a Murji’, misguided."⁹⁵

⁹⁴ Ibn Taymiyyah (رحمته الله) said, "The fourth: The presumption of the one who thought that there is nothing in the heart except taṣdīq and that the dhāhir (outward) is nothing but action of the limbs. What is correct is that the heart has action alongside taṣdīq and the outward (dhāhir) is (both) outward speech (of the tongue) and outward action and both of them are necessary consequences of what is internal..." (Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā 7/554) and a page earlier Ibn Taymiyyah said, "And from this we know that whoever's heart believed with a firm, resolute faith, **it is impossible for him not to speak with the two testimonials (of faith) whilst having the ability to do so**. For not uttering the two testimonials whilst having the ability necessitates the absence of the complete faith of the heart. And through this, the error of Jahm (bin Ṣafwān) and whoever followed him in their claim that pure faith (in the heart alone) **without the outward īmān** will benefit in the Hereafter, becomes clear, because this is impossible." (Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā 7/553). From these two quotes and others it is clear that the expression of the tongue is considered from the dhāhir (outward) and from the outward īmān. And Abu al-Ḥusayn Ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Maḥṭīyy (d. 337H) in his famous book *Al-Tanbīh wal-Radd ʿalā Ahl al-Ahwāʾ wal-Bidaʾ*, describes the claim of one of the factions of the Murjiʾah, "Amongst them are a faction who claim that īmān is just the knowledge (maʿrifah) of the heart **and is not an action (fiʿl) of the tongue** and nor action (ʿamal) with the body and that whoever knew Allāh with this heart then he is a believer..." (Cairo, 1413H, p. 108). This again illustrates that the dhāhir (outward) includes the action of the tongue and is not just the action of the limbs. Ibn Taymiyyah said, "So when he mentioned īmān alongside Islām, he made Islām to be the outward actions: **the two testimonials**, the prayer, the zakāh, fasting and the Ḥajj. And he made īmān to be what is in the heart of faith in Allāh, His Angels, His books, His Messengers and the Last Day." (Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā 7/14). Ibn Taymiyyah also said, "That which the Salaf, the Imāms and the majority of the people are upon is that the binding requirement of that (inward īmān) must manifest on the limbs. Whoever said that he believes the Messenger, loves him and venerates him with his heart **but never spoke with the kalimah of Islām and nor performed any of its obligations without any fear (in doing that)**, this one cannot be a believer inwardly, rather he is a disbeliever. Jahm and whoever agreed with him claimed that he is a believer inwardly and that the mere knowledge (maʿrifah) and assent (taṣdīq) in the heart is what brings about the īmān that necessitates reward on the Day of Judgement **without any outward speech or action**. And this is futile in both reason and legislation as has been discussed in detail in other than this place." (Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā 14/120).

⁹⁵ From a telephone recording which took place on 09/03/1421H and which was subsequently published, along with a telephone conversation with Shaykh Ibn al-ʿUthaymīn, in a cassette entitled, "Difāʾ an al-Albānī" (In Defence of al-Albānī) by Muʿassasah Majālis al-Hudā in Algeria.

Shaykh Rabī also said, "I see that one should keep away from the word 'jins' due to what it contains of generality and ambiguity and because the people of tribulations cling to it and because this word is not found in the Book, nor a Sunnah, nor did the Salaf use it in the definition of *īmān*." Refer to *Ittiḥaf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-ʿUrfān*, (p. 249).

Note that the word *jins* (meaning genus) is found in the speech of Ibn Taymiyyah (and others) in the course of discussing the issue of *īmān*. However the Ḥaddādiyyah - and this is the main thrust of the Shaykh Rabī's criticism - are entering this word into **the actual definition** (taʿrīf) of *īmān*, such that if you do not say *tārik jins al-ʿamal kāfir* (the one who abandons the genus of action is a disbeliever) you are upon *Irjāʿ*. And this is a clear lie upon the Salaf, as they did not use this in the definition of *īmān*. As for its use by some of the Scholars, such as the saying of Ibn Taymiyyah, "It has already preceded that the genus of actions (*jins al-aʿmāl*) are from the binding necessities of the *īmān* of the heart and that complete *īmān* in the heart⁹⁶ without anything of the outward actions is impossible."⁹⁷ All of these types of statements are from the angle of showing the connection between the inward and the outward which Ahl al-Sunnah affirm in opposition to the Murjiʿah and this is largely a theoretical issue to show conceptual errors of the Murjiʿah when they expelled the actions of the heart from *īmān*.⁹⁸ This led them to imagine erroneous, impossible scenarios and to declare Paradise obligatory and Hellfire prohibited for those who only brought the speech of the heart (*taṣdīq*, *maʿrifah*) or those who added *iqrār* (statement of the tongue) but were intent on not fulfilling the obligations out of wilful, stubborn opposition or arrogance (*ʿinād*, *kibr*), and thus did not bring any of the outward actions. The Murjiʿah declared these as believers, perfect in their *īmān*! And one can see Ibn Taymiyyah pointing out this faulty conception in the minds of the Murjiʿah and the erroneous conclusions based around it in many of his statements.

Shaykh Ibn al-ʿUthaymīn was asked, "What is your viewpoint concerning the one who says, 'The one who abandons the genus of action (*jins ul-ʿamal*) is a *kāfir*, and the one who leaves actions solitarily (*āḥād al-ʿamal*) is not a *kāfir*'?" The Shaykh replied, **"Who spoke of this principle? Who said it?! Did Muhammad the Messenger of Allāh say it?! These words have no meaning to them. We say, whoever Allāh and His Messenger have declared a disbeliever then he is a disbeliever. And whoever Allāh and His Messenger do not declare a disbeliever is not a disbeliever. This is what is correct. As for 'jins ul-amal' and 'āḥād ul-amal' then all**

⁹⁶ The Murjiʿah claim that *īmān* is complete in the heart with *taṣdīq* alone and that *taṣdīq* does not increase or decrease, and Ibn Taymiyyah is explaining here that complete *īmān* in the heart, which must include the action of the heart (*inqiyād* and what follows on from it) must produce outward *īmān* by necessity.

⁹⁷ *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā* (7/616).

⁹⁸ And those from the Murjiʿah who entered something of the actions of the heart into *īmān* fell into a contradiction when they expelled the outward actions of the heart from *īmān* and Ibn Taymiyyah addressed this mistake of theirs in *Kitāb al-Īmān*. Refer to *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā* (7/195) and (7/550). As for the extremists, the Jahmiyyah, they did not enter the actions of the heart into *īmān*.

of this is but nonsense (clangor) and in which there is no benefit." *Cassette: Question From Qatar on the Accusation of Irjā' Against al-Albānī (30th April 2000).*⁹⁹

This insightful statement of Ibn al-ʿUthaymīn highlights what we mentioned right at the beginning of this article, **that there is a difference between theoretical issues and practical issues** and that in the discussion of theoretical issues we are dealing with conceptions and thoughts, associated terms and phrases that can divorce us from the practical rulings and realities. This reveals the strategy of the Ḥaddādiyyah in that they sail the oceans of theoretical discussions found in the speech of the Scholars in this topic (and others) so that they can extract quotes that have multiple layers of context behind them and use them against their opponents from Ahl al-Sunnah.

Shaykh Rabīʿ said, in refutation of Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī (seven years ago), "He entered what he calls *jins al-ʿamal* into the issue of *īmān* and claims that it is a pillar (rukn) in the definition of *īmān*. I had advised him about clinging to ambiguous words from which is *jins al-ʿamal*, for it is a general word and alongside that it has no mention in the Book or the Sunnah none of the Salaf entered it into the definition of *īmān*. I requested him and his party to bring just its mention (alone) in the Qurʾān and the Sunnah and an explanation of who entered it into the issues of *īmān* or the definition of *īmān* from amongst the Salaf, and so they were unable to do that. Then they began to make recourse to expressions from some of the later ones from Ahl al-Sunnah in which they have no proof (in any case) because these statements are not in line with what the Ḥaddādiyyah intend. And I requested him and his party to restrict themselves to the definition of the Salaf for *īmān* that it is *speech and action*, or that it is *speech, action and belief, it increases and decreases* and in this is sufficiency, for it is a comprehensive, restricting (definition) comprising a refutation against the Muʿtazilah, Khawārij and the Murjiʾah. But they refused to show anything but continuous discord so that they can arrive at declaring Ahl al-Sunnah innovators, to wage war against them and to occupy them away from performing the obligations of daʿwah to Allāh. For this reason, the definition that the Salaf agreed upon and their imāms from the Companions and Tābiʿīn after them was not sufficient for them, and they added (their own statement) that whoever does not make takfīr of the one who abandons *jins al-ʿamal* is a Murjiʾ, rather an extremist Murjiʾ (at that)... And I announced many times that I declare the one who abandons action (ʿamal) to be a disbeliever, and that I simply warn against the use of ambiguous words such as *jins al-ʿamal* but they did not desist from accusing me with Irjā'." Refer to *Ittiḥaf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-ʿUrfān*, (p. 250-251).

Shaykh Rabīʿ also said, "Your saying regarding *jins al-ʿamal* that it is one of the pillars (arkān) in the definition of *īmān*, then I say to you: When the Salaf defined *īmān* they said in its definition, *īmān is speech and action* and some of them said, *Speech, action and belief* and I define *īmān* as the Salaf defined it, and I explained the madhhab of the Murjiʾah who do not enter action into *īmān*, and I did not find the word *jins al-ʿamal* in the definition of *īmān*. So

⁹⁹ This is a well-known and famous tele-link that took place in Qaṭar following much debate on this issue during that time.

I ask you, did the Salaf, who did not enter the word *jins al-ʿamal* into the definition of *īmān* are they Murjiʿah to you?" Refer to *Ittiḥaf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-ʿUrfān*, (pp. 248-249).

Shaykh Rabī also said, in clarifying their doubts around seven years ago, "It is desirable that you advise them not to delve into (this issue) of *jins al-ʿamal* because it is a matter the Salaf did not delve into from what I know. It is better to stick to what the Salaf affirmed and believed, that *īmān* is speech and belief, the speech of the heart and the tongue and the action of the heart and limbs, and that it increases and decreases, it increases with obedience and decreases with disobedience. Then to have faith in the ḥadīths of intercession which indicate that he who said '*There is none who has the right to be worshipped but Allāh (alone)*' whilst there is a speck's weight of *īmān* in his heart or what is less than a speck's weight of *īmān* will exit the Hellfire. The doctrine of the Extremist Murjiʿah regarding *īmān* is that it is acquaintance (maʿrifah) only, and with some of them it is assent (taṣdīq) only, amongst these are the Ashʿarites. And with the Murjiʿat al-Fuqhāʾ, *īmān* is the assent of the heart and the affirmation of the tongue. And in the view of all of these factions, action (ʿamal) is not from *īmān*, and *īmān* (to them) does not increase or decrease. **So now, if one (comes along) and says that the one who abandons *jins al-ʿamal* is deficient in *īmān*, or that the one who commits a major sin is deficient in *īmān*, then it is not correct to say that he has agreed with the Murjiʿah, because the Murjiʿah do not speak with the increase of *īmān* or its decrease.** Rather, the major sinner to them (the Extreme Murjiʿah) is complete in *īmān*, in fact, (to them) the *īmān* of the most sinful of people is like the *īmān* of Jibrīl and Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). This matter is clear to the students of knowledge, so I do not know how you were unaware of this?" Refer to *Ittiḥaf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-ʿUrfān*, (pp. 254-255).

Shaykh Rabī also said, whilst refuting Ḥaddādi criminals such as Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī and Fawzī al-Baḥraynī, "You have incited against me using the issue of *jins al-ʿamal*, and I did not even approach the (issue of) the one who abandons *jins al-ʿamal* in my advice (to you), as to whether he is a disbeliever or not a disbeliever. Rather, I simply rejected your statement that whoever does not declare such a one a disbeliever is in agreement with the Murjiʿah through the saying that (such a person's) *īmān* is deficient **which is not actually said by the Murjiʿah**. So when such a person who **does not** declare that person (the one who abandons *jins al-ʿamal*) to be a disbeliever is from amongst those who enter action into *īmān* and says it increases and it decreases, then how can making an analogy for him with the Murjiʿah and putting him alongside them be correct, when they (the Murjiʿah) do not enter actions into *īmān* (to begin with) and nor speak with its increase or decrease? Thus the basis and justification of putting him alongside them (the Murjiʿah) is the saying of the decrease of *īmān*¹⁰⁰ which is not found fundamentally and it (that *īmān* cannot decrease) is the well-

¹⁰⁰ What the Shaykh means here is that when a person says: The one who does not bring *jins al-ʿamal* (meaning anything from the outward actions) **is deficient in *īmān*** (because he believes *īmān* can increase and decrease), then there is no basis here to throw him alongside the Murjiʿah, because the Murjiʿah do not believe *īmān* increases and decreases. So making analogies between them is false, especially when the basis of the analogy can only be based upon this person's belief that the

known saying of the Murji'ah. This was the angle of my criticism of them, and there is no doubt that they are in error in putting (those holding this view) alongside them (the Murji'ah) as it is missing of one of the pillars of (valid) analogy (qiyās)." Refer to *Ittiḥaf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-'Urfān*, (pp. 255-256).

Shaykh Rabī said in his refutation of the misguided Ḥaddādi, Fawzī al-Baḥraynī, "Al-Baḥraynī said (p. 39) of his (treatise), al-Burkān, 'And he (Rabī) does not make takfīr on (the issue of) 'jins al-'amal', rather he is contradictory regarding it and flees from the word 'jins al-'amal' with his claim that the Salaf did not speak with it. So the man stumbles and confuses the issues of īmān, and he does not wish to acknowledge that.' I (Rabī) say: Verily, this is from the greatest of lies, for I have explicitly stated, repeatedly, takfīr of the one who abandons action ('amal). However, the Ḥaddādiyyah have a vile principle which is that when they impute a statement to a person which he is free of and (from which) he openly announces his innocence, then they will persist in continuing with that accusation against that oppressed person with what they imputed to him. With this vile principle, they excel over the Kharijites. I have said repeatedly: The one who abandons action entirely is a kāfir, zindīq. However, I prohibited adherence to the word 'jins' because it contains generality, ambiguity that leads to tribulation. I made it clear that there is no existence for this word in the Book, the Sunnah, and no existence in the speech of the Noble Companions (رضي الله عنه) and nor in the evidences (presented) by Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah in the issues of īmān. I also explained the foreignness of this word to the Arabic language and the confusion in the sayings of the language specialists regarding its meaning. I explained all of that with a clear, sufficient explanation for the one who desires the truth and who wants to free himself from tribulations and commotion. But the Ḥaddādiyyah, due to their bankruptcy in proofs through which they try to argue against Ahl al-Sunnah, continue in stubbornness (in this matter), upon the way of the people of desires who cling to futile statements and words not expressed by the Book and the Sunnah. For the word *jins* is like the words *jawhar*, 'araḍ, *jabar*, *ḥayyiz* and their likes of futile words that entered the Ahl al-Kalām, in their varying factions, into misguidance..." Refer to *Ittiḥaf Ahl al-Ṣidq*, (pp. 260-261).

Shaykh Rabī also said in his refutation of the criminal Fawzī al-Baḥraynī, "And this devotion in looking into tribulation did not suffice you until you clung to the word *jins* (genus) and you did not suffice with the sayings of the Salaf in this field. For amongst them are those who make takfīr of the one who abandons the prayer. Amongst them is the one who makes takfīr of the one who abandons the prayer and withholds the zakāh. Amongst them is one who does not make takfīr of those who abandon the (four) pillars. And amongst them is one who makes takfīr of the one who abandons action entirely. All of these (varying) statements constrained you and thus you clung to the word *jins* which has no existence in the Book or the Sunnah. Until even the leading scholars of the language

īmān of this person (who leaves *jins al-'amal*) is **deficient**. The Murji'ah do not believe this to begin with, so there is no true basis to compare the two. A person who says abandoning prayer is not disbelief but major sin which severely harms īmān and invites punishment is free of the saying of the Murji'ah.

consider it to have been entered into the language (from outside). You clung to it for the purpose of incitement, tribulations and revilement upon Ahl al-Sunnah. You clung to it in a way that the people of desires cling (to their sayings), and you say that so and so said it and so and so said it. But so and so are free from your oppression and falsehood, for they did not cause commotion by it and nor did they wage a war for its sake. Their intent in applying this word is other than your intent... you made this to be a drawn sword against Ahl al-Sunnah, and these are some of your tribulations and incitements against Ahl al-Sunnah."¹⁰¹

From what has preceded the reader can see that the Ḥaddādiyyah bring ambiguous phrases into the definition of īmān that were not known by the Salaf and then they create tribulations through these phrases, intending by that to declare the Salafi scholars astray and misguided.

Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān was asked, "Is it correct to say, '*jins al-ʿamal*' (the genus of action) is an innovated term not related from the Salaf and it is a general, ambiguous word'? or is it better to leave (this statement)? May Allāh bless you and bring benefit through you?" And Allāh knows best, it appears this may have been a question sought so that Shaykh Rabī's refutations against the Ḥaddādīs like Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī can be undermined, perhaps the questioner wanted Shaykh al-Fawzān to affirm, that one should not claim that *jins al-ʿamal* is an innovated term. The Shaykh responded, "We have not known this in the speech of our Scholars and the Scholars of the Salaf. We do not know of differentiating between '*jins al-ʿamal*' and ʿamal (action). You simply say 'action'!! Action is from īmān, action is from īmān. īmān is speech of the tongue, belief in the heart and acting with the limbs. **They did not say '*jins al-ʿamal*' for the (action of) the limbs.** This phrase has no basis for it, this phrase has no basis for it. Perhaps it has come from the Murji'ah! Perhaps it came from the direction of the Murji'ah."¹⁰²

Ironically, we see the agreement between Shaykh al-Fawzān and Shaykh Rabī who warn from innovated terms in defining īmān. However it is clear that Shaykh al-Fawzān is not aware of the evil designs of those Ḥaddādīs and Takfīrīs who brought this phrase *jins al-ʿamal*, intending by that to make takfīr of Muslims and accuse their Scholar with Irjā'. It is not the Murji'ah who brought this, but the Quṭbiyyah, Surūriyyah, Takfīriyyah, Ḥaddādiyyah, and this latest band of extremist Ḥaddādīs are using these issues in order to elicit statements against Shaykh Rabī and others, whilst these Scholars are not fully aware of the history and reality of those Ḥaddādīs who are approaching them.

In addition, they have another approach of treating anyone who speaks with the explanations of the Salaf as being misguided and from the Murji'ah. From the examples of

¹⁰¹ Refer to the Shaykh's article Kashf Akādhīb wa Tahṛīfāt wa Khiyānāt Fawzī al-Baḥraynī on <http://www.rabee.net>.

¹⁰² Refer to <http://www.sahab.net/forums/index.php?showtopic=146108> for the audio.

that is the statement of the Salaf and the Imāms of the Sunnah that īmān has a foundation (aṣl) and a branch (far') and that the branch perfects the foundation.

The Statements of the Imāms of the Sunnah That Īmān Has a Foundation and a Branch

When the Takfīrī Ḥaddādiyyah began to use the issues pertaining to īmān as a means of discrediting the Imāms of the Sunnah who did not perform mass, unrestricted takfīr of the rulers over the Muslim lands, and began to innovate statements and judgements not known to the Salaf, Shaykh Rabī stood to defend those Imāms of the Sunnah. The Ḥaddādiyyah began to say that anyone who says īmān has a foundation which is belief and a branch which is action and that one is a completion of the other is a Murji'. Shaykh Rabī refuted them and said that this is stated by many Imāms of the Salaf and that saying "*outward action is a completion (kamāl) of the inward īmān*" does not equate to expelling actions from īmān. When Shaykh Rabī rendered spurious their oppressive claims, they then began to contact some of the Salafī Scholars such as Shaykh al-Fawzān and read selected, isolated parts from the Shaykhs writings, detached from the wider context. And since the subject of īmān is intricate, with many different factions having their own statements and explanations of those statements, it is possible to isolate a statement and present it in a way that appears to agree with a foundation from the foundations of the people of misguidance.¹⁰³

Imām Muḥammad bin Ishāq bin Mandah (رحمته الله) said in his Kitāb al-Īmān (1/331-332), "**The people of the Jamā'ah said: Īmān is all of the acts of obedience (those) with the heart, the tongue and all of the limbs. Save that it is has a foundation (aṣl) and a branch (far'). As for**

¹⁰³ The Ḥaddādiyyah have done this recently on this issue of īmān having a foundation and a branch, they have solicited some speech from Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān and spread it online. This will not harm neither Shaykh Rabī nor the Salafīs since these games have been played before, over the past two decades, by the Surūriyyah, Turāthiyyah and Quṭbiyyah and others. They read out the speech of Shaykh Rabī based on the Imāms of the Salaf that īmān has a foundation that is the inward īmān and a branch which is the outward īmān and which is a completion and perfection of īmān and without any context and background it can easily be understood that this person is from the Murji'ah who expels actions from īmān. Thus, Shaykh al-Fawzān responded that this person is a liar in what he claims. However, what Shaykh Rabī established is the truth and it is the view of Ahl al-Sunnah without exception that the outward actions are a completion of the īmān that is inward and at the same time those outward actions are from the reality of īmān. This is founded upon revealed texts and the statements of the Imāms of the Salaf. However, since the Murji'ah expel actions from īmān, they would also make these same statements, saying that the foundation of īmān is in the heart (and they would restrict it to the heart or the heart and tongue) and that what is outward is only a perfection of īmān, without actually being from īmān itself. So the difference between Ahl al-Sunnah and the Murji'ah is clear, however, it is very easy to take the statements of a Scholar and present them in a way, devoid of context, such that another Scholar understands those statements in light of the views of the astray sects and thus passes judgement upon those statements as misguidance. No doubt, the saying of the Murji'ah that outward actions are only a perfection of īmān and not from it is error and misguidance, this is agreed by everyone. But as for describing actions as an extension and perfection of the foundation, **being tied to it, required by it through necessity and being from the overall īmān**, then this is the understanding of Ahl al-Sunnah and is not misguidance.

its foundation, it is acquaintance with Allāh, believing (that He is truthful) and (believing) in Him, and in whatever came from Him, with the heart and tongue, alongside humility to Him, love of Him, fear of Him, veneration of Him, alongside abandonment of arrogance, disdain and obstinacy. If he brings this foundation he has entered into īmān and its label and ruling is binding for him. **But he will not have completed (mustakmilan) [his īmān] until he brings its branch (far')**, and its branch is what is obligatory upon him, or the farā'id (the obligations) and avoiding the prohibitions, and the report has come from the Prophet (ﷺ) that he said, "*Īmān consists of seventy or sixty-odd branches, the most superior of them is the testimonial, "Lā ilāha illallāha" and the lowest of them is to remove something harmful from the floor, and modesty is a branch of īmān.*"

Muḥammad bin Nasr al-Marwazi (رحمته الله) said in the course of his refutation of the Murji'ah, "And we say: That īmān has an aṣl, foundation."¹⁰⁴ If even an atom's weight is removed from it, the appellation of īmān will be removed altogether (the whole of īmān will be gone). And from whomever this is not removed, the appellation of īmān will remain with him. **However, after this it increases, adding īmān on top of his īmān. Then if there is any decrease in what is additional to this foundation (aṣl), the actual foundation does not decrease, which is affirmation (iqrār) that Allāh is the truth and what He says is the truth.** This is because any deficiency with respect to this (foundation) is actually doubt (shakk) about Allāh, is He true or not? And this is like the example of a date-palm tree that has branches and leaves. **Every time a branch falls from it, the appellation of 'tree' remains for it, however after this decrease it is in a state other than what it was before of perfection, but without its naming changing.** It is a tree that is deficient in its branches, and other trees are more perfect than it since they are complete. And Allāh the Mighty and Majestic said, '**The example of a good word is like a good tree whose foundation (aṣl) is firmly established and whose branches reach up to the heaven...**' to the end of the verse. So He made the example of this tree an example for the word "Imaan", and He made it have a foundation (aṣl) and a branch (far')..."¹⁰⁵

And **Ibn Taymiyyah** (رحمته الله) said, "So either (īmān) is taṣdīq (assent) of the heart only as the Jahmiyyah and whoever followed them from the Ash'arites say, or it is of the heart and tongue as the Murji'ah say, or the tongue (alone) as the Karrāmiyyah say, or taṣdīq with the heart, tongue and action, for all of them [the three] enter into the meaning of taṣdīq upon the madhhab of the People of Ḥadīth... Then, in the Book, it (īmān) is (mentioned) with two meanings: **A foundation (aṣl) and an obligatory branch (far' wājib).** The foundation that is in the heart is behind action [giving rise to it], this is why He separated between them with His saying, "**Those who believe and do righteous deeds**" (98:7) and [there is] that which combines them both as in His saying, "**Verily the Believers...**" (8:2) and "**Those who believe seek your permission...**" (9:44) and the ḥadīth of modesty (al-ḥayā') and the [ḥadīth of] the

¹⁰⁴ This is the affirmation of Tawḥīd and Messengership.

¹⁰⁵ Ta'dhīm Qadr al-Ṣalāt (2/703).

delegation of ‘Abd al-Qays [which mentions pillars of Islām as being from īmān]. And it (īmān) is comprised of:

- A **basis (aṣl)** without which it cannot be complete
- **Obligatory [duties] (wajīb)**, whose neglect cause (īmān) to be deficient and render the one guilty of this punishable
- **Recommended [duties] (mustahabb)** whose absence cause the greatness of rank to be lost.

And amongst the people [in light of the above] are those who wrong their own souls, those who are just in between (following a middle course), and those who are foremost (in goodness). [Similar to what we find in physical entities and actions] such as Ḥajj, the physical body, the mosque and other such entities, actions and characteristics. And from its various elements [which constitute īmān] are those which if they are not present will reduce it [from being] most perfect, and those which will cause it to fall short of perfection – and this is abandoning the obligatory duties and falling into the forbidden matters. And from it is that which will cause its basis (rukṇ) to be impaired, and that is the abandoning of belief (i’tiqād) and speech (qawl) – and which the Murji’ah and Jahmiyyah claim to be [what justifies] the appellation [of īmān]. And by this [classification] will the doubts of all the sects be put to an end. **The foundation (aṣl) [of īmān] is in the heart and its perfection (kamāl) lies in the outward actions, in opposition to Islam since its basis is what is external and its perfection lies in the heart...**"¹⁰⁶

And Ibn Taymiyyah also said, "And the religiosity (dīn) established with the heart of īmān in terms of knowledge and states of being (meaning actions of the heart), **that is the foundation (aṣl)**. And the outward actions they are **the branches (furū’)**, and they comprise **the perfection (kamāl) of īmān**."¹⁰⁷ He also said, "Just as Ahl al-Sunnah said that whoever abandons the branches (furū’) of īmān does not become a disbeliever until he abandons the foundation of īmān which is belief (i’tiqād)."¹⁰⁸

To the Ḥaddādiyyah, this explanation from Ibn Taymiyyah is Irjā’, despite his statements that īmān consists of belief, speech and action, that all of them are pillars (arkān) in īmān, or necessary (lāzim) to īmān or a part (juz’) of īmān and that at the same time, from another perspective, it is said to have a foundation (aṣl) and a branch and that the branch stems from the foundation and completes the whole. What they fail to understand is that describing action (‘amal) to be a pillar (rukṇ) or from the binding necessity (lāzim) or a part (juz’) of īmān, alongside it also being a branch (far’) that stems out of the foundation (aṣl), and being a completion (tamām) or perfection (kamāl) of the foundation and the whole **does not necessitate that action is not from īmān – all of that is simultaneously correct, there is no conflict in any of that**. This is why factions of Ahl al-Sunnah hold that the

¹⁰⁶ Majmū’ al-Fatāwā (7/637).

¹⁰⁷ Majmū’ al-Fatāwā (10/355-356).

¹⁰⁸ Majmū’ al-Fatāwā (11/138).

outward actions are from īmān but a person who neglects them does not become a disbeliever, so long as he does not bring a nullifier of Islām, but he is a sinful believer, deficient in īmān, subject to the threat of punishment.

In addition to this, the Ḥaddādiyyah have also made use of the issue of the excuse of ignorance (al-‘udhru bil-jahl) and establishing the proof (iqāmat al-ḥujjah) in order to accuse the Salafi Scholars of Irjā’.

The Excuse of Ignorance and Establishing the Proof in Matters of Kufr and Shirk

Since the Murji’ah do not include actions into the reality of īmān (due to their expulsion of the actions of the heart from the inward īmān as was done by Jahm bin Ṣafwān), they conceived of impossible scenarios and affirmed belief for one who was upon kufr in reality. Thus, they envisaged that a man can have taṣdīq in his heart, affirm the truth of the kalimah outwardly and affirm that Muḥammad (ﷺ) is truthful yet at the same time revile the Messenger (ﷺ), fight against the Believers and perform actions of shirk, and none of this expels him from īmān. He remains a believer, perfect in īmān, guaranteed Paradise! The Ḥaddādiyyah took the issue of the excuse of ignorance and employed it to accuse the Salafi scholars of agreeing with the extremist Murji’ah in expelling actions from īmān and agreeing with the Murji’ah who say takfīr is restricted to takdhīb (denial), istiḥlāl (declaring what is unlawful to be lawful) or juḥūd (rejection) and the likes which relate to the speech of the heart only, and that a believer can never leave īmān no matter what his actions, even if they be major kufr and shirk.

However, the issue of the excuse of ignorance for the one who falls into major kufr and shirk is something firmly established with the Scholars past and present, and these ideological battles that the Ḥaddādiyyah are waging only prove that their intent is not Shaykh Rabī but rather the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah as a whole. **Shaykh Rabī is only the scapegoat because he is vocal in refuting them and exposing their plots and stratagems. They actually intend the remaining Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah.**

Here are statements from some of the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah on this topic, whilst keeping in mind that, just like in the issue of the abandonment of prayer, the Scholars do differ on whether an ignorant person can be excused for falling into kufr and shirk, and also the parameters and scope within which this excuse can be afforded.

Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah (رحمته الله) said, "For we, after acquaintance with what the Messenger (ﷺ) came with, know by necessity that he did not legislate for his ummah that they call upon anyone from the dead, neither the prophets, nor the righteous or others besides them, neither with the word istiḥāthah (seeking rescue) and nor with other than it, and nor with the word isti’ādhah (seeking refuge) or other than it. Just like he

did not legislate for his ummah that they prostrate to a dead person or other than a dead person and what is similar to this. Rather, we know that he prohibited from all these matters and that it is from the shirk which Allāh and His Messenger made unlawful. **However, due to the preponderance of ignorance, and scant knowledge of the remnants of the messengership amongst many of the latecomers, takfīr is not made of them on account (of what has been mentioned) until that which the Messenger (ﷺ) came with becomes clear to them (yatabayyan) from that which opposes it.** For this reason, never did I explain this issue to anyone who understood the foundation of Islām, ever, except that he grasped it and said, "This (establishment of the proof) is the [very] foundation of the religion," and one of the senior amongst the knowledgeable shaykhs from our associates said, "This is the greatest of what you have explained to us" due to his knowledge that this is the foundation of the religion."¹⁰⁹

Ibn al-Qayyim (رحمته الله) said, "I say: Whoever disbelieved on account of his doctrine, such as the one rejects the origination of the universe, resurrection of the bodies, the knowledge of the Exalted Lord of all created things and that He acts through His will (mashī'ah, irādah), then his testimony¹¹⁰ is not accepted because he is upon other than Islām. And as for the people of innovation who are in agreement with the foundation of Islām (itself) but differ in some of the foundations (uṣūl) such as the Rāfiḍah, Qadariyyah, Jahmiyyah, the Extremist Murji'ah and other than them, they are of three types: **The first of them:** The ignorant blind-follower who has no insight. This one does not disbelieve but is a sinner. His testimony is not rejected if he was unable to learn guidance, and his ruling is the same as the weak ones (mustaḍ'afīn) from the men, women and children who have no route and are not guided in the path. Perhaps Allāh will pardon them and Allāh is ever indeed pardoning, forgiving. **The second type:** One who is capable of asking, seeking guidance and knowing the truth but abandons that due to occupying himself with his worldly affairs, his authority, his pursuing delights and livelihood and other than that. This one is neglectful, deserving of punishment, sinful by abandoning what is obligatory upon him of the taqwā of Allāh to the best of his ability. The ruling upon this one is like the ruling of his likes who abandon some of the obligations. If the innovation and desire that is with him overwhelms the Sunnah and guidance that is with him, his testimony is rejected, and if the Sunnah and guidance that is with him dominates, then it is accepted. **The third type:** That he asks and seeks, and the guidance becomes clear to him (yatabayyan lahu al-hudā), but he leaves it out of taqlīd (blind-following) and ta'aṣṣub (bigotry), or due to hatred or enmity towards its associates. The least that can be said about such a one is that he is a sinner (fāsiq), and making takfīr of him is subject to ijtihād and tafṣīl (detail)¹¹¹. If he is an open caller and

¹⁰⁹ Kitāb al-Istighāthah (2/731).

¹¹⁰ These are all the view of the Philosophers who tried to merge Islām with Greek philosophy and some of them were Bāṭiniyyah, using the veil of Shi'ism to push their ideas amongst Muslims, such as Ibn Sīnā.

¹¹¹ Note that Ibn al-Qayyim said this is a matter of **further detail** and it should **not** be understood that the one who falls into major kufr or shirk after guidance is conveyed to him and becomes clear to him that he is only a sinner and not a disbeliever. The significant thing here is that he is

announcer, his testimonies, verdicts and rulings are rejected alongside the ability to do that and his testimony, verdict or ruling is not accepted unless it is a necessity, such as when the likes of these are dominant (in a land) and have taken control of it, or when the judges, scholars who issue verdicts and witnesses are from amongst them. Rejecting their testimonies in such a situation entails great corruption, and it is not possible to do that, so they are accepted due to necessity."¹¹²

This statement of Ibn al-Qayyim is significant as it relates to some of the claims of the extremist Ḥaddādī, ‘Abdullāh al-Jarbū’, whose ideas are mentioned later.

Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb (رحمته الله) said, "As for what the enemies have mentioned about me: That I make takfīr on the basis of presumption, and on the basis of loyalty, **or that I make takfīr of the ignorant person upon whom the proof has not been established**, then this is a mighty slander. They desire to make the people flee from the deen of Allāh and His Messenger by it."¹¹³ And he (رحمته الله) also said, "And likewise, his distortion upon the common people that Ibn Abd al-Wahhāb says, '*Whoever does not come under my obedience is a disbeliever.*' And we say: Sublime are you (O Lord), this is a mighty slander! Rather, we call Allāh to witness over what he knows from our hearts that whoever acts upon Tawḥīd and frees himself from Shirk and its people, then he is a Muslim in whatever time and place (he maybe in). But we make takfīr of the one who associates partners with Allaah in His ilāhiyyah (sole right of worship), **after we have made clear to him the proof for the futility of shirk.**"¹¹⁴

And he (رحمته الله) also said, "And as for the lie and slander, then it is like their saying that we make generalized takfīr (of the masses), and that we make emigration (hijrah) obligatory towards us for the one who is able to manifest his religion, and that we make takfīr of the one who does not make takfīr and who does not fight, and multiple times the likes of this (type of lying and slander). All of this is from lying and slander by which they hinder the people from the dīn of Allāh and His Messenger. And when it is the case that we do not make takfīr of the one who worships the idol (tomb) which is on the grave of ‘Abd al-Qādir, and the idol which is on the grave of Aḥmad al-Badawī and their likes, **due to their ignorance, and the absence of the one to notify them (of their opposition)**, then how could we make takfīr of the one who does not associate partners with Allāh, when he does not emigrate to us and who does not make takfīr (of us) and does not fight (against us)? **"Glory be to you (O Lord), this is a mighty slander."** (24:16)"¹¹⁵ And he (رحمته الله) said, "And as for takfīr: Then I make takfīr of the one who knew (the reality) of the dīn of the Messenger, and

including the common folk from the Rāfiḍah, Jahmiyyah and extreme Murji’ah amongst those who have the excuse of ignorance.

¹¹² In Turuq al-Ḥukmiyyah (Dār ‘Ālam al-Fawā’id, pp. 464-465).

¹¹³ In Majmū’ Mu’allafāt al-Shaykh Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb (7/25) in his letter to Muḥammad bin ‘Īd.

¹¹⁴ Ibid (7/60).

¹¹⁵ In the section Fatāwā wa Masā’il (4/11).

then after he knew it, he reviled it, prohibited the people from it and showed enmity to the one who implemented it. This is the one I declare a disbeliever and most of the ummah, and all praise is due to Allāh, are not like that."¹¹⁶

And **Shaykh ‘Abd al-Laṭīf bin ‘Abd al-Raḥmān bin Ḥasan** whilst refuting the accusation against his grandfather (Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Waḥhāb) stated, "And Shaykh Muḥammad (رحمته الله) was from the greatest of people in withholding and desisting from applying (the judgement of) kufr, until he would not be resolute upon the takfīr of the ignorant person who called upon other than Allāh from the inhabitants of the graves or other than them when one who could advise him and make such proof be conveyed to him - the abandoner of which would fall into disbelief - was not readily available to him. He said in one of his letters, 'And when we do not fight against the one who worships the shrine of al-Kawāz until we advance with calling him to make the religion sincerely and purely for Allāh (alone), then how can we make takfīr of the one who did not emigrate to us despite being a believing monotheist.' And he had been asked about the likes of these ignorant people and he affirmed that the one upon whom the proof had been established and was capable of knowing the proof, he is the who disbelieves by worshipping the graves."¹¹⁷

Due to the presence of other statements from the Mashāyikh of the da‘wah that relate to the conveyance (bulūgh) and understanding (fahm) of the proof through the Qur’ān one will find that a difference of opinion (or a perceived one) has arisen in this matter. These differences can be explained and resolved in that not all people who fall into kufr can be given the excuse of ignorance since parameters and contexts can vary, and in different situations, the Mashāyikh of the da‘wah of Tawḥīd took the approach relevant to the realities of the people in question. So there are ways to resolve these apparent conflicts and you will also find in the statements of the Imāms of the Sunnah an acknowledgement of a legitimate difference of opinion or difference of understanding and application of that understanding. This is in stark difference to the Ḥaddādiyyah who claim anyone who affirms the excuse of ignorance in principle is upon the dīn of the Murji‘ah and is arguing on behalf of the Mushriks (as some of these vile and filthy Ḥaddādīs who have no shame and no taqwā of Allāh have started claiming).¹¹⁸

Imām Ibn Bāz (رحمته الله) was asked, "If I see someone invoking the (dead) in the grave, seeking rescue from him, then he has been afflicted with shirk, shall I call him (to the truth) on the

¹¹⁶ Al-Durar al-Saniyyah (1/73).

¹¹⁷ Minhāj al-Ta’sīs wal-Taqdīs (Dār al-Hidāyah, 1407H, p. 98-99).

¹¹⁸ One of them ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Juhānī has started attacking Shaykh Rabī accusing him of reviving the religion of Ibn Jarjīs (a grave-worshipper refuted by the Mashāyikh of the da‘wah, from the offspring of Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Waḥhāb) - all due to the issue of the excuse of ignorance. From the vile speech for which he will have to answer for on the Day of Judgement is his statement, "What a pleasure to the eye of the grave-worshippers is Rabī al-Madkhalī! I do not think anyone has defended them after Dāwūd bin Jarjīs like him" in one of his articles. Why do these people not say the same about Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn or Shaykh ‘Abd al-Muhsin or even Shaykh al-Fawzān in whose fatāwā there can be found the excuse of ignorance for the grave-worshipper and also the common Rāfiḍī.

basis that he is a Muslim or shall I call him on the basis that he is a Mushrik if I wanted to call him to Allāh, the Mighty and Majestic, and explain to him?" And he (رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) replied, "Call him through another expression, neither this (that he is Muslim) and neither that (that he is a Mushrik), say to him, "O So and so, servant of Allaah, this action of yours which you have done is shirk, it is not worship, it is the action of the ignorant mushriks, the action of the Quraysh and the likes of Quraysh, because there is a barrier to the takfir of such a one and (takfir of him) would cause to him to flee (from the truth) when you call him. And also because making takfir of an individual is (a matter) other than the action which is shirk, the action is shirk, but the one who performs it does not become a Mushrik because there could a barrier to his takfīr, his ignorance, or his lack of insight in the definition of the scholars. And also in calling through the label of shirk (calling him a Mushrik) is turning him away, so you call him by his name, then you explain to him that this action is shirk." And in response to the follow up question, "What is the stronger view regarding takfīr of a specific person?" the Shaykh (رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) explained, "When the evidences and proof are established against him which indicate his kufr (to him), and the path has been made clear to him and he persists, then he is a disbeliever. **However, some of the scholars hold that whoever falls into some of the affairs of shirk and he may be confused or may be ignorant and does not know the reality, then they do not make takfīr of him until it is explained to him and guides him to (the realization) that this is disbelief and misguidance, and that this is the action of the first mushriks.** And if he persists after the clarification, he is judged to be a disbeliever (through this disbelief)."¹¹⁹

Imām Ibn Bāz does have other statements that suggest the absence of the excuse of ignorance because the Qurʾān has been conveyed and the proof is established and the affairs of Tawḥid are known and manifest. However, as we said, these differences can be explained by the fact that different sets of people have different circumstances and the same Scholar might grant the excuse of ignorance to a person, but not to another, depending on the situation and context, and because what is known from the religion by necessity (al-maʿlūm min al-dīn bil-ḍurūrah) varies from time to time and place to place and even person to person in similar circumstances.¹²⁰

Shaykh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Rāhijī presented a question to Shaykh al-Fawzān, "The questioner says, 'Whoever performs shirk, such as (a person) calling upon other than Allaah for example, for a cure to an illness (or ill person), so do we say 'He is a mushrik' or do we say, 'His action is shirk' (with the knowledge) that he says 'Lā ilāha ilallāh' and he fast and makes pilgrimage?' Shaykh Ṣālih al-Fawzān answered, "When he does not have an excuse in falling into Shirk then he is a mushrik. As for when he is **ignorant**, or a **muqallid** (blind-follower of others), or he makes an interpretation he considers to be correct, then the

¹¹⁹ Al-Fawā'id al-ʿIlmiyyah min al-Durūs al-Bāziyyah (2/273-274).

¹²⁰ For example, an expat worker may spend years in a Muslim country where Tawhid is manifest, however, he may never speak the language of that country (Arabic) and never be informed that what he does in his own land, of soliciting aid from the dead and the likes, is shirk that invalidates his Islām.

(affair) is explained to him, then if he disobeys, then the judgement of shirk is made upon him, because his ignorance has now ceased."¹²¹

And **Shaykh al-Fawzān** has fatāwā regarding the common Shi'ah too. The Shaykh was asked, "May Allāh be benevolent to possessor of excellence, he says: Are the Rāfiḍah disbelievers and is it distinguished between their scholars and general-folk in that regard?" He responded, "The principle is that whoever invoked those besides Allāh or sacrificed to other than Allāh or performed any action of worship for other than Allāh, then he is a disbeliever whether he is from the Rāfiḍah or other than them, from the Rāfiḍah or other than them. Whoever worships other than Allāh with any of the types of worship, then he is a disbeliever and likewise whoever claims that it is obligatory to follow one besides the Messenger (ﷺ), then he is a disbeliever, from amongst the Rāfiḍah or other than them. The Rāfiḍah consider their imāms to have a higher status than the Messenger, and that their imāms do not err, that they are infallible, they do not err. And that they have the right to declare lawful what they wish and declare unlawful what they wish. Is this not the greatest disbelief and refuge is with Allāh. This is found with them in their books, this is not hidden, and they have many affairs besides that." Then it was said, "He (the questioner) says: Is to be distinguished between their scholars and general-folk in that regard?" And Shaykh al-Fawzān said, "Their scholars are more severe, because they know that this is falsehood and they adopted it, there is no doubt about their disbelief. As for their common-folk, if the proof is established against them and then they persist, they disbelieve. **As for when the proof is not established, then they are people of misguidance and they do not disbelieve.**"¹²²

Shaykh al-Fawzān also has other fatāwā in which it is apparent that he does not grant the excuse of ignorance, and this can be understood to mean that the excuse of ignorance does not always apply to all people, in all situations, even if it is accepted as a principle. The issue is in when can it be applied and to whom. But despite the existence of these fatāwā why do not the Ḥaddādiyyah accuse the Shaykh of reviving the religion of Dāwūd bin Jarjīs (the grave-worshipper) and other such slanders which they throw against Shaykh Rabī? Because they are Takfīrī criminals feigning Salafiyyah and feigning attachment to the Scholars of Najd and the Scholars of the da'wah of Tawḥīd, using them as a veil for their evil designs and agendas. And when some of these extremist Ḥaddādīs such as Badr al-Dīn al-Munāṣarah make clear their attachment and sympathy for the Terrorist Khārijites of ISIS, then you can see where these people are heading and what they desire.

Shaykh Ibn al-'Uthaymīn (رحمته الله) discusses this matter in *Sharḥ al-Mumtī'* (6/191-195), "Ignorance (al-jahl) is excused by the Book, the Sunnah and the consensus of the Muslims in generality (meaning, not in every situation, but in the generality of situations). Evidences from the Qur'ān include, **"And We never punish until We have sent a Messenger**

¹²¹ Refer to <http://www.manhaj.com/manhaj/?obkwf> for the audio recording.

¹²² Refer to <http://www.alfawzan.af.org.sa/node/5118> and also here <http://www.manhaj.com/manhaj/?dkhtd>.

(to give warning)" (17:15), "And We sent not a Messenger except with the language of his people, in order that he might make (the Message) clear for them" (14:4), "And never will your Lord destroy the towns (populations) until He sends to their mother town a Messenger reciting to them Our Verses. And never would We destroy the towns unless the people thereof are oppressors" (28:59), "And if We had destroyed them with a torment before this, they would surely have said: 'Our Lord! If only You had sent us a Messenger, we should certainly have followed Your signs before we were humiliated and disgraced'." (20:134). And in the Sunnah, the saying of the Messenger (ﷺ), "Indeed Allaah has pardoned for my Ummah that which occurs due to error, forgetfulness and compulsion." And the evidences indicating that ignorance is an excuse are very many. **However is the claim of ignorance accepted from everyone?** The answer is no. For the one who lived amongst the Muslims and denied the prayer, or the zakāh, or fasting, or the Ḥajj and said, "I do not know" his saying is not accepted, because this is known to be from the religion by necessity, since both the scholar and the ignorant know this. However, if he was new to Islām, or was raised in the desert far away from the cities and towns, then his claim of ignorance is accepted and he does not disbelieve. But we teach him and if he persisted after the clarification then we judge him with disbelief. This is one of the great matters (requiring) verification and conceptualization. For amongst the people are those who (declare) unrestrictedly, "There is no excuse of ignorance in the foundations of the religion, such as Tawḥīd, and if we found a Muslim in some of the towns or some of the desert regions worshipping a grave or a saint, and he says he is a Muslim and that he found his forefathers upon this and did not know it was Shirk, he is not to be excused."

That which is correct is that he does not disbelieve, because the first thing that the Messengers came with is Tawḥīd, and alongside that, the Exalted said, "**And we do not punish until after we have sent a Messenger**" (17:15). Hence, it is necessary for a person to be an oppressor (wilfully rejecting truth), otherwise he does not deserve punishment. Further, dividing the religion into foundations (uṣūl) and branches (furūʿ) was rejected by Shaykh al-Islām (Ibn Taymiyyah), and this classification did not occur until after the blessed generations, right at the end of the third century. Shaykh al-Islām said, "How can we say that the prayer is from the branches?!" Because those who divide the religion into foundations and branches make the prayer to be from the branches - yet it is the second pillar from the pillars of Islām, and likewise, zakāh, fasting and Ḥajj. So how can it be said that it is from the branches. However, in some situations a person is not excused due to ignorance, and this is when it is within his ability to learn, yet he did not do so, despite the doubt (shubḥah) being with him. Like a man, when it is said to him, "This is ḥarām" yet he believes it to be ḥalāl, so here, at the very least, he should have a doubt, and so here, it is binding upon him to learn so that he can arrive at certainty. We will not excuse this person for his ignorance because he was neglectful in educating himself, and neglect invalidates the excuse. However, the one who is ignorant and he does not have a doubt and believes that that which he is upon is the truth, or he says that this (what he is upon) is the truth, then there is no doubt that this person does not intend opposition, and does not intend disobedience and disbelief. So it is not possible that we make takfīr of him until even if he

was ignorant of a foundation from the foundations of the religion. For faith in zakāh and its obligation is a foundation from the foundations of the religion, yet alongside that, the ignorant one is not declared a disbeliever.

Built upon this, the condition of many of the Muslims in some of the Islāmic lands will become clear, those who seek rescue from the dead, and they do not know this is ḥarām. Rather, they may have been deceived that this is from what brings one closer to Allāh and that this (person) is a walī (saint) of Allāh and what resembles the likes of this. Yet these (people) embrace Islām, zealous over it, believing that what they are doing is from Islām and no one has come to them who has explained to them. So these are excused, they are not to be treated as the stubborn opposer (al-mu'ānid), the one to whom the scholars say, "This is shirk" and he says, "But this is what I found my forefathers upon." The ruling upon this one is the ruling upon those about whom Allāh the Exalted said, "**Indeed we found our forefathers upon this way and we shall indeed guide ourselves by their tracks**" (43:22). If it is said: How can these people be excused and yet the Ahl al-Fatrah¹²³ were not excused, for the Messenger (ﷺ) said, "*My father and your father are in the Fire*"¹²⁴, then it is said: It is not for us to go beyond the texts (regarding the Ahl al-Fatrah), for if the Messenger (ﷺ) had not said that his father is in the fire, the requirement of the Sharī'ah principle would be that he would not be punished and that his affair would be with Allāh, just like all the other people of the interval (between Messengers). The most correct saying is that the people of the interval will be tested on the Day of Judgement with whatever Allāh wills. As for these people, they believe that they are upon Islām, and no one has come to them to teach them. In fact, there may be amongst them one from the scholars of misguidance who says (to them) what they are upon is the truth." End quote from Shaykh Ibn al-'Uthaymīn.

Shaykh Ibn al-'Uthaymīn (رحمته الله) said, during his tafsīr of Sūrah al-An'ām, "**The second benefit:** That this judgement is for the one upon whom the proof has been established by way of the truth coming to him. As for when he does not know the truth, then he is (one of) two types (of people): He could be following the religion of truth but he does not know it¹²⁵, so he prays, gives zakāh, fasts and and makes Ḥajj, but he seeks rescue from the dead. We judge this one with Islām when the proof has not been established upon him. Or he could be following a false religion and does not ascribe to the true religion, thus he does not follow the religion of Islām to begin with and the proof has not reached him and he does not know that he is upon misguidance. However, he follows a religion other than that of Islām. This one is treated by us as a disbeliever. Thus, if anyone died now from the non-Muslims and the da'wah of Islām had not reached him, then we do not pray over him, nor

¹²³ Literally, *people of the interval* those living after the remnants of the teachings of previous prophethood had disappeared.

¹²⁴ The Messenger (ﷺ) said this to a man whose father had died upon shirk and kufr prior to Islām in order to console him.

¹²⁵ Meaning he does not know the reality of the religion of truth, as occurs in times or places where ignorance is widespread and knowledge is little.

do we ask for mercy for him because he follows a religion other than Islām. As for the Hereafter, then his affair is with Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ). And if he had been a Muslim, following the religion of Islām, and says, 'I testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allaah and Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah' and establishes the prayer, gives zakāh but brings major shirk, not knowing it is major shirk, then we treat him as a Muslim, we wash him, shroud him, pray over him and bury him with us so long as the proof has not been established upon him."¹²⁶

We can leave the final word to **Shaykh Rabī bin Hādī** on this matter,¹²⁷ "This issue, the issue of the excuse of ignorance [in matters of disbelief] or the absence of the excuse [of ignorance], there are people of tribulation who revolve around it! They desire to separate the Salafīs and cause some of them to strike others! I used to be in al-Madīnah and (the brother) Riyāḍ al-Saīd contacted me, and he is known and present in al-Riyāḍ now and he said, "There are here in al-Ṭā'if, fifty youths, all of them make takfīr of al-Albānī!!" Why!? Because he does not make takfīr of the grave-worshippers and applies the excuse of ignorance to them! Fine, those people (in reality must) also make takfīr of Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim and many of the Salaf because they grant the excuse of ignorance, and they have evidences, from them, **"And We never punish until We have sent a Messenger (to give warning)"** (17:15), and from them, **"And whoever contends with the Messenger after the guidance has been made plain to him and chooses a path other than that of the Believers, we shall leave him in the path he has chosen and burn him in the Fire, what an evil refuge?"** (4:115) and from them, **"And never does Allāh misguide a people after He guides them until He makes clear to them what they should avoid"** (9:115).

And there are other texts which indicate that a Muslim does not disbelieve due to anything of kufr he has fallen into, we say, fallen into kufr, this kufr which he has fallen into due to ignorance for example, then we do not make takfir of him until we make the proof clear to him and establish the proof against him. If he then shows stubborn opposition, we make takfir of him. This is the saying that a number of the Imāms of the da'wah of Najd are upon, and some of them, their speech may vary, making the establishment of the proof conditional at one time, and another time saying the excuse of ignorance is not given! So some people cling to the sayings of the one who does not give the excuse of ignorance, yet neglects the clear texts about the establishment of the proof being a condition and that takfir is not made of a Muslim who falls into a mukaffir (nullifier) until the proof is established upon him. And from them is what I mentioned from Imām al-Shāfi'ī (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ), and the texts which I mentioned to you.

I used to know an esteemed Shaykh who did not give the excuse of ignorance, and we used to study in Ṣāmitah, and this Shaykh visited us (there) and he used to carry this notion! However, he would not kindle tribulations and would not dispute or argue or declare astray the one who would give the excuse of ignorance. And we lived as friends for close to forty

¹²⁶ Tafsīr al-Qur'an al-Karīm, (Dar Ibn al-Jawzī, 1433), p. 39.

¹²⁷ Fatāwā Faḍīlat al-Shaykh Rabī bin Hādī 'Umayr al-Madkhalī (1/309-312).

years! He died recently, may Allāh have mercy upon him. I once sat in one of the gatherings and one (of the people in the gathering) affirmed the absence of the excuse of ignorance. So I mentioned to him these proofs and I mentioned to him that the Scholars of Najd know each other and some of them (affirm) the excuse of ignorance and some of them do not (affirm the) excuse, yet they are bonded (as brothers), there are no differences, nor arguments, nor matters stirred (between them) and nor (this) and nor (that)... So he remained quiet and did not argue because he did not want tribulation. So we know that this difference (of opinion) is found in Najd between some of the Mashāyikh and other than them, however, there is no dispute and no declaring astray and no war or tribulation (between them). But this is the way of the Ḥaddādiyyah O brothers! The conniving, misguided Ḥaddādī faction has been devised in order to kindle tribulation between Ahl al-Sunnah and for them to strike one another! **And they are (in reality) concealed Takfiris, and they have other calamities possibly besides takfīr.** They use the vilest form of deception (taqiyyah) as a veil for their vile methodology and their corrupt goals!

I saw a youth affected by this methodology and he would carry a book in which there were selected sayings about the absence of the excuse of ignorance, and he would travel between al-Riyāḍ, al-Ṭāʾif, Makkah and al-Madīnah and so on. He would be with us and study with us, then we but perceived that he was carrying this idea in this manner. So I debated him a number of times and I explained to him the methodology of Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah and the methodology of the Salaf and the evidences, yet he would argue. I said to him, "Who is your Imām (in this matter)?" He would say, "So and so and so and so." I researched and I found - by Allāh - that they (those who were cited from) had conflicting statements, excusing due to ignorance at one time and not excusing due to ignorance at another. He said to me, "So and so is with me (on this matter)," I said to him, "This is the speech of so and so - I have got it ready for you - this so and so, he excuses due to ignorance and makes the establishment of the proof to be a condition." He said, "No, I am with Ibn al-Qayyim." I said to him, "But from time, you rejected Ibn al-Qayyim! Ibn al-Qayyim specifies the establishment of the proof as a condition," and so he was confounded, but he persisted upon his misguidance. He stubbornly rejected and he (happened to be) expelled from the country and later returned. And in my debate with him I said to him, "A disbelieving people in a peninsula somewhere, in Britain or the Pacific Ocean or other than it, none of the Salafīs have come to them, but Jamāʿat al-Tablīgh come to them and teach them and they (the Tablīghis) say that this is Islām, and within (this Islām they teach) are deviations, innovations and affairs of shirk, and within it are misguidances and within it is such and such... and they say to them, 'This is Islām.' So they accept it (as such), and seek nearness to Allāh (through that) and they worship Allaah upon this religion which has been called Islaam, do you declare them to be disbelievers, or do you clarify for them and establish the proof against them?" He said, "They are disbelievers and establishing the proof is not a condition!" I said to him, "Go to Algeria for you are more severe than those revolutionaries now, you are more severe in takfīr than them, go to them for there is no place for you in this country."

The madhhab of Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim regarding this is established upon proofs and evidences, and it is the madhhab of the Salaf - if Allāh wills - and whoever founded (his madhhab) and was satisfied with other than this and remained silent, we have no concern with him, however, that he goes and kindles tribulations and declares (others) as astray and declares (others) as disbelievers, then no, no by Allāh, silence should not be held regarding him. I advise the youth that they leave this matter because it is a way from among the ways of the people of evil and tribulation which they spread amongst the Muslims. Fine, eras have passed over you from the time of the Imām Muḥammad bin Abd al-Wahhāb to this day of ours, there were not any battles between them on this matter at all. The one who made ijtihād and held this view he kept silent and went on his way, he affirmed it in his book and spread it, that's it, and he went on his way. And the one who opposed him, he went on his way, all of them are brothers, there are not any differences (in the hearts) between them, and nor disputations and nor did anyone declare another to be misguided or to be a disbeliever. As for these, then they declare (others) to be disbelievers (on this issue)! Look at this - through this they reached the level of making takfir of the leading scholars of Islaam, which indicates the vileness of their orientations and the evil of their goals. So I advise the Salafī youth that they should not delve into this matter.

As for the strongest madhhab (in this matter): It is requiring establishment of the proof to be a condition (prior to takfir of a specific individual), and when it does not appear to be stronger to him, then upon him is to remain silent and to respect his other brothers. He should not declare them astray, because they have the truth, and with them is the Book of Allaah, and with them is the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allāh (ﷺ) and with them is the methodology of the Salaf. And the one who wishes to make takfir, he (ought to) make takfir of the Salaf! And make takfir of Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Abd al-Wahhāb as well! The Imām Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb said, 'We do not make takfir of those who make ṭawāf around the graves and who worship them until we establish the proof against them, because they have not found one who would clarify (the matter) for them!'" End quote from Shaykh Rabīʿ.

From the above one can see the position of the Shaykhs of Ahl al-Sunnah in our time, Imām Imām al-Albānī, Imām Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn and others, and whilst other scholars may differ, they do not declare each other astray on these issues, just like the issue of abandonment of prayer. However it is the criminal Ḥaddādiyyah who use these issues to make accusations of Irjāʿ against Ahl al-Sunnah, because they are concealed Takfirīs and they desire evil for Ahl al-Sunnah and the lands in which the daʿwah of Tawḥīd is established and in which Salafi scholars are present and honoured and referred back to. Some of them have expressed their support for the Terrorist Khārijites of ISIS and thus reveals what these people conceal of hatred for the Scholars of Tawḥīd and Sunnah and perhaps some of these extremist Ḥaddādīs intend to give ideological support for those Khārijites, for what they conceal is much worse than what they have thus far revealed, and Allāh knows best their vile intentions.

Between the Conveyance (Bulūgh) and Understanding (Fahm) of the Proof

An issue of further detail in the matter of the excuse of ignorance and establishment of the proof used by the Ḥaddādiyyah to stir tribulation between Ahl al-Sunnah is that of whether a person is required to understand the proof or not. Their intent is to say that the person merely needs to hear the proof they are not required to understand it, even if they are ignorant or have a doubt. Here, to avoid prolonging the issue, we will make a couple of citations to show that from the Scholars of Tawḥid and Sunnah are those who affirm that **some degree of understanding** is required for the proof to be established.

Ibn Taymiyyah (رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) said, "And these statements on account of which the one who expresses them becomes a disbeliever, sometimes (it can be the case) that those texts that necessitate knowledge of the truth have not reached him, or they may have reached him but they are not established (as authentic) with him, **or he was unable to understand them**, and he may have also been subject to a doubt (shubhah) on account of which Allāh will excuse him."¹²⁸

And **Ibn Taymiyyah** (رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) said, "... Once this is known, entering into takfīr of a specific person from those ignorant ones and their likes - wherein it is judged that they are amongst the disbelievers - is not permissible except after the establishment of the revealed proof (al-ḥujjah al-risāliyyah) against them through which it becomes clear to them (yatabayyan bihā) that they are opposing the Messengers, even if this statement (in question) is disbelief no doubt. And this speech is in relation to the takfīr of all specific individuals, alongside the fact that some of these innovations are more severe than others. And some of the innovators have such faith that is not found with others, and thus it is not permissible for anyone to make takfīr of anyone amongst the Muslims, even if he errs and makes a mistake **until the proof is established upon him and the right way becomes evident to him**. The faith of one that is established with certainty cannot be negated from him due to mere doubt. Rather, it cannot be negated except after the establishment of the proof and removal of the doubt."¹²⁹

Shaykh Ṣāliḥ Āl al-Shaykh was asked a question on this matter, and since he is from the descendants of Shaykh al-Islām Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, his answer should suffice every deluded Ḥaddādī. He was asked, "What is the difference between explanation of the proof (*bayān al-ḥujjah*) and establishment of the proof (*iqāmat al-ḥujjah*)." And he explained, "**Establishing the proof** (*iqāmat al-ḥujjah*) comprises a number of things. First, presentation of the proof and make another person hear the proof. Allāh (جَلَّ وَجَلُّهُ) said, "**So grant him protection that he may hear the words of Allāh**" (9:6). Second, explanation of the proof,

¹²⁸ Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (23/346).

¹²⁹ Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (12/500-501).

with the meaning to make clear what this proof indicates through the tongue (language) of the one who is being spoken to. Make clear the proof (*īdāh al-ḥujjah*), meaning to say that the evidence (cited) indicates such and such, the meaning of *‘ibādah* (worship) is such and such, and the proof therein is such and such. **Third**, to put an end to the doubt (*shubhah*) if the one who is being presented (the proof) has a doubt. **Fourth**, to understand the proof (*fahm al-ḥujjah*) in accordance with the language (of the one being spoken to). This actually enters into some of what (has preceded) but the Scholars have textually stated it (separately) for an objective.

The Scholars said previously, 'Understanding the proof is not a condition, what is intended is just to **establish** the proof' and this is correct. However, understanding (*fahm*) is of two types. The understanding of the tongue (*fahm lisān*) and the understanding of satisfaction (*fahm qanā‘ah*)¹³⁰. **As for the understanding of the tongue** this is from the establishment of the proof (a part of it) and it is required for the understanding of the meaning, so that he understands the angle of the proof, he understands the evidence, and understands the language (used to explain it) and understands the words, and understands the principles (*qawā‘id*), and understands the angle of indication (in the proof), and understands the refutation of the doubt, all of this is necessary. However, the second understanding, **the understanding of satisfaction**, this is not a condition. For this reason, the Shaykh and Imām of the Da‘wah (رحمة الله) said, 'If understanding of the proof was made a condition, then no one would become a disbeliever except the stubborn denier (*mu‘ānid*),' (he means to say) if we had said that understanding the proof was a condition, meaning the understanding of satisfaction, then he said, 'No one would become a disbeliever except a stubborn denier.' So what is the state of the stubborn denier? He would say, 'I am satisfied (with the proof) but I do not believe.' So no one would disbelieve except the stubborn denier if we had specified understanding of the proof (with satisfaction) as a condition.

However, here, the understanding of satisfaction is not a condition, he says, 'I am not satisfied' and he may sometimes say 'I am satisfied' but he is arrogant, 'I do not desire to believe' (he would say). Allāh, the Exalted, said "**They say: Shall we follow you whilst the lowly ones follow you**" (26:111). They are satisfied (with the proof) but they do not desire *īmān*, and Allāh, the Sublime says, "**And they rejected them (the signs), while their [inner] selves were convinced thereof, out of injustice and haughtiness**" (27:14), they were convinced of the (signs), satisfied (with the evidence) but stubborn rejection prevented them. **So this is not what is desired**. He may have understood the proof, but he is not

¹³⁰ What is intended here is that a person may 'understand' the proof but he may say he is not satisfied with it such that he accepts it. By way of example, you may explain proofs to an atheist, and he may understand them rationally, but he may not be satisfied by them. Similarly, a person who commits shirk, you may present the proofs to him, make him understand the proofs and the angles of evidences so he understands all of that, but he might say, 'I am not satisfied.' So attaining understanding and being satisfied are two separate things. Therefore, when it is said that understanding the proof is a condition, the understanding being referred to is the understanding of expression, clarification (making a person understand through the language he understands through evidence) and not the understanding that brings satisfaction to a person.

satisfied with it due to a factor that is present with him, such as holding steadfast to shirk or to the foundations of shirk and what is like that. So the likes of this one, the understanding of satisfaction is not a condition. As for the understanding of the tongue (fahm al-lisān) and of explanation (fahm al-bayān), then this is a must, and it enters into establishment of the proof (iqāmat al-ḥujjah)."¹³¹ End quote from Shaykh Ṣāliḥ Āl al-Shaykh.

This leaves no room for misunderstanding the intent of the Shaykhs of the Da'wah of Tawḥīd. The person being invited is made to understand the proof and its explanation to the level required to make him understand that he has opposed the dīn of the Messenger (صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). A greater level of understanding than this, such that he has to be satisfied and content with the proof and so on is not necessary. The proof remains established if he continues in his action and does not pursue the matter to remove ignorance from himself since he has been made to understand that he is in opposition to what the Messenger brought. With this tafṣīl (detail), the doubt and ambiguity is removed and another rock is taken from the hands of the Ḥaddādīs.

A Glimpse of the New Extremist Ḥaddādiyyah

It is befitting here to mention some of the specific claims and doctrines of the new wave of extremist Ḥaddādīs who have become vocal at a time when the terrorist Khārijites of ISIS are on the march and who are upon the very same doctrines of these Ḥaddādīs, on the basis of which they justify their slaughter of Sunnī Muslims. Perhaps the main theoretician is 'Abdullāh al-Jarbū' (former teacher of 'aqīdah at al-Jāmi'ah al-Islāmiyyah, al-Madīnah).¹³² From his views are:¹³³

That those whom he calls the *Contemporary Murji'ah* are claiming that the excuse of ignorance means the absence of takfīr of the grave and idol-worshippers or those who fall into the nullifiers of Islām and that they (the *Contemporary Murji'ah*) maintain the label of Islām for the one who falls into grave-worship and through this they fall into an Irjā' more vile (akḥbath) than that of Jahm bin Ṣafwān.¹³⁴ That anyone who says "*Lā ilāha illallāh*" verbally no longer has the excuse of ignorance in matters of major shirk, since he has understood the meaning of what he expressed and the proof is already established and

¹³¹ This is a question put to the Shaykh following his lecture titled, *Manhaj A'immat al-Da'wah Fil-Da'wah* (at 1h 27m 30s). Audio is in my possession. This lecture has also been published by Maktabah Ibn 'Abbās (2006CE) and the answer can be found on pp. 81-82.

¹³² Do not be deceived by commendations, graduations and positions, but look to see whether a man is guiding himself by the Salaf and is following the way of the firmly-rooted, major Scholars of the time.

¹³³ These are summarized from a survey of his recordings and transcripts posted on one of the main online outlets for the propagation of this extremist Ḥaddādiyyah.

¹³⁴ The likes of Shaykh Ibn al-'Uthaymīn and Shaykh al-Fawzān and numerous others do not escape from this judgement of this extremist Ḥaddādi, when one reads their verdicts on this issue of the excuse of ignorance.

anyone who grants the excuse of ignorance here is guilty of Irjā'. To this end he selectively cites from scholars about whom it is known that they have said otherwise. From them are Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim, Ibn al-'Uthaymīn. That those who require the proof not only to be conveyed (bulūgh) but also to be understood and the shubhah (doubt) to be removed are upon a bid'ah initiated by the Mu'tazilī, al-Jāhīdh.¹³⁵ That those who hold the excuse of ignorance in all matters, in matters of kufr and shirk are claiming that this amounts to absence of takfīr, that the one who is excused by his ignorance is not declared a disbeliever, and that such people have inherited this saying from Dāwūd bin Jarjīs, a grave-worshipper from Irāq refuted by the grandsons of Shaykh al-Islām Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb.¹³⁶ That anyone who manifests the open, major shirk that clashes with the foundation of Islām is a mushrik, kāfir, even if knowledge has not reached him. And for the proof to be established it is sufficient that the evidence reaches him,¹³⁷ it is not required that he understands the evidence or for any doubts which he may have to be removed. And anyone who opposes this has fell into the Irjā' of al-Jāhīdh, the Mu'tazilī and Dāwūd bin Jarjīs and others. That there is a difference between a matter being explained (yubayyin) to someone and a matter becoming clear (yatabayyan) to someone and all that is required is the former, not the latter.¹³⁸ That he knows of no difference between the scholars of the past or present¹³⁹ that anyone who falls into the major affairs of shirk or kufr, he becomes a kāfir, mushrik, automatically by way of that (in the life of this world), there is no excuse of ignorance for

¹³⁵ Refer to Shaykh Ṣāliḥ Āl al-Shaykh's clarification of this issue wherein he makes taḥqīq (verification) of the actual position of the Shaykhs of the da'wah of Tawḥīd of Najd regarding this matter.

¹³⁶ Al-Jarbū' stated (6/12/1433H), in the course of refuting the Salafī scholar, Shaykh Muḥammad bin 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-'Aqīl (from al-Madīnah al-Nabawiyyah), "And the second error they inherited from Dāwūd bin Jarjīs (grave-worshipper in Irāq fighting against the da'wah of Tawḥīd) is that they claimed the excuse of ignorance is always understood to mean the absence of takfīr (of the one falling into it). Thus whoever is excused due to ignorance, then he is not a disbeliever. And this is a great mistake, the first to speak with it was Dāwūd bin Jarjīs al-Iraqī al-Naqshabandī, the vile one who became famous by contending against the reformist da'wah of Shaykh Muḥammad bin 'Abd al-Wahhāb. Thus, the doubt of these later Murji'ah is mixing between the excuse of ignorance and the absence of the takfīr." From a transcript of audio recordings published by his follower, Yūsuf al-Zākūrī online.

¹³⁷ There are scholars in whose speech this is understood in that due to the spread and preponderance of Islām, the proof is already established and the excuse of ignorance cannot be used. All that is required is for the proof to reach him and **the ability to know and understand**, this is sufficient to establish the proof against him (and not that he has to understand). However, the difference here is that these scholars do not judge the other scholars who require some level of understanding and removal of doubt with the very extreme and harsh judgements that we find in the speech of the Ḥaddādī extremists. And further, the very scholars whose speech the Ḥaddādīs rely upon have numerous clear statements that indicate otherwise.

¹³⁸ This opposes what is found in the statements of the Scholars such as Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah who said, "However, due to the preponderance of ignorance, and scant knowledge of the remnants of the messengership amongst many of the latecomers, takfīr is not made of them on account (of what has been mentioned) until that which the Messenger (ﷺ) came with becomes clear to them (yatabayyan) from that which opposes it." Kitāb al-Istighāthah (2/731).

¹³⁹ This is a clear lie when one reads the statements of Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Qayyim, Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, Ibn al-'Uthaymīn and even some statements of al-Fawzān in relation to the common Rāfiḍah.

him, and if he was ignorant because knowledge never reached him or he was not able to study, he is treated like the Ahl al-Fatrah (those living in a period after the teachings of prior messengership had disappeared and who were upon kufr and shirk).¹⁴⁰

Also from these Ḥaddādī extremists is **Abu ‘Abdallāh Yūsuf al-Zākūrī al-Maghribī** who is a follower of al-Jarbū‘. He accuses the Salafī Scholars of *"arguing in favour of the ignorant amongst the mushriks and showing friendliness with their scholars"* and that their da‘wah is *"only to obliterate the signposts of Tawḥīd and to revive the religion of ‘Amr bin Luhay [pre-Islāmic mushrik] in the garment of Salafiyyah"* and that *"they portray themselves to the common-folk that they are the guardians of Tawḥīd and its callers whereas in reality they are its enemies to it and haters of it."* He says about them that *"their call is only one, to argue on behalf of the mushriks in general and to venerate them whilst deceiving the people with ascription to Salafiyyah and the call to Tawḥīd"* and he says thereafter, *"So does anyone doubt today that they are more dangerous than the mushriks themselves, because they veil themselves with Tawḥīd, yet aid its opposite and they claim to make war against Shirk yet they defend its people and love them."* And with all of these grave and mighty oppressions, he accuses the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah of being the *"Contemporary institute of Irjā’"*.¹⁴¹ And whoever reflects upon all of this will realize that none of the Salafī Scholars, not even Imām Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, nor the Scholars of Najd and the contemporary ones such as Shaykh al-Fawzān are immune from them. The basis upon which he makes these clear statements of takfīr is that the scholars spoken being of grant the excuse of ignorance to a Muslim who has fallen into matters of major kufr or shirk.

And another is **‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Juhanī** and from his statements, *"What a pleasure to the eye of the grave-worshippers is Rabī‘ al-Madkhalī! I do not think anyone has defended them after Dāwūd bin Jarjīs like him."*¹⁴²

We see this repeated reference to **Dāwūd bin Jarjīs**, and he was a grave-worshipper from Irāq who was refuted in a book titled, *Minhāj al-Ta’sīs wal-Taqdīs Fī Kashf Shubuhāt Dawūd bin Jarjīs* written by **Shaykh ‘Abd al-Laṭīf ‘bin Abd al-Raḥmān bin Ḥasan**. We see the deception of these extremist Ḥaddādīs in that the issue with Dāwūd bin Jarjīs was not that he held

¹⁴⁰ If you reflect on much of what has preceded from this Ḥaddādī, it entails (even if he may deny it) takfīr of a large part of the ummah who reject that Allāh is above the Throne, above the heavens, such as the Ash‘arīs and Mātūrīdīs, since this is a foundational matter of īmān whose evidences are as clear as the daylight sun in the Qur’ān and the Sunnāh and it is a matter known through fiṭrah. Thus, they would be judged disbelievers, apostates in the life of this world because the proof has "reached them." And just like many of these people are deceived into believing that it is from Tawḥīd to deny Allāh is in a "place" then likewise many of those who fall into shirk are deceived into thinking that what they do is something Allāh is pleased with. So when you say there is no excuse of ignorance in matters which are clear, open and major (jaliyyah), then you have opened the door to mass takfīr of the Muslim ummah.

¹⁴¹ See: <http://www.sahab.net/forums/index.php?showtopic=146095>.

¹⁴² In one of his articles titled, *"Limādha al-Taṣaddī li Rabī‘ al-Madkhalī."* And this is an individual whose heart has been blinded and he rejected what he used to know because in the years passed defended Shaykh al-Albānī from the various accusations made against him by the Takfīrīs and likewise he defended Shaykh Rabī‘ against the various detractors from the factions of Qūṭbiyyah, Ikhwāniyyah, Takfīriyyah.

the excuse of ignorance for those falling into major shirk, but that he made attempts to justify shirk with Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ). He did not believe that sacrificing to other than Allāh, or seeking rescue from other than Allāh was major shirk to begin with. And after proofs were established he would say that is merely unlawful and that a person has fallen into minor shirk or done something which is mustahabb (recommended) and he wrote fifty evidences to establish seeking rescue from the dead is recommended. And he would claim that invoking the righteous and seeking rescue from them is not the same as invoking the idols. He also twisted statements of Ibn Taymiyyah to present the idea that a person cannot fall into kufr or that kufr cannot be established upon him, whereas Ibn Taymiyyah was speaking in the context of takfir bil-iṭlāq (declaring statements, beliefs and actions to be kufr) and takfir bil-‘ayn (declaring a person to be a kāfir).

From the above one can see the mighty and oppressive slander of these extremists against Shaykh Rabī in their claim that he is invalidating Tawḥīd and arguing for the dīn of the Mushrikīn and what is like that. This, because he stood to defend those scholars who affirm the excuse of ignorance in matters of major kufr and shirk. Shaykh Rabī himself differentiates between those who preach doctrines of kufr and shirk (such as the leaders of the Rāfiḍah, the extreme Ṣūfīs such as Ibn ‘Arabī, the Ittiḥādiyyah, the Bāṭiniyyah and other types of heretics) for whom there is no excuse of ignorance and the common-folk who are granted the excuse of ignorance. Just like he advises that tribulations not be caused in this issue due to differences in understanding between the Scholars.

The Issue of Action and the Terms Shart Ṣiḥḥah and Shart Kamāl

We have one more issue used by the Ḥaddādiyyah and the Ḥājūrites¹⁴³ and that is the usage of the phrases shart ṣiḥḥah and shart kamāl in the subject of actions and īmān.

Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah (رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) said, "That which the jamā‘ah is upon is that whoever did not express īmān with his tongue (the shahādah) without any excuse will not be benefited by what is in his heart of knowledge (ma‘rifah) and that speech (qawl, meaning the shahādah), for one who is able (to express it), **is a condition for the validity of īmān (shart fi ṣiḥḥat al-īmān).**"¹⁴⁴

Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī (رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) - as indicated by some of the people of knowledge - was the first to make use of these terms in the course of contrasting the position of Ahl al-Sunnah with the position of the Mu‘tazilah.¹⁴⁵ He stated, "The Mu‘tazilah say it is action, statement and belief. But the difference between the Mu‘tazilah and the Salaf is that Mu‘tazilah make

¹⁴³ Some of the Ḥaddādī Ḥajūrites raised this issue in 2012 as part of their agenda to defame and slander anyone who did not side with Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī in the fitnah that was initiated by him against Ahl al-Sunnah.

¹⁴⁴ Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl, (taḥqīq Muḥammad Chaudhury and Muḥammad al-Ḥalwānī). Ramādī lil-Nashr (2/974).

¹⁴⁵ Fath al-Bārī (1/60-61).

actions **a condition for the validity of īmān** whereas the Salaf make them **a condition for the perfection of īmān**."

Imām al-Albānī (رحمته الله) alluded this statement in his book *Hukm Tārik al-Ṣalāt*, when he said, "...So where is the answer to the prayer being **a condition for the validity** (shart ṣiḥḥah) of īmān?! Meaning, that it is not just a condition for the perfection of īmān (shart kamāl), for all the righteous actions are **a condition for the perfection** with Ahl al-Sunnah, in opposition to the Khawārij and the Mu'tazilah those who say that the major sinners will remain eternally in the fire, alongside the Khawārij making explicit takfīr of them (the sinners)."¹⁴⁶

And **al-Ḥāfidh al-Ḥakamī** (رحمته الله) has similar words, "And the difference between this - meaning the saying of the Mu'tazilah - and between the saying of the Righteous Salaf is that the Salaf did not make all of the actions to be **a condition for validity** (shart ṣiḥḥah). Rather, they made many of them **a condition for perfection**, just as 'Umar bin 'Abd al-'Aziz said regarding them, 'Whoever perfects them has perfected īmān, and whoever does not perfect them has not perfected īmān.' But the Mu'tazilah made all of them a condition for the validity (of īmān), and Allāh knows best."¹⁴⁷

Along with other issues, such as al-Albānī's position on the excuse of ignorance in matters of kufr and shirk, and his position of tafṣīl (detail) in the issue of not ruling by what Allāh has revealed, and his affirmation of the ḥadīths of shafā'ah (intercession), the Takfīriyyah Ḥaddādiyyah assaulted Imām al-Albānī, with some of them accusing him of being a Jahmite in the matter of īmān - a view that the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah consider to be kufr itself. In the decade following that (2000s), the Ḥaddādīs like Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī and Fawzī al-Baḥraynī began to accuse Shaykh Rabī' of claiming that actions are a condition for the perfection of īmān (shart kamāl) claiming that unless one says actions are a condition of validity (shart ṣiḥḥah), he is a Murji'. This was a gross slander upon Shaykh Rabī' because he never used these terms and discouraged and warned from their use due to the ambiguity they contain. Because Shaykh Rabī' defended Imām al-Albānī against the Ḥaddādiyyah, they tarnished him with things that he is free of.

The Stance of Shaykh Rabī' in the Face of the Fabrications of the Ḥaddādiyyah

Shaykh Rabī' said in refutation of Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī, "I, by Allāh, I rejected this statement from others even before al-Albānī (رحمته الله) stated this expression, which is '*action is a condition of perfection in īmān*'... and anyone who ascribes anything other than this to me is the greatest

¹⁴⁶ *Hukm Tārik al-Ṣalāt* (p. 42).

¹⁴⁷ *Ma'ārij al-Qubūl* (2/21). The difference here is that al-Ḥāfidh al-Ḥakamī did not generalize for both the Salaf and the Mu'tazilah, he stated the tafṣīl of the Salaf (some actions are shart ṣiḥḥah and some are shart kamāl) but for the Mu'tazilah he generalized and said they hold all actions to be shart ṣiḥḥah. And what is correct - if we accept the usage of these terms - that the Mu'tazilah do not hold all actions to be shart ṣiḥḥah just like those from Ahl al-Sunnah who consider the abandonment of prayer to be kufr would not hold all the righteous actions to be shart kamāl.

of fabricating liars."¹⁴⁸ And he said, "I am the first of those who fought against the saying that action is a condition for the perfection in īmān or a condition for the validity of īmān. I repeated this rejection for years until this day of mine."¹⁴⁹ And he also said, "Allāh knows that I was the first of those who prevented the saying that action is a condition of perfection or a condition of validity (in īmān), and this was the year 1415H (1995CE) or thereabouts, and I continued in preventing from that until this day of mine and we did not see from Fawzī al-Baḥraynī and his Ḥaddādī sect any position towards those who spoke with it. And when we advised Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī about principles and judgements (of his) that are rejected by Islām, he and those Ḥaddādīs that were gathered around him departed from us, (only to) wage war against us with their lies and treacherous deceptions and whatever they took from the Takfīrīs of (the phrase) *jins al-ʿamal* and the issue of action being a condition of perfection (sharṭ kamāl) [as a means to war against us]."¹⁵⁰

And Shaykh Rabīʿ also said, "I have never said that action is a condition of perfection in īmān in a day amongst the days and nor in any moment from the moments, neither in my lessons, nor my cassettes, nor in my statements. Rather, I am from the first who warned against it, and I request from those who speak in the issues of īmān and other than it that they adhere to what the Salaf affirmed, especially in the definition of īmān, that it is speech, action and belief and that it increases and decreases, and I warn against saying condition of perfection (kamāl) and condition of validity (ṣiḥḥah), and from using (the phrase) *jins al-ʿamal*, due to what they contain of tribulations and due to the ambiguity that is in (the phrase) *jins al-ʿamal*."¹⁵¹

These phrases (sharṭ ṣiḥḥah, sharṭ kamāl) can be found in the statements of the Scholars, such as Shaykh Ibn Bāz (رحمته الله), Shaykh Ibn al-ʿUthaymīn (رحمته الله) and others.

The Usage of These Phrases by the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah

Shaykh Ibn al-ʿUthaymīn (رحمته الله) said in his Sharḥ of al-Nawawī's Forty Ḥadīth, "And there is no need for us to say what is circulating now, between the youth and the students of knowledge: Are actions from the perfection of īmān or from the validity of īmān? There is no need for this question, meaning that a person asks you and says: Are actions a condition of perfection of īmān or a condition of the validity of īmān? We say to him: the Companions (رضي الله عنهم) are more noble than you, more knowledgeable than you, and more eager than you for goodness. And they did not ask the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) this question. Therefore, what suffices them suffices you. When evidence shows a person leaves Islām by this action then it becomes a condition for the validity (ṣiḥḥah) of īmān. And when evidence shows that he does not exit (Islām) it becomes a condition of the perfection (kamāl) of īmān. The topic has ended. As for trying to contend and refute and make disputation, such that

¹⁴⁸ Refer to *Ittiḥaf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-ʿUrfān*, p. 177-178.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid. p. 179.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid. p. 179.

¹⁵¹ Ibid. p. 180.

whoever opposes you, you say this one is a Murji' and whoever agrees with you, you are pleased with him, and if he adds, you say this one is from the Khawārij, then this is not correct. For this reason, my counsel to the youth and students of knowledge is that you leave investigation of this matter, and that we say: What Allaah, the Exalted and His Messenger (ﷺ) have made a condition for the validity of īmān and its remaining, then it is condition, and whatever has not [been made a condition], then no, [and through this] we settle the matter."¹⁵²

Shaykh Ibn Bāz (رحمته الله) in response to the question of Shaykh 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Rājīhī as to whether actions are a condition of validity or perfection in īmān replied, "From the actions are those which are a condition for the validity (ṣiḥḥah) of īmān, īmān is not valid without them, such as prayer. Whoever abandoned it has disbelieved. And from them are what amount to a condition for the perfection (kamāl), īmān is valid without them, but the person who leaves them is sinful, disobedient." Then Shaykh 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Rājīhī said, "The one who does not make takfīr of the one who abandons prayer from the Salaf, is action a condition of perfection to him or a condition of validity?" Shaykh Ibn Bāz replied, "No, action to everyone is a condition of validity (sharṭ ṣiḥḥah), save that they differed about what (affair) validates īmān [from the outward actions]. So a group said it is the prayer, and upon it is the consensus of the Companions, as has been cited from 'Abdullāh bin Shaqīq, **but others have said other than this.**"¹⁵³ Save that the genus of action (jins al-'amal) must be present for the validity of īmān in the view of all of the Salaf, for this reason īmān to them is speech, action and belief, it is not valid except with all of them together."¹⁵⁴

One can see the clear intent behind the use of the phrases sharṭ kamāl and sharṭ siḥḥah by these Scholars is to separate those actions whose abandonment leads to the nullification of īmān and those actions whose abandonment leads to deficiency in īmān. And Ibn Bāz acknowledges the differing views when he said, "No, action to everyone is a condition of

¹⁵² Sharh al-Arba'īn al-Nawawīyyah (pp. 337-338).

¹⁵³ Refer to the book *al-Maqālāt al-Athariyyah* of Shaykh Rabī for a detailed discussion on the authenticity of the narration of 'Abdullāh bin Shaqīq relied upon by those who hold there is a consensus from the Companions. The Shaykh establishes that this particular narration is not authentic from 'Abdullāh bin Shaqīq due to weakness in its chain and also because 'Abdullāh only narrated from a dozen or so of the Companions and the claimed consensus cannot be ascertained through just this narration. However, what is closer to authenticity is another narration related by al-Khallāl in al-Sunnah (4/144), who narrates which his chain from 'Abdullāh bin Shaqīq who said, "We have not known any of the actions about which it has been said that its abandonment is kufr except the prayer." Shaykh Rabī says that there is no problem with this statement because there is no claim of consensus within it. Shaykh Rabī also says that when one looks at the books mentioning matters of consensus, such as *Marātib al-Ijmā'* of Ibn Ḥazm, *Naqd Marātib al-Ijmā'* of Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Iqnā' Fī Masā'il al-Ijmā'* of Ibn al-Qaṭṭān, there is no mention of this alleged consensus about the abandonment of prayer. Likewise it is not found in the work of Ibn al-Mundhir, *al-Ijmā'*, who actually says regarding this matter, "I did not find any consensus regarding the (two matters)" referring to the issue of the prayer and presence or absence of the kufr of the one who abandons it. Refer to *al-Maqālāt al-Athariyyah* (p. 51 onwards).

¹⁵⁴ Mentioned by 'Iṣām al-Sinānī in *Aqwāl Dhawī al-'Urfān* and cited by Shaykh Rabī in *Ittiḥāf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-'Urfān* (pp. 186-187).

validity (sharṭ ṣiḥḥah), save that they differed about what (affair) validates īmān [from the outward actions]. So a group said it is the prayer, and upon it is the consensus of the Companions, as has been cited from ‘Abdullāh bin Shaqīq, **but others have said other than this...**" From this, the difference between Imām Ibn Bāz and those Takfīrī Ḥaddādīs, is that Ibn Bāz acknowledges that whilst some state that a person must pray in order for his īmān to be valid, **others have said other than this**, meaning other scholars do not agree that prayer is required to validate īmān as they hold its abandonment is not the kufr which expels from the religion, but that which makes a person a great and evil sinner and which is a route to major disbelief. Likewise, when Imām Ibn Baz says, that the genus of action must be present for īmān to valid, **this can only mean the prayer** for those who hold its abandonment to be kufr. Because upon this view, if a person abandoned the prayer but removed something harmful from the floor (or brought any other action, large or small), he has brought the genus of action (jins al-‘amal)¹⁵⁵ **yet he is still a disbeliever in this view**, due to his abandonment of prayer. How can he still be a disbeliever when he has clearly brought the genus of action indicating that he has brought something of outward īmān to validate the truthfulness of the inward īmān? So using the word jins al-‘amal creates this ambiguity and confusion. **The central issue in reality is abandonment of prayer.**

The Ḥaddādiyyah make tactical use of these issues because of the variation in the speech of the Scholars. This allows them to pick and choose to strategically construct their accusation of Irjā‘ against their targets from Ahl al-Sunnah for their evil and sinister agendas. We can appreciate this more when we see other scholars such as Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalī and Shaykh ‘Abdullāh al-Ghudayān stating a generalization that action is a condition of validity (sharṭ ṣiḥḥah).

Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalī (رحمته الله) said, "So they (the Murji'ah) did not differentiate between jins al-‘amal (action in principle, in its genus) - and which is considered a condition for the validity of īmān (sharṭ fi ṣiḥḥat al-īmān) with Ahl al-Sunnah - and between the individual elements and instances of action the abandoner of which is not perfect in īmān."¹⁵⁶

Once more, as Shaykh Rabī explains in a number of his articles, what is really meant by jins al-‘amal is the prayer, it can only mean the prayer, so those who use this term should say instead that if a person does not pray he is a disbeliever. Because if he brought jins al-‘amal (at least something of outward action, anything) but did not pray, we now have a contradiction in this principle. If he brought jins al-‘amal, he is a believer even without praying. So this creates a conflict in the view of those who make takfīr through abandonment of prayer, and they should simply suffice with saying that actions are from īmān, whether a pillar (rukṇ) or part (juz’), and the one who abandons prayer is a

¹⁵⁵ Meaning, that he has brought action in principle, he has brought something of outward action, which means action is now established, he has brought its genus, because he brought something that enters into it.

¹⁵⁶ Al-Ajwibah al-Sadeedah (1424H, Cairo, 6/318).

disbeliever because not praying is an indication of the absence of the inward compliance (inqiyād). This comprises no potential contradiction in this view, because it remains focused on the issue of prayer.

And **Shaykh ‘Abdullāh al-Ghudayān** (رحمته الله) said, "Īmān is speech, action and belief and action is condition for the validity (shart ṣiḥḥah) of īmān, and the Murji'ah do not make action a condition for the validity of īmān, meaning (to them) that a person does not pray, nor fast, nor give zakāh and he abandons all of the commandments and falls into the prohibitions, and they say he is a believer, because taṣdīq is sufficient for īmān. No doubt this is ignorance."¹⁵⁷

At this point, one can clearly see - in relation to these terms - that the affair comes back to the issue of prayer. Whoever says abandoning prayer is major kufr will say action is a condition for the validity (shart ṣiḥḥah), and if they use the word jins al-‘amal, that only creates unnecessary confusion and leads to a contradiction as has preceded, so it is best avoided. And whoever says abandoning prayer is not disbelief, such as Imām al-Albānī, will say actions are a condition of perfection, and in no way does this view amount to Irjā' because whoever holds this view does not say that the one who neglects action has brought the obligatory īmān, or is complete in his faith and will not be punished in the Hellfire at all. Rather, they consider him to be the most sinful of the people, subject to great punishment in the Hereafter, unless he repents. So he is either a kāfir or a great sinner (in the two views amongst Ahl al-Sunnah), but to the Murji'ah he is a believer, perfect in his īmān, his īmān not being harmed by his abandonment of deeds.

In contrast to all of the above, we have yet another view and that is from **Shaykh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Rājīhī** who was asked,¹⁵⁸ "The questioner says: Some contemporaries have appeared with new sayings regarding īmān and have said: Action is a condition for the perfection (kamāl) of īmān and is not a condition for its validity (ṣiḥḥah)?" To which he replied, and pay attention to this answer, "I do not know of a basis for this saying that perfection is made a condition, that it is a condition of perfection (kamāl) or a condition of validity (ṣiḥḥah). I do not know of any basis for this saying, neither in the madhhab of the Murji'ah nor in the madhhab of Ahl al-Sunnah. Ahl al-Sunnah - the majority of them - say that: Īmān is speech of the tongue, taṣdīq of the heart and acting with the heart and acting with the limbs, that īmān is action and intention, it increases with obedience and decreases with disobedience. Hence action is a part (juz') of īmān, and īmān is made up of these things, the taṣdīq of the heart, the speech of the tongue, the actions of the limbs, the actions of the heart, hence īmān has become how many parts? All of these parts, the taṣdīq of the heart, it is necessary that he affirms with the tongue, that he speaks with the tongue, and makes taṣdīq with the heart and acts with his heart and acts with his limbs, all of this enters into the meaning (musammā) of īmān, the label (ism) of īmān. But the Murji'ah say what? They

¹⁵⁷ Published in al-Madīnah Newspaper, 3rd August 2009.

¹⁵⁸ In his explanation of Kitāb al-Īmān of Abu ‘Ubayd al-Qāsim bin Sallām. Refer to <http://portal.shrajhi.com/Media/ID/6315> for audio and transcript.

say actions are not from īmān, but they - the actions - are an evidence for īmān, or they are required by īmān, or they are the fruits of īmān...

As for the saying that action is *shart kamāl* (action is a condition for the perfection) or *shart ṣiḥḥah* (condition for the validity, correctness), then I do not know of any basis for this saying, neither from the saying of the Murji'ah and nor from the saying of Ahl al-Sunnah. How can it be *shart kamāl*? Action is not a condition, neither *shart kamāl* and nor *shart ṣiḥḥah*, rather it is a part (*juz'*) of īmān, a part of īmān, so this saying I do not know of any basis for it, it neither agrees with the madhhab of the Murji'ah, and nor with the madhhab of the majority of Ahl al-Sunnah. Rather, it could be said: That it agrees with the madhhab of the Murji'ah from the angle that they expelled actions from the essence of īmān in general, meaning, that as close as it can get to the Murji'ah, in that they expelled action from īmān. **So the one who says action is *shart kamāl* or *shart ṣiḥḥah*, we say, this is the madhhab of the Murji'ah, you have expelled actions from the essence of īmān. Either you say, "Action enters into the musamma of īmān " or is "a part of īmān". If you say action is not from īmān, then you are from the Murji'ah irrespective of whether you said *shart kamaal* or *shart sihhah*, or that it is an evidence for īmān, or required by eemaan, or a fruit of īmān. Everyone who expels action from īmān then he is from the Murji'ah, is this clear? ... So the one who says: Action is a condition of perfection (*shart kamāl*) or a condition of validity (*shart ṣiḥḥah*), he has expelled action from īmān and has thus become from the Murji'ah ... so this new saying, they said: *shart kamāl* or *shart sihhah*, he is to be put alongside the Murji'ah because he expelled action from īmān.**" End quote.

We can see here yet another perspective and by now we can see the type of confusion that exists through the use of these phrases, each of which is used by a different scholar to convey a different meaning that he deems correct in context.

Thus, one who holds abandoning prayer is not kufr will say the righteous actions are a condition of the perfection of īmān, intending by that to rebut the Khārijites and Mu'tazilah who make takfīr by way of major sins. And another might say, actions are a condition for the validity of īmān intending by that to show action is a pillar (*rukn*) and part (*juz'*) of īmān. And yet another makes *tafṣīl* and say some actions are condition of validity such as prayer, which if abandoned is kufr and others are a condition of perfection. And yet others say that anyone who uses the word *shart* (condition) at all, whether it is *shart ṣiḥḥah* or *shart kamāl*, then he has expelled actions from īmān and agreed with the Murji'ah. **Note:** The extremist Ḥaddādīs are going to those who have views such as this one, like **Shaykh 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Rājihī**, in order to elicit judgements of *Irjā'* against other scholars.

Ambiguity in Definitions

This confusion arises because of the ambiguity in the words *shart* (condition) and *'amal* (action). As for ***shart***, then the word can be defined to mean "*that which is external to a thing and without which it cannot exist*" and an example of this is the *wuḍū'* (ablution), it is not part

of the prayer, it is external to the prayer, but the prayer cannot exist without it. So when we say that wuḍū' is a condition of the validity (ṣiḥḥah) of prayer, upon this definition, we are saying wuḍū' is not from the prayer, it is external to it, and the prayer is not valid without it. However, it can be defined more generally as " *that whose existence the reality (of a thing) depends upon irrespective of whether it is a pillar therein or external to it.*" With this definition we can say that something is a condition for something else without it being external to it, here the word shart is used with the meaning of rukn (pillar) and this is found in the usage of the jurists (fuqahā'). With this definition we can say that reciting fātiḥah or the making the tashahhud is a condition of validity (ṣiḥḥah) of the prayer without it implying that the fātiḥah or tashahhud are not part of the prayer.

And likewise 'amal (action), this can comprise many things. First, it can refer **to the action of the heart** and also **the action of the limbs**. Also action refers to both **fi'l** (performing an action) and **tark** (abandonment of an action), so 'amal really comprises these two things, abandonment and performance, both are considered actions. So if you abandoned an act of shirk or kufr or a major sin, this would count as an action. Thus, abandonment of shirk and kufr becomes an action. Likewise, there are actions which are pillars (**arkān**), like the prayer and fasting and there are the obligations (**wājibāt**) like the rights of the parents, and then there are recommendations (**mustaḥabbāt**). So action is of different types and levels and it may not be clear what a Scholar intends by action, or what he is including within action ('amal) when says shart ṣiḥḥah or shart kamāl.

When a person says **action is a condition for the perfection of īmān**, is he including the abandonments (*turūk*, such as abandoning shirk and kufr)? This would be incorrect. Or is he including only the performances (*afāl*, the righteous actions)? Or is he referring to the pillars, or obligations, or recommendations? And conversely, when a person **says action is a condition for the validity of īmān**, is he referring to the recommendations, or obligations or pillars? Thus, we can see here that there can be an inclination to the views of the Murji'ah and likewise an inclination to the views of the Khārijites and Mu'tazilah through the ambiguity and generalizations inherent in the use of these words. From this, you can see that various formulations can be constructed based on these term and it would be easy to make the accusation of Irjā' against a Scholar of choice (due to the ambiguity in these phrases) through the speech of another Scholar. In fact it can even be made against the one who says action is a condition for the validity (shart ṣiḥḥah) of īmān.

For example, we can take the statement of Shaykh 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Rājiḥī¹⁵⁹ who says that anyone who uses the word shart (condition) for actions, to say they are a condition of perfection (kamāl) or to say they are a condition of validity (ṣiḥḥah) is a Murji', regardless of which one it is. And from this we can make the accusation of Irjā' against Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalī and Shaykh 'Abdullāh al-Ghudayān who say action is a condition for the validity

¹⁵⁹ The new wave of Ḥaddādīs are approaching Shaykh 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Rājiḥī as part of their agenda to attack Shaykh Rabī' and misrepresenting the Shaykhs views and positions through selective quoting.

of īmān (*shart ṣiḥḥah fil-īmān*). So this is a field in which the Ḥaddādiyyah have realized, they have a fertile ground in which to play their games, deceive the Salafīs and push their evil agendas by cleverly constructing accusations of Irjā' in a topic which has a lot of detail to it and in which Scholars intend different things through the phrases used, allowing their statements to be used against others by people with evil intent.

Insight From Shaykh Muḥammad al-‘Aqīl

It is here that we can bring the appropriate and insightful words of **Shaykh Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-‘Aqīl** who said, "This is a summary of this issue (of the excuse of ignorance), and this issue has equivalent issues (that are like it) for example, "actions are a condition for perfection (kamāl) or a condition for validity (ṣiḥḥah)", this (issue) is a sister-issue (to the issue of the excuse of ignorance). We do not say "shart kamāl" nor do we say "shart ṣiḥḥah", we say "actions are from īmān". However we do not show severity upon a Salafi who says, "shart kamāl" or "shart ṣiḥḥah." For this one (in saying shart kamāl) has a salaf (a precedence) and that one (in saying shart ṣiḥḥah) also has a Salaf (a precedence). I say that this matter (of the excuse of ignorance) has other equivalent issues, because they are propagated in order to bring about separation between Ahl al-Sunnah, and by Allāh besides whom there is none worthy of worship besides Him, *al-‘udhru bil-jahl* (the excuse of ignorance) and *al-a‘maal shart kamāl* or *shart ṣiḥḥah* (actions being a condition for the perfection or validity [of īmān]) and what is like them from the issues, then verily they are propagated for no reason except to split the Salafīs. And practically, they have split them. They tried to strike the Salafīs, some of them against others, with strength, until it reached tabdīl (declaring as innovators), rather reaching takfīr."¹⁶⁰

However, that which has been said by Shaykh Rabī' is best which is that these terms should be avoided due to their ambiguity and due to the tribulations that they invite from the direction of Ḥaddādiyyah who have agendas and designs against Ahl al-Sunnah for which these issues serve as tools and mechanisms.

Shaykh Rabī' Hitting the Nail on the Head Once More

We will leave the final word here with Shaykh Rabī' bin Hādī who said, in defence of the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah, "They accused al-Albānī of Irjā' because this expression occurred from him, may Allāh pardon him, the likes of this expression occurred from the Imāms (of the past) and no one judged them with Irjā'. Mis'ar (bin Kidām) did not make exception (istithnā') in īmān... and it was said to Imām Aḥmad, "Is he a Murji'?" and he said, "No." And we do not know Mis'ar (رَجْمَةُ اللَّهِ) to make war against Irjā' as Ahl al-Sunnah (meaning al-Albānī) wage war (against it), those whom you (Ḥaddādiyyah) accuse of Irjā', out of oppression and wrongdoing. For if Imām Aḥmad was asked today about the expression of al-Albānī [actions are a condition for the perfection of eemaan] he would have said, "He is not a Murji'" ... and I, by Allāh, I rejected this expression from others, even before al-Albānī

¹⁶⁰ In his risālah called *Mas'alah al-‘Udhru bil-Jahl innamā Tūrad li Tafaṭṭiq Ahl al-Sunnah*.

(رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said it, this expression, "Action is a condition of perfection in īmān" and Ibn Bāz (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) shares with him somewhat, they asked him about action, is it a condition of perfection (kamāl) or of correctness (ṣiḥḥah)? He said, "From it is that which is a condition of validity, such as the prayer" and in my presence he said, "and the actions of the heart" and in the presence of others besides me he said, "From the actions are those that are a condition of validity, such as the prayer and whatever is besides it, then it is a condition of perfection." So he shared with al-Albānī (in this matter) by a great deal - in relation to all of Islām, except the prayer, in relation to all actions of īmān except the prayer and (yet these people, the Ḥaddādiyyah), they say, "al-Albānī is Murji'."

And today, the Ḥaddādiyyah, they are from the offshoots (secretions) of the Ikhwān and the Qutbiyyah, they carry the flag of war against Ahl al-Sunnah and they render them Murji'ah and Ḥizbiyyīn ... and (only) they are Ahl al-Sunnah as they claim... and many of the Scholars say (الایمان أصل والعمل كمال) "(Inward) īmān is the foundation and action is perfection" and (والعمل و فرع), "and action is a branch," they say this speech, shall we say they are Murji'ah?! I seek refuge in Allāh from this. The point of evidence here is that this drivel (they speak) now with "Irjā', Irjā'" and "So and so is a Murji'", these people carry the spirit of the Khawārij, and they share with them to a great extent, they share with them in malice towards Ahl al-Sunnah, and lying and fabricating against them. Ibn Bāz and Ibn 'Uthaymīn and others, the speech of al-Albānī reached them in this matter, and they exonerated him from Irjā', they did not say "Murji'", just as (Imām) Aḥmad exonerated Miṣ'ar and others, I do not recall their names now¹⁶¹, they would say to him (Imām Aḥmad), "Is so and so a Murji'" and he

¹⁶¹ The others being alluded to here by Shaykh Rabī', who are similar to Miṣ'ar bin Kidām are the likes of Ibrahim al-Taymī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sullamī, 'Awn bin 'Abd Allāh and others. The issue was that they did not make exception in īmān (meaning to say "I am a believer, if Allāh wills") and this position was the same as what the Murji'ah were saying who also abandoned making this exception in one's īmān. Because Ahl al-Sunnah include actions within īmān, then in order to avoid two things, they permitted making an exception in one's īmān. These two things are to avoid praising oneself by claiming one's deeds have been accepted, that one has brought the desired īmān through sincere, righteous deeds acceptable to Allāh. This is implied by saying, without restriction, "I am a believer." And secondly, because one does not know what he will die upon. Thus affirming īmān for oneself without restriction and exception is erroneous because one does not know the deeds he will die upon. From these two considerations, the Salaf, who held actions are from īmān, being a part of it, and being a branch from the foundation that is the īmān in the heart, they permitted a person to say "I am a believer, if Allāh wills" which means to resign the reality of faith to Allāh's will and not to claim to have brought it. However, in affirming faith resolutely (without the exception), they (Miṣ'ar and others) were intending the aṣl (foundation) of īmān and not the perfection of īmān, so they did not see the necessity of making the exception. Some people accused them of Irjā' on account of this because of the apparent agreement with the saying of the Murji'ah who believed īmān is only taṣdīq in the heart. Thus, making an exception in one's īmān tantamounts to doubt (in that taṣdīq) and is disbelief. However, the likes of Miṣ'ar and others were free and innocent from the creed of the Murji'ah as they were not coming from this angle. They refrained from making the exception, because they were intending the foundation of the īmān. Meaning, belief in Allāh, the Angels, the Books, Messengers, the Last Day and al-Qadar and so on. This is the same as what the Murji'ah intended, that you cannot make an exception (say "if Allāh wills") as this necessitates doubt. But Miṣ'ar and others did not expel actions from īmān, unlike the Murji'ah. This is why Imām Aḥmad exonerated Miṣ'ar from this, because he knew and understood his saying. And the same

would say "No," but others would accuse him (Mis'ar) of al-Irjā'. What type of zeal is this? It is enmity and malice that pushed him (meaning one from the Ḥaddādiyyah) to this, not jealousy (in favour) of Ahl al-Sunnah, by Allāh, they are liars, by Allāh, this is not out of jealousy for Ahl al-Sunnah, but it is due to malice for Ahl al-Sunnah and to seek revenge against their disputant, for the person who is jealous for the Sunnah does not do this and by Allāh we are more jealous for the Sunnah and more severe in retribution against Ahl al-Bid'ah, but these people, they have little trace in this regard (towards Ahl al-Bid'ah)...

Those Ḥaddādites, you come to them now, by Allāh, with texts, narrations in order to satisfy them in matters that they raised (invented) against Ahl al-Sunnah, but they reject them (those texts), and they (Ahl al-Sunnah) bring them the speech of Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim and so and so and so and so from the Imāms, by Allaah, they reject it! I believe that the first Ḥaddādites did not reach this level, so beware of them and warn from them for if they do not make repentance to Allāh and take stock of their own souls, then they are heading towards crashing into the pit (hāwiyah), that which the people of innovations before them fell into, and their destination is the destination of those who preceded them, because Allaah promised aid for the people of truth, for He, the Truth, the Sublime, said, **"And our hosts, they verily will be the victors"** (37:173). So no matter how much they boast to the people that they are "Atharīa" and "People of Truth", then they are not people of truth, rather they are upon falsehood and they are not "Atharis" rather they are insolent ones and arrogant ones ... they are not from the athar and its people and nor from the (good) manners and its people, or from their manhaj and their fear (of Allāh) in anything. Warn against them whilst you unite between yourselves, and bring about mutual brotherhood and deal with each other with good manners and Islāmic etiquette and show mercy to one another and show mutual affection for one another. For indeed the people of innovations and misguidance and numerous factions of (different) creeds they cluster together against Ahl al-Sunnah, they wage war against them and they have made the Ḥaddādiyyah to be the head of the spear in slaughtering Ahl al-Sunnah, but Allāh will

here, what Shaykh al-Albānī and Shaykh Ibn Bāz meant in their use of the phrase "actions are condition in īmān" (for its perfection), they were speaking here from the angle of affirming that major sins do not invalidate one's īmān, unlike what the Khawārij (and Mu'tazilah) believed. However, the expression is unrestricted, ambiguous because those who actually do expel actions from the reality (haqīqah) or meaning (musammaa) of īmān (the Mātūrīdī Hanafīs and others), some amongst them also use this statement *"actions are a condition of perfection"* but intend something else by it, based upon their foundation that actions cannot be from īmān fundamentally as they treat this to be synonymous with the doctrine of the Khārijites whom they were intending to oppose. This is the point being made by Shaykh Rabī here, referring to what happened in the past on the issue of al-Istithnā' where some were accused of Irjā' due to apparent outward agreement in an issue, when they were actually free of it, and this is similar to what the Ḥaddādiyyah have done on this issue of al-Albānī and the statement *"actions are a condition for the perfection of īmān."* The contemporary Ḥaddādiyyah play upon these types of issues in order to accuse Ahl al-Sunnah of Irjā', and this is what we also find from the followers of Yahyā al-Ḥajūrī. From them is Abū Fujūr 'Abd al-Fattāḥ al-Kanādī al-Sūmālī and also Mūsa Millington from Trinidad, two ignoramuses who attempted to stir up this issue in order to justify and propagate the accusation of Irjā' against Ahl al-Sunnah.

demolish their spears as He demolished them beforehand, He will demolish them now and after, if Allaah wills." End quote from Shaykh Rabī'.¹⁶²

It is not surprising then that the followers of Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī al-Ḥaddādī should stir these issues against the Salafīs. In 2012 one of these fame-seeking, diseased Ḥaddādīs by the name of Abū Fujūr 'Abd al-Fattāh al-Kanadī al-Ṣumālī sought to use this issue against myself and he was aided and supported in that by another ignoramus by the name of Mūsā Millington al-Trinidādī.¹⁶³ All of that was for the sake of venting anger and seeking revenge for Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī, and not because they desired defence of the Salafī 'aqidah and its carriers. This is because at the same time, both of these ignoramuses and liars claim that 'Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) instituted a bid'ah into the dīn of Islām, which the rest of the Companions, including 'Alī (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) were complicit in, because they remained silent about it and did not reject it, until it spread and became acted upon by the ummah at large.

So when these astray, misguided souls do not refrain from accusing the Companions of departing from the Sunnah of the Messenger (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) and not enjoining the good and prohibiting the evil through this evil position towards the action of 'Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ), then what trust and value can be placed in anything they write in the affairs of religion, let alone claims of defending the 'aqidah?!

Abu 'Iyāḍ Amjad Rafīq

10th Shawwāl 1435H / 6th August 2014

Updated 16th Shawwāl 135H / 12th August 2014

¹⁶² From the Shaykh's lecture titled *Kalimah Fī Tawḥīd wa Ta'līq 'alā ba'd A'māl al-Ḥaddādiyyah al-Jadīdah*, a transcript of which is here <http://www.sahab.net/forums/index.php?showtopic=139759>.

¹⁶³ Refer to the following thread for details, <http://www.salafitalk.com/threads/977>.

Appendix 1: The Ḥadīth of Shafā'ah Between its Dhāhir and Its Ta'wīl

What follows will illustrate the inconsistency in explaining away the ḥadīths of intercession which speak of the one having done no good whatsoever being delivered from the Fire to be in reference to the one who was **unable** to do any good deeds.

Shaykh Sāliḥ al-Fawzān was asked¹⁶⁴ the following: "The ḥadīth reported by the two Shaykhs (Bukhārī and Muslim) that Allāh will take out a people **"...who had not done any good whatsoever..."**, is it said that "goodness" is mentioned in the indefinite form following a negation and thus this (amounts to a) generalization for all good and thus (the view) of not making takfīr of the one who abandons the prayer, with major disbelief, is derived from this?"

The Shaykh answered. "[The statement] **"...who had not done any good whatsoever..."**, they are from the people of faith because they died, they spoke with the shahādah for example and died, their (lives) were sealed with Tawḥīd and Īmān, all of their lives were upon disbelief and sin, so when Allāh desired good for them, they entered into Islām, then they were taken suddenly, they died before they were able to perform action, they died upon Tawḥīd because Allāh sealed (their lives) with faith. There occurs in the ḥadīth, *"A man performs the actions of the people of the Fire until there is only an armspan between him and it and then [what is decreed in] the Book overtakes him and he acts with the action of the people of Paradise and thus enters it."* So if Allāh shows favour to the servant and he enters into Islām, then death comes to him suddenly, he spoke with the two testimonials and he was sound and fine, then something befell him and he died suddenly, such a one did not do anything but pronounce the two testimonials, believing in them, knowing their meaning and desiring to act upon their requirements, however he was not able. He died upon faith. This is the one who did not do any good whatsoever during his life because his life was sealed (at the end) with faith. As for the one who abandons prayer, this is one is considered from the apostates and is not from the people of faith, when he dies upon that, he is an apostate¹⁶⁵ and he is not from the people of faith, and his (life) was not sealed with goodness."

Then the questioner asks a follow up: "The one who was not able to perform (any) action (of good) he will enter the Fire due to not acting?"¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁴ Published on <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Aj9TH50KBC8> and saved as local copy.

¹⁶⁵ Notice here the centrality of the issue of abandonment of prayer to this entire debate. Those who do not make takfīr of the one who abandons prayer would say that whoever died whilst neglecting good deeds he is an extremely sinful person, but not a disbeliever, and he will be punished in the Hereafter. This in no way constitutes Irjā'.

¹⁶⁶ This is because the ḥadīth is in relation to intercession and applies to one who has entered the Fire and so the questioner, appearing confused, asks a follow up to ascertain whether such a one, so described, will be punished by the Fire or not, because in light of the circumstances, this one does not deserve the Fire.

The Shaykh answered: "Islām erases what was before it, he will not enter the Fire because Allāh has forgiven him due to repentance and speaking with the two testimonials and Islām erases what was before it"¹⁶⁷. If he had committed evil deeds after he entered into Islām, major sins, this one is subject to entering the Fire. Yes, as for what is before Islām, then it is pardoned, **"Say to those who disbelieve, if they cease (from their disbelief), He will forgive them for what has passed..."** (8:38). So what is before Islām, Allāh pardons it and Islām erases it. As for what is after Islām, from the major sins, then this requires detail¹⁶⁸, yes."¹⁶⁹

There is a problem with this view which is not free of inconsistency and contradiction as Shaykh Rabī and Shaykh al-Albānī point out, in that it is erroneous to interpret this ḥadīth **"... who had not done any good whatsoever..."** - which is referring to those who are the most sinful of people - to mean those who entered Islām and were unable to perform good deeds because they died shortly thereafter. This is a contradiction because such people should not be punished. Yet, the ḥadīth is referring to those who are severely punished, until they become like burnt coals.

Imām al-Albānī was asked about this particular interpretation of this ḥadīth and he rebutted it when he said, "And the mutawātir ḥadīths regarding intercession on the Day of Judgement, *"Take out from the Hellfire he in whose heart there is an atom's weight of goodness"* and in a narration, *"... of īmān"*, he was not able to perform the actions of īmān?! And in the authentic ḥadīths, there occurs, "Which of the deeds are most excellent?", the best of actions, and he mentioned amongst them, the prayer, the Ḥajj and what is like that. He has not able to perform any of the righteous actions, so nothing remained in his heart except an atom's weight of goodness or īmān. So what is the meaning of the ḥadīth?! And is this is how the Scholars of the Salaf cited this ḥadīth from whom we have taken 'aḳīdah?! When they cited the intercession and the ḥadīths of intercession, do they mean (to refer) to the

¹⁶⁷ This invalidates the interpretation of the statement **"...who had not done any good whatsoever..."** that it refers to the one who uttered the shahādah and then died suddenly thereby unable to perform any good deeds because such a one will not enter the Fire to begin with and will not need intercession.

¹⁶⁸ The tafṣīl (detail) here returns back to the issue of the ruling on the abandonment of prayer. If he abandons the prayer, he is an apostate and will not receive intercession in one view and in the other, he is extremely sinful, deficient in īmān and will be punished in the Hellfire unless he repents.

¹⁶⁹ Compare this with what was cited earlier from Shaykh al-Fawzān when the Shaykh said, "Those who entered into Islām and were not able to perform action and who died, they are not in need of intercession, they are not in need of intercession, because they are not punished for abandoning action because they did not have the ability for it. They are not in need of intercession. Intercession is for the one who abandoned something from the actions which are less than kufr, less than shirk, and he deserved punishment. Intercession will benefit this person by Allāh's permission. Because he is a Muslim who has sin with him, he deserves punishment, and the intercession of those who intercede will benefit him, when Allāh grants permission for that, yes. As for when he is **not able** to perform action, he speaks with the two testimonials as a believer, being truthful (in that) and then was not able to perform action, this person does not require intercession." Refer to the following link <http://saif.af.org.sa/ar/node/1690> (saved as a local copy). This makes it is clear that the ḥadīth is **not** referring to those who entered Islām and were genuinely unable to perform actions due to a legitimate reason.

ones who were not able to perform an action of goodness?! Like this?! Then in that case you have fallen into what you have rejected from those who opposed you from the people of desires. You are revolving and circulating around authentic ḥadīths and interpreting them due to an idea that is established in your minds. You are not able, until this day, to affirm (this idea) from evidences from the Book and the Sunnah, except through ta'wīl. In any case, the evidences you have mentioned are against you, because you have made ta'wīl of them in a way that resembles the ta'wīl of the Mu'awwilah of the texts of the Book and the Sunnah that relate to the Divine Attributes! And we right now (in such a case), there is no difference between us and the people of kalām from the angle of ta'ṭīl (denial), the difference is only in form! Those people explain away the texts related to the Divine Attributes and these ones explain away the texts related to legislative rulings, and ta'ṭīl (denial, explaining away) [in both situations] is the one [and the same]!"¹⁷⁰

Shaykh Rabī' said, "I have not seen anyone from the Imāms of Islam oppose these ḥadīths or make ta'wīl of his saying (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) "...who had not done any good whatsoever..." to mean that they are excused because they were unable to perform action (due to a valid excuse). But if they were excused and were not able to do any action, then how can Allāh enter them into the Fire and punish them with severe punishment, whilst He, the Majestic and Exalted says, "**Allāh does not burden a soul more than it can bear**" (2:286) and Allāh is compassionate, merciful, He teaches His servants to say, "**O Our Lord do not place upon us a burden like you placed on those before us**" (2:286) and our Lord - the most-merciful of those who show mercy - teaches His servants to say, "**And do not burden us with what for which we do not have the ability**" (2:286). Those who did not do any good at all are from the most severe of criminals, Allāh punished them for their persistent crime with severe punishment, because they were able to perform action, they were able for the duration of their lives. I hope that whoever made this ta'wīl announces his repentance from it, because it opposes the Qur'an and the Sunnah."¹⁷¹

In light of the above, it is apparent that the strength of proof is with those who affirm the ḥadīth as it is, upon its dhāhir,¹⁷² and it is this very ḥadīth that forms one of the strong

¹⁷⁰ In the cassette, Silsilah al-Hudā wal-Nūr, no. 297, second side.

¹⁷¹ In the Shaykh's article, *Maḍāmīn al-Maqālāt al-Athariyyah* posted on Sahab.Net.

¹⁷² In an authentic ḥadīth reported by al-Ḥākīm in al-Mustadrak (no. 2270), from Abū Hurayrah (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) who said that the Messenger of Allāh (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) said, "A man **who had not done any good whatsoever**, used to give loans to the people and he would say to his messenger, 'Take (from the people) only what is easy (for them to give) and leave what is difficult (for them). And pardon them, perhaps Allāh, the Most High, might pardon us.' So when he perished, Allāh (عَزَّ وَجَلَّ) said, 'Have you done any good at all?' And he said, 'No. Except that I used to have a servant, and I used to give loans to people. Whenever I would send him to have the loans settled, I would say to him: Take what is easy, and leave what is difficult, and pardon (the debtors), perhaps Allāh will pardon us.' Allāh, the Exalted said, 'I have pardoned you'." Declared **ṣaḥīḥ** by al-Albānī in *Ṣaḥīḥ Sunan al-Nasā'ī*. Note in this ḥadīth it is apparent that the man had been forgiven and did not enter the Hellfire, and thus did not require intercession. As for those who enter the Fire, they will come out either by intercession or by the pure mercy of Allāh - and it is said about the last of them that they "**had not done any good whatsoever**." It is possible to reconcile the conflict in this subject with the following

arguments of those (from the Salaf, past and present) who hold the view that the one who abandons prayer is not a disbeliever. Shaykh Rabī also points out (in *al-Maqālāt al-Athariyyah*) about those from the Salaf who are known to have two views on the ruling on the abandonment of prayer, that amongst them are those who are likely to have changed their view when they came across the ḥadīths of intercession which are so strong and powerful in their indication that they force submission and cannot be explained away.¹⁷³

Realizing this, the Ḥaddādiyyah have become very explicit in their goal of establishing that whoever does not make takfir of the one who abandons prayer, or whoever affirms the issue is a legitimate difference of opinion, "*...has revived Irjā'*" - this is what they are saying and they know that the crux of this matter goes back to the issue of the prayer.

One of them, 'Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Juhanī - a vile and ignorant extremist Ḥaddādī and a leading figure in the attack against Shaykh Rabī - has explicitly stated that anyone who treats the issue of abandonment of prayer as a legitimate difference of opinion and who accommodates the absence of takfir of the one who abandons the prayer as an acceptable position, even if he disagrees with it, **has revived Irjā'**. In a recent article, he claims that the

observation: From what has preceded from the quotes of Shaykh al-Albānī and Shaykh Rabī (in his defence of those holding this view), they make it explicitly clear that it is not possible for a Muslim to live his whole life and not do a good deed, this is impossible. So here there is agreement that the one without any action whatsoever, cannot be a Muslim, from a theoretical point of view, as this situation cannot be imagined. Additionally, this ḥadīth indicates that the wording "**who had not done any good whatsoever**" is not taken absolutely, but in reference to what is **overwhelmingly** the case in an individual, since the individual in the above ḥadīth had good deeds. So up to here, everyone is in agreement. Then for those who hold the abandonment of prayer to be major kufr, every single person to be eventually removed from the Fire, **must have prayed**. It cannot be the case that he did not pray yet had other good deeds, otherwise this would entail a contradiction in that view. If he did not pray, he is a disbeliever and his other deeds count for nothing. What this illustrates is that if we accept the other view, abandoning prayer not being major kufr, is a legitimate juristic opinion, then the wording "**who had not done any good whatsoever**" refers to those who did not pray, and if this is the case, then this ḥadīth (in light of the previous one) means that they **overwhelmingly had no goodness except a very small amount**, and this does not actually clash with the ḥadīth upon its dhāhir, since the goodness (ʿamal) these people brought is either **a**) merely īmān in Allāh and His Messenger which entails both the inward and outward īmān (taṣdīq, inqiyād and outward iqrār with the tongue). Abu Hurayrah reports that the Messenger of Allāh (ﷺ) was asked, "Which action (ʿamal) is most excellent?" He replied, "īmān in Allāh and His Messenger?" It was said, "Then what?" He said, "Jihād in the path of Allāh." It was said, "Then what?" He said, "A righteous Ḥajj." Reported by both al-Bukhārī and Muslim in Kitāb al-īmān. Or **b**) īmān in Allāh and His Messenger as has preceded alongside such goodness that involves pure abandonments of the heart and limbs such as repelling suspicion and envy, not harming the people and what is like that (these do not require any physical action), even if a person was neglectful of all the practical obligations. So the position of those who do not make takfir of the one who abandons prayer can be argued and justified, without it entailing Irjā' at all. Whatever the case, when both sides are explicit in affirming that actions are from īmān it is incorrect to make accusations of Irjā' - and this is something desired by the extremist Ḥaddādīs, they desire to cause splits between the Scholars by carrying issues and misrepresenting sayings of the Scholars whom they are targeting for their evil agendas.

¹⁷³ Al-Maqālāt al-Athariyyah of Shaykh Rabī (p. 92, and p. 101).

difference of opinion on the abandonment of prayer is an innovated, newly-introduced opinion which came after a consensus (ijmā') and he says,

إن بقيتم تنظرون إلى الخلاف في حكم تارك الصلاة إلى أنه خلاف معتبر , وأن القول بإسلام تارك الصلاة
قول سلفي معتبر , فقد أنعشتم الإرجاء

He says, "If you remain looking at the difference regarding the ruling of the one who abandons prayer as an acceptable, considered difference (of opinion) and that the statement of affirming Islām for the one who abandons prayer is an acceptable, considered Salafi viewpoint, then you have revived Irjā'." For this reason, it is binding upon these Ḥaddādiyyah to start attacking many of the Salafi scholars. They have already started in fact, they have spoken against Shaykh 'Abd al-Razzāq al-'Afīfī¹⁷⁴ (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) and even Imāms Ibn Baz (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) and Ibn Uthaymīn (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) and likewise making remarks about Ibn Taymiyyah - since all of these scholars and many more affirm the difference of opinion regarding the abandonment of prayer.

In fact, they even ought to attack Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān and the Muftī, Shaykh 'Abd al-'Azīz because they affirm this difference too. So these are evil people, they intend evil for Ahl al-Sunnah, and they are trying to engineer speech from some of the Salafi scholars today, in order to cause splits between Ahl al-Sunnah through the use of complicated issues in which it is very easy to misrepresent a person's views, and the Ḥajāwirah have started using their shubuhāt as ammunition against Shaykh Rabī in order to seek revenge for their Ḥaddādī leader, Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī.

Updated 17th Shawwāl 135H / 13th August 2014

¹⁷⁴ The Shaykh said about the absence of takfīr of the one who abandons prayer, "And this is the most well-known and the most abundantly (held) view, and it is almost an Ijmaa', yet it is not an Ijmaa', however due to the vast abundance of those who hold this view, it is almost an Ijmaa'." Fataawaa ash-Shaikh Abdur-Razzaaq Afeefee (p. 394)

Appendix 2: The Various Groups and Sayings of the Murji'ah

Abu al-Ḥusayn Ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Maṭṭīyy (d. 337H) mentions¹⁷⁵ 12 groups of the Murji'ah and we will summarize them here, statements in quotes are direct translations. A person should reflect carefully on what is below in order to realize the utter falsehood of the accusation against those Scholars from Ahl al-Sunnah who hold the view that has been explained above (regarding the one who neglects the outward obligations). Abu al-Ḥusayn (رحمه الله) said:

1. "Amongst them are a faction who claim that whoever bore witness with the testimonial of truth (shahādah) will enter Paradises no matter what deeds he does thereafter and that he will never enter Hellfire even if he brings the adhā'im [mighty destructive deeds like shirk, kufr], abandons the emphasized obligations (farā'id) and falls into the major sins."
2. "Amongst them are a faction who claim that īmān is just the knowledge (ma'rifah) of the heart and is not an action (fi'l) of the tongue¹⁷⁶ and nor action ('amal) with the body and that whoever knew Allāh with this heart then he is a believer, even if he prayed towards the East or the West (to other than the qiblah) and even if he wore a girdle around his waist.¹⁷⁷ They said: If we made the affirmation (iqrār) of the tongue obligatory upon him, we would have made obligatory the action of the body. Until some of them said: Prayer is from the weakness of īmān, whoever prayed, his īmān weakened."
3. "Amongst them are a faction who claim that affirmation (iqrār) with the tongue that none has the right to be worshipped but Allāh alone is a must, and (affirmation) of the Prophets (عليهم السلام) and with whatever has come from Allāh, but whoever abandoned action thereafter is a believer, with the revelation not declaring [his īmān] to be deficient in anything."¹⁷⁸
4. "Amongst them are a faction who claim that affirming the revelation is a must but then they reject from its explanation whatever they wish. They said: We bear

¹⁷⁵ Al-Tanbīh wal-Radd 'alā Ahl al-Ahwā' wal-Bida' (Cairo, 1413H, from p. 105 onwards). Note that this is an important and highly valued historical book that is referred to by Salafi scholars for information on the views of the various sects and their splinter groups.

¹⁷⁶ Note how the expression of the tongue is referred to as action (fi'l), and we have already cited the explanation of Ibn Taymiyyah earlier that the "dhāhir" (outward) includes the expression of the tongue in addition to the actions of the limbs.

¹⁷⁷ This would make Christians, Jews and others to be believers, those who worship with another religion whilst having ma'rifah (knowledge of Allāh).

¹⁷⁸ The Murji'ah say such a one is perfect in faith, there being no deficiency in his faith, whereas Ahl al-Sunnah, those who do not make takfīr of the one who abandons prayer, say that he is the most sinful of the Believers, subject to severe punishment, with his īmān severely damaged and weakened by his action.

witness that there is nothing worthy of worship but Allāh and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). But then they said: [He who says]: We do not know if he is the one who is in Makkah or Madīnah, or the Prophet in Khurasān [that such a one] is a believer. They said: [He who says]: We affirm Ḥajj but we do not know if it is in Makkah or a house in Khurasān [that such a one] is a believer. They affirmed that the swine is unlawful [and said]: [He who says]: We do not know if this is the swine or the donkey [that such a one is a believer]."

5. "Amongst them are a faction who claim that their īmān is like the īmān of Jibrīl, Mikā'īl, the near Angels and the Prophets."
6. "Amongst them are a faction who claim that they are believers, having perfected (mustakmilan) īmān, there not being any deficiency in their īmān, there being no doubt (in that) even if one of them fornicates with his mother or sister, and commits the mighty (calamitous) deeds, falls into the major sins, the shameful deeds, drinks alcohol, kills another, consumes interest and what is unlawful, abandons the prayer, zakāh, and all of the emphasized obligations (farā'id), backbites, mocks, ridicules (others) and speaks. And this is strong ignorance. How can he have perfected īmān who has opposed its conditions, traits and required legislative duties? Do you not see that in the Book of Allāh there is the accepted īmān and the rejected īmān?"
7. "Amongst them are a faction who claim that they are believers in truth (reality), just like the reality of the people of Paradise whose reality (of faith) Allāh described, **"They are the believers in truth"** (8:4). But whoever claims he is in Paradise is in the Fire, and whoever claims he is a scholar, then he is an ignoramus and whoever claims he is truthful - meaning in his faith - then he is a liar."
8. "Amongst them are a faction who claim that their faith remains constant permanently, it does not increase, even if he performs the great obligations, showed awe (piety) in his religion, abandoned what is unlawful, always made pilgrimage, and prayed or fasted continuously. And likewise, it will not decrease, even if he committed sins (sayyi'āt) and the major sins (kabā'ir) and the shameful deeds (fawāḥish), committed what was unlawful openly, or abandoned the prayer and did not ever fast or perform Ḥajj."
9. "Amongst them are a faction who claim that īmān increases with an increase in actions continuously, without end or limit but that it does not decrease on account of any action from the actions of the criminals, nor by abandonment of the emphasized obligations (farā'id) or perpetrating what is perpetrated by the oppressors."

10. "Amongst them are a faction who claim that there is no hypocrisy (nifāq) in this ummah, yet Hudhayfah was asked about hypocrisy and he said: That you speak with the tongue but do not act."
11. "Amongst them are a faction who claim that īmān and islām are a single name (label), that īmān does not have any superiority in rank over islām. And here Sa'd bin Abī Waqqāṣ says: The Messenger of Allāh (ﷺ) gave something to one man but did not give to another. So I said: O Messenger of Allāh, you gave to so and so but not to so and so and he is a Mu'min (believer). So he (ﷺ) said: 'Or a Muslim.' He said it three times. Al-Zuhrī said, 'So we hold īmān to be a word (speech) and islām to be action.'¹⁷⁹

Though al-Maṭṭiyy mentioned 12 factions, there appear to be only 11 mentioned here and perhaps the one he mentioned at the beginning of the book (p. 35) is the 12th faction, Allāh knows best.

From the above, the difference between saying:

A man who has taṣdīq in his heart along with inqiyāḍ that gives rise to the basic actions of the heart which then lead him to manifest this outwardly by making iqrār (affirmation) with the tongue [which if he was to abandon despite having the ability would prove the absence of īmān in his heart] and who then left the obligations (out of neglect and laziness)¹⁸⁰ (and not out of 'inād or kibr)¹⁸¹, he is a sinful believer, his neglect has harmed his īmān, caused it to decrease, (because actions are from the reality of īmān). And in the Hereafter, (unless He is forgiven first), he will enter the Fire and be most severely punished until he turns into coal. And he will only be removed after the interceders have interceded and there only remains the pure mercy and bounty of Allāh, who will remove him and his likes from the Fire and throw them into the River of Life.

And saying:

¹⁷⁹ Islām and īmān are two different levels as is clear from the ḥadīth of Jibrīl (ﷺ) and whilst a person might display outward Islām (outward actions), this Islām is only validated by inward īmān, on account of which a person's rank rises to the level of īmān over and above Islām. However, when mentioned together in the same sentence, passage or context, īmān refers to the inward belief (referred to by al-Zuhrī as "*kalimah*", meaning belief) whereas Islām refers to the outward actions.

¹⁸⁰ Upon our understanding that the correct view on abandoning fasting, zakāh and Ḥajj whilst affirming their obligation is not major kufr and as for the prayer, there is a difference of opinion.

¹⁸¹ A person may have taṣdīq but not have inqiyāḍ (compliance of the heart) since though he knows the truth of Islām and the Messenger, and may even affirm it outwardly and say "Yes, I believe Islām is the truth", he is intent and determined not to follow it for whatever motivation exists for him to do that. And underlying all of that is either kibr (arrogance) or 'inād (wilful, stubborn opposition) and the likes which prove the absence of the presence of the actions of the heart - despite the presence of taṣdīq.

A man who has pure ma'rifah (knowledge) or taṣḍīq (assent) in his heart through which the īmān in his heart is complete (tām) and perfect (kāmil) is guaranteed Paradise through that alone. Or if he acknowledges outwardly [that none has the right to be worshipped but Allāh and Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh]¹⁸² he is guaranteed Paradise [and in a view ascribed to the Extremist Murji'ah, Hellfire is prohibited for him] because his īmān is perfect without him having brought a single good deed (because actions are not from the reality of īmān). Alongside that he may revile the Messenger and fight against the believers and worship idols and [in the view of the Extremist Murji'ah] he remains a perfect believer merely due to the taṣḍīq in his heart, or taṣḍīq and (iqrār) outward affirmation. Or that he may neglect all the obligations and fall into all the major sins and his īmān remains intact, perfect, complete, not deficient and not being harmed at all (because actions are not from īmān). And the īmān of this man is equal to the īmān of Jibrīl and the Prophets and Abu Bakr and 'Umar. And if he performed all the obligations and avoided all the prohibitions, then his īmān would not have increased at all, since īmān cannot increase or decrease (because actions are not from īmān). And since [in a view ascribed to the Extremist Murji'ah] Hellfire is prohibited absolutely to the likes of this person, then the ḥadīths of intercession are denied, since none from the people of the qiblah who have the basis of īmān will enter the Hellfire to begin with.

Can be clearly seen.

¹⁸² To grasp the point here, you should be aware that many of the pagans knew that Muhammad was the Messenger of Allāh and that what he called to was the truth and they knew the truth of the kalimah "*Lā ilāha illallāh*". But it was love of the world, love of fame, love of position and wealth and fearing the blame of their tribes, and not wanting to leave the way of their forefathers and the likes which prevented them from Islām. So here, it is the action of the heart (inqiyād, compliance) and what follows on from it such as maḥabbah (love) and the likes which were absent and were not expressed because of the preventing desire in their heart. Thus the taṣḍīq they had in their hearts, which under normal circumstances (in the absence of desire) would have led to the actions of the heart, was concealed and covered by whatever desire existed in their hearts. This the nature of kufr (disbelief), **it is NOT restricted to the absence of taṣḍīq alone**, since many disbelievers and pagans know and accept that Muḥammad is the Messenger, yet they do not affirm this outwardly, or if they do, they do not take Islām as their dīn due to some desire that prevents them. Not understanding this point here is from the great errors of the Murji'ah which led them to misguidance in their views.

Appendix 3: Bayān Talbīs al-Ḥajāwīrah

Understanding the Techniques Used by the Ḥajāwīrah to Shield Yaḥyā al-Ḥajāūrī and His Major and Most Serious Bid'ahs

As for what is mentioned about the Ḥajāwīrah in the Netherlands, their claim that the sum of all the refutations made against Yaḥyā al-Ḥajāūrī contain lies and distortions¹⁸³, that they translated and compiled the various refutations against these criticisms into a lengthy PDF article, and subsequently affected some Salafīs who took sides with al-Ḥajāūrī, believing that they looked at the evidences and were convinced that al-Ḥajāūrī is correct or has been wronged, then you should note the following:

That for which al-Ḥajāūrī has been criticized falls into a number of categories:

1. Great and mighty calamities in which the criticism is sound, strong and the ḥujjah has been established upon him and he has withheld from clarification and repentance or he has persisted in his falsehood. These are with respect to the most important uṣūl of our religion, such as accusing the Companions (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ) of initiating Irjā', accusing them of participating in the murder of 'Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ), and accusing 'Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) of instituting bid'ah, mukhālafah and ḍalālāh¹⁸⁴ and what is similar to that. In these issues, despite their clarity, al-Ḥajāūrī and the Ḥajāwīrah have argued with bāṭil and have not successfully defended their leader, but have used sophistry, compiled shubuhāt (that have been systematically refuted) and relied upon the very taqlīd they claim to oppose and reject. In these issues the proof is established upon al-Ḥajāūrī and he is an innovator on account of just one of these issues, let alone the collection of them, because he has not recanted or repented after the truth has been made clear. He and his followers played games and often changed goalposts in these issues as a means of deceiving others about the core underlying issue.

¹⁸³ This is a hugely inflated claim. How can the sum of what al-Ḥajāūrī has been refuted for and the affairs in which he is refuted by the speech of the Major Scholars such as Shaykh al-Fawzān, Shaykh Ibn al-'Uthaymīn, Shaykh Rabi' and many of the students of knowledge all just be mere lies and distortions? In reality, there are firmly established evidences that al-Ḥajāūrī has opposed the uṣūl of Ahl al-Sunnah. However, these Ḥajāūrītes started looking for mistakes of the Scholars like Shaykh Rabi' and Shaykh 'Ubayd and imputed things to Shayh Muḥammad bin Ḥādī and they began looking in turn for the mistakes of the Mashāyikh of Yemen, and employed all of that as a means of shielding the major errors of al-Ḥajāūrī and diverting attention from them.

¹⁸⁴ In this issue the Ḥajāwīrah make taqlīd of Shaykh Muqbil (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) in whose time this issue had not been exhaustively debated and resolved by a detailed analysis of the claimed evidences. Thus, we can excuse those who have passed and may have held this view due to erroneous ijtihād. However, after exhaustive debate and after the truth has been made clear and all evidences evaluated and their reality made clear, such excuses are not possible for people who persist in this erroneous view due to **ta'aṣṣub** (partisanship), **taqlīd** (blind-following) and **hawā** (desire).

2. Affairs for which he made an apparent or alleged retraction, and thus in their view, criticism of him in those matters is no longer justified. For example, the poet who described al-Ḥajūrī as "*Imām al-Thaḳalayn*" has made open repentance on two occasions from this speech, but we have not heard al-Ḥajūrī himself announce his repentance and recantation because in many of these instances of ghuluww, he is found affirming them or remaining silent about them or thanking the writer or poet who expressed them. And no clear, explicit repentance has been found in the actual speech of al-Ḥajūrī. He may have statements like, "*This is wrong*", "*I am not pleased with it*", "*Leave these affairs*", "*I don't agree with this*" and the likes, but this does not amount to a recantation or repentance. The Ḥajūrītes only portray this as repentance and recantation. Despite their claims of al-Ḥajūrī having recanted, there are not any clear, unambiguous written or spoken words of recantation or repentance that have come from him in the major issues that are established against him.
3. Affairs in which the criticism against al-Ḥajūrī is obscure, lacks clarity, needs further elaboration and thus appears weak and these types of criticisms give opportunity to the Ḥajāwirah to cast doubt on the firmly established and undeniable deviations and innovations al-Ḥajūrī has been criticised for. The Major Scholars who have criticized al-Ḥajūrī have only done so on the basis of clear, apparent issues¹⁸⁵ but as for the refutations of many of those who write on forums and the likes, then perhaps there is to be found amongst them what is mentioned here. The Ḥajāwirah rejoice in their forums and gatherings with these affairs which blind them from the misguidance of al-Ḥajūrī in clear cut issues.
4. Criticisms which may have received legitimate replies and have been resolved or criticisms in which al-Ḥajūrī may have been wronged even. We say this to grant the Ḥajāwirah the best and most favourable situation for them to illustrate that even despite all of this, **they are still upon falsehood** and cannot defend al-Ḥajūrī on the most grave and serious of his errors and that al-Ḥajūrī remains an innovator, even just on one issue alone.

The Ḥajāwirah in Netherlands (and elsewhere) have simply gathered together the futile refutations by al-Ḥajūrī's students against the first category of issues in which the truth is not with them at all and added the remaining three categories to create "clutter" and "distraction" around the most serious issues so as to dilute them or push them out. A person who does not know the realities and has not looked in fine detail in all the major issues (in the first category) and has not seen the clear falsehood of the Ḥajāwirah in trying to defend al-Ḥajūrī, their deception and playing games, he will be confused or convinced by the remaining three categories.

¹⁸⁵ Take for example the severe statements of Shaykh Rabi', Shaykh al-Fawzān and Shaykh Ibn al-ʿUthaymīn in the issue of the first adhān of ʿUthmān (رضي الله عنه).

So those who have been misguided and misled by those Ḥajāwirah from amongst the Salafīs, they should repent and restore their intellects and sufficient for them are only a few issues, which if they were to look at it in detail, would indicate to them that Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī and his followers are people of desires and that they argue in falsehood. From them is the issue of ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) and the first adhān of Jumu‘ah. Anyone who looks into this one issue objectively and without bias will see the fraudulent attempts of the Ḥajāwirah to defend al-Ḥajūrī and that in the end, all they have left to fall back upon, is the very taqlīd they claim to fight against - devoid of any evidences whatsoever. After they were left empty-handed by the refutations of the Scholars like Shaykh Rabī, Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn, Shaykh al-Fawzān¹⁸⁶ and others, they deliberately chose taqlīd, ta‘aṣṣub and hawā. Likewise the issue of accusing the Companions of participating in the murder of ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) and the various games played by al-Ḥajūrī in trying to cover that up.

So the point here is there are firmly established, valid criticisms against al-Ḥajūrī in matters of uṣūl and he has been refuted by a large number of Scholars and students of knowledge and a variety of issues, and he stands alone, there is none from the people of knowledge who are with him and defending him except those with bigotry towards him from his own students. Due to the zeal of these students, they spend hours and hours in compiling, writing, refuting in order to confuse the people so that those major and serious issues which are established against al-Ḥajūrī remain obscure and hidden. May save Ahl al-Sunnah from their evil and guide them, amīn.

¹⁸⁶ Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn has stated that whoever says the ādhan of ‘Uthmān an innovation reviles the Messenger, the Caliphs and the Companions and also that he is a foolish-minded astray innovator. Shaykh al-Fawzān said these people desire to declare ‘Uthmān an innovator and that to hold this view about ‘Uthmān is itself an innovation and that whoever holds this is an innovator. Refer to <http://www.alhajuri.com>.

Appendix 4: Yahyā al-Ḥajūrī is a Muḥtadī' (Innovator) on Just One Issue Alone, We do not Need Tens or Hundreds!

Al-Ḥajūrī 's View Comprises Revilement of the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم), Ṭabḍī of Uṭhmān (رضي الله عنه), the Companions and Almost the Entire Ummah¹⁸⁷

If we accept - **just for argument's sake** - that al-Ḥajūrī has been lied upon by students of knowledge, his words have been twisted or that he has explained or taken back some of what he was criticised for - then know that none of that, if we grant it to the Ḥajūrītes, would change the fact that al-Ḥajūrī is still a muḥtadī' (innovator) on just one or two or three issues alone. From them is imputing **bid'ah**, **mukhālafah** and **ḍalālāh** to the action of Uṭhmān (رضي الله عنه). This bid'ah is defended vigorously by al-Ḥajūrī and his followers, who take the same judgement as him.

The view Yahyā al-Ḥajūrī is defending and fighting for, tooth and nail, has its origin in the saying of the Rāfiḍī, Ibn al-Muṭahhir,¹⁸⁸ and he relies upon the erroneous ijtiḥād of Shaykh Muqbil (رحمة الله) who is excused because the matter was not sufficiently debated and argued at the time (as it has now) such that the basis upon which he held his view was established as being futile. Whilst we can excuse Shaykh Muqbil, we do not have the same situation for Yahyā al-Ḥajūrī and his followers because every last piece of evidence they tried to bring has been refuted.¹⁸⁹ All the Ḥajūrītes are left with is **pure taqlīd** and the statement "*there is khilāf in the issue*" and a fake display of trying to defend the honour of Hishām bin al-Ghāz whose narration (going back to Ibn 'Umar) they depend upon to make the accusation against Uṭhmān (رضي الله عنه).¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁷ What is in this title is derived from the judgements of scholars such as Shaykh al-Fawzān, Shaykh Ibn al-Uthaymīn and from the very claims of al-Ḥajūrī and the principles he believes about those who act upon innovation or approve of it, that they are callers to innovation by their action alone. Please read all of this section and the statements of al-Ḥajūrī himself and the judgements of the Scholars upon his saying will make this affair clear.

¹⁸⁸ Ibn Taymiyyah said, "It is strange (amazing) that the Rāfiḍah reject something that Uṭhmān did in [open] view of the Anṣār and the Muḥājirīn without them rejecting it from him and which all the Muslims followed him in, and that is the adhān of Jumu'ah." Minhaj al-Sunnah (6/293).

¹⁸⁹ They also tried to use the view of Imām al-Albānī, which they twisted to try to make it appear in favour of al-Ḥajūrī, when in reality it convicts al-Ḥajūrī. Imām al-Albānī's view is that the action of Uṭhmān was a Sunnah because it was legislated for a valid and intelligible reason, and wherever and whenever that reason is found, this Sunnah of Uṭhmān can be implemented. The Shaykh was only criticising **the incorrect implementation** of the Sunnah of Uṭhmān and not the actual Sunnah itself as a matter of principle. Refer to <http://alhajuri.com/?bfbqfsl> for elaboration and Shaykh al-Albānī's speech is quoted in this section.

¹⁹⁰ When Shaykh Rabī' showed that the narration from Ibn 'Umar (رضي الله عنه) they relied upon which comes through Hishām bin al-Ghāz is shādh and munkar (conflicts with what is otherwise known and established), and that there is some finer detail in the ta'dīl given to Hishām by the Imāms of Ḥadīth, the Ḥajūrītes began to write articles with exaggerated titles such as this (التابعي نعوذ بالله من الهوى): (الجليل هشام بن الغاز تحت الأقدام) "We seek refuge in Allāh from desire: Hishām bin al-Ghāz, the noble successor is now under the feet" and what is like this. From here you see the utter misguidance and blindness of

Al-Hajūrī Does not Distinguish Between the One Who Calls and the Who Does Not Call to Bid'ah and Treats them the Same

Before we look at Hajūrī's view on the first adhān of 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) it is important to understand it in light of some of the other misguided principles of al-Hajūrī. In the cassette, "al-Qawl al-Jaliyy" al-Hajūrī asks his students:¹⁹¹

The saying of some of them, the division of some people of the Innovators into callers to their innovation and other than the callers to innovation, do the evidences support this division? Is it correct or futile?

And after some discussion with them, he says:

Futile (bāṭil), by Allāh, futile, and I swear by it too, that it is futile... every innovating person who has an innovation with him **is considered to be a caller to his innovation...** There is not to be found an innovator on the face of the earth, any innovator, and it be said about him, "*It is not possible for him to call to his innovation through speech or action*"... Da'wah (calling to Allāh) is both speech and action, it is not restricted to just speech. **And this division is futile, futile... it is empty speech, this division is empty speech.** And if you refuse (to accept this) we will make an assault through a research piece and an explanation of that, even if the majority speak with it, **by Allāh it is a futile division, yes... it is empty speech, empty speech.** Is this division correct?! Yes we have seen some of Ahl al-Sunnah affirming this division. I am against this division due to evidences from the Qur'an, the Sunnah and reality... the issue is as clear as the sun, this is a futile division, this division has an observation (against it). It is found with the majority of the Scholars, it is not from just one of them, but it has an observation, **it is not correct, it is not correct, it is not correct...**

The meaning of this is that anyone who acts upon an innovation is automatically a caller to that innovation whether he calls to it by speech in addition to his action or not. This means that if al-Hajūrī defends this principle in the manner that he does, and we see how he describes the action of 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه), then it means, by application of this principle of al-Hajūrī, 'Uthmān (and refuge is from Allāh) was an open caller to **bid'ah** (innovation) and **ḍalālāh** (misguidance) and **mukhālafah** (opposition) and a caller to an **umm al-bid'ah** (mother of innovation), all words used by al-Hajūrī in relation to the adhān of 'Uthmān. This is why when you read one of the verdicts of Shaykh Ṣaliḥ al-Fawzān below when he

these people which is the end result of following desires. If you just reflect on their actions, they make a pretence of defending the honour of a narrator of ḥadīth, a Tabī'ī, because Shaykh Rabī stated that his narration from Ibn 'Umar is shādh and in his ta'dīl there is some finer detail, just so that they can justify their allegation against one who is loftier and greater, 'Uthmān bin 'Affān (رضي الله عنه), in order to establish that he instituted bid'ah, mukhālafah and ḍalālāh into the religion and implying that that anyone who followed him in that (from the Companions and all the Scholars until this day of ours) are innovators or callers to innovation!

¹⁹¹ Refer to *al-Mukhtaṣar Fī Bayān Ba'd Mukhālafāt Yahyā al-Hajūrī* (p. 31 onwards).

asked about those say that the action of ‘Uthmān was *bid’ah* but we do not say he was a *mubtadi*¹⁹², the Shaykh rejects this excuse and declares the person who says it as an innovator.

The Claims of al-Ḥajūrī

Here are the views of al-Ḥajūrī from his book *Ahkām al-Jumu‘ah* (Dar Sharqayn):

وإن قال كما قال جميع علماء الأمة: إنه مُحدث - يعني أذان عثمان - كما أجمع على ذلك علماء الإسلام قلنا له: ألا ترى في الحديث أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يُحذرك من مُحدثات الأمور ويقول: إنها ضلالة

And if (a person) says as all of the scholars of the Ummah said: It is innovated [(muḥdath) meaning the adhān of Uthmān] as has been unanimously agreed upon by the Scholars of Islām¹⁹³, then we say to him: Do you not see in the ḥadīth that the Messenger of Allāh (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) warns you from the newly-invented matters, and he says that they are misguidance?

فقد خالف فعل عثمان رضي الله عنه نصًا صريحًا من فعل النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - أنه لم يكن يفعل هذا الأذان

‘Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ), in his action, has opposed an explicit text from the action of the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) in that he did not used to do this adhān.

وهذه البدعة إنما ولدت من تلك الأم, بدعة الأذان الأول

And this *bid’ah* was born out of that mother (of innovation), the *bid’ah* of the first adhān.

أما من تابعه - يعني عثمان - على ذلك الخطأ بعد بيان الحجة فهو في ذلك مبتدع، لا عذر له في مخالفة سنة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وصاحبيه

As for the one who followed him (meaning ‘Uthmān) in that error after the evidence has been established, then he is an innovator (*mubtadi*), there is no excuse for him in opposing the

¹⁹² This is said by the Ḥaddādī Ḥājurites such as Musā Millington al-Trinidādī who wrote on the forum run by the Ḥaddādī, Khālīd al-Gharbānī, "Saying that the adhān of ‘Uthmān is a *bid’ah* does not necessitate declaring Uthmān bin ‘Affān an innovator."

¹⁹³ Al-Ḥajūrī is implying in these words that the action of ‘Uthmān is considered by the Scholars of Islām as a newly-invented misguidance and he is claiming a consensus on this matter. He is a liar in this claim and any Ḥajūrīte who believes him and speaks with this is a liar too. Notice his use of the word *muḥdath* (through which he is intending to say "innovated"). Shaykh Muḥammad bin Hādī said, "And he instituted (sanna) this adhān, we do not say he innovated it (aḥdathahu), we say he instituted it, because he is a person of the Sunnah, and we are ordered to follow it (the Sunnah)..." from an audio recording, transcribed here: <http://www.sahab.net/forums/?showtopic=136806>

Sunnah of the Messenger of Allāh (ﷺ) and his two companions [meaning, Abū Bakr and ‘Umar].

The followers of al-Ḥajūrī have not ceased to vehemently defend and support these claims over the years, despite their knowledge that they are opposed by the *ijmā‘* of the Companions and of the Ummah, which indicates that they have chosen misguidance after guidance has been plainly conveyed and made clear.

Refutation of al-Ḥajūrī's False Claim of *Ijmā‘* (Consensus)

Sa‘īd bin al-Muṣayyib (رحمته الله) said, "So ‘Uthmān (رحمته الله) ordered with the adhān of Jumu‘ah, the third, and then **the Sunnah became established upon that**, hence a third adhān was not given except on Jumu‘ah from the time ‘Uthmān legislated it."¹⁹⁴

Ibn al-Mundhir said, "When the people increased (in number) ‘Uthmān bin ‘Affān (رحمته الله) ordered a third call (to prayer) in number, and it is the first (of them) which he began after sun reaching the zenith (doing this) in the presence of the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār and **not a single one of them rejected it that we know of, and then the Ummah remained upon this until this day of ours.**"¹⁹⁵

Ibn Qudāmah (رحمته الله) said, " And the first adhān is legislated at the beginning of the time because ‘Uthmān (رحمته الله) legislated it **and the Ummah acted upon it after him** and it is legislated for informing of the time, the second for informing of the khuṭbah (sermon) and the iqāmah for the establishment of the prayer."¹⁹⁶

Ibn Taymiyyah (رحمته الله) said "And it can be addressed by saying: This adhān, when it was legislated by ‘Uthmān (رحمته الله) and **the Muslims agreed upon it**, it became a shar‘iyy (legislative) adhān."¹⁹⁷ And he also said, "And what ‘Uthmān did of the (introducing) the first call, **the people agreed upon it after him**, the people of the four madhhabs and others, just as they agreed upon what ‘Umar legislated of gathering the people together in Ramaḍān behind a single imām."¹⁹⁸

Al-Kirmānī in his explanation of Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, "And if you said, how was it legislated? I say: Through the *ijtihād* of ‘Uthmān and the agreement of all of the Companions with him

¹⁹⁴ Tarīkh al-Madīnah (3/960) of al-Nimrī. The iqāmah was also considered a call to prayer and hence in the speech of some scholars, the adhān of ‘Uthmān is referred to as the *third* adhān.

¹⁹⁵ Al-Awsat min al-Sunan wal-Ijmā‘ (Dār al-Falāh, 1431H, 4/63).

¹⁹⁶ Refer to al-Kāfī of Ibn Qudāmah (1/494).

¹⁹⁷ Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā 24/193-194.

¹⁹⁸ Minhaj al-Sunnah (6/292).

through silent approval and absence of rejection and it thus became a consensus through silent approval."¹⁹⁹

Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī (رحمته الله) said, "And Ḥarb quotes from Ishāq bin Rāhūyah that the first adhaā for Jumu'ah is introduced, it was introduced by 'Uthmān. He saw that (the adhān) will not be heard unless he increases the callers to pray so that those furthest away will be informed (of time of Jumu'ah) **and hence it became a Sunnah**, because it is upon the khulafā' to look into such matters for the (benefit of) the people."²⁰⁰ And Ibn Rajab said a little later (p. 231), "And his statement in this narration which was related by al-Bukhārī here, '*And so the affair became established upon that*', indicates that this was when 'Uthmān ordered it, it continued and it was not abandoned after that. **And this shows that 'Alī remained upon it and did not invalidate it, for two of the rightly-guided Caliphs agreed upon its performance**, may Allāh be pleased with them all."

Shaykh Abā Buṭayn (رحمته الله) said, "And what was done by the Companions, the Imāms and Tābi'īn upon which the label of bid'ah is applied, then that is a linguistic bid'ah, such as in the saying of 'Umar, "What an excellent bid'ah this is" meaning, the Tarāwīḥ prayer, and likewise **the addition of 'Uthmān and the Companions of the first adhān for Jumu'ah**. Then this does not enter into the saying of the (صلى الله عليه وسلم) "Every innovation is misguidance" because it has a basis in the legislation. And also because it is from what the caliphs instituted and they have a Sunnah that is obligatory to follow due to his saying (صلى الله عليه وسلم), '*You must follow my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly-guided caliphs after me*'. "²⁰¹

Shaykh Ibn Bāz (رحمته الله) said, "And for this reason, the Companions accepted [the instituted adhān] from him - meaning 'Uthmān - in his time, **and the Muslims acted upon it after him...** and likewise what 'Umar (رضي الله عنه) did of gathering the people behind a single Imām in the Tarawīḥ prayer in Ramaḍān."²⁰²

Shaykh Ibn Bāz, Shaykh 'Abdallāh al-Ghudayān and Shaykh 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Āfīfī (رحمهم الله) in whose fatwā there occurs, "It is established from the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) that he said, 'You must follow my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly-guided caliphs, hold on to it with your molars' to the end of the ḥadīth. And the call (to prayer) on the day of Jumu'ah, the first one used to be when then imām can and sat on the pulpit during the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), Abū Bakr and 'Umar (رضي الله عنهما). Then when it was the caliphate of

¹⁹⁹ Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (6/26), through *Ithāf Ahl al-Īmān bi Ijmā' al-'Ulamā' alā Sunniyyat al-Adhān al-Awwal alladhī Sannahū 'Uthmān*. This consensus is also affirmed by **Mullā 'Alī al-Qārī**, **Badr al-Dīn al-'Aynī** (from the Ḥanafī jurists) and likewise **Muḥammad Ṣiḍḍīq Ḥasan Khān**.

²⁰⁰ In his *Fatḥ al-Bārī* (8/220-221). Note that Yahyā al-Ḥajūrī clipped this statement in his book *Aḥkām al-Jumu'ah* and cited it as follows, "He (Ishaq) said: The first adhaan of the day of Jumu'ah is innovated, it is was innovated by 'Uthmān, this athar was mentioned by Ibn Rajab in *Fatḥ al-Bārī* (8/220-221)." And this is clear dishonesty on behalf of al-Ḥajūrī in citation.

²⁰¹ *Al-Durar al-Saniyyah* (8/103).

²⁰² Refer to <http://www.binbaz.org.sa/mat/10052>.

‘Uthmān and people increased (in number), ‘Uthmān ordered with what is now the first adhān on the day of Jumu‘ah, **and it is not a bid‘ah due to what has preceded of the (Prophetic) command to follow the Sunnah of the rightly-guided caliphs.** And the basis for that is what is related by al-Bukhārī, al-Nasā‘i, al-Tirmidhī, Ibn Mājah and Abū Dāwūd and the wording is his, "From Ibn Shihāb: al-Sā‘ib bin Yazīd informed me: That the first adhān used to be when the imām sat on the pulpit on the day of Jumu‘ah during the era of the Prophet (ﷺ) and Abu Bakr and Umar (رضي الله عنهما). Then when it was the caliphate of Uthmān and people increased (in number), ‘Uthmān ordered the third adhān. So it this adhān was made at al-Zūra’ (a market in al-Madīnah). Then the affair remain established upon that." And al-Qastalānī commented upon this ḥadīth in his explanation of al-Bukhārī, saying: That the call (to prayer) that ‘Uthmān added was at the entrance of the time [at the zawāl], and he called it "the third" on account of it being additional to the adhān given when the imām arrives and the iqāmah given for the prayer itself, and the iqāmah is also mostly labelled as an "adhān" on account of them both being a means of notification. And this (third) adhān was when the Muslims increased in number, so he (‘Uthmān) added it out of his ijtihād. **And the agreement of all of the Companions with him through their silence and absence of rejection, made it become a silently-approved consensus.** And with Allaah lies success, and may the prayers and salutations be upon our Prophet Muhammad, his family and companions."²⁰³

In the speech of **Ibn Taymiyyah** (رحمهم الله) is a rejection of the reasoning of al-Ḥajūrī and his likes when he said as occurs in Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (21/319), "And he (ﷺ) said in the ḥadīth which the authors of the Sunan have related, and authenticated by al-Tirmidhī and others, 'You must follow my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly-guided caliphs after me, hold fast to it and bite onto it with your molars, and beware of the newly-invented affairs, for every innovation is misguidance.' So whatever the rightly-guided caliphs instituted is not a legislatively (defined) innovation that is prohibited against, even if it is described as 'innovation' linguistically, due to it having been initiated (without precedence). Just as ‘Umar said, 'What an excellent innovation this is'." And he (رحمهم الله) said elsewhere (32/347), "For when others oppose the rightly-guided caliphs (in a matter), it is their saying that is superior because the Prophet (ﷺ) said, 'You must follow my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly-guided caliphs after me. Hold fast to it and bite onto it with the molars. And beware of the newly-invented matters, for every innovation is misguidance'."

As for **Shaykh al-Albānī** (رحمهم الله) then he has a book titled, "*al-Ajwibah al-Nāfi‘ah ‘an As‘ilah Lajnah Masjid al-Jāmi‘ah*" (Beneficial Questions To the Questions of the Committee of the Grand Mosque) in which he explains that ‘Uthmān's addition of the adhān was for an intelligible reason and wherever this reason is found, the adhān of ‘Uthmān is legislated. The Shaykh does not deny that this adhān is from the Sunnah, but he criticized those who do not implement it properly in modern times. He also answered the question about where to perform this adhān, **should the need arise** and he stated, "Yes, we do not see anything to

²⁰³ Fatāwā al-Lajnah al-Dā‘imah (8/198).

prevent this (additional) adhān of ‘Uthmān (being performed) when it is from the external entrance of the barracks because it causes the passers-by on the path to hear and informs them that in the barracks there is a masjid in which prayer is established, so they go to it and pray within it in the same way that those who are resident in the nearby houses on the path, however it is desirable that only a short time should separate between the two adhāns, because the Sunnah is to begin the khutbah straight after the zawāl (noon) after the adhān."²⁰⁴

This clearly shows that in its foundation, Imām al-Albānī does not consider this adhān to be a bid‘ah - unlike Ibn Muṭahhir al-Rāfiḍī and Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī.²⁰⁵

The Various Deceptions of the Ḥajūrites Regarding the Narration of Ibn ‘Umar (رضي الله عنه)

The Ḥajūrites depend largely upon a narration from Ibn ‘Umar (رضي الله عنه) in which he describes an adhān (without its context being made clear) to be a *bid‘ah*. Ibn Abī Shaybah relates in his Muṣannaf: Shabābah narrated to us from Hishām bin al-Ghāz from Nāfi‘ from Ibn ‘Umar who said, "The first adhān on the day of Jumu‘ah is a bid‘ah."²⁰⁶ They have fought tooth and nail over this narration all in order to ascribe bid‘ah to the action of ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه). Here are some of their major deceptions regarding this narration.²⁰⁷

1. Assuming it is authentic, Ibn ‘Umar (رضي الله عنه) only spoke of the "first adhān" without specifying it as being the one instituted by ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه). He may have been speaking about another adhān. Especially when he himself did not reject the adhān of ‘Uthmān during his khilāfah or during the khilāfah of ‘Alī (رضي الله عنه) and nor after it. And in the context of the narration as it has come, Ibn ‘Umar was responding to a question of a Syrian man, and it could be in relation to a different adhān.²⁰⁸
2. In order to make this narration stronger than what it is, they claim that it is related in many other sources when it is related only by Ibn Abī Shaybah in his Muṣannaf and the ascription of this report to the book of Wakī by Ibn Rajab and al-Jaṣṣās.

²⁰⁴ Refer to al-Ajwibah al-Nāfi‘ah ‘an As’ilah Lajnah Masjid al-Jāmi‘ah (p. 25) and for more details refer also to <http://alhajuri.com/?bfbqfsl>.

²⁰⁵ Many of the Ḥajūrites protest at this junction and say that Shaykh Muqbil said it is a bid‘ah. This only proves that they are Muqallidah (blind-followers) and hold onto a mistaken saying of Scholar who was not made aware of his mistake by invalidation of his evidences.

²⁰⁶ Shaykh Rabī has written extensively to refute the inflated claims of some of the students of al-Ḥajūrī, and has established that this narration is shādh (obscure), munkar (rejected) because it clashes with what is well-known and established and numerous other considerations that relate to the narrator Hishām bin al-Ghāz.

²⁰⁷ Refer to <http://www.sahab.net/forums/?showtopic=137362>.

²⁰⁸ See further below for a discussion of the adhān of Hishām bin ‘Abd al-Malik and quote from Imām al-Shāṭibī.

3. Referencing this narration to those who did not relate it at all, such as Ibn Abī Ḥātim, the Muṣannaf of ‘Abd al-Razzāq and al-Sunan of al-Dārimī. All of this is to make the narration appear more widely accepted and reported than it actually is.
4. Their claim that Hishām bin al-Ghāz is not alone in narrating this, and then they mention the names of other narrators. However in the reports of these narrators there is no mention at all of ‘Uthmān's adhān being a bid‘ah. Rather, they mix between three different narrations:
5. **The first of them:** Is the statement of Ibn ‘Umar, "*Every innovation is misguidance even if the people see it is as something good.*" This is reported through Hishām bin al-Ghāz from Nāfi‘ from Ibn ‘Umar, and it is related by al-Marwazī (in al-Sunnah), Ibn Baṭṭah (in al-Ibānah al-Kubrā), al-Bayhaqī (in al-Madkhal), al-Lālikā‘ī (Sharh Uṣūl al-I‘itqād), Abu Shāmah (in al-Bā‘ith) and al-Harawī (in Dhamm al-Kalām). So the deception of the Ḥajūrites is to mix this narration with the other one, and then claim that all of these six sources establish the innovated nature of the adhān of ‘Uthmān. Despite the fact that there is no mention of this adhān in any of these reports and this statement is related on its own.
6. **The second of them:** The narration under question, from Ibn ‘Umar through Hishām bin al-Ghāz that the adhān of Jumu‘ah is a bid‘ah, as related by Ibn Abī Shaybah. And here, it is only Hishām bin al-Ghāz who relates this from Nāfi‘. There is no authentic report from any of the Salaf that described the adhān of ‘Uthmān specifically as being a bid‘ah, and even this report relied upon by the Ḥajūrites, does not describe ‘Uthmān's adhān specifically. Rather, it is merely a reference to a "first adhān" on Jumu‘ah and this can have an explainable context. If we assume this report to be correct and authentic, it can have two explanations. **The first**, that the word bid‘ah here is being used in its linguistic sense and not the legislative sense. Hence, it is not a bid‘ah rejected by the Sharī‘ah, but only a factual description of an action that was not done before, and hence is introduced, new. This is purely a linguistic usage. Or **second**, that Ibn ‘Umar is not actually speaking about the adhān of ‘Uthmān but about affairs that happened later, matters innovated by the people related to the manner of performance of the adhān or what is like that. However, this report was used wrongly to find fault with ‘Uthmān and the Companions in general, in relation to the original institution of the adhān itself, as has been done by the Rāfiḍah.
7. **The third of them:** A report from Wakī‘ from Hishām bin al-Ghāz who said, "I asked Nāfi‘ about the first adhān of Jumu‘ah and he said, 'Ibn ‘Umar said: It is an innovation, and every innovation is misguidance, even if the people see it as something good'." This report has not been related by anyone in any of the published books but it was referenced by Ibn Rajab and also al-Jaṣṣās to a book of Wakī‘. Here it is possible that it was in the book of Wakī‘ or that Ibn Rajab and al-Jaṣṣās simply joined to two separate narrations together. Both Ibn Abi Shaybah and

Muḥammad bin Naṣr (al-Marwazī) reported from Wakī and they never mentioned this wording.

8. What has preceded indicates the problem with this report. However, if we accept that it is authentic, there is an explanation for it in that it is referring to the adhān introduced by Hishām bin ‘Abd al-Malik that was performed in front of the imām or the minbār (instead of outside). **Imām al-Albānī** quotes from **Imām al-Shāṭibī** in explanation of this, "Ibn Rushd said: The adhān performed right in front of the imām on Jumu‘ah is disliked because it is innovated (muḥdath) and the first to introduce it was Hishām bin ‘Abd al-Malik. He moved the adhān that used to be made from al-Zūrā’ to al-Musharrafah and the adhān made from al-Musharrafah to in front of the imām (inside the mosque).²⁰⁹ He was then followed in that by those caliphs who came after him to this day of ours. He said: And this is bid‘ah, that which was done by the Messenger (ﷺ) and the rightly-guided caliphs after him is the Sunnah. And Ibn al-Ḥabīb mentioned that the adhān given when the imām ascended the pulpit remained during the time of ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه), in agreement with what has been reported by the specialists of authentic transmission and ‘Uthmān did not add to what was before him except the adhān from al-Zūrā’. Thus, Hishām bin ‘Abd al-Malik's transfer of the legislated adhān from the minaret to in front of the imām (in the mosque) is a bid‘ah (innovation) in that (already) legislated matter."²¹⁰
9. From what has preceded, the error of the Ḥajūrites is evident and plain and they wrongly take the agreement of the scholars that the adhān of ‘Uthmān was not done previously by the Prophet (ﷺ), Abu Bakr (رضي الله عنه) and ‘Umar (رضي الله عنه) and wrongly take this to mean that it is innovated in the blameworthy, legislative sense of the meaning of the word bid‘ah. Then they rely upon a narration that is not established from Ibn ‘Umar, and if it was, it has two perfect explanations. Ibn ‘Umar is either using the word bid‘ah with a linguistic meaning, as did his father, ‘Umar, in relation to the tarāwīḥ prayer, or he is referring to the action of Hishām bin ‘Abd al-Mālīk in relation to the original adhān as has preceded.
10. When the attachment of the Ḥajūrites to this dubious narration is invalidated, their deliberate abandonment of a clearly narrated ijmā‘ (consensus) affirming the legislated nature of the adhān of ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) is known, their opposition to all the major Salafī scholars of today who have spoken on this issue such as Imām Ibn Bāz, Imām al-Albānī, Imām Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn, Shaykh Rabī bin Hādī, Shaykh Ṣālīḥ al-Fawzān and others is known, and their taqlīd of Sunnī scholars whose error has become clear is no longer permitted for them, and they then persist in ascribing

²⁰⁹ Thus, the alleged statement of Ibn ‘Umar, rather than referring to the adhān instituted by ‘Uthman and called from al-Zūrā’, is referring to the original adhān (that was always done outside the mosque) being transferred to inside the mosque and performed in front of the imām.

²¹⁰ Al-Ajwibah al-Nāfi‘ah ‘an As’ilah Lajnah Masjid al-Jāmi‘ah (p. 28 onwards).

bid'ah to the action of 'Uthmān, it is clearly that they are only left with the disgraceful scenario of wilfully choosing to make taqlīd of Ibn Muṭahhir al-Rāfiḍī²¹¹ and the Rāfiḍah (the first to make this claim against 'Uthmān as a means of attacking the Companions in general)! From Allāh is aid sought, how desire blinds the vision of the heart!

Verdicts of the Scholars that Convict al-Ḥajūrī and His Followers as Misguided Innovators Who Desire to Make Tabdī' of 'Uthmān and Revile the Companions

These are the verdicts of **Imām Ibn Bāz**, **Shaykh Ibn al-'Uthaymīn** and **Shaykh al-Fawzān** on the subject of the first adhān of 'Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) and the intent here is to show that the Ḥajāwirah are people of desires and deception when they spread doubts against Shaykh Rabī through the statements of Shaykh al-Fawzān [which are being engineered and elicited by the latest wave of Ḥaddādīs (some of whom are sympathizers to and have connections to the Takfīrī Khārijites of ISIS)].

Imām Ibn Bāz (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) was asked, "We have a difference regarding the first adhān on the day of Jumu'ah. Amongst them are those who say that it is not from the Sunnah because it is not related from the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) and it is obligatory to abandon it. And amongst them are those who persist in continuing with the first adhān. So what is the Sunnah O respected Shaykh?" and he replied, "**The first adhān is from the Sunnah, because 'Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) did it and the Companions affirmed that from him**, because the Messenger of Allāh (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) said, 'You must follow my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly-guided caliphs after me' and he is from the rightly-guided caliphs. So 'Uthmān did that and the Companions affirmed that from him, and it contains benefits such as notifying the people that today is the day of Jumu'ah so that they can prepare to come early for it. **So there is no harm in it and it is not a bid'ah**, because it is from the Sunnah of the rightly-guided caliphs. And the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) advised with that (the Sunnah of the rightly-guided caliphs)."²¹²

Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān was asked, "Esteemed Shaykh, may Allāh grant you success, in the first adhān for the Jumu'ah prayer, is it repeated alongside the mu'adhdhin?" The Shaykh answered, "Yes, it is an adhān, it is a legislative adhān because it is from the Sunnah of the Rightly-Guided Caliphs, it was commanded by 'Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ), the third caliph. **And it was in the presence of 'Alī bin Abī Ṭālib from the rightly-guided caliphs, and in the presence of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and no one rejected that from him**. Except what is reported from Ibn 'Umar as is mentioned by Ibn Abī Shaybah in his Muṣannaf²¹³, that he

²¹¹ He was the first to make this claim and Ibn Taymiyyah refuted him in Minhāj al-Sunnah.

²¹² Fatāwā Nur 'ala al-Darb (13/207). And the Shaykh actually has numerous fatāwā on this matter.

²¹³ Refer to Shaykh Rabī's extensive refutations against the Ḥajūrītes in relation to this narration which is shādh and munkar (rejected) and which the Ḥajūrītes have been fighting desperately to affirm and prove only so that they can exonerate their Ḥaddādī leader in his accusation of bid'ah against 'Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ).

(Ibn 'Umar) says it is a bid'ah and Ibn Rajab (رحمته الله), when he cited the speech of Ibn 'Umar, said that he intends the good bid'ah (the good innovation) [with its linguistic meaning], he does not intend the evil bid'ah [with its legislative meaning], similar to what his father ('Umar) said regarding the tarawih prayer, 'What an excellent bid'ah this is', meaning an innovation linguistically and not a innovation legislatively (speaking). Yes."²¹⁴

Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān was asked, "Esteemed Shaykh, one of the du'āt (callers) says, "We do not declare 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) an innovator - but we say that the first adhān on the day of Jumu'ah is an innovation." He (the questioner) says, what is the ruling of this statement of his?" His response was, **"This itself is bid'ah (innovation), the man, this itself is bid'ah [to hold this position], he is an innovator.** It is obligatory to withhold his tongue from the likes of this speech. 'Uthmān is a rightly-guided caliph, and the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, "You must follow my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly-guided caliphs after me..." Is this [speech of his against 'Uthmān] from his eagerness for the Sunnah?? He declares the Companions innovators, declares the Caliphs innovators!! Is the Sunnah like this?! We ask Allāh for pardon! **This is from ignorance (jahl) and not knowing the bid'ah from Sunnah.** Yes."²¹⁵

In his lesson on the day of Sunday, 14/05/1435H, Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān was asked, "May Allaah be benevolent to you, this questioner says: Is the first adhān of the day of Jumu'ah considered an innovation?" The Shaykh answered, "Our (previous) speech [on this subject] has become of no value." Then the questioner says, "May Allāh be benevolent to you esteemed Shaykh, the questioner says: Some people say that the reason for which 'Uthmān ordered the first adhān is no longer present." The Shaykh said, **"It has not ended, your desire is to make tabdīl of 'Uthmān.** This is not a permissible affair. Is this from your eagerness for the Sunnah? The action of 'Uthmān is from the Sunnah by testimony of the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم)! "You must follow my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly-guided Caliphs after me." Respect the Companions! Especially the rightly-guided Caliphs, respect them! For they are the most superior of the Ummah, do not speak about them!"²¹⁶

What Shaykh al-Fawzān has mentioned here is very significant because if you look at the corrupt uṣūl of al-Ḥajūrī, such as not distinguishing between the one who does not call to his bid'ah verbally and the one who does, and that the one who implements any practical bid'ah (in worship) is automatically a caller to it by his action and renders him a mubtadi'

²¹⁴ See <http://alhajuri.com/dld.cfm?a=vazbjh> for audio. From this speech of Shaykh al-Fawzān, you can see that those scholars who come across this narration (which is established as being shādh and munkar in any case), because they hold the Companions in respect, they interpret this remark ascribed to Ibn 'Umar upon the same light as the remark made by his father, 'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb (رضي الله عنه). This is unlike the Rāfiḍah such as Ibn al-Muṭāhhir (refuted by Ibn Taymiyyah in Minhāj al-Sunnah) and those upon whom the ḥujjah is now established, such as the Hajāwirah, who persist in imputing bid'ah to 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) after the Scholars demolished their bid'ah and ḍalālāh.

²¹⁵ See <http://alhajuri.com/dld.cfm?a=sdduoq> for audio.

²¹⁶ See <http://alhajuri.com/dld.cfm?a=znxoar> for audio.

(innovator), then it leaves no room except to say - if al-Ḥajūrī is consistent and truthful in his corrupt uṣūl - that 'Uthmān was a caller to bid'ah and ḍalālah. This is why the Scholars do not accept the excuse that "'Uthman made ijtihād, his action was a bid'ah but we do not declare him an innovator." This is deception and playing games, because the corrupt uṣūl you are propounding does not allow you to make these excuses.

In the speech of Shaykh al-Albānī (رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) in Kitāb al-Janā'iz, there is a refutation and falsification of this excuse used to justify the accusation against 'Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ). The Shaykh said, "The innovation whose misguidance is textually stated by the legislator is: a) Everything that clashes with the Sunnah of statements, actions or beliefs, **even if it (arose due to) ijtihād...** c) Every affair whose legislation is not possible except by a text or restriction (to the Book and Sunnah) and for which no text actually exists, then it is an innovation, **except what comes from a Companion, and that action is repeated by him without any rejection (from others).**"²¹⁷

In this statement, where the Shaykh is defining and explaining the innovation which is declared to be misguidance legislatively. He explains firstly that ijtihād does not prevent something from being declared an innovation and misguidance. And secondly that whatever cannot be legislated without a text from the Book and the Sunnah is an innovation, unless it came from a Companion, it was repeated by him and the Companions never showed any rejection to it. And this clearly applies to the action of 'Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) which was done openly, on a weekly basis, amongst thousands of Companions.

And from the numerous statements of **Shaykh Ibn al-'Uthaymīn** on this subject, "And the Jumu'ah (prayer) has a first adhān which is from the Sunnah of 'Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ), and he is one of the rightly-guided Caliphs whose Sunnah we have been commanded to follow. Some of those pretending to be clever who claim that they are Salafis, Sunnis say: We do not accept the first adhān of Jumu'ah, it is a bid'ah, it was not present in the time of the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). **This statement of theirs is a revilement upon the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), a revilement upon the rightly-guided Caliphs and a revilement upon the Companions.** And these paupers reached this limit without knowing. As for it being a revilement upon the Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), it is because the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) said, "You must follow my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly-guided Caliphs after me." And by consensus of the Muslims, 'Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) is from the the rightly-guided caliphs. And as for it being a revilement upon the rightly-guided Caliphs, then it is a revilement upon 'Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) and he is from them. And whoever reviles one of them, reviles all of them, just like the one who rejects a single Messenger, he has rejected of all of the Messengers. And as for it being a revilement of the Companions, then it is because the Companions did not show rejection against 'Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) alongside the fact that if he had erred (in this matter), they would have rejected (this error) just as they showed rejected when he completed (the prayer to

²¹⁷ Kitāb al-Janā'iz (p. 305).

four rak'ahs) whilst in Mina during Hajj. However, regarding the first adhān of Jumu'ah, they did not show rejection against him. So are these opposers who are pretending to be clever more knowledgeable of the Sharī'ah and its objectives than the Companions?! The Messenger of Allāh (ﷺ) spoke the truth when he said, "*The latter part of this uymmah will curse its first part*" and refuge is with Allāh, and he reviles them. So the first adhān is a legislated adhān by indication of the Prophet (ﷺ) and the Sunnah of the chief of the believers 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) and by consensus of the Companions, with an ijmā' sukūti (silent consensus), and no one has any excuse, may Allāh cut the tongue of the one who criticizes the rightly-guided Caliphs of this ummah and the Companions."²¹⁸

Shaykh Ibn al-'Uthaymīn also said, "And he has strayed who said that it is a bid'ah, and he has declared the Companions (رضي الله عنهم) as fools and has declared the rightly-guided Caliph ('Uthmān) as a fool. And we say: **You are the innovator (mubtadi')** in this saying which you have claimed that it is a bid'ah. How can it be bid'ah when the Messenger (ﷺ) has called it a Sunnah, "... [follow] the Sunnah of the rightly-guided Caliphs after me." However, those people (who say this) are foolish-minded, even if they are senior in age. How can you declare the Companions to be astray with their leader 'Uthmān bin 'Affān. And yet you claim that you are a person of the Sunnah? Rather, you are a person of bid'ah in this saying."²¹⁹

And **Shaykh Ibn al-'Uthaymīn** also said, "As for the one who rejects it from the newly-arisen ones and says, 'It is a bid'ah' and declares 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) to have been misguided (in his action), **then he is the astray innovator.**"²²⁰

This is a matter that the Hajūrīte Innovators **are persisting upon** even after all of their alleged evidences have been annihilated and invalidated and they are left with nothing but **pure taqlīd** of whoever expressed this viewpoint before them and following their desires and wallowing in **ta'aṣṣub** (bigoted partisanship). This issue alone is sufficient and clear enough to enter them into the ranks of the Mubtadi'ah (Innovators) and none should be deceived by them and their refutations against the refutations of Ahl al-Sunnah against them. Even if they were correct in every single thing that they claim - for argument's sake - whilst they continue to hold this view towards the action of 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه), **they are Innovators just on this account alone** and their being correct in everything else - if we accept that purely for argument's sake - will avail them nothing.

So no one is deceived by these people except that in his heart there is something of belittlement of the honour of the Companions (رضي الله عنهم) and this is why, when you look at

²¹⁸ Sharḥ Riyāḍ al-Ṣāliḥīn, in the chapter on the excellence of the adhān (Dar al-Salam, 1st edition, 1423H, p. 1278)

²¹⁹ Recorded lesson on Sharḥ Riyāḍ al-Ṣāliḥīn. Refer to <http://alhajuri.com/?fvwezev> for audio.

²²⁰ Refer to <http://alhajuri.com/?mzwdxmm> for full documentation of these three statements of the Shaykh.

the people of knowledge, there is no one who is actually defending al-Ḥajūrī because anyone from the people of knowledge who comes to know the views which al-Ḥajūrī is upon and defending will not hesitate to declare him an innovator - just on one issue, let alone a collection of them.

Abu 'Iyāḍ Amjad Rafīq
8th Shawwāl 1435H / 4th August 2014

Appendix 5: How to Silence a Ḥājurite (or Tens, Hundreds and Thousands of them), Force them to Flee on Their Heels and Prove They are Upon Bid‘ah and Dalālah Without Argument or Debate

To all of Ahl al-Sunnah in all corners of the Earth where the Ḥājūrites have a presence: It is not necessary to debate or waste time with the Ḥajāwirah, the scholars warn against debates with them. However, the Ḥājūrites have a lot of zeal and activity in spreading their shubuhāt online, and if Ahl al-Sunnah remain silent, it leaves the impression, just by the sheer amount of activity of these Ḥājūrites, that they are upon the truth. If you were to do something and it had to be effective, then we suggest the following: Invite a Ḥājūrite, or tens, or hundreds or a thousand of them - **whilst you are just a single person** - find a decent sized mosque that can accommodate you all. Make it clear this is not a debate, but simply wudhū, two rak‘ahs of prayer and a supplication to Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ):

Take the lead and perform your two rak‘ahs of prayer, gather your heart, bring to mind your love of ‘Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ), the Ṣahābah (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ) and 1400 years of Salafi Scholarship from the time of the Companions during ‘Uthmān's reign to this day of ours. Think about all of that for a while until your emotions develop and gain momentum, then raise your hands and make du‘a *aloud and openly* with the following:

O Allāh, that which I hold as my dīn before You is that ‘Uthmān (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) instituted a Sunnah for an intelligible reason which the Companions understood and which was taken as acceptance and implemented by the Companions and the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah and the Ummah thereafter. The Messenger (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) indicated to us that there would be affairs which the Rightly-Guided Caliphs would institute and would be from his Sunnah and I believe that the action of ‘Uthmān was rightly-guided and I am following the overwhelming majority of the Ummah with almost entirely no exception in this matter, and I am upon what Alī (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) and the rest of the Companions were upon, likewise the Scholars of Islām to this day of ours, including Shaykh al-Fawzān, Shaykh Rabīʿ, Shaykh Ibn Baz, Shaykh Ibn al-Uthaymīn and many others are upon, along with the tafṣīl (detail) provided by Imām al-Albānī on the matter. O Allāh if I and all of these Scholars thereafter and the majority of the Ummah are believing what amounts to a lie against your religion, and propagating a lie against your religion by holding this view, then may the curse of Allāh, the Angels, and all of mankind be upon the liars. Amīn.

Then turn to the Ḥājūrite (or the tens, hundreds or thousands of them) and demand that if they are truthful, that they invoke Allāh earnestly with the following:

O Allāh, that which I hold as my dīn before you is that ‘Uthmān²²¹ instituted a bid‘ah (innovation), a mukhālafah (opposition), and a ḍalālah (misguidance) in the religion as textually stated by my shaykh Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī, and that the Companions present in his time corroborated this bid‘ah and acted upon it and became callers to it by their action and that the ḥujjah is established according to the argument of my shaykh Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī because all of them knew that the Messenger (ﷺ) did not do it and he (ﷺ) had warned them continuously and persistently to beware of newly-invented matters. I hold, as does my shaykh Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī, that this action of ‘Uthmān was an *umm al-bid‘ah* (mother of innovation) which settled in the ummah and was unfortunately used as a justification for other innovations as stated by my shaykh Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī, and that anyone who followed ‘Uthmān in that bid‘ah (innovation) and mukhālafah (opposition) after knowing the evidence then he is an innovator (*mubtadi'*) whoever that may be, from the time of the Companions to this day of ours - since the one who acts on an innovation is automatically a caller to innovation according to my shaykh Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī. I consider the statements of Shaykh al-Fawzān, and Shaykh Ibn Bāz and Shaykh Ibn ‘Uthaymīn, Shaykh Rabī and all other contemporary Scholars who defend the action of ‘Uthmān to be misguided because they only lend support to the bid‘ah instituted by ‘Uthmān whose action You are no doubt displeased with O Allāh, as the action of ‘Uthmān according to my shaykh Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī, has been used to justify other innovations in the religion. O Allāh if I and my shaykh Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī are propagating a lie in all of this (after the proof presented by our opponents), then may the curse of Allāh, the Angels and all of mankind be upon the liars. Amīn.

It is not possible for any Ḥajūrīte to deny any of the above or argue about it, because all of this is either textually written or verbally expressed by al-Ḥajūrī or necessitated by his corrupt uṣūl and the Ḥajūrītes have been defending this bid‘ah of al-Ḥajūrī for many years, hence it is mutawātir from them and about them and is undeniable. These are their very views, explicit or implied. So they should not be cowardly in expressing them as clearly as we have expressed these views for them. If they are truthful in their belief, and sincere to Allāh and consider their position to be a defence of Allāh's dīn, then let the cowards come out and invoke the curse of Allāh upon the liars if indeed they are truthful in this issue! There is no other way to deal with a Ḥajūrīte other than this, because they are an argumentative, incessant people who will waste your time. If you have to have any engagement with them, **this is the only way**. Do not entertain any other discussion on any other issue, because that is part of their strategy, to divert you from the most obvious and clear of their bid‘ahs which render them misguided innovators and then to deceive the people by portraying that al-Ḥajūrī and the Ḥajāwirah have been wronged and lied upon!

²²¹ We have not added (ﷺ) after the name of ‘Uthmān (ﷺ) here in the speech demanded from the Ḥaddādi Ḥajūrītes because they are essentially claiming Allāh is **NOT** pleased with the action of ‘Uthmān (ﷺ) because it is bid‘ah and ḍalālah and mukhālafah of the Messenger (ﷺ) which spread into the ummah.

Finally, as Ibn Taymiyyah said, "It is strange (amazing) that the Rāfiḍah reject something that ʿUthmān did in [open] view of the Anṣār and the Muhājirīn without them rejecting it from him and which all the Muslims followed him in, and that is the adhān of Jumuʿah."²²² It is strange that the Ḥājūrites, following the Rāfiḍah, reject something ʿUthmān (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) did in [open] view of the Anṣār and the Muhājirīn without them rejecting it from him and which all the Muslims followed him in, and that is the adhān of Jumuʿah. And Shaykh Rabīʿ said, "The eye of no person is pleased with a rejected narration²²³ whose import is revilement upon the Companions of Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) in that they affirmed an innovation that was announced every week in the highest (most open) of places, whilst Allāh has praised them, that they are the best of the ummah, so He said, **"You are the best nation brought out for mankind, you enjoin the good and prohibit the evil"**."²²⁴ As for the Ḥājūrites, their bidʿah necessitates that those Companions present in the time did not forbid the evil and therefore cannot truly be "*the best of mankind*" and this counts as a revilement upon them as indicated in the speech of Shaykh Ibn al-ʿUthaymīn as has preceded. Refuge is with Allāh from such misguidance in which the Rāfiḍah find pleasure and support.

And may the ṣalāt and salām be upon the Messenger Muḥammad, his family and all of his Companions and whoever followed his guidance.

Abu ʿIyāḍ Amjad Rafīq

9th Shawwāl 1435H / 5th August 2014

Last document update: 19th Shawwāl 1435H / 15th August 2014

²²² Minhaj al-Sunnah (6/293).

²²³ The narration through Hishām bin al-Ghāz going back to Ibn ʿUmar.

²²⁴ In the Shaykh's article, "*al-Dhabb ʿan Khalifah al-Rāshid ʿUthmān*" in refutation of the extremist Ḥājūrite, Yūsuf bin al-ʿId al-ʿInābī al-Jazāʾrī.