

Repelling the
Accusation of

IRJA'

From the Scholars
of Ahl Al-Sunnah

Unravelling the Deception of the
Takfirīs and Ḥaddādīs in Maligning
the Salafī Scholars



COMPILATION & ANNOTATION BY
Abū 'Iyaad Amjad Rafiq



**Repelling the
Accusation of
IRJA'
From the Scholars
of Ahl Al-Sunnah**



Unravelling the Deception of the
Takfirīs and Ḥaddādīs in Maligning
the Salafī Scholars



SHAYKH RABĪ' BIN HĀDĪ (رَبِيعُ اللَّهِ) SAID:

“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 (*taqīyyah*) as a veil for their vile methodology and their corrupt goals!”



NOTE: The original Ḥaddādīs were concealed Takfīrīs and they are present today wearing the gown of Salafiyyah and engaged in spreading doubts against the senior Salafī scholars. However, the extremism of the Ḥaddādīs in the matter of *tabdī'* is something that some of Ahl al-Sunnah have also fallen into, and hence, they have been described by the people of knowledge as “Ḥaddādīs” from that angle, or their way has been described as that of the Ḥaddādiyyah. Hence, there are the originating core Ḥaddādīs, such as Maḥmūd al-Ḥaddād and ‘Abd al-Laṭīf Bāshmil. Then those who developed the ideology, especially as it relates to *tabdī'* through various principles, such as Bāshmil himself and Fāliḥ al-Harbī. Then there was Fawzī al-Baḥraynī. Then others who fell into the ways of the Ḥaddādiyyah in their treatment of Ahl al-Sunnah, and they include Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī, Muḥammad bin Hādī, Ḥishām al-Beily among others.

For more details, refer to the book *Excerpts From the Destruction of the Falsehoods of ‘Abd al-Laṭīf Bāshmil* which can be accessed here: <https://abuiyaad.com/a/radd-bashmil>

FREE EBOOK: NOT FOR SALE

Title: Repelling the Accusation of Irjā' From
the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah

Compilation & Notes: Abū 'Iyaad Amjad Rafiq

Version 2.0: Şafar 1448 • July 2026

1st Ebook Edition: 1448H • 2026 CE

© 2026 TheNobleQuran.com

@AbuIyaadSP • AbuIyaad.com

All rights reserved worldwide. No part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced or utilised in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, without prior permission from the copyright holder.

Visit:

Salaf.com • Aqidah.com • Manhaj.com

TheNobleQuran.com • AlHajuri.com

Takfiri.com • Bidah.com • Madeenah.org

SalafiBookstore.com • SalafiSounds.com

for Authentic Islāmic Information

Transliteration of Arabic Terms

In transliterated words, Arabic letters correspond to their English equivalents with the exception of the consonants below:

Consonants

ع	‘	ص	ṣ
ث	th	ض	ḍ
ح	ḥ	ط	ṭ
خ	kh	ظ	ḍh
ذ	dh	ع	‘
ش	sh	غ	gh

Vowels

Short: ا a — i — u

Long: آ ā إ ī أ ū

Diphthongs: أو aw إي ay

Adulations and Salutations

عَزَّوَجَلَّ The Mighty and Majestic (Allāh).

سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى The Sublime and Exalted (Allāh).

تَبَارَكَ وَتَعَالَى The Blessed and Exalted (Allāh).

صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ May blessings and peace be upon him (the Prophet).

عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ / عَلَيْهَا السَّلَامُ / عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام Peace be upon him / her / them.

رَحِمَهُمُ اللَّهُ / رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ May Allāh have mercy upon him / them.

Note: It is impossible to translate the Qur’ān into any other language whilst retaining its full range and depth of meaning. Hence, all texts from the Qur’ān cited in this work, whilst providing an accurate enough rendition of the basic meaning, remain limited due to the limitations of the English language and are unable to convey what is in the Qur’ān of limitless meanings through its grammatical constructions in the pure and eloquent Arabic Language.

Foreword (2026)

9

Foreword (2014)

12

Historical Background of the Ikhwānīs,
Takfīrīs and Ḥaddādīs

13

1. Defining the Issue Relating to Prayer
and Outward Actions

28

2. Statements of the Scholars Regarding
Prayer and Outward Actions

34

3. Understanding the Two Views of Ahl al-Sunnah

45

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

49

5. The Core Foundation of the Murji'ah

57

6. What is the Reality of the *Bid'ah* of the Murji'ah?

60

7. The Narration of 'Abd Allāh bin Shaqīq
Regarding Prayer

66

8. The Ḥadīths of *Shafā'ah*

68

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

73

10. Ahl al-Sunnah Believe in the Ḥadīths of Intercession

76

11. The Kharijites, Mu'tazilah and Murji'ah Deny the
Ḥadīths of Intercession

80

12. The Ḥajāwirah Are an Evil People Who Lack Principles

82

13. The Ḥajūrites, the Previous Ḥaddādīs and the
Accusation of *Irjā'* Against Shaykh Rabī' & Ahl al-Sunnah

84

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

86

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

98

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

104

17. Between the Conveyance (*Bulūgh*) and
Understanding (*Fahm*) of the Proof

124

18. A Glimpse of the New Extremist Ḥaddādiyyah

129

19. The Issue of Action and the Terms *Shart*
Ṣiḥḥah and *Shart Kamāl*

135

20. The Stance of Shaykh Rabīʿ Regarding Ambiguous
Terms and the Fabrications of the Ḥaddādiyyah

138

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

140

22. Ambiguity in Definitions

148

23. Insight From Shaykh Muḥammad al-ʿAqīl

151

24. Shaykh Rabīʿ Hitting the Nail on
the Head Once More

153

APPX 1. The Ḥadīth of *Shafāʿah* Between its
Dhāhir and Its *Taʿwīl*

159

APPX 2. The Various Groups and Sayings
of the Murjiʿah

168



Foreword (2026)



All praise is due to Allāh, the Lord of the Worlds and may He make good mention of His Messenger (in the highest company) and of his family and companions and grant them safety, to proceed:

This is a treatise I wrote in 1435H (2014 CE) following the *fitnah* of Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūri and his followers — an extension of the *fitnah* of the Ḥaddādiyyah involving oppressive, unwarranted *tabdīʿ* and *tajrīḥ* — when some of them had joined forces with the Ḥaddādīs and used their doubts out of revenge for al-Ḥajūri.¹

The *fitnah* of the Ḥaddādiyyah is a recurring one and it centres around unwarranted, oppressive *tabdīʿ* and *taḍlīl* that are without evidence. When this takes place in the ranks of Ahl al-Sunnah, a chain of events follows leading to divisions and enmities due to people's sentimental attachments to the oppressor and the oppressed.

This evil methodology was used to target Ahl al-Sunnah by former Takfīrīs, after they realised that Ahl al-Sunnah were too strong for their Quṭbī, Takfīrī ideology to have any prospect of succeeding.

The First Wave Ḥaddādīs were Maḥmūd al-Ḥaddād and its main theoretician, ʿAbd al-Laṭīf Bāshmīl. They appeared while the

1 This work was written after the Salafīs of Netherlands requested some assistance in dealing with the local Ḥajūrites who had joined forces with the Ḥaddādīs and began to spread doubts about some of the main callers in the Netherlands at that time centred around the issues of *īmān* and *Irjāʾ*, following on from the same accusations against Shaykh al-Albānī and Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī.

Surūrī methodology was being exposed and refuted during the 1990s. After them came Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī and Fawzī al-Baḥraynī who brought other principles to justify acceptance of unwarranted *tabdīʿ*. Then they were followed by Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī and some years later, Muḥammad bin Hādī, and they are Third Wave Ḥaddādīs.

It is from justice to point out that they cannot all be treated the same, because the original Ḥaddādīs were Takfīrīs and were serving the cause of the *aḥzāb* (political factions). However, the core method, oppressive, unjustified *tabdīʿ* of Salafīs that does not follow the principles of the Salafī methodology, is something that others can fall into and thereby, resemble the Ḥaddādīs despite their staunch positions regarding the issues of rulership, obedience, rebellion, blameworthy politics and the people of innovation. This is what Muḥammad bin Hādī fell into and his way was described as the way of the Ḥaddādīs by Shaykh Rabiʿ and others.

Then there are others who have more ominous signs of resemblance to the Ḥaddādiyyah, for not only do they have oppressive *tabdīʿ* of Salafīs and fierce, vicious wars against Salafī shaykhs and students who venerate the foundations of the Sunnah, they are also complicit in matters of sedition, war, bloodshed, praise and defence of Ḥaddādī innovators, infusing *taḥazzub* into the Salafī youth and seeding divisions and splits in the ranks of Ahl al-Sunnah.

One of the most telling signs of the Ḥaddādī machinery in motion is the accusation of *Irjāʾ* against Shaykh al-Albānī (رحمهُ اللهُ). From the Ḥaddādī innovators who accused Shaykh al-Albānī of “agreeing with the Ashʿarī Murjiʾah” is Hishām al-Beily from Egypt and he has revilements against the senior scholars and shaykhs of that land, at the head of them Shaykh Ḥasan bin ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Bannā (رحمهُ اللهُ). While the shaykhs of Egypt declared him a Ḥaddādī and a deviant over ten years ago, some have tried to polish his image, prop him up and reintroduce him into the Salafī *daʿwah*, out of treachery to Ahl al-Sunnah.

The issue of Imām al-Albānī and the accusation of *Irjā'*, or agreeing with the Murji'ah is a red line. The senior scholars clarified this matter thirty years ago, when scholars such as Shaykh Ibn al-'Uthaymīn, Shaykh Rabī' bin Hādī, Shaykh Ibn Bāz, Shaykh Aḥmad al-Najmī, Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalī, Shaykh 'Ubayd al-Jābirī and others (رَحِمَهُمُ اللَّهُ) cleared Shaykh al-Albānī of this accusation.

Hence, accommodating Ḥaddādī innovators like al-Beily whose origins are with the Qutbīs, praising them, defending them and claiming that they have a right to attack those who attack them are all clear signs of corruption in methodology.

For this reason, it is important for the Salafī who values the affairs of creed and methodology, that he be on guard in relation to these matters, for when they appear on the horizon or on the surface, it is a sign that what is behind or beneath is much worse.

The treatise in your hands deals with a wave of Ḥaddādīs who took up the controversial issues used by their predecessors in the issue pertaining to *īmān*. They selected issues in which there are differences among scholars and controversies to cause doubt and confusion, and to extend the accusation of *Irjā'* to other scholars besides Shaykh al-Albānī (رَحِمَهُمُ اللَّهُ).

Abū 'Iyaaḍ Amjad Rafīq
Muḥarram 1448 – July 2026

Foreword (2014)



A new wave of Ḥaddādiyyah has appeared and become vocal over the past year or so. Among 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 Quṭbiyyah 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-Juhānī 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 recognise 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.

Abū Iyaaḍ Amjad Rafīq

24 Shawwāl 1435 – 20 August 2014

Historical Background of the Ikhwānīs, Takfīrīs and Ḥaddādīs



Between the late 1980s and early 1990s **Imām al-Albānī** (رحمته الله) 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-Ikhwan 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’*.² 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).³

2 Abū al-Faḍl ‘Abbās bin Manṣūr al-Saksakī (d. 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 their’s (i.e. that of Ahl al-Sunnah) leads to the saying that Imān is speech without action. Yet all of this is incorrect regarding them.” *Al-Burhān fī Ma‘rifah ‘Aqā'id Ahl al-Adyān* (pp. 65-66).

3 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-Ḥawālī: “What is all this tumult

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 Abū 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 to a return to the way of the Salaf, to *taṣfiyah* and *tarbiyah*, a call to the way of the Prophets and Messengers in *ʿaqidah*, 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,⁴ the accusation was

about the Salafi Aqidah?!... You preach the Salafi doctrine in theory and then you call to the doctrine of the Khawaarij practically?!"

4 Imām al-Albānī was asked concerning the book of Safar al-Ḥawālī, *Dhāhirat al-Irjā' fī al-Fikr al-Islāmī*, and in this book *takfir* is performed

expanded to include others as the years passed.⁵ 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, Abū A‘lā Mawdūdī and those poisoned by them. This was an ideological

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 [Islāmic] University (of Madīnah) and I was asked in a gathering about my opinion on Jamā‘at al-Tabligh. 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 Jamā‘ah who have emerged in the present times and who have opposed the Salaf, I say here, in accordance with the statement of al-Ḥāfiḍh al-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, 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 Surūriyyah are the Khawārij 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-Īmān*. 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 al-Sunnah — and all praise is due to Allāh — in the issues pertaining to *īmān*, and then there come — in the present times — reckless ignoramuses, 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...” *Al-Dhabb al-Aḥmad ‘an Musnad al-Imām Aḥmad*, p. a33 (1420H).

5 Shaykh Ibn Bāz and Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn were not spared accusations of *Irjā’* from some of the more extreme among the Khārijites and Takfīrīs.

assault from the direction of the Takfīriyyah Qutbiyyah and Surūriyyah and it was carried by the likes of ‘Abd al-Raḥman ‘Abd al-Khāliq, Muḥammad Surūr, Muḥammad Qutb and others.

Some Takfīrīs such as Maḥmūd al-Ḥaddād who were former Qutbīs, 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 Salafī 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.

More recently, **a new wave of Ḥaddādiyyah**⁶ has appeared within Saudī Arabia (and elsewhere) and some of them have connections or sympathies towards the Takfīrī Kharijites of ISIS.⁷ 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

6 From them, ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Juhanī, Badr al-Dīn al-Munāṣarah, ‘Abd Allāh al-Jarbū‘, Aḥmad al-Ḥāzimī, ‘Abd Allāh Ṣawwān al-Ghāmīdī, ‘Imād Farāj, Abū ‘Abd Allāh 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 (Muḥammad 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.

7 The accusation of *Irjā’* against the Salafī 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).

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-‘udhr bi al-jahl*) in matters of *kufr* and *shirk* **c)** statements used by some of Ahl al-Sunnah such as *shart sihhah* and *shart 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 *tabdī’* 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 *‘aqidah* 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.⁸ In the meanwhile, some of the Ḥaddādiyyah in Saudi Arabia (such as ‘Abd Allāh al-Ghāmīdī) have been following the way of the Takfīriyyah Quṭbiyyah of the 1990s by using deception and lies in trying to engineer statements from the Major Scholars against Shaykh Rabī’.⁹

No sooner had they got some speech from some of those scholars like Shaykh Ṣāliḥ 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**¹⁰ 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 Salafī 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

8 In early 2012 some of these ignorant and misguided Ḥaddādīs such as Abū 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.

9 Allāh knows best how many attempts the Quṭbiyyah and Surūriyyah made in trying to get speech from the Major Scholars against Shaykh Rabī’ during the 1990s in order to defend Sayyid Quṭb 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.

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

oppose the Rāfiḍah, they deserve loyalty,¹¹ even if their actions are disagreeable. So their hearts are inclined towards each other

11 In his book *Tartīb al-Madārik wa Taqrīb al-Masālik*, Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ (رحمهُ اللهُ) 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 Abū al-Faḍl al-Mumsī, 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 *jumu‘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-Khārījī) 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 Kharijite 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.

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-Juhanī¹² and other corrupt and ignorant individuals.

In this is a great and mighty lesson for those who are deceived today by the revolt of a Takfiri Kharijite (Abū 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 extremist terrorists believe that the Rāfiḍah Shī‘ah whom they consider to be 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 Takfiri 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-Ḥajūrī 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.

12 ‘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 Murjī. This indicates the great danger of mixing with the Ḥizbīyyīn 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-Lālikā’ī (no. 120).

In this article we aim to address some of these *shubuhāt*, in particular the accusation of *Irjā'* against the Salafi scholars and their students which is centred around the issues of abandonment of prayer, the neglect and abandonment of the outward obligations, dubious phrases such as *jins al-'amal* or *shart kamāl* and *shart 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 Abū al-Faḍl al-Saksakī (d. 683H).

Abū al-Faḍl 'Abbās Ibn Manṣūr al-Saksakī said: "The Manṣūriyyah (a sect of the Khawārij), and they are the associates of 'Ab Aullāh 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 their's (that of Ahl al-Sunnah) leads to the saying that *īmān* is speech without action. Yet all of this is incorrect regarding them."¹³

13 *Al-Burhān fī Ma'rifah 'Aqā'id Ahl al-Adyān* (pp. 65-66).

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 'Abd Allāh 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 *takfir* 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 to 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 *masājīd* 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.¹⁴ Because the environment is such that it forces a person to do good. In the presence of so many factors that strongly invite and encourage a person to do good, it is not possible for him ever 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.

14 Ibn Taymiyyah said: “Disbelief (*kufṛ*) is the absence of faith (*īmān*), whether he has with him rejection (*takdhīb*), or arrogance (*istikbār*) or stubborn refusal (*ibā'*) or turning away (*i'rād*). Thus he in whose heart *taṣḍīq* (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 *taṣḍīq* alone, but also *inqiyād* (inward compliance). The fact that a person can live a whole lifetime 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 *taṣḍīq* (which does not amount to *īmān*), unless this individual was actually a hypocrite, devoid of *taṣḍīq* 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*.

Likewise it is **extremely difficult**¹⁵ 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**.¹⁶

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

15 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 among 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.

16 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.

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 ‘Abd Allāh 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, then by Allāh’s mercy, because there remains a speck of *īmān* in his heart, which is *taṣdīq*, and something of *inqiyād* and *ikhḷāṣ* (alongside his outward affirmation). And another person, Zayd, in another better and stronger land who brought the same as ‘Abd Allāh 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 to 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 (*inqiyād*, *maḥabbah*) in a way **that cannot be said for certainty** about ‘Abd Allāh.

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, ‘Abd Allāh al-Jarbū¹⁷ 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,

17 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 Rāfidāh.

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 *shahadah*, 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 and 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 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.¹⁸

Abū ‘Iyaaḍ Amjad Rafīq

10 Shawwāl 1435 – 6 August 2014

18 I have been informed (13 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 Ṣāliḥ 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 our treatise, *Regarding the Adhān of ‘Uthman: Bayān Talbīs al-Ḥajāwirah*, which can be viewed here: <https://abuiyaad.com/a/adhan-uthman>.**

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 Takfīrī faction that has appeared recently with sympathies to the terrorists of ISIS (such as al-Juhānī, al-Zākūrī, al-Ghāmīdī and al-Munāṣarah and others), they have decided to target the conveyor. 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-Ghāmīdī, al-Juhānī).

Defining the Issue Relating to Prayer and Outward Actions



With respect to your questions¹⁹ regarding the Ḥajāwirah Ḥaddādiyyah in the Netherlands and their accusation of *Irjā'* against the brother Abū 'Abd Allāh 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**²⁰ and the second is a **practical matter**. Both are explained in more detail as follows:

01 — Describing the reality of *īmān* and the connection (*irtibāṭ*) and binding nature (*talāzum*) between the *bāṭin* (inward) and the *dhāhir* (outward). This is inward *īmān* (*taṣdīq* of the heart

19 This article was originally written (6 Shawwāl 1435 – 2 August 2014) in response to a question from the Netherlands (3 Shawwāl 1435 – 30 July 2014) regarding the attacks of the Hājurites against some of the Salafī students of knowledge, accusing them of *Irjā'*. **Note:** Sadly, the *fitnah* of Muḥammad bin Hādī of unwarranted *tabḍī'* and *taḍlīl* which peaked in 2018 split the Salafīs in the Netherlands, and most of the students went with Muḥammad bin Hādī due to his status and prior trust.

20 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 an imaginary, theoretical matter (*jins al-'amal*) which has given rise to much debate and controversy.

and ‘amal of the heart) and outward *īmān* (*qawl* of the tongue [*shahādah*] and the action of the 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’rifah*²¹ 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.²²

These groups did not include the actions of the heart into *īmān* (*inqiyād*, *maḥabbah* and what follows them) as a result of which they presumed these false views.²³ From here, the issue is raised about a person who has *taṣdīq* in his heart and has the basis of the actions of the heart (*inqiyād*). Is it conceivable that nothing outward²⁴ should come from him at all? We find Imām al-Albānī

21 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).

22 Refer to Appendix 2 for more details on the claims of the Murji’ah.

23 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.

24 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 Abū al-Ḥusayn Ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Maṭīyy (d. 337H) in his famous book, *al-Tanbih wal-Radd ‘alā Ahl al-Ahwā’ wal-Bida’*, describes the claim of one of the factions of the Murji’ah: “Among 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).

and Shaykh Rabī' (رَبِيعُ بْنُ أَبِي رَافِعٍ) 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 entered²⁵ — and this scenario is used to illustrate the link between *taṣdīq* of the heart and its '*amal*' (action) and between the '*amal*' of the 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

25 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*.

occurrences as Ibn al-Qayyim (رحمہ اللہ) said.”²⁶ 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 Murji‘, misguided.”²⁷ And this is where we are led to the second consideration:

02 — 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.²⁸ 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

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

27 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 al-Albānī* (In Defence of al-Albānī) by Mu‘assah Majālis al-Hudā in Algeria.

28 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.

and at the same time not make *takfīr* of the one 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?

Statements of the Scholars Regarding Prayer and Outward Actions



This is a view found among a faction of Ahl al-Sunnah past and present²⁹ and it is held in light of Sharī'ah texts.³⁰ 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 (صلى الله عليه وسلم): “*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 the 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 (*shahādatān*). Its cessation occurs by bringing that which invalidates it [in belief, speech and

29 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*.

30 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*.

action] and cannot be reconciled with it. **As for when the 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...³¹ **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.”³²

Since there is no agreement or consensus on the abandonment of the remaining four pillars,³³ then abandonment of the outward

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

32 In his *Fath al-Bārī* (Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 1/20 onwards).

33 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 laziness, without wilful denial, *juhūd*. So we do not perform *takfīr* 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 *takfīr* of anyone who violates the two testimonies through committing that which

obligations not amounting to *kufr* is a view that 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 *takfīr* 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 among the Murji'ah?” And he answered: “No. This one is from Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah. Whoever speaks with the absence of *takfīr* 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...”³⁴

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 (صلى الله عليه وسلم) 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*

is unanimously agreed upon to be major *kufr* and *shirk* (in belief, speech or deed) and abandonment of prayer is not agreed upon.

34 *Hiwār Hawla Masā'il al-Takfīr ma'a 'Allāmah al-Shaykh 'Abd al-'Azīz Ibn Bāz* and it is found also in al-Furqān 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 *takfīr* of whoever abandons the prayer.

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 he is 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 believer.**"³⁵ Signed by 'Abd Allāh bin Qu'ūd, 'Abd Allāh bin Ghudayān, 'Abd al-Razzāq al-'Afifī, and 'Abd al-'Azīz Bin Bāz.

Ibn al-Bannā' al-Ḥanbalī (d. 471H – رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ) said: "Chapter: And [belief in] the intercession of our Prophet (ﷺ) 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

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

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.”³⁶

Ibn Taymiyyah (رحمته الله) 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 statements³⁷ 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 Abū 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**

36 *Al-Radd ‘alā al-Mubtadi’ah* (p. 195) as cited by Shaykh Rabī‘ in his article *al-Ḥaddādiyyah Tatasaqqaṭ 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 *kufṛ* that invalidates it, and nor anything that removes *ikhhlās* (sincerity). I hold that there is some laxity in his saying ‘who said only once in the life of the world.’”

37 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.

abandonment of any of them. And these (different) statements are known to the Salaf.”³⁸

38 *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 Takfirī 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 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Yūsuf al-Zākūrī.

This individual has accused the Salafī Scholars of “arguing in favour of the ignorant among 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: “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 *Ijrā‘*.”

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 realise 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

Muḥammad bin Naṣr al-Marwazī (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) 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 Aṣḥāb 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.”³⁹

Imām Ibn Bāz (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) 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 (*āṣl*) of the religion, they are the foundation (*asās*) of the religion. **Thus, a group of the people of knowledge have adopted the**

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>.

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

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 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 *kufṛ* and this is the stronger view as has preceded and it is the most correct...”⁴⁰

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.⁴¹ And they have doubts, they have doubts (for their

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

41 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, he has opposed the saying of the Murji’ah.

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."⁴²

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 (*taṣḍīq*). 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 *taṣḍīq* (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 (*taṣḍīq*) 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 disbelieve 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 (*taṣḍīq*) 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 abandoned any one of the Islāmic pillars such as prayer, zakāh, fasting and Ḥajj. **And**

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

the second saying is that no one disbelieves except the one who rejects [their obligation].³⁴³

In his commentary on the remark of Ibn Abī al-‘Izz’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** (رحمہ اللہ) said: “If this agreement (consensus) is authentic from the Murji’ah, then what the explainer (Ibn Abī al-‘Izz) 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.⁴⁴ 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)? 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?”

43 *Al-Durar al-Saniyyah* (1/479).

44 Shaykh Ibn Bāz is pointing out here that if this is in reality what they believe, then it can be 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*.

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

45 *Al-Ta’līqāt al-Bāziyyah ‘alā Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* (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 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 Quṭbiyyah, 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 Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān and others.

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 (رحمهُ اللهُ) 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 (*aṣl*) 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

47 *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (7/644).

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

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 minuscule 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 *kufr*,⁴⁹ 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

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.

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

This view is found among 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

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* (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 al-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 *kufīr*”, that does not mean you have said “Prayer is not from *īmān*” and likewise: “Not fasting is not *kufīr*”, 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 *kufīr*” 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 among them know this very well. **They have to establish that not making *takfīr* of the**

is the severe weakness of *īmān* (for those who do not make *takfīr*), or its absence (for those who do make *takfīr*).

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

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*.

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*) 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

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

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 (رضي الله عنه) 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

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, Takfiriyyah, 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-īman 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.

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 minuscule 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 *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

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

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 أَوْرَثْنَا الْكِتَابَ الَّذِينَ اصْطَفَيْنَا مِنْ عِبَادِنَا فَمِنْهُمْ ظَالِمٌ لِّنَفْسِهِ
وَمِنْهُمْ مُّقْتَصِدٌ وَمِنْهُمْ سَابِقٌ بِالْخَيْرَاتِ يُاذِنُ اللّٰهُ ذَٰلِكَ 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 Allāh. That [inheritance] is what is the great bounty.” [35:32]

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 Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) and he obligated upon the ummah of Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) what he did not obligate upon other than them. And the *īmān* that used to be obligatory before the revelation of the entire Qur’ān was not like the *īmān* that was obligatory after the revelation of the (entire) Qur’ān. And the *īmān* that is obligatory upon the one who knew what the Messenger (صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) 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).

As for the Murji'ah they do not accept *īmān* increases or decreases or that the Believers vary in their *īmān*⁵⁶ and the Extremists among the Murji'ah hold that it is not possible for a person who utters the *shahādah* to enter the Fire to begin with⁵⁷ and among them are

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'īl 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." *Sharḥ 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 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 that 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

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 Paradise. And whoever did perform them, then*

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..." *Ṭarīq 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 fall into major sins can be forgiven by Allāh's mercy and avoid punishment.

*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

59 This ḥadīth is **ṣaḥīḥ** and is related by Mālik in *al-Muwaṭṭaʿ*, ‘Abd al-Razzāq in his *Muṣannaḡ*, al-Ḥumaydī, Ibn Abī Shaybah, Aḥmad in his *Musnad*, al-Dārimī, Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasāʿī and Ibn Ḥibbān. Refer to *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Jāmiʿ al-Ṣaḡhīr* of al-Albānī (no. 3243).

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 among them) because it is prohibited to him.**

Abū al-Ḥusayn Ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Malṭīyy (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 among 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 among 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. **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 calamitous deeds (*adhā’im*),⁶¹ abandons the obligations and commits the major sins.”⁶²

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*.⁶³ Before we look at the ḥadīth of

60 *Al-Tanbīh wal-Radd ‘alā Ahl al-Ahwā’ wal-Bida’* (Maktabah Madbūlī, 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 *Al-Tanbīh wal-Radd* (p. 105). From these two quotes it is clear that the Murji’āh 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 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-Malṭiyi.

63 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 *aḥādīth* 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

intercession, it is important to make a note about the claimed consensus among the Companions of the *takfīr* of the one who abandons the prayer.

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 among 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.

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 laḥū*) or a part of it (*juzʿ*), as this is only a difference in wording — then he is in plain manifest error and this is the *bid‘ah* of *Irjāʿ* 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).”⁶⁴

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 *Irjāʿ*. In other words, you can still be guilty of *Irjāʿ*, 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.

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

64 *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (7/621).

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 among 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 among 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 'Abd Allāh were not from the Murji'ah, and nor was Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī and his likes. They (the Murji'ah) became opposed (*naqīḍ*) to the Khārijites and the Mu'tazilah and they 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)...”⁶⁵

Ibn 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-Fuquhā’), the Ahl al-Kalām from the Murji’ah, the Karrāmiyyah, the Kullābiyyah, the Ash’ariyyah and the Shī’ah, the Murji’ah among 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 said: ‘He is a believer, perfect in *īmān*.’ And Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā’ah said: ‘He is a believer, deficient in *īmān*’ and had this not been the case, he would not have been punished, just as he is deficient in righteousness and piety by agreement of all the Muslims.”⁶⁶

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 *īmān* (*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.

65 *Majmū’ al-Fatāwā* (13/38-39).

66 *Majmū’ al-Fatāwā* (7/354).

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 *taṣḍīq*) — 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*) 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.”⁶⁷

67 *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (7/297).

In this analysis of Ibn Taymiyyah, he points out that the Murji'ah 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 *īmān* (since actions are 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 among them) consider the difference between Ahl al-Sunnah and the Murji'ah al-Fuqhā' to be one of wording only.⁶⁸

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

68 Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān was asked: "Does the difference with the Murji'ah al-Fuqhā' 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.

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 the one who says: '*Lā ilāha illallāh*' while 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!"⁶⁹

Not believing the abandonment of the outward obligations to be *kufṛ* **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 Rabi' and others, keeping in mind that Shaykh Rabi' 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'ah al-Fuquhā as is clear.

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

The Narration of ‘Abd Allāh 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 *tabiʿī*, ‘Abd Allāh 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 Rabīʿ has established that this particular narration is not authentic from ‘Abd Allāh bin Shaqīq due to weakness in its chain and also because ‘Abd Allāh 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 with his chain from ‘Abd Allāh bin Shaqīq who said: “We have not known any of the actions about which it has been said that its abandonment is *kufṛ* except the prayer.” Shaykh Rabīʿ says that there is no problem with this statement because there is no claim of consensus within it. Shaykh Rabīʿ also says that when one looks at the books mentioning matters of consensus, such as *Marātib al-Ijmāʿ* of Ibn Ḥazm, *Naqd Marātib al-Ijmāʿ* of Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Iqnāʿ fī Masāʾil al-Ijmāʿ* 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-Ijmāʿ*, 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 *kufṛ* of the one who abandons it.⁷⁰

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

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 ‘Abd Allāh bin ‘Umar that the one who did not perform Ḥajj, despite wealth and health, is a disbeliever. And similarly, it is related from ‘Abd Allāh bin Mas‘ūd that the one who abandons zakāh is not a Muslim. Similarly, how can this narration of ‘Abd Allāh 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.⁷¹

The above considerations show that the narration of ‘Abd Allāh 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 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*.

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

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 among 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 recognise.'*⁷² 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*

72 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.

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 Saʿīd al-Khudrī used to say: “If you do not believe me about this ḥadīth, then recite if you wish:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَظْلِمُ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ وَإِنْ تَكُ حَسَنَةً يُضَعِفَهَا
وَيُؤْتِ مِنْ لَدُنْهُ أَجْرًا عَظِيمًا ﴿٤٠﴾

‘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.⁷³ They will have become like burnt coals and He will throw them into a river by the entrances of Paradise which is called “the River of Life” ... to the end of the ḥadīth, related by Imām Muslim in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*.⁷⁴

73 Ibn al-Qayyim mentions in *al-Salāh wa Ḥukm Tārikihā* (p. 21) that among 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-Shāfiʿī, Ibn Baṭṭāh and others.

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

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 *ikhhlās* (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*, *ikhhlās* 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

coal⁷⁵ 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*.⁷⁶

Then a faction of the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah — on the basis of this ḥadīth and others⁷⁷ — have affirmed that a people will leave the Fire who did not do any good, after being 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

75 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.

76 Refer to *al-Maqālāt al-Athariyyah* of Shaykh Rabī' (pp. 64-67 and also pp. 68-69). And Ibn Wazīr al-Ṣan'ānī 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).

77 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 (*shaīrah*) of *īmān*, b) those who have a mustard seed's weight of *īmān*, c) those who have 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 illā-Allāh* — 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 illallāh.*”

the statement of Tawḥīd who did not do any good whatsoever with their limbs.”⁷⁸

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 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.”⁷⁹

78 *Fatḥ al-Bārī* of Ibn Rajab (1/285) and refer to *al-Takhwīf min al-Nār* (p. 187).

79 *Al-Maqālāt al-Athariyyah* of Shaykh Rabī‘ (p. 88).

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.⁸⁰

Shaykh Rabī' said: "I have not seen anyone from the Imāms of Islām 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:

لَا يَكْفُلُ اللَّهُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا أَوْسَعَهَا

'Allāh does not burden a soul more than it can bear.'

[2:286]

And Allāh is compassionate, merciful, He teaches His servants to say:

80 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*).

رَبَّنَا وَلَا تَحْمِلْ عَلَيْنَا إَصْرًا كَمَا حَمَلْتَهُ عَلَى الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِنَا

‘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:

رَبَّنَا وَلَا تُحَمِّلْنَا مَا لَا طَاقَةَ لَنَا بِهِ

‘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.”⁸¹

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 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 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

81 In the Shaykh’s article, *Maḍāmīn al-Maqālāt 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’.

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."⁸²

In this statement, Shaykh Ṣāliḥ 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.

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

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 *īmān* 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).

- 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***⁸³ 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 Jah-miyyah 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 person's *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*

83 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).

(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*, *ikhhlāṣ* 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.⁸⁴

Thus, the view that brother Abū ‘Abd Allāh 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 limbs 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 (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) in regard to the evil sinners who did no good at all

84 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 (*īmād*), 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!

(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 Rabi' 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 (رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ). 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 (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), 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 (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) regarding this word upon a way that opposes their (correct) interpretation."⁸⁵

85 *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,

As for the person who believes that the sinner who has the basis of *īmān* in his heart (*taṣdīq* and *inqiyād*), has uttered the *shahadah*, and who abandons the obligations and righteous deeds, **that he is the most sinful of the believers, will enter the Fire, be punished severely**, and due to his Tawḥīd 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.

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).

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 Rabīʿ disparaged their leader in Ḥaddādiyyah, Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī.⁸⁶ They were not spreading these doubts until the past two months or so. Before this, Shaykh Rabīʿ 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-Fawzān⁸⁷ against Shaykh Rabīʿ, 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 Rabīʿ — and they are happy to drink the *bāṭil* of the Ḥaddādiyyah into their hearts, in order to

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

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

seek revenge for the sake of al-Ḥajūrī against Shaykh Rabīʿ, 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 Allāh, the Most High, protect Ahl al-Sunnah from the evil of all these factions of Ḥaddādiyyah, in all places, *āmīn*.

The Ḥajūrites, 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 mention their evidences for that.**”⁸⁸

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 them⁸⁹ and between those who

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

89 Meaning those mentioned in the texts.

abandon all actions entirely?⁹⁰ [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*.⁹¹

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

91 Refer to *Ittiḥāf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-'Urfān* (pp. 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*.

The Use of Innovated Terms in the Definition of Īmān Such as Jins al-ʿAmal



The Ḥaddādiyyah insist on new definitions pertaining to *īmān* that the Salaf never expressed in order to construct the accusation of *Irjāʾ* against Ahl al-Sunnah. From them is their claim that the statement of the one who abandons *jins al-ʿamal* is a *kāfir* is fundamental to the definition of *īmān*. They have other statements too such as *īmān* decreases until nothing from it is left⁹² and they insist unless you speak with and corroborate these phrases in the definition of *īmān*, you are guilty of *Irjāʾ*. In addition, they treat phrases which are stated by many of the Salaf, including Ibn Taymiyyah, to be *Irjāʾ* such as *īmān* having a foundation (*aṣl*) and a branch (*farʿ*) and that the branch is a perfection of the foundation. What follows are clarifications from Shaykh Rabīʿ that expose the evil nature of the Ḥaddādiyyah and likewise that of the Ḥājūrites, some of whom are now spreading these *shubuhāt* against Shaykh Rabīʿ as a means of venting their anger and seeking revenge for the sake of their Ḥaddādī master, al-Ḥajūrī.

As for the term *jins al-ʿamal*, the Ḥaddādiyyah and Takfīriyyah are not united upon what they intend by this term. Some of

92 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 *Irjāʾ*. 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 *Irjāʾ*.

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 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.⁹³ This means that whoever speaks with the *shahādah*

93 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 Abū al-Ḥusayn Ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Maṭīyy (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: “Among 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

has brought the *jins al-ʿamal* 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 *Irjāʾ* 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-ʿamal* 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.”⁹⁴

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 (*taṣḍīq*) 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).

94 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, *Difāʿan ʿan al-Albānī* (In Defence of al-Albānī) by Muʿassah 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*.”⁹⁵

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 Shaykh Rabī‘’s criticism — are entering this word into **the actual definition** (*ta’rīf*) of *īmān*, such that if you do not say: *tārik jins al-‘amal kāfir* (the one who abandons the genus of action is a disbeliever) you are upon *Irjā’*. 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-a‘māl*) 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 Murji’ah and this is largely a theoretical issue to show conceptual errors of the Murji’ah when they expelled the actions of the heart from *īmān*.⁹⁸ This led them

95 Refer to *Ittiḥāf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-‘Urfān* (p. 249).

96 The Murji’ah 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 (*inqiyāḍ* and what follows on from it) must produce outward *īmān* by necessity.

97 *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (7/616).

98 And those from the Murji’ah who entered something of the actions of the heart into *īmān* fell into a contradiction when they expelled the

to imagine erroneous, impossible scenarios and to declare Paradise obligatory and Hellfire prohibited for those who only brought the speech of the heart (*taṣḍīq, 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 (*inād, 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 al-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 Muḥammad 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 al-ʿamal*’ and ‘*āḥād al-ʿamal*’ then all of this is but nonsense (clangour) and in which there is no benefit.”**⁹⁹

This insightful statement of Ibn al-ʿUthaymīn highlights what we mentioned right at the beginning of this article, **that there is**

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*.

99 Refer to the cassette: *Question From Qatar on the Accusation of Irjāʾ Against al-Albānī* (30th April 2000). This is a well-known and famous tele-link that took place in Qaṭar following much debate on this issue during that time.

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: “He entered what he calls *jins al-ʿamal* into the issue of *īmān* and claims that it is a pillar (*rukṇ*) 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 among 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-‘amal* is a Murji’, rather an extremist Murji’ (at that)... And I announced many times that I declare the one who abandons action (‘*amal*’) to be a disbeliever, and that I simply warn against the use of ambiguous words such as *jins al-‘amal* but they did not desist from accusing me with *Irjā’*.¹⁰⁰

Shaykh Rabī‘ also said: “Your saying regarding *jins al-‘amal* 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 Murji’ah who do not enter action into *īmān*, and I did not find the word *jins al-‘amal* in the definition of *īmān*. So I ask you, did the Salaf, who did not enter the word *jins al-‘amal* into the definition of *īmān* are they Murji’ah to you?”¹⁰¹

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-‘amal* 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 Murji’ah regarding *īmān* is that it is acquaintance (*ma’rifah*) only, and with some of them it is assent (*taṣḍīq*) only, among these are the Ash‘arites. And with the Murji’ah al-Fuquhā’, *īmān* is the assent

100 Refer to *Ittiḥaf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-‘Urfān* (p. 250-251).

101 Refer to *Ittiḥaf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-‘Urfān* (pp. 248-249).

of the heart and the affirmation of the tongue. And in the view of all of these factions, action (*‘amal*) 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-‘amal* 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 Murji’ah, because the Murji’ah do not speak with the increase of *īmān* or its decrease.** Rather, the major sinner to them (the Extreme Murji’ah) 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?”¹⁰²

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-‘amal*, and I did not even approach the (issue of) the one who abandons *jins al-‘amal* 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 Murji’ah through the saying that (such a person’s) *īmān* is deficient **which is not actually said by the Murji’ah**. So when such a person who **does not** declare that person (the one who abandons *jins al-‘amal*) to be a disbeliever is from among those who enter action into *īmān* and says it increases and it decreases, then how can making an analogy for him with the Murji’ah and putting him alongside them be correct, when they (the Murji’ah) 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 Murji’ah) is the saying of the decrease of *īmān*¹⁰³ which is

102 Refer to *Ittiḥaf Ahl al-Šidq wal-‘Urfān* (pp. 254-255).

103 What the Shaykh means here is that when a person says: “The one who does not bring *jins al-‘amal* (meaning anything from the outward

not found fundamentally and it (that *īmān* cannot decrease) is the well-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*).¹⁰⁴

Shaykh Rabī' said in his refutation of the misguided Ḥaddādī, 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.

actions) is deficient in *īmān* (because he believes *īmān* can increase and decrease), then there is no basis here to throw him alongside the Murji'ah, because the Murji'ah 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 *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.

104 Refer to *Ittiḥaf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-'Urfān* (pp. 255-256).

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 (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ) 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..."¹⁰⁵

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 among them are those who make *takfīr* of the one who abandons the prayer. Among them is the one who makes *takfīr* of the one who abandons the prayer and withholds the *zakāh*. Among them is one who does not make *takfīr* of those who abandon the (four) pillars. And among 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 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

105 Refer to *Ittiḥaf Ahl al-Ṣidq* (pp. 260-261).

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.”¹⁰⁶

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-‘amal*’ (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 Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān to affirm, that one should not claim that *jins al-‘amal* 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-‘amal*’ and ‘*amal* (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-‘amal*’ for the (action of) the limbs. This phrase has no basis for it, this phrase has no basis for

106 Refer to the Shaykh’s article *Kashf Akādhīb wa Taḥrīfāt wa Khiyānāt* Fawzī al-Baḥraynī on <http://www.rabee.net>.

it. Perhaps it has come from the Murji'ah! Perhaps it came from the direction of the Murji'ah.”¹⁰⁷

Ironically, we see the agreement between Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān and Shaykh Rabī' who warn from innovated terms in defining *īmān*. However, it is clear that Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān is not aware of the evil designs of those Ḥaddādīs and Takfīrīs who brought this phrase *jins al-'amal*, 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 so 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 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.

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

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 Ṣāliḥ 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.¹⁰⁸

108 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

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 has a foundation (aṣl) and a branch (far’).** As for 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 are binding for him. **But he will not have completed (mustakmilan) [his *īmān*] until he**

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 Ṣāliḥ 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.

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 illallāh” and the lowest of them is to remove something harmful from the floor, and modesty is a branch of īmān.*”

Muḥammad bin Naṣr al-Marwazī (رحمهُ اللهُ) said in the course of his refutation of the Murji'ah: “And we say: That *īmān* has an *aṣl*, foundation.¹⁰⁹ 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:

مَثَلًا كَلِمَةً طَيِّبَةً كَشَجَرَةٍ طَيِّبَةٍ أَصْلُهَا
ثَابِتٌ وَفَرْعُهَا فِي السَّمَاءِ ﴿٢٤﴾

109 This is the affirmation of Tawḥīd and Messengership.

‘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.’ [14:24]

So He made the example of this tree an example for the word “*Īmān*”, and He made it have a foundation (*aṣl*) and a branch (*farʿ*)...”¹¹⁰

And Ibn Taymiyyah (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said: “So either (*īmān*) is *taṣdīq* (assent) of the heart only as the Jahmiyyah and whoever followed them from the Ashʿarites say, or it is of the heart and tongue as the Murjiʿah 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 (*farʿ 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:

الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ

‘Those who believe and do righteous deeds.’ [98:7]

And [there is] that which combines them both as in His saying:

إِنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُونَ

‘Verily the Believers...’ [8:2]

And:

أَنْ يُجَاهِدُوا

‘Those who believe seek your permission...’ [9:44]

110 Taʿdhīm Qadr al-Ṣalāh (2/703).

And the ḥadīth of modesty (*al-ḥayāʾ*) and the [ḥadīth of] the 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] (*wajib*)**, 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 among 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...**¹¹¹

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 are **the branches (*furūʿ*)**, and they comprise

111 *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā* (7/637).

the perfection (*kamāl*) of *īmān*.”¹¹² He also said, “Just as Ahl al-Sunnah said that whoever abandoned the branches (*furūʿ*) of *īmān* does not become a disbeliever until he abandons the foundation of *īmān* which is belief (*ʾitiqād*).”¹¹³

To the Ḥaddādiyyah, this explanation from Ibn Taymiyyah is *Irjāʿ*, 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 (*juzʿ*) 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 (*ʿamal*) to be a pillar (*rukṇ*) or from the binding necessity (*lāzim*) or a part (*juzʿ*) of *īmān*, alongside it also being a branch (*farʿ*) 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 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-ʿudhr bil-jahl*) and establishing the proof (*iqāmah al-ḥujjah*) in order to accuse the Salafi Scholars of *Irjāʿ*.

112 *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā* (10/355-356).

113 *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā* (11/138).

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 (رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) said: “For we, after acquaintance with what the Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) 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 *istighāthah* (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 among many of the latecomers, *takfīr* is not made of them on account (of what has been mentioned) until that which the Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) 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 among 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.”¹¹⁴

114 *Kitāb al-Istighāthah* (2/731).

Ibn al-Qayyim (رحمته الله) said: “I say, Whoever disbelieved on account of his doctrine, such as the one who rejects the origination of the universe, the resurrection of the bodies, the knowledge of the Exalted Lord of all created things and that He acts through His will (*mashīah, irādah*), then his testimony¹¹⁵ 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.

115 These are the views 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 among Muslims, such as Ibn Sīnā.

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 *taqlid* (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).¹¹⁶ If he is an open caller and 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 among 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.”¹¹⁷

This statement of Ibn al-Qayyim is significant as it relates to some of the claims of the extremist Ḥaddādī, ‘Abd Allāh 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.”¹¹⁸

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

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

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

And he (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) 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 Tawhīd 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 Allāh in His *ilāhiyyah* (sole right of worship), **after we have made clear to him the proof for the futility of shirk.**”¹¹⁹

And he (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) 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)”¹²⁰

And he (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said, “And as for *takfīr*: Then I make *takfīr* of the one who knew (the reality) of the *dīn* of the Messenger, and 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

119 Ibid (7/60).

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

declare a disbeliever and most of the ummah, and all praise is due to Allāh, are not like that.”¹²¹

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 (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) 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 one who disbelieves by worshipping the graves.”¹²²

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

121 *Al-Durar al-Sanīyyah* (1/73).

122 *Minhāj al-Ta’sīs wal-Taqdīs* (Dār al-Hidāyah, 1407H, pp. 98-99).

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).¹²³

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 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 (رحمته الله) replied: “Call him through another expression, neither this (that he is Muslim) and neither that (he is a Mushrik), say to him: “O so-and-so, servant of Allāh, 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 takfīr of such a one and (*takfīr* of him) would cause to him to flee (from the truth) when you call him. And also because making *takfīr* 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

123 One of them ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Juhanī 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-Wahhāb) — 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 Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān in whose *fatāwā* there can be found the excuse of ignorance for the grave-worshipper and also the common Rāfiḍī.

there could be 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 (رحمته الله) 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).**”¹²⁴

Imām Ibn Bāz does have other statements that suggest the absence of the excuse of ignorance because the Qur’ān has been conveyed and the proof is established and the affairs of Tawhīd 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-ma’lūm min al-dīn bil-ḍurūrah*) varies from time to time and place to place and even person to person in similar circumstances.¹²⁵

124 *Al-Fawā'id al-Ilmiyyah min al-Durūs al-Bāziyyah* (2/273-274).

125 For example, an expat worker may spend years in a Muslim country where Tawhīd is manifest, however, he may never speak the language of that country (Arabic) and never be informed that what he does in his own

Shaykh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Rāhijī presented a question to Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān: “The questioner says: ‘Whoever performs *shirk*, such as (a person) calling upon other than Allāh 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 Ṣāliḥ 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 (affair) is explained to him, then if he disobeys, then the judgement of *shirk* is made upon him, because his ignorance has now ceased.”¹²⁶

And Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān has *fatāwā* regarding the common Shi‘ah too. The Shaykh was asked: “May Allāh be benevolent to the 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 among 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

land, of soliciting aid from the dead and the likes, is *shirk* that invalidates his Islām.

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

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 Ṣāliḥ 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.**”¹²⁷

Shaykh Ṣāliḥ 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 *fatwās* 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

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

(meaning, not in every situation, but in the generality of situations).
Evidences from the Qur'an include:

وَمَا كُنَّا مُعَذِّبِينَ حَتَّىٰ نَبْعَثَ رَسُولًا ﴿١٥﴾

‘And We never punish until We have sent a Messenger (to give warning).’ [17:15]

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَسُولٍ إِلَّا بِلِسَانٍ قَوْمِهِ لِيُبَيِّنَ لَهُمْ ۖ

‘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]

وَمَا كَانَتْ رَبُّكَ مُهْلِكَ الْقُرَىٰ حَتَّىٰ يَبْعَثَ فِي أُمِّهَا رَسُولًا يَتْلُو عَلَيْهِمْ ءَايَتِنَا وَمَا كُنَّا مُهْلِكِي الْقُرَىٰ إِلَّا وَأَهْلُهَا ظَالِمُونَ ﴿٥٩﴾

‘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]

وَلَوْ أَنَّا أَهْلَكْنَاهُمْ بِعَذَابٍ مِّن قَبْلِهِ لَقَالُوا رَبَّنَا لَوْلَا أَرْسَلْتَ إِلَيْنَا رَسُولًا فَنَتَّبِعَ ءَايَتِكَ مِّن قَبْلِ أَن نَّذَلَ وَنُخْزَىٰ ﴿١٢٤﴾

‘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 Allāh has pardoned for my mmah 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 among 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 persists after the clarification then we judge him with disbelief. This is one of the great matters (requiring) verification and conceptualization. For among 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 find 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:

وَمَا كُنَّا مُعَذِّبِينَ حَتَّى نَبْعَثَ رَسُولًا ﴿١٥﴾

‘And We never punish until We have sent a Messenger (to give warning).’ [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 (*shubhah*) 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 does not have a doubt and believes that what 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-muʿānid*), 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:

بَلْ قَالُوا إِنَّا وَجَدْنَا آبَاءَنَا عَلَىٰ أُمَّةٍ وَإِنَّا عَلَىٰ آثَرِهِمْ مُّهْتَدُونَ ﴿٢٢﴾

‘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-Fatrah¹²⁸ were not excused, for the Messenger (ﷺ) said: “*My father and your father are in the Fire*”,¹²⁹ 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 among 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 it,¹³⁰ so he prays, gives zakāh, fasts and makes Ḥajj, but he seeks rescue from the dead. We judge this

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

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

130 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.

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 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 Allāh and Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh*' 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."¹³¹

We can leave the final word to **Shaykh Rabī' bin Hādī** on this matter:¹³² "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-Sa'īd 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

131 *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-Karīm* (Dar Ibn al-Jawzī, 1433), p. 39.

132 *Fatāwā Faḍīlat al-Shaykh Rabī' bin Hādī 'Umayr al-Madkhālī* (1/309-312).

and Ibn al-Qayyim and many of the Salaf because they grant the excuse of ignorance, and they have evidences, from them:

وَمَا كُنَّا مُعَذِّبِينَ حَتَّى نَبْعَثَ رَسُولًا ﴿١٥﴾

‘And We never punish until We have sent a Messenger (to give warning).’ [17:15]

And from them:

وَمَنْ يُشَاقِقِ الرَّسُولَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُ الْهُدَىٰ وَيَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ سَبِيلِ
الْمُؤْمِنِينَ نُوَلِّهِ مَا تَوَلَّىٰ وَنُصْلِهِ ۚ جَهَنَّمَ سَاءَتْ مَصِيرًا ﴿١١٥﴾

‘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:

وَمَا كُنَّا أَنْ نَضِلَّ قَوْمًا بَعْدَ إِذْ هَدَيْنَاهُمْ حَتَّى
يُبَيِّنَ لَهُمْ مَا يَتَّقُونَ

‘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 *takfīr* of him until we make the proof clear to him and establish the proof against him. If he then shows stubborn opposition, we make *takfīr* 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 *takfīr* is not made of a Muslim who falls into a *mukaffīr* (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 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-Ṭā'if, Makkah and al-Madīnah and so on. He would be with us and study with us, then we 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 Jamā'ah al-Tabligh come to them and teach them and they (the Tablighis) 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 Allāh upon this religion which has been called Islām, 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 among 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 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 *takfīr* of the leading scholars of Islām, 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 *takfīr* 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 Allāh, and with them is the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allāh (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) and with them is the methodology of the Salaf. And the one who wishes to make *takfīr*, he (ought to) make *takfīr* of the Salaf! And make *takfīr* of Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Abd al-Wahhāb as well! The Imām Muḥammad bin ‘Abd al-Wahhāb said: ‘We do not make *takfīr* 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 of the quote from Shaykh Rabī’.

From the above one can see the position of the Shaykhs of Ahl al-Sunnah in our time, 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 *Irjā’* against Ahl al-Sunnah, because they are concealed Takfīrīs and they desire evil for Ahl al-Sunnah and the lands in which the *da’wah* 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 Tawḥīd and Sunnah are those who affirm that **some degree of understanding** is required for the proof to be established.

Ibn Taymiyyah (رحمته الله) 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.”¹³³

And **Ibn Taymiyyah** (رحمته الله) 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 among 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

133 *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (23/346).

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 among 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.”¹³⁴

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 (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ), 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 (*iqāmah al-ḥujjah*).” And he explained: “Establishing the proof (*iqāmah al-ḥujjah*) comprises a number of things. **First**, presentation of the proof and making another person hear the proof. Allāh (جَلَّ وَعَلَا) said:

فَأَجِرْهُ حَتَّى يَسْمَعَ كَلِمَ اللَّهِ

‘So grant him protection that he may hear the words of Allāh.’ [9:6]

Second, explanation of the proof, 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 (*iḍāḥ 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

134 *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (12/500-501).

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*).¹³⁵ **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 (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) 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

135 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.

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:

قَالُوا أَنْتُمْ لَكُمْ وَاتَّبَعَكَ الْأَرْذَلُونَ ﴿١١١﴾

‘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:

وَجَحَدُوا بِهَا وَاسْتَيْقَنَتْهَا أَنْفُسُهُمْ ظُلْمًا وَعُلُوًّا فَانْظُرْ كَيْفَ
كَانَ عَاقِبَةُ الْمُفْسِدِينَ ﴿١٤﴾

‘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 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 (*iqāmah al-ḥujjah*).”¹³⁶
— End of 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 اللَّهُ 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.

136 This is a question put to the Shaykh following his lecture titled, *Manhaj A’immah 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 (2006 CE) and the answer can be found on pp. 81-82.

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 ‘Abd Allāh al-Jarbū’ (former teacher of ‘*aqīdah*’ at al-Jāmi‘ah al-Islāmiyyah, al-Madīnah).¹³⁷ From his views are:¹³⁸

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 (*akhbath*) than that of Jahm bin Ṣafwān.¹³⁹ That anyone who says “*Lā ilāha illallāh*” verbally no longer has the excuse of ignorance in matters of

137 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.

138 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.

139 The likes of Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn and Shaykh Ṣāliḥ 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.

major shirk, since he has understood the meaning of what he expressed and the proof is already established and 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-Jāhidh.¹⁴⁰ 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.¹⁴¹ 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

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

141 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-Irāqī 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.

established it is sufficient that the evidence reaches him,¹⁴² 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.¹⁴³ That he knows of no difference between the scholars of the past or present¹⁴⁴ that anyone who falls into the major affairs of shirk or *kufir*, he becomes a *kāfir*, *mushrik*, automatically by way of that (in the life of this world), there is no excuse of ignorance for 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

142 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.

143 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 among 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).

144 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 Rāfiqah.

living in a period after the teachings of prior messengership had disappeared and who were upon *kufr* and *shirk*).¹⁴⁵

Also from these Ḥaddādī extremists is Abū ‘Abd Allāh Yūsuf al-Zākūrī al-Maghribī who is a follower of al-Jarbū‘. He accuses the Salafī Scholars of “arguing in favour of the ignorant among 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

145 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.

Irjā”.¹⁴⁶ And whoever reflects upon all of this will realise 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 Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān are immune from them. The basis upon which he makes these clear statements of *takfīr* is that the scholars being spoken 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.”¹⁴⁷

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 Ḥadadādīs in that the issue with Dāwūd bin Jarjīs was not that he held 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 it is merely unlawful and that a person has fallen into minor *shirk* or done something which is *mustaḥabb* (recommended) and he wrote fifty evidences to establish that seeking rescue from the dead is recommended. And he would claim that invoking the

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

147 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, he 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 and Takfīriyyah.

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 *kufṛ* or that *kufṛ* cannot be established upon him, whereas Ibn Taymiyyah was speaking in the context of *takfīr bil-iṭlāq* (declaring statements, beliefs and actions to be *kufṛ*) and *takfīr bil-ʿayn* (declaring a person to be a *kāfir*).

From the above one can see the mighty and oppressive slander of these extremists against Shaykh Rabīʿ 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 *kufṛ* and *shirk*. Shaykh Rabīʿ himself differentiates between those who preach doctrines of *kufṛ* and *shirk* (such as the leaders of the Rāfiḍah, the extreme Ṣūfīs such as Ibn ʿArabī, 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 Ḥājūrītes¹⁴⁸ 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 (رحمته الله) 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 fī ṣiḥḥah al-īmān*).”¹⁴⁹

Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī (رحمته الله) — 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.¹⁵⁰ He stated: “The Mu’tazilah say it is action, statement and belief. But the difference between the Mu’tazilah and the Salaf is that the Mu’tazilah make actions a condition for the validity of *īmān* whereas the Salaf make them a condition for the perfection of *īmān*.”

148 Some of the Ḥaddādī Ḥajūrītes raised this issue in 2012 CE 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.

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

150 *Fath al-Bārī* (1/60-61).

Imām al-Albānī (رحمته الله) alluded to this statement in his book, *Ḥukm Tārik al-Ṣalāh*, 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).”¹⁵¹

And al-Ḥāfiḍh 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-‘Azīz 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.”¹⁵²

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

151 *Ḥukm Tārik al-Ṣalāh* (p. 42).

152 *Ma‘ārij al-Qubūl* (2/21). The difference here is that al-Ḥāfiḍh 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 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 Rabīʿ of claiming that actions are a condition for the perfection of *īmān* (*sharṭ kamāl*) claiming that unless one says actions are a condition of validity (*sharṭ ṣiḥḥah*), he is a Murjiʿ. This was a gross slander upon Shaykh Rabīʿ because he never used these terms and discouraged and warned from their use due to the ambiguity they contain. Because Shaykh Rabīʿ defended Imām al-Albānī against the Ḥaddādiyyah, they tarnished him with things that he is free of.

The Stance of Shaykh Rabīʿ Regarding Ambiguous Terms and the Fabrications of the Ḥaddādiyyah



Shaykh Rabīʿ said in refutation of Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī: “I, by Allāh, I rejected this statement from others even before al-Albānī (رحمهُ اللهُ) 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 of fabricating liars.”¹⁵³ 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.”¹⁵⁴ 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 (1995 CE) 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].”¹⁵⁵

153 Refer to *Ittiḥaf Ahl al-Ṣidq wal-ʿUrfān* (pp. 177-178).

154 Ibid. (p. 179).

155 Ibid. (p. 179).

And Shaykh Rabī‘ also said: “I have never said that action is a condition of perfection in *īmān* in a day among 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-‘amal*, due to what they contain of tribulations and due to the ambiguity that is in (the phrase) *jins al-‘amal*.”¹⁵⁶

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-‘Uthaymīn (رحمته الله) and others.

156 Ibid. (p. 180).

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



Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) said in his explanation 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 (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ) are more noble than you, more knowledgeable than you, and more eager than you for goodness. And they did not ask the Messenger (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) 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 whoever opposes you, then you say this one is a Murji’ and whoever agrees with you, then 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 Allāh, the Exalted and His Messenger (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) 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.”¹⁵⁷

157 *Sharḥ al-Arba‘īn al-Nawawīyyah* (pp. 337-338).

Shaykh Ibn Bāz (رحمته الله) in response to the question of Shaykh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Rājiḥī¹⁵⁸ 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*, then *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-Rājiḥī 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 (*shart 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 ‘Abd Allāh bin Shaqīq, **but others have said other than this.**

¹⁵⁹ Save that the genus of action (*jins al-‘amal*) must be present for

158 Shaykh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Rājiḥī is from the scholars of Riyāḍ whom the Ḥaddādīs would contact and ask loaded questions about the issues of Imān and *Irjā’*, and Shaykh Rabī’ (رحمته الله) pointed out how it is from the way of the Ḥaddādīs to feign love and respect for certain scholars only because it serves their interests against others.

159 Refer to the book *al-Maqālāt al-Athariyyah* of Shaykh Rabī’ for a detailed discussion on the authenticity of the narration of ‘Abd Allāh 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 ‘Abd Allāh bin Shaqīq due to weakness in its chain and also because ‘Abd Allāh 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 with his chain from ‘Abd Allāh bin Shaqīq who said: “We have not known any of the actions about which it has been said that its abandonment is *kufṛ* 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

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.”¹⁶⁰

One can see the clear intent behind the use of the phrases *shart kamāl* and *shart sihhah* 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 validity (*shart 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 ‘Abd Allāh bin Shaqīq, **but others have said other than this...**” From this, the difference between Imām Ibn Bāz and those Takfirī 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 be valid, **this can only mean the prayer** for those who hold its abandonment to be *kufr*. Because upon this view, if

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).

160 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).

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*),¹⁶¹ **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 ‘Abd Allāh al-Ghudayān stating a generalization that action is a condition of validity (*shart siḥḥah*).

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* (*shart fi siḥḥah al-īmān*) with Ahl al-Sunnah — and between the individual elements and instances of action the abandoner of which is not perfect in *īmān*.”¹⁶²

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

161 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.

162 *Al-Ajwibah al-Sadīdah* (1424H, Cairo, 6/318).

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 (*juzʿ*), and the one who abandons prayer is a 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 ‘Abd Allāh al-Ghudayān (رحمته الله) said: “*Īmān* is speech, action and belief, and action is a condition for the validity (*shart siḥḥah*) 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.”¹⁶³

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 *kufṛ* will say action is a condition for the validity (*shart siḥḥah*), 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 *Irjāʿ*, 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 among

163 Published in al-Madīnah Newspaper, 3 August 2009 CE.

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-Rājiḥī¹⁶⁴ who was asked:¹⁶⁵ “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 Aḥl al-Sunnah. Aḥl al-Sunnah — the majority of them — say that: *Īmān* is speech of the tongue, *taṣḍīq* 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 *taṣḍīq* 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 *taṣḍīq* of the heart, it is necessary that he affirms with the tongue, that he speaks with the tongue, and makes *taṣḍīq* 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 say actions are not from *īmān*, but they

164 Shaykh 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Rājiḥī is from the scholars of Riyāḍ whom the Ḥaddādīs would contact and ask loaded questions about the issues of *Imān* and *Irjā'*, and Shaykh Rabī' (رحمته الله) pointed out how it is from the way of the Ḥaddādīs to feign love and respect for certain scholars only because it serves their interests against others.

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

— 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, then 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 *musammā* 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 *īmān*, 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 siḥḥah*), he has expelled action from *īmān* and has thus become from the Murji'ah ... so this new saying, they said: *shart kamāl* or *shart ṣiḥḥah*, he is to be put alongside the Murji'ah because he expelled action from *īmān*." — End of 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 (*juzʿ*) of *īmān*. And yet another makes *tafṣīl* and says 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 siḥḥah* 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-Rājiḥī,¹⁶⁶ in order to elicit judgements of *Irjāʾ* against other scholars.

166 Shaykh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Rājiḥī is from the scholars of Riyāḍ whom the Ḥaddādīs would contact and ask loaded questions about the issues of *Imān* and *Irjāʾ*, and Shaykh Rabīʿ (رحمة الله) pointed out how it is from the way of the Ḥaddādīs to feign love and respect for certain scholars only because it serves their interests against others.

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 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 (*mustahabbāt*). 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 (*ʿamal*) when he says *sharṭ ṣiḥḥah* or *sharṭ 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 *kufṛ*)? This would be incorrect. Or is he including only the performances (*afʿāl*, 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 Murjiʿah and likewise an inclination to the views of the Khārijites and Muʿtazilah 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 terms, and it would be easy to make the accusation of *Irjāʿ* 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 (*sharṭ ṣiḥḥah*) of *īmān*.

For example, we can take the statement of Shaykh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Rājiḥī¹⁶⁷ who says that anyone who uses the word *sharṭ* (condition) for actions, to say they are a condition of perfection (*kamāl*) or to say they are a condition of validity (*ṣiḥḥah*) is a Murjiʿ, regardless of which one it is. And from this we can make the accusation of

167 Shaykh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Rājiḥī is from the scholars of Riyāḍ whom the Ḥaddādīs would contact and ask loaded questions about the issues of *Imān* and *Irjāʿ*, and Shaykh Rabīʿ (رحمة الله) pointed out how it is from the way of the Ḥaddādīs to feign love and respect for certain scholars only because it serves their interests against others.

Irjā' against Shaykh Zayd al-Madkhalī and Shaykh 'Abd Allāh al-Ghudayān who say action is a condition for the validity of *īmān* (*sharṭ 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: “*sharṭ kamāl*” nor do we say “*sharṭ ṣiḥḥah*”, we say: “actions are from *īmān*”. However, we do not show severity upon a Salafi who says: “*sharṭ kamāl*” or: “*sharṭ ṣiḥḥah*.” For this one (in saying *sharṭ kamāl*) has a salaf (a precedence) and that one (in saying *sharṭ 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-‘udhr bil-jahl* (the excuse of ignorance) and *al-a’māl sharṭ kamāl* or *sharṭ 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 Salafis. And practically, they have split them. They tried to strike the Salafis, some of them against others, with strength, until it reached *tabdīr* (declaring as innovators), rather reaching *takfīr*.¹⁶⁸

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

168 In his *risālah* called *Mas’alah al-‘Udhr bil-Jahl innamā Tūrad li Tafrīq Ahl al-Sunnah*.

Ḥaddādiyyah who have agendas and designs against Ahl al-Sunnah for which these issues serve as tools and mechanisms.

Shaykh Rabīʿ Hitting the Nail on the Head Once More



We will leave the final word here with Shaykh Rabīʿ bin Hādī who said, in defence of the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah: “They accused al-Albānī of *Irjāʾ* 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 *Irjāʾ*. Misʿar (bin Kidām) did not make exception (*istithnā*) in *īmān*... and it was said to Imām Aḥmad: ‘Is he a Murjī?’ and he said: “No.” And we do not know Misʿar (رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) to make war against *Irjāʾ* as Ahl al-Sunnah (meaning al-Albānī) wage war (against it), those whom you (Ḥaddādiyyah) accuse of *Irjāʾ*, 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 *īmān*] he would have said: ‘He is not a Murjī’... and I, by Allāh, I rejected this expression from others, even before al-Albānī (رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) said it, this expression: ‘Action is a condition of perfection in *īmān*’, and Ibn Bāz (رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) 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 Quṭbiyyah, 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: ‘(الإيمان أصل والعمل كمال) Inward *īmān* is the foundation and action is perfection)’ and: ‘(والعمل 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 now,¹⁶⁹ they would

169 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 (Mis’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 Mis’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 Mis’ar and others did not expel actions from *īmān*, unlike the Murji’ah. This is why Imām Aḥmad exonerated Mis’ar from this, because he knew and understood his saying. And the same 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 among 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-

say to him (Imām Aḥmad), “Is so-and-so a Murji” and he 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 and 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 Allāh, 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 Allāh promised aid for the people of truth, for He, the Truth, the Sublime, said:

وَإِنَّ جُنْدَنَا لَهُمُ الْغَالِبُونَ ﴿١٧٣﴾

‘And our hosts, they verily will be the victors.’ [37:173]

Sunnah of *Irjā’*, and this is what we also find from the followers of Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī. From them are Abū Fujūr ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ al-Kanadī 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.

So no matter how much they boast to the people that they are “Atharīs” 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 demolish their spears as He demolished them beforehand, He will demolish them now and after, if Allāh wills.” End quote from Shaykh Rabī.¹⁷⁰

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.¹⁷¹ 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 ‘*aqīdah* and its carriers. This is because at the same time, both of these ignoramuses and liars claim that ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) instituted a *bid’ah* into the *dīn* of Islām, which the rest of the Companions,

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

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

including ‘Alī (رضي الله عنه) 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 (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and not enjoining the good and prohibiting the evil through this evil position towards the action of ‘Uthmān (رضي الله عنه), then what trust and value can be placed in anything they write in the affairs of religion, let alone claims of defending the ‘*aqīdah*?!

May Allāh make good mention of His Prophet (in the highest company) and of his family and companions, and grant them safety.

Abū ‘Iyaad Amjad Rafīq

16 Shawwāl 1455 – 12 August 2014

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 Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān was asked¹⁷² 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

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

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 apostate¹⁷³ and he is not from the people of faith, and his (life) was not sealed with goodness.”

Then the questioner asks a follow-up question: “The one who was not able to perform (any) action (of good), will he enter the Fire due to not acting?”¹⁷⁴

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.”¹⁷⁵ If he had committed evil deeds after he entered into

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

174 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 question 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.

175 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

Islām, major sins, this one is subject to entering the Fire. Yes, as for what is before Islām, then it is pardoned:

قُلْ لِلَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا إِنْ يَنْتَهُوا يُغْفَرْ لَهُمْ مَا قَدْ سَلَفَ

“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 detail,¹⁷⁶ yes.”¹⁷⁷

deeds because such a one will not enter the Fire to begin with and will not need intercession.

176 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.

177 Compare this with what was cited earlier from Shaykh Ṣāliḥ 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 clear that the ḥadīth is not referring to those who entered Islām and were genuinely unable to perform actions due to a legitimate reason.

There is a problem with this view which is not free of inconsistency and contradiction as Shaykh Rabīʿ 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 refers 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 among them, the prayer, the Ḥajj and what is like that. He was 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 how the Scholars of the Salaf cited this ḥadīth from whom we have taken ‘*aqīdah*?! When they cited the intercession and the ḥadīths of intercession, do they mean (to refer) to the 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 *taʿwīl*. In any case, the evidences you have mentioned are against you, because you have made *taʿwīl* of them in a way that resembles the *taʿwīl* of the

Mu'awwilah of the texts of the Book and the Sunnah that relate to the Divine Attributes! And 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]!"¹⁷⁸

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:

لَا يُكَلِّفُ اللَّهُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا

"Allāh does not burden a soul more than it can bear."
[2:286]

And Allāh is compassionate, merciful, He teaches His servants to say:

رَبَّنَا وَلَا تَحْمِلْ عَلَيْنَا إِصْرًا كَمَا حَمَلْتَهُ عَلَى الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِنَا

"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:

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

رَبَّنَا وَلَا تُحِمْنَا مَا لَا طَاقَةَ لَنَا بِهِ^ط

“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.¹⁷⁹

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*,¹⁸⁰ and it

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

180 In an authentic ḥadīth reported by al-Ḥākīm in *al-Mustadrak* (no. 2270), from Abū Hurayrah (رضي الله عنه) who said that the Messenger of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) 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 (عز وجل) 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 observation: From what has preceded from the quotes of Shaykh al-Albānī and Shaykh Rabi’ (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 (*amal*) 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).

Abū Hurayrah reports that the Messenger of Allāh (ﷺ) was asked: “Which action (*amal*) 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 abandonment 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 *takfīr* 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

is this very ḥadīth that forms one of the strong 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 among 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.¹⁸¹

Realizing this, the Ḥaddādiyyah have become very explicit in their goal of establishing that whoever does not make *takfīr* 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 *takfīr* 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 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

splits between the Scholars by carrying issues and misrepresenting sayings of the Scholars whom they are targeting for their evil agendas.

181 *Al-Maqālāt al-Athariyyah* of Shaykh Rabī‘ (pp. 92, 101).

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-‘Afīfī¹⁸² (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) and even Imāms Ibn Baz (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) and Ibn Uthaymīn (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) and likewise making remarks about Ibn Taymiyyah (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) — 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.

182 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 *Ijmā*’, yet it is not an *Ijmā*’; however, due to the vast abundance of those who hold this view, it is almost an *Ijmā*’.” *Fatāwā al-Shaykh ‘Abd al-Razzāq Afīfī* (p. 394)

The Various Groups and Sayings of the Murji'ah



Abū al-Ḥusayn bin ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Malṭīyy (d. 337H) mentions 12 groups of the Murji’ah and we will summarize them here.¹⁸³ A person should reflect carefully on what is below in order to realise 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). Abū al-Ḥusayn (رحمهُ اللهُ) said:

01. “Among 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.”

02. “Among 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 tongue¹⁸⁴, nor action (*‘amal*) with the body and that whoever knew Allāh with this heart then he is a believer, even if he prayed

183 Note: Statements in quotes are direct translations. Refer to *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.

184 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.

towards the East or the West (to other than the *qiblah*) and even if he wore a girdle around his waist.¹⁸⁵ 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.”

03. “Among 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 (ﷺ) 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.”¹⁸⁶

04. “Among 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 witness that there is nothing worthy of worship but Allāh and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh (ﷺ). 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].”

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

186 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.

05. “Among them are a faction who claim that their *īmān* is like the *īmān* of Jibrīl, Mīkā’īl, the near Angels and the Prophets.”

06. “Among 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*?”

07. “Among 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:

أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ حَقًّا

“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.”

08. “Among 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 (*fawāhish*), committed what was unlawful openly, or abandoned the prayer and did not ever fast or perform Ḥajj.”

09. “Among 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 (*farāʾiḍ*) or perpetrating what is perpetrated by the oppressors.”

10. “Among them are a faction who claim that there is no hypocrisy (*nifāq*) in this ummah, yet Ḥudhayfah was asked about hypocrisy and he said: That you speak with the tongue but do not act.”

11. “Among 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 Saʿd 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 *muʾmin* (believer). So he (ﷺ) said: ‘Or a Muslim.’ He said it three times. Al-Zuhri said: ‘So we hold *īmān* to be a word (speech) and *Islām* to be action.’”¹⁸⁷

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 *taṣḍīq* in his heart along with *inqiyād* 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

187 *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-Zuhri as “*kalimah*”, meaning belief) whereas *Islām* refers to the outward actions.

would prove the absence of *īmān* in his heart] and who then left the obligations (out of neglect and laziness,¹⁸⁸ and not out of *‘inād* or *kibr*),¹⁸⁹ 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:

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]¹⁹⁰ he is guaranteed Paradise [and in a view ascribed to the

188 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.

189 A person may have *taṣḍīq* but not have *inqiyād* (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 *taṣḍīq*.

190 To grasp the point here, you should be aware that many of the pagans knew that Muḥammad 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

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 Abū 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.

This can be clearly seen.

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 is 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.

Repelling the Accusation of Irjā' from the Scholars of Ahl Al-Sunnah

Recently (2013-2014), a new wave of Ḥaddādiyyah has appeared within Saudī Arabia (and elsewhere). Some of them have connections or sympathies towards the Takfīrī Kharijites of ISIS. 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 *shartḥ sihhah* and *shartḥ 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‘. The Ḥaddādiyyah have monopolised the controversies and differences in these topics, turning them into entry points for their hostile agendas. This work provides a detailed treatment of these affairs.



Abū 'Iyaad
Amjad bin Muḥammad Rafīq



abuiyaad.com



@AbulyaadSP



t.me/abuiyaadsp