



#### **Description**

Doubts around the Daâ wah Part 2

Bismillahi Wal Hamdullillah Was SalÄ∏ tu Was SalÄ∏ mu â∏ alÄ∏ Rasoolillahi

AmmÄ∏ Baâ∭ d:

Introduction

Ahlus Sunnah in the west face a resurfacing trial, one that isnâ t new to them.

The trial of a people who are displeased with the **true** methodology of ahlil hadīth.

A people who are upset with the fact Ahlus Sunnah are distinguished from other than them, and wish to turn Salafiyah into a melting pot that accepts everyone and excludes no one, except its true proponents.

A people who accuse the people of Sunnah and hadīth of being harsh and extreme, due to their correct implementation of the methodology of Ahlul hadÄ«th.

A people who attempt to paint Ahlus Sunnah as a people who do not believe in softness, gentleness and clemency and its application, as though they are not very familiar with those texts.



A people who call to TamyÄ«â∏ (watering the true methodology down) and attempt to make that fair seeming.
A people who throw out a $\hat{a}$ lifeline $\hat{a}$ to those who seeks to destroy true Salafiyah with false misconstrued principles.
A people who have no concern except to attack the people of Sunnah and hadīth, and defend their methodology, while the true people of innovation are safe from their tongues, their writings and their videos.
A people who spread confusion and misguidance in the name of $\hat{a} \square$ justice $\hat{a} \square$ .
A people who are guilty of doing with Ahlus Sunnah, what they accuse Ahlus Sunnah of.
A people who accuse the callers to the Sunnah of being ignorant, while <b>they</b> are the true paupers in knowledge and are a people unknown.
A people who bring joy to the hearts of the people of misguidance for their ignorant defence of them, when they attempt to weaken the solid framework of Ahlul hadÄath.
Who accuse the defenders of the methodology of the companions and their successors of extremism, oppression and injustice, either by way of them using innovated principles or misusing established ones, but despite their (daily) efforts and striving, Ahlus Sunnah are not affected.
The Prophet -صÙ $\ $ Ù $\ $ اÙ $\ $ Ù $\ $ Ù $\ $ عÙ $\ $ Ù $\ $ سÙ $\ $ Ù â $\ $ said (as occurs in the hadeeth of Mugheerah Ibn Shuâ $\ $ bah:
$\hat{a} \square$ There will never cease to be a group from my Ummah manifest upon the truth, not being harmed by those who oppose them, nor those who forsake them until the affair of Allah comes and they are upon that $\hat{a} \square$
(BukhÄ□ ri: 7311 Muslim: 156)
Neither are their attempts new to Ahlus Sunnah, they (Ahlus Sunnah) are very familiar with them!
He also said (as occurs in the hadeeth of IbrÄ□ heem Ibn Abdur RahmÄ□ n Al â□ Udhri):
$\hat{a} \square$ This knowledge is carried in every generation by the trustworthy ones, they repel from it the distortions of those who go beyond bounds, the fabrications of



those who fabricate, and the false interpretations of the ignorantall all
(Baihaqi: (10/209 hadeeth no#: 20700)
But as some of the Salaf used to say:
â The ignoramus is his own enemy, how then will he be anyones friend?â □
Shaikhul IslÄ $\square$ m Ibn Taimiyah narrates the statement of $\underline{Im}$ A $\square$ m MÄ $\square$ lik who said:
$\hat{a} \square$ When knowledge is meagre, disaffection and aversion becomes manifest, and when narrations (of the Salaf) are meagre, desires become plentiful $\hat{a} \square$
(Al FatÄ□ wÄ□ 17/308)
<u>Abu bakr Al khawÄ</u> <u>rizmi (d. 383H)</u> said:
$\hat{a} \coprod$ Allah has refused to let anyone fall into a ditch except he who has dug it, for indeed the evil plot does not encompass except he who devises it! $\hat{a} \coprod$
(Yateemiyatud Dahr: 4/226)
Thus he who is unhappy with the methodology of the Salaf, and speaks against it, and against those who defend and implement it, does nothing but harm himself, the methodology is Allahâ s methodology, for it is his deen, and the one who seeks to please the people by speaking against it, earns the anger and wrath of Allah, regardless of the good he thinks he is doing.
The Prophet $-\emptyset\mu\dot{U}$ $ \dot{U}$
$\hat{a}_{\square}$ Whoever seeks to please Allah, by way of that which displeases the people, Allah will be pleased with him and will make the people pleased with him. And whosoever seeks to please the people through the displeasure of Allah, Allah will be displeased with him, and will make the people displeased with himâ $_{\square}$
(Collected by Ibn HibbÄ□ n 1/510 and declared â□ SahÄ«hâ□ by Shaikh AlbÄ□ ni Sahih Targhīb 2/547)
Unfortunately, those who claim isl $\ddot{A}$ h (rectification) with their speech, do nothing but cause ifs $\ddot{A}$ d (corruption) through their ignorance (if we even accept they are being sincere)



The members of the <u>FatwÄ□ Committee of Saudi Arabia</u> mention in refutation of <u>Muraad Shukri</u> who fell into negligence in Takfeer and followed the path of the murjiâ□ ah:
â It is upon the one whose feet are not firm upon knowledge; to refrain from entering into these affairs, so there does not come from him harm and
corruption in aqĪdah far greater than the rectification they were hoping to
<u>achieve</u> â∏ ¦â∭
(FatÄ□ wÄ□ Al lejnatid DÄ□ â□ imah: Fatwa no# 20212 â□ 2/135)
This individual (who I know personally and who came to my home in Madinah) thought he was doing well â defending the balanced position but fell into negligence and had a group of individuals defending this â balanced position of his, in various countries! Therefore when individuals speak a In defense of the deen, we must attempt to perceive the goal and intent. What is the goal? What will the outcome of this speech be? What do they intend by their statements ultimately?
<u>ImÄ</u> m Al BarbahÄ ri mentioned:
â∏ look!, May Allah show you mercy, to the speech of anyone you hear
speaking in your time specifically and donâ $\Box$ t be hasty, and donâ $\Box$ t enter into anything from it until you ask, is it some thing the companions of the messenger used to say? Or any of the UlamÄ $\Box$ ? So if you find a narration then do not go past it for anything, and donâ $\Box$ t choose anything over it and thus fall into the fire!â $\Box$
speaking in your time specifically and donâ $\square$ t be hasty, and donâ $\square$ t enter into anything from it until you ask, is it some thing the companions of the messenger used to say? Or any of the UlamÄ $\square$ ? So if you find a narration then do not go past it for anything, and donâ $\square$ t choose anything over it and thus
speaking in your time specifically and donâ $\Box$ t be hasty, and donâ $\Box$ t enter into anything from it until you ask, is it some thing the companions of the messenger used to say? Or any of the UlamÄ $\Box$ ? So if you find a narration then do not go past it for anything, and donâ $\Box$ t choose anything over it and thus fall into the fire!â $\Box$
speaking in your time specifically and donâ to be hasty, and donâ to tenter into anything from it until you ask, is it some thing the companions of the messenger used to say? Or any of the UlamÄ ? So if you find a narration then do not go past it for anything, and donâ to theose anything over it and thus fall into the fire!â (Sharhus Sunnah p23 â Point 5)  Pay attention to the statement of the ImÄ mâ the speech of anyone you hear speaking in your time specificallyâ This is a clear indication that this manhaj was not restricted to the period of the Salaf as some would have us believe, rather for every
speaking in your time specifically and donâ to be hasty, and donâ to tenter into anything from it until you ask, is it some thing the companions of the messenger used to say? Or any of the Ulamä ? So if you find a narration then do not go past it for anything, and donâ to the choose anything over it and thus fall into the fire!â (Sharhus Sunnah p23 â Point 5)  Pay attention to the statement of the Imä mâ to the speech of anyone you hear speaking in your time specificallyâ This is a clear indication that this manhaj was not restricted to the period of the Salaf as some would have us believe, rather for every time!



 $\hat{a}_{\square}$  The intent here is that they corrupt the textual evidences through that which they attribute to them from Qarmatah (definition will follow below) and distorting words from their places, just as they have corrupted intellectual evidences, and reversed the nature of perceived affairs from their reality, and by changing the Fitra that Allah has created things upon. Therefore they use general ambiguous speech, because that is better for purposes of delusion and misrepresentation  $\hat{a}_{\square}$ 

(MinhÄ∏ jus Sunnah: 1/187)

<u>Shaikh Abdur RahmÄ</u> <u>n Ibn NÄ</u> <u>sir As Sâ</u> <u>adi</u> said: â <u>Al Qarmatah</u> (is a term used) in regard to textual evidence and safsatah (is a term used) in regard to intellectual evidence. they both come together in that they(these two terms) refer to rejection of what is not to be rejected, rejection of basic things, things known by necessityâ | {(he goes on to mention)..Because evidence is of two types: Textual and Intellectual, thus textual evidence, if it is authentic and its indications are clear, then whosoever distorts its clear indications then (it is said) he has Qarmatah (fell into rejection of what is crystal clear) an attribution to the (deviant) QarÄ mitah BÄ tiniyah (sect) those who explain text that are known by necessity to everyone with distortion, the like of which is recognized by the Aalim and the ignorant..â

(Al Ajwibatun NÄ□ fiâ□ ah 291-294)

## 

We start with this doubt, because this claim, though it appears fair seeming, the real intent behind it is an evil one. It seeks is to destroy the status of the people of knowledge, their statements and their guidance. This doubt has been used throughout time to cunningly belittle the people of knowledge in the mind of the unsuspecting innocent layperson, and to replace the people of knowledge with these individuals, who present themselves as people skilled in the knowledge of understanding strong or weak evidences. Thus reliance falls upon them.

By way of this statement of theirs, the statements of the people of knowledge have little worth, rather true worth is in the hands of this individual who will dictate who and what is



to be taken from and who and what is to be rejected. This is particularly when it come to the affair of their statements against the people of deviation. As though the people of knowledge do not speak from a standpoint of taqwa and fear of Allah, but desire. As if the people of knowledge are fickle individuals who speak against people upon a whim. The Salaf of this Ummah would *truly* value the statements of the people of knowledge. Not so these unknowns.

Then they will use, in order to slight the statements of the UlamA = 1, statements of the Imaams that where mentioned in relation to affairs of rulings of the shariah, connected to actions, dealings and ijtihA = 1.

Such as the statement of Abu Hanīfah:

 $\hat{a} \square$  It is not permissible to take from my statements unless you know where I took $\hat{a} \square$ 

Or the statement of  $\underline{lm\ddot{A}} \underline{\square} m Ash sh\ddot{A} \underline{\square} fi\hat{a} \underline{\square} i$   $\hat{a} \underline{\square} If$  you find my statement going against the book or the Sunnah throw my statements against the wall $\hat{a} \underline{\square}$ 

These individuals regularly use statements and principles out of place or to oppose specific issues of methodology. it is well known that a principle in figh may not necessarily be a principle in agidah and vice versa.

These aforementioned statements, are true statements that were mentioned to emphasise the importance of holding on to evidence in issues of shariah. But they are used by these individuals, to put doubt upon the statements, verdicts and advises of the Scholars, because when the scholars speak against someone and warns, often times the general person may not be acquainted with the reasons for the warning, and may not even understand the gravity of the issue, even if it were explained to them!

As Al Hasan Al Basri mentioned:

 $\hat{a}_{\square}$  The fitna, when it appears, it is known by the Ulam $\ddot{A}_{\square}$ , and when its tail end appears (i.e. when it is over) it is known by every general person $\hat{a}_{\square}$ 

That is to say when fitna arises it is spotted, detected and understood by the people of knowledge, how will the ignorant one perceive it, if it is intricate?

Based upon the statements of these ignoramuses, we should leave the general people to get engrossed in these issues, relying upon their own weak deficient understanding,



possibly becoming unsatisfied with the evidence presented by those scholars, (since he (the layman) may be ignorant of the foundation that has been opposed) and thus go astray!

Knowledge of the men is in the hands of the people of Knowledge!

# The Methodology of Criticism with the Salaf

It is established with the people of Sunnah and HadÄ«th, that the people of knowledge have a methodology related to criticism well known. This methodology is connected to the strong position they have against innovations in the religion, and is connected to the precise science of Jarh and $taâ$ deel (Criticism or praise of the Narrators). None of that which we hear from the ignorant ones, about the $a$ correctâ salafi positiona concerning deviant individuals, takes this science into consideration. Rather we hear the Ummah being referred back to the principles of the Ikhwaan Al MuslimÄ«n repackaged as $a$ !. Perhaps the reason for this is the fact that our communitites in the west have been strongly influenced by the $a$ wah of the Ikhwaan Al MuslimÄ«n for decades (we will discuss this later inshallah), so the ignorant one refers back to this as $a$ while it is nothing but $a$ True Balanced IslÄ $a$ and $a$ Just Salafiyahâ while it is nothing but $a$ True Misguidance $a$ .
The one who has knowledge of the method of criticism with the Salaf, their attitude towards it, and the statements of the people of Sunnah will be upon clarity
<u>SufyÄ</u> n Ath Thowri said:
$\hat{a}_{\square}$ When a man who dies is mentioned then do not look towards the statements of the general people (i.e. praise or dispraise) rather look to the statements of the people of knowledge and intellect (in determining how he was) $\hat{a}_{\square}$
(Al Hilyah: 7/26)
IbrÄ□ hÄ«m ibn ShamÄ□ s said
We asked WakÄ«â $\square$ (d. 196H or 197H) about KhÄ $\square$ rijah ibn Musâ $\square$ ab (d. 168H a weak narrator of hadÄ«th) and why he does not take from him, he replied:â $\square$ I will not narrate from him, Ahmad Ibn Hanbal prohibited me from narrating from himâ $\square$



(TabaqÄ□ t Al HanÄ□ bilah: 1/392)

He did not mention here anything to do with the reason, just the warning!

Abu Moosä Muhammad Ibnil Muthanä (d. 252H) said â Isaw in the lap of Abdur Rahmä n Ibn Mahdi (d. 198H) a book wherein he had crossed out (the name of) a man so I said Oh Abu Saâ Äd why have you crossed his hadä th out? He responded: Yahya Ibn Saâ Äd (Al Qattaan: d. 198H) informed me that he has been accused of being upon the opinion of Jahm (ibn Safwä n, the innovator) so I crossed his hadä th outâ

(Al Hilyah: 9/6)

In this narration this great  $Im\ddot{A}$  m in knowledge, piety and taqwa, did not take from a man due to an accusation, was this great  $Im\ddot{A}$  m in Hadeeth pathetic and unjust?!

It was said to Ibn  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\square}$  Aun (d. 150H)  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\square}$  Why don $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\square}$  t you narrate from such and such? He responded:  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\square}$  Because Abu BustÄ $_{\square}$  m Shu $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\square}$  bah (d. 160H) left him $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\square}$ 

(Taarikh Baghdaad: 9/260)

Was this typical  $\hat{a} \square$  *Cultish behaviour* $\hat{a} \square$  from *Ibn Aun*? Did he  $\hat{a} \square$  oppress $\hat{a} \square$  the one he refused to take from?

In this narration we see that these great scholars of the Salaf did not take knowledge from the aforementioned individuals and criticised their integrity, citing as their reason that the people of Hadīth and Sunnah did not take from them, people of Sunnah who were familiar with the man as his affair. Not once do we see them saying  $\hat{a}_{\square}$  ...So I went to speak to him myself to verify $\hat{a}_{\square}$  or  $\hat{a}_{\square}$  ...but I will continue to take from them until the evidence is shown to me $\hat{a}_{\square}$  or  $\hat{a}_{\square}$  did they advise him? $\hat{a}_{\square}$  because they knew The People of Hadīth are most knowledgable concerning advice and nasÄ«hah and that their speech is based upon them fearing Allah and knowing they will have to stand before Allah with what they say!

In fact even when individuals denyed with their own mouths what had been attributed to them, the people of Sunnah would not reject what was established with the people of Sunnah concerning the individual, since it is well known that the people of innovation are cunning, tricky and deceptive.



$\underline{\text{Im\"{A}}} \  \   \text{m Khateeb Al Baghd\"{A}} \  \   \text{di} \   \text{(d. 463H) mentions the statement of S\"{A}} \  \   \text{lih the son of} \  \   \text{di} \  \  \text{di} \  \   \ \  \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \   \  \text{di} \  \   \text{di} \  \    \  \  \  \ \  \  \  \ $
ImÄ□ m Ahmad who inform his father that some one had come to see him who said his
name was daawÅ«d (DawÅ«d ibn Ali Adh DhÄ□ hiri) his father aid : â <b>From where</b> ? He
replied â∏ <b>AsbahÄ</b> ☐ <b>n</b> â∏ he said: â∏ <b>what does he do</b> ? and SÄ☐ lih did not do
well to define who he was Abu Abdillah (Imam Ahmad) did not cease asking until he
realised who he was. He said: Him! Muhammad Ibn YahyÄ An NaisÄ bå«ri wrote
to me informing me that he holds that the qur n is createdâ so his son said:
He negates and rejects that! He replied â  ☐ Muhammad Ibn YahyÄ ☐ is more
trustworthy that him! do not give him permission to come to me!
(Collected by Khateeb Al BaghdÄ□ di in TarÄ«kh Al BaghdÄ□ d 8/374)
Was this more â⊞ <i>Cliche-ish</i> â⊞ â <u></u>
behavior from ImÄ□ m Ahmad? did ImÄ□ m Ahmad wrong him by not accepting from him
his denial? should he have â <u>been more of a manâ</u> <u>and talk to him</u> ? Perhaps
give him an interviewlet him have his say! Or was this a methodology <b>Well-Known</b> ?
Shaikh of Abu Hanayfah camo to us in Pasrah and Avoob (As Sikhiyaaniy d. 1214
Shaikh of Abu Han $\mathbb{A}$ «fah came to us in Basrah and Ayoob (As Sikhiyaani: d. 131H b. 66) didn $\mathbb{a}$ t go to see him, so neither did we, for if Ayoob didn $\mathbb{a}$ t go to see someone we too would not go. Laith Ibn Abi Sulaim came to Us and Ayoob went to see him so we too went $\mathbb{a}$
b. 66) didnâ $ \Box $ t go to see him, so neither did we, for if Ayoob didnâ $ \Box $ t go to see someone we too would not go. Laith Ibn Abi Sulaim came to Us and Ayoob
b. 66) didnâ $ \square $ t go to see him, so neither did we, for if Ayoob didnâ $ \square $ t go to see someone we too would not go. Laith Ibn Abi Sulaim came to Us and Ayoob went to see him so we too wentâ $ \square $
b. 66) didnâ t go to see him, so neither did we, for if Ayoob didnâ t go to see someone we too would not go. Laith Ibn Abi Sulaim came to Us and Ayoob went to see him so we too wentâ (TabaqÄ t Ibn Saâ d: 7/286)
b. 66) didnâ t go to see him, so neither did we, for if Ayoob didnâ t go to see someone we too would not go. Laith Ibn Abi Sulaim came to Us and Ayoob went to see him so we too wentâ (TabaqÄ t Ibn Saâ d: 7/286)  Bear in mind that HamÄ dibn Abi SulaimÄ n was a taabiâ i who had taken from
b. 66) didnâ t go to see him, so neither did we, for if Ayoob didnâ t go to see someone we too would not go. Laith Ibn Abi Sulaim came to Us and Ayoob went to see him so we too wentâ (TabaqÄ t Ibn Saâ d: 7/286)  Bear in mind that HamÄ dibn Abi SulaimÄ n was a taabiâ i who had taken from Anas Ibn Maalik! and Ibraaheem An Nakhaiâ and that HamÄ dibn Zaid was
b. 66) didnâ to go to see him, so neither did we, for if Ayoob didnâ to go to see someone we too would not go. Laith Ibn Abi Sulaim came to Us and Ayoob went to see him so we too wentâ (TabaqÄ to Ibn Saâ to d. 7/286)  Bear in mind that HamÄ do ibn Abi SulaimÄ no was a taabiâ to who had taken from Anas Ibn Maalik! and Ibraaheem An Nakhaiâ to and that HamÄ do Ibn Zaid was born in the year 98H. That would mean that if we were to say HamÄ do ibn Abi SulaimÄ no visited basra just before he died, HamÄ do Ibn Zaid wouldnt have been more than 18 years old! Shouldnâ to Imaam Ayoob be teaching these young students
b. 66) didnâ to see him, so neither did we, for if Ayoob didnâ to see someone we too would not go. Laith Ibn Abi Sulaim came to Us and Ayoob went to see him so we too wentâ (TabaqÄ to Ibn Saâ to 7/286)  Bear in mind that HamÄ do ibn Abi SulaimÄ no was a taabiâ to who had taken from Anas Ibn Maalik! and Ibraaheem An Nakhaiâ no and that HamÄ do Ibn Zaid was born in the year 98H. That would mean that if we were to say HamÄ do Ibn Abi SulaimÄ no visited basra just before he died, HamÄ do Ibn Zaid wouldnt have been more than 18 years old! Shouldnâ to Imaam Ayoob be teaching these young students the etiquette of visiting and taking from the people of knowledge? particularly this elderly
b. 66) didnâ to see him, so neither did we, for if Ayoob didnâ to see someone we too would not go. Laith Ibn Abi Sulaim came to Us and Ayoob went to see him so we too wentâ (TabaqÄ to Ibn Saâ to 7/286)  Bear in mind that HamÄ do ibn Abi SulaimÄ no was a taabiâ to who had taken from Anas Ibn Maalik! and Ibraaheem An Nakhaiâ no and that HamÄ do Ibn Zaid was born in the year 98H. That would mean that if we were to say HamÄ do Ibn Abi SulaimÄ no visited basra just before he died, HamÄ do Ibn Zaid wouldnt have been more than 18 years old! Shouldnâ to I Imaam Ayoob be teaching these young students the etiquette of visiting and taking from the people of knowledge? particularly this elderly man who was a student of the companion Anas Ibn Maalik? but though he was praised
b. 66) didnâ to see him, so neither did we, for if Ayoob didnâ to see someone we too would not go. Laith Ibn Abi Sulaim came to Us and Ayoob went to see him so we too wentâ to see him so we to saa taabiâ to i who had taken from Anas Ibn Maalik! and Ibraaheem An Nakhaiâ to and that HamÄ to Ibn Zaid was born in the year 98H. That would mean that if we were to say HamÄ to dibn Abi SulaimÄ no visited basra just before he died, HamÄ to dibn Zaid wouldnt have been more than 18 years old! Shouldnâ to Imaam Ayoob be teaching these young students the etiquette of visiting and taking from the people of knowledge? particularly this elderly man who was a student of the companion Anas Ibn Maalik? but though he was praised by some, he was accused of irjaa, thus Ayoob did not go to see him, neither did his many
b. 66) didnâ to t go to see him, so neither did we, for if Ayoob didnâ to t go to see someone we too would not go. Laith Ibn Abi Sulaim came to Us and Ayoob went to see him so we too wentâ to to see him so we to sae to see him had taken from Anas Ibn Maalik! and Ibraaheem An Nakhaiâ to and that HamÄ to dibn Zaid was born in the year 98H. That would mean that if we were to say HamÄ to dibn Abi SulaimÄ no visited basra just before he died, HamÄ to dibn Zaid wouldnt have been more than 18 years old! Shouldnâ to to limaam Ayoob be teaching these young students the etiquette of visiting and taking from the people of knowledge? particularly this elderly man who was a student of the companion Anas Ibn Maalik? but though he was praised by some, he was accused of irjaa, thus Ayoob did not go to see him, neither did his many students. From his students were Sufyaan Ibn Uyainah, Sufyaan at Thawri, HamÄ do
b. 66) didnâ to see him, so neither did we, for if Ayoob didnâ to see someone we too would not go. Laith Ibn Abi Sulaim came to Us and Ayoob went to see him so we too wentâ to see him so we to see him so had taken from Anas Ibn Maalik! and Ibraaheem An Nakhaiâ to and that HamÄ to dibn Abi SulaimÄ to no visited basra just before he died, HamÄ to dibn Zaid wouldnt have been more than 18 years old! Shouldnâ to to see heaching these young students the etiquette of visiting and taking from the people of knowledge? particularly this elderly man who was a student of the companion Anas Ibn Maalik? but though he was praised by some, he was accused of irjaa, thus Ayoob did not go to see him, neither did his many students. From his students were Sufyaan Ibn Uyainah, Sufyaan at Thawri, HamÄ dibn Salamah, HamÄ dibn Zaid, Shuâ bah, Maâ mar Ibn Raashid, Ismaaâ
b. 66) didnâ to t go to see him, so neither did we, for if Ayoob didnâ to t go to see someone we too would not go. Laith Ibn Abi Sulaim came to Us and Ayoob went to see him so we too wentâ to to see him so we to sae to see him had taken from Anas Ibn Maalik! and Ibraaheem An Nakhaiâ to and that HamÄ to dibn Zaid was born in the year 98H. That would mean that if we were to say HamÄ to dibn Abi SulaimÄ no visited basra just before he died, HamÄ to dibn Zaid wouldnt have been more than 18 years old! Shouldnâ to to limaam Ayoob be teaching these young students the etiquette of visiting and taking from the people of knowledge? particularly this elderly man who was a student of the companion Anas Ibn Maalik? but though he was praised by some, he was accused of irjaa, thus Ayoob did not go to see him, neither did his many students. From his students were Sufyaan Ibn Uyainah, Sufyaan at Thawri, HamÄ do



Al Hasan Ibn IJsÄ☐ said I asked (Abdullah) Ibn MubÄ☐ rak (d. 181) about AsbÄ☐ t (Ibn Muhammad (d. 200H)) and Muhammad Ibn Fudhail Ibn GhazawÄ☐ n (d. 194H or 195H accused of the bidâ☐ ah of Tashayuâ☐ (early Shiâ☐ ism)) and he remained silent.  After a number of days he saw me and said â☐ Oh Hasan your two companions (i.e. the two you asked me about) our companions (i.e. the people of Sunnah) are not pleased with themâ☐
(Dhuâ∏ afaa ul â∏ Uqaili: 1/119)
Al Hasan did not follow this statement up with $\hat{a}_{\square}$ well what was their evidence?? $\hat{a}_{\square}$ so did they fall short in relation to giving the muslim his right? Or was it because this an affair well known!
Abdullah Ibn Umar As Sarkhasi said â $ \square $ I ate with a person of innovation once, and that reached Abdullah ibn MubÄ $ \square $ rak and he said: â $ \square $ I will not speak to him for thirty days!â $ \square $
(Collected by Al lillakÄ∏ â∭ i in â∭ Sharh lâ∭ tiqÄ∏ d Ahlis Sunnah: 1/139)
Did Abdullah Ibn Umar As Sarkhasi respond with: â∏ Well why doesnâ∏ t he ask me what happened?â∏ or â∏ Subhanallah I could have had a number of reasonsâ∏ or other similar arguments we hear from the ignorant ones! Was this â∏ childishâ∏ â∏ cultishâ∏ behavior from Ibnil MubÄ∏ rak ?
If the Salaf held onto the principles these people claim, imagine the state the AhÄ□ deeth of the Messenger of Allah would be in today!?
Statement such as $\hat{a}_{\square}$ akhi just take benefit $\hat{a}_{\square}$ or $\hat{a}_{\square}$ dont listen to those brothers $\hat{a}_{\square}$ or $\hat{a}_{\square}$ the shaikh is just a man with an opinion akhi! $\hat{a}_{\square}$ or $\hat{a}_{\square}$ What is the shaikhs evidence akhi $\hat{a}_{\square}$ would have destroyed the Sunnah!
Certainly we will hear (from them) that these narrations are not acted upon correctly, or are not to be acted upon in this way (as though they are just some historical record!) or were for a particular time or or orâ
Just as we hear these people quoting principles we have been teaching for over a quarter of a century, since the early nineties, as our teachers, the Ulamaa of Madinah, taught us, (from them ShaikhanÄ HamÄ d Al AnsÄ ri (and his Son), ShaikhanÄ Umar FalÄ ta, ShaihanÄ Abdul Muhsin Al â Abä d (and his son), ShaikhanÄ Ali NÄ sir Al FaqÄ«hi, ShaikhanÄ Rabeeâ Ibn HÄ di, ShaikhanÄ Ubaid Al JÄ biri, ShaikhanÄ



Muhammad Ibn HÄ di, ShaikhanÄ Abdullah al BukhÄ ri, ShaikhanÄ Ahmad An Najmi to name but a few. Or those who taught us the book of Allah. Such ShaikhanÄ Ubaidallah Al AfghÄ ni or Abdullah Al Juhani among others. Or those who were our study companions who we benefited greatly from upon the path, such as Shaikh UsÄ ma Al â Amri, Shaikh Fuâ Ä d Al â Amri Shaikh KhÄ lid Adh dhafeeri or Shaikh NizÄ r HÄ shim AbbÄ samong others, people we actually spent time and **studied** with, not odd visits)

Do these previously mentioned narrations mean we are calling to abandonment of evidence? Of course not but we must first understand what evidence (particularly in issue of jarh (disparagement)) is!

In response to this common doubt and in refutation of Abul Hasan Al Maâ∏ ribi Our Shaikh RabÄ« Ibn HÄ□ di mentions: (and pay close attention to this!):

- â From the fundamental principles of Ahlis Sunnah is: â Know the truth, and you will know the men and the fact that the truth is not known because of the men (i.e. because it is held by certain individuals.
- And from the fundamental principles of Ahlis Sunnah is: â
   — Evidence is sought to
   substantiate positions held by individuals, they themselves are not the
   evidence.

These fundamentals or evidences have been neglected, destroyed and wasted by Abul Hasan Al Maâ ribi and his supporters, he created a smokescreen of claims, that him and his followers reiterate, claiming to the people that they are Ahlus Sunnah and they are the â people of evidence and that they do not accept statements except with daleel (evidence) and that they are people of principles and other than them are unstable and fear the mention of fundamentals and principles, and that a they do not make tagleed of anyone and and that such and such (people of knowledge and Sunnah) are not infallible, and that we are not bound to accept the statement of such and such nor such and such, and other such statements, the like of which, when incidents transpire, we see the statement of the guided khalifah Ali a Radhiyallahu anhu a concerning the khawaarij, being true of them. When they used to repeat their statement a Indeed rule is but for Allah!a so he said: a A statement of truth, but what is intended by it is falsehood!a (Muslim:1066)



of:
â Fundamentalsâ and â principlesâ and the â seeking of proofsâ and the â clinging to evidenceâ and â fighting against taqleedâ , and that â We donâ thave popes or religious chiefs or custodiansâ.
We recognise and understand, that the apparent statement is truth, but they intend by way of it great falsehood, <b>they intend by way of it agitation and wreaking havoc</b>
and fitan with the people of Haq and Sunnah.
So Ahlus Sunnah engaged them and confronted them, with the book and the Sunnah and with the Manhaj of the Salaf us Saalih and with their sound, guided principles, and they (Ahlus Sunnah) exposed these principles of theirs and stripped them of the â weaponsâ they had the cheek and insolence to present, of â Fundamentalsâ and
(Majmooâ∏ Ash Shaikh RabÄ«â∏ 13/175-176)
Bear in mind, Our Shaikh wrote these words in refutation of Abul Hasan 15 years ago!
As the Arab parable goes $\dot{U}$ ا أشØ" $\dot{U}$ ا $\dot{U}$ Ü $\dot{U}$ Ü $\dot{U}$ Ü $\dot{U}$ Ø© Ø"ا $\dot{U}$ Ø"Ø§Ø±ØØ© â $\dot{U}$ How much tonight resembles last night!â $\dot{U}$ perhaps now it becomes clearer to some of us, why Shaikh RabÄ« sought from certain individuals to free themselves from Abul Hasan Al Maâ $\dot{U}$ ribi, is it a coincidence then, that today we see them championing the very same rhetoric!
May Allah save us from being self-conceited, arrogant, vain-glorious individuals concerned only with promoting ourselves and our $\hat{a}_{\square}$ achievements $\hat{a}_{\square}$ and grant us Knowledge of the $\hat{a}_{\square}$ $True\hat{a}_{\square}$ Manhaj of the Salaf of this Ummah.
Was Sallallahu â∏ alaa Nabiyinaa Muhammad



#### @abuhakeembilal

### Category

- 1. Da'wah
- 2. Manhaj

#### **Date**

11/05/2025

#### **Date Created**

08/22/2017