

Albani & his Friends  
A Concise Guide to the Salafi Movement

Gibril Fouad Haddad

SECOND REVISED EDITION

AQSA PUBLICATIONS

## Al-Albānī & His Friends A Concise Alphabetical Guide

- (1) ‘Abd al-Khāliq, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān
- (2) ‘Abd al-Salām, Muḥammad Aḥmad
- (3) Abū Zayd, Bakr ibn ‘Abd Allāh
- (4) Al-Albānī, Nāṣir
- (5) Al-Anṣārī, Ḥammād
- (6) Dimashqiyya, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān
- (7) Harrās, Muḥammad Khalīl
- (8) Al-Hilālī, Salīm
- (9) Ibn Bāz, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz
- (10) Al-Jazā’irī, Abū Bakr
- (11) Al-Khumayyis, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān
- (12) Al-Madkhalī, Maḥmūd
- (13) Al-Madkhalī, Rabī‘
- (14) Al-Qaḥṭānī, Muḥammad
- (15) Salmān, Mashhūr Ḥasan
- (16) Al-Shuqayrī, Muḥammad
- (17) Al-Tuwayjirī, Ḥamīd
- (18) Al-‘Uthaymīn, Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ
- (19) Al-Wādi‘ī, Muqbil
- (20) Zāhir, Iḥsān Ilāhī
- (21) Zaynū, Muḥammad Jamīl & al-Fawzān, Ṣāliḥ

Abū Dharr told me: “I was walking with the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ when he said: ‘I swear I fear for my *Umma* other than the Anti-Christ far more than I fear him!’ He repeated it three times. I said: ‘Messenger of Allāh! What is it you fear more than the Dajjal for your *Umma*?’ He replied: ‘Misguiding leaders.’”

(Narrated from Abū Tamīm al-Jayshānī and also from ‘Umar, Shaddād, Thawbān, and Abū al-Dardā’ by Aḥmad (cf. al-Arna’ūt 35:222 §21296 *ṣaḥīḥ*)

was revealed, due to its majesty and the fear caused in them by the invocation of punishment pronounced towards its end. One needs only to imagine them gathered together with the Muslims before the Ka‘ba as the Prophet ﷺ himself recited this newly-revealed Sūra to them from beginning to end. Similar examples are the reactions of the unbelievers at the invocations of punishment they heard from the believers. For example, ‘Utba ibn Rabī‘a’s reaction when he heard the verse {*If they turn away, tell them: I have warned you of a destruction similar to that of ‘Ād and Thamūd*} (Fuṣṣilat 13). Upon hearing this, ‘Utba placed his hand on the mouth of the Prophet ﷺ so that the threat of punishment would be averted. And when Khubayb ibn ‘Adī pronounced a similar threat, Abū Sufyān lied down on the ground together with his son Mu‘āwiya to deflect its harm.

10. The late Sayyid ‘Abd Allāh Sirāj al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī (d. 1422/2002 *raḥimahullāh*) also has a long, extremely detailed treatment of the story of the cranes in his masterful book *Hadī al-Qur‘ān al-Karīm ilā al-Ḥujjati wal-Burhān* (2nd edition, 1994, p. 155-182). He too concludes that it is a forgery.

#### 11: MUḤAMMAD IBN ‘ABD AL-RAḤMĀN AL-KHUMAYYIS

One of the latest Wahnābī popelets of misguided auto-da-fés against *Ahl al-Sunna wal-Jamā‘a*, Muḥammad al-Khumayyis authored a doctoral thesis at the University of Muḥammad ibn Sa‘ūd entitled *Uṣūl al-Dīn ‘ind al-Imām Abī Ḥanīfa* then turned it into a 650-page brick he published in the same town, at Riyadh’s Dār al-Ṣumay‘ī. This work perpetuates the usual Najdī misrepresentation of the early Muslims, the Sacred Law, and the Religion as a whole to make them say the contrary of what they said. In predictable betrayal of the title, the book is only another self-absorbed, complacent manifesto of Wahnābism by a Wahnābī promoted by Wahnābis for the consumption of Wahnābis. Among its aberrations:

- Al-Khumayyis claims that the seventeen *Musnads* of Imām Abū Ḥanīfa, Allāh be well-pleased with him, were compiled after his time and are therefore attributed to him unreliably. This is like the claim of the non-Muslims and their ignorant acolytes that the ḥadīth was compiled after the time of the Prophet ﷺ: what matters is not the time of the final compilation but the veracity of transmission and attribution, while it is established that setting pen to paper took place at the earliest stages of ḥadīth transmission from the Prophet ﷺ himself, let alone from the Imāms of later generations such as Sufyān al-Thawrī, Ibn Jurayj, al-Awzā‘ī, or Abū Ḥanīfa, Allāh be well-pleased with them.

The attack against Abū Ḥanīfa the *Musnid* is enshrined in two lines of the *Tankīl* (1:214) originally written in refutation of Imām al-Kawtharī’s *Ta’nīb al-Khaṭīb* by the *Lā-Madhbahī* Wahhābī ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Mu‘allimī then rehashed by Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Razzāq Ḥamza, Muḥammad Naṣīf,<sup>205</sup> and Nāṣir al-Albānī in which al-Mu‘allimī’s confused pen (and/or others) wrote of the *Masānīd* of Imām Abū Ḥanīfa: “Most of the compilers of those *Masānīd* came late, a group of them are accused of lying, and whoever among them is not accused has in his chains to Abū Ḥanīfa, for the most part, narrators of undependable rank.” Such a statement is itself a litotic exercise in vagueness and unreliability since it backs its assertions with nothing, and the assertions themselves are so vague as to be meaningless. One should also beware of the pronouncements of Wahhābīs against early Ḥanafī narrators from Abū Ḥanīfa, since their business is to discredit such narrations on principle according to their lusts and not on a scientific basis. This fact becomes abundantly clear when critics are faced with the inevitable question: What compilers do you mean exactly? The *Masānīd* of Abū Ḥanīfa, as listed by the ḥadīth masters Abū al-Mu‘ayyad Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd al-Khwārizmī (d.

<sup>205</sup> As stated by Imām al-Kawtharī himself in the introduction to his counter-refutation, *al-Tarḥīb bil-Tankīl* and as indicated to me by Dr. Nūr al-Dīn ‘Itr when I asked him about the *Tankīl*: “Which of the *Tankīls* do you mean? For several hands mixed their stamp to that of al-Mu‘allimī.” I was also told by Wā‘il al-Ḥanbalī in Damascus that ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Nāṣir al-Albānī told him that the reason al-Albānī fell out with Zuhayr al-Shāwīsh was over the royalties from the publication of the *Tankīl* which contained the (uncredited) alterations and additions of al-Albānī.

655) in his *Manāqib Abī Ḥanīfa*, Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Ṣāliḥī (d. 942) in *‘Uqūd al-Jumān*, and Ibn Ṭūlūn (d. 953) in *al-Fihrist al-Awsat*, are narrated with their chains by the following:

- (1) *al-Ḥāfiẓ* Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb al-Ḥārithī al-Bukhārī.<sup>206</sup>
- (2) *al-Ḥāfiẓ* Abū al-Qāsim Ṭalḥa ibn Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far al-Shāhid.
- (3) Abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn al-Muẓaffar ibn Mūsā.
- (4) *al-Ḥāfiẓ* Abū Nu‘aym Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-Aṣbahānī al-Shāfi‘ī.
- (5) Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Bāqī al-Anṣārī Qāḍī Māristān.
- (6) *al-Ḥāfiẓ* Abū Aḥmad ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Adī al-Jurjānī al-Shāfi‘ī the author of *al-Kāmil fīl-Du‘afā’*.
- (7) Abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥubaysh from al-Ḥasan ibn Ziyād al-Lu‘lu‘ī.
- (8) Qāḍī Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Umar ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ashnānī.
- (9) Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Khālīd al-Kalā‘ī.
- (10) *al-Ḥāfiẓ* Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Khusrū al-Balkhī.
- (11) *al-Ḥāfiẓ* Qāḍī Abū Yūsuf’s *Āthār*.
- (12) Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī’s *samā’*.
- (13) Ḥammād ibn Abī Ḥanīfa.
- (14) Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī’s *Āthār*.
- (15) Qāḍī Abū al-Qāsim ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī al-‘Awwām.
- (16) *al-Ḥāfiẓ* Abū Bakr ibn al-Muqri’.
- (17) *al-Ḥāfiẓ* Abū ‘Alī al-Bakrī.

<sup>206</sup> Abū Zur‘a said he was weak.

Each one of the narrators between each of the above scholars and Imām Abū Ḥanīfa is mentioned by name though not documented by al-Khwārizmī, al-Ṣāliḥī, and Ibn Ṭūlūn. Yet anti-Ḥanafīs *muqallids* cling to the *ijmālī* disparagement they find in the *Tankīl* without firsthand knowledge of the narrators. In addition, Imām al-Kawtharī and his editor in the *Ta'nīb*, Aḥmad Khayrī, also mention five more *Masanīd* which, unlike the foregoing ones, are no longer extant except for Zufar's, narrated by the following:

(18) *al-Ḥāfiẓ* al-Dāraquṭnī, which al-Khaṭīb said he had in his possession in Shām.

(19) *al-Ḥāfiẓ* Ibn Shāhīn, which al-Khaṭīb said he had in his possession in Shām.

(20) *al-Ḥāfiẓ* Ibn 'Uqda, mentioned by al-Badr al-'Aynī in his *Tārīkh al-Kabīr* and containing 1,000+ ḥadīths.

(21) Muḥammad ibn Makhlād al-Dūrī al-Bazzāz, mentioned in al-Khaṭīb's *Tārīkh Baghdād*.

(22) *al-Ḥāfiẓ* Abū al-Hudhayl Zufar ibn al-Hudhayl al-'Anbarī's *Āthār*.

- Al-Khumayyis claims that none of the doctrinal texts attributed to Abū Ḥanīfa are authentically his except the *'Aqīda* of Imām al-Ṭaḥāwī. This is originally an orientalist speculation which Wahhābīs are only glad to endorse since it suits their *hawā*. Al-Khumayyis himself shows that early Ḥanafī doctrinal works all have well-known chains of transmission but he chooses to discard them on the basis of his own specious discreditation of the narrators:

I. *Al-Fiqh al-Akbar*. It is narrated by Naṣr or Nuṣayr ibn Yaḥyā al-Balkhī (d. 268), from Muḥammad ibn Muqātil al-Rāzī, from 'Īsām ibn Yūsuf ibn Maymūn al-Balkhī, from Ḥammād ibn Abī Ḥanīfa, from his father.

The above narrators are all truthful. Al-Bukhārī alone declared Ibn Muqātil weak – as mentioned by al-Khalīlī in *al-Irshād* – but without explanation, hence Ibn Ḥajar dismisses this weakening as

based on a difference in *Madhhab* and the fact that Ibn Muqātil, like all Ḥanafis, was considered a *Murji’*.<sup>207</sup> Ibn Sa’d declared ‘Iṣām weak but this is also rejected as unconfirmed since Ibn Sa’d’s severity against the Kufans is known, and Ibn Ḥibbān, although a rabid enemy of Ḥanafis, declared him “highly reliable despite occasional errors” while al-Khalīlī graded him “truthful” (*ṣadūq*). As for Ḥāmmād, al-‘Uqaylī declared him weak then Ibn ‘Adī but their case is the same as Ibn Ḥibbān and Ibn Sa’d regarding Ḥanafis. Hence, Abū al-Muzaffar al-Isfarāyīnī declared this chain sound in *al-Tabṣira fīl-Dīn*.

II. *Al-Fiqh al-Absaṭ*. Its text is in catechetical format and differs from the first in content as well. Its chain contains al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī al-Alma’ī al-Kāshgharī and Abū Muṭī’ al-Ḥakam ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muslim al-Balkhī who are both weak although their religion is beyond reproach according to al-Sim‘ānī and Ibn al-Mubārak respectively. Al-Khumayyis confuses Abū Muṭī’ with Abū Salama al-Ḥakam ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Khaṭṭāf, whom Abū Ḥātim accused of lying, while he only declared Abū Muṭī’ weak.<sup>208</sup>

III. *Al-‘Ālim wal-Muta‘allim*. Its text contains a noted emphasis on the necessity of learning *kalām* for the protection of one’s faith and the defense of religion, identical to *Istiḥsān al-Khawḍ fī ‘Ilm al-Kalām*, which Imām al-Ash‘arī wrote after the Ḥanbalī Abū Muḥammad al-Barbahārī slighted his *Ibāna*. It is at the very least a work by the student of Imām Abū Ḥanīfa, Abū Muqātil Ḥafṣ ibn Salm al-Samarqandī, and the first of its two chains adduced by al-Khumayyis is impeccable and formed of Imāms of *fiqh* up to Abū Muqātil who is upright but weak as a narrator.

<sup>207</sup> See our documentation of Sunni versus non-Sunni *irjā’* in our *Four Imāms and Their Schools*.

<sup>208</sup> Al-Dhahabī in *al-‘Ulūw* attributes *al-Fiqh al-Akbar* to Abū Muṭī’ al-Balkhī as mentioned by Shaykh Shu‘ayb al-Arna’ūt in his edition of *Aqāwīl al-Thiqāt* (p. 63) but he means the version known as *al-Fiqh al-Absaṭ*. The orientalist name the two versions respectively *Fiqh al-Akbar I* and *Fiqh al-Akbar II* cf. Watt’s *Islamic Creeds*.

IV. *Risāla ilā ‘Uthmān al-Battī*.<sup>209</sup> Undoubtedly written by the Imām and narrated from Abū Yūsuf, its chain is impeccable and comes through al-Marghīnānī the author of the *Hidāya* (misspelled as “Marghiyānī”), Abū al-Mu‘īn al-Nasafī the *Mutakallim*, and other Imāms.

V. *Al-Waṣīyya*. The chain adduced by al-Khummayis is similar to the previous one but he shows no knowledge that there are several *Waṣīyyas* attributed to the Imām, not just one.

The same Khumayyis also produced two books against the Ash‘arīs and the Māturīdīs, respectively entitled *Manhaj al-Ash‘ariyya fīl-‘Aqā’id* and *Manhaj al-Māturīdiyya fīl-‘Aqā’id*, which the Jordanian researcher Ustadh Sa‘īd Fawda in his *al-Naqd wal-Taqwīm* said were characterized by the following flaws:

- deep ignorance of the doctrines of *Ahl al-Sunna wal-Jamā‘a*;
- inability to probe the issues in the way of the great *mujtahid* Imāms of *kalām*;
- confinement to *taqlīd* without real understanding of Sunni ‘*aqīda*;
- sanctification of Ibn Taymiyya and his followers as part of the said *taqlīd*.

The same Khumayyis also produced a thirty-five page libel he named *al-Tanbihāt al-Saniyya ‘alā al-Hafawāt fī Kitāb al-Mawāhib al-Lāduniyya* published by the same house, which he begins with an epigraph from another zealot of Wahhābism, Maḥmūd Shukrī al-Alūsī’s (d. 1342) *Ghāyat al-Amānī* (2:14): “Al-Qasṭallānī was among the extremists of the tomb lovers (*al-qubūriyya*) [!]. He affirms the intermediary of the polytheistic type (*al-wāsiṭat al-shirkiyya*) [!!] by making an analogy between Allāh Most High and the kings of this world.” In addition to heinous envy of the Friends of Allāh, such a charge exhibits a Mu‘tazilī type of disavowal of intercession and, what is worse, materialist disbelief in the realities of *Barzakh* established

<sup>209</sup> We translated this letter in full in our *Four Imāms and Their Schools*.



from the Prophetic reports through mass transmission.<sup>210</sup> {*And you will find them greediest of mankind for life and greedier than the idolaters*} (2:96).

Khumayyis then proceeds to list what he claims are mistakes Imām al-Qaṣṭallānī, Allāh be well-pleased with him, committed, in which list he himself reveals his ignorance of Qur’ān, Sunna, and Consensus. For example:

- He takes al-Qaṣṭallānī to task for mentioning the ḥadīths in support of the desirability of visiting the Prophet ﷺ in Madīna and the ruling that it is among the acts most pleasing to Allāh (*min a‘zam al-qurubāt*). We have documented the former in our *Four Imāms* (Muslim Academic Trust) and our introduction to Imām Ibn Jahbal’s refutation of Aḥmad ibn Taymiyya (AQSA Publications). As for the latter, al-Qaṣṭallānī is only expressing the Consensus of *Ahl al-Sunna*, in addition to his remark that some Mālikīs held the *ziyāra* to be obligatory, whether the materialists and intercession-deniers like it or not!

- He says that Imām al-Qaṣṭallānī, Allāh be well-pleased with him, said *lā yaṣīḥḥ* of the ḥadīth “Whoever makes pilgrimage and does not visit me, has been rude to me” then, “despite this admission, he builds on this ḥadīth his claim that the visit of the Prophet’s ﷺ grave is obligatory... how can they build their minor and major analogies and its results on a ḥadīth they admit to be a falsehood (*bāṭil*)??” This criticism shows ignorance of the difference between the *fiqhī* application to a ḥadīth of the expression “it is not *ṣaḥīḥ*” – such as the identical expression of Imām Aḥmad concerning the *Basmala* before *wuḍū’* whose ḥadīths are only *ḥasan* – and its preclusion from being used in absolute terms as if it were forged and “a falsehood”! As for the ḥadīth “Whoever makes pilgrimage and does not visit me, has been rude to me,” al-Dāraquṭnī narrated it in his *Sunan* and Imām

<sup>210</sup> See our translation of Shaykh al-Islām fil-Balad al-Ḥarām Sayyid Muḥammad ibn ‘Alawī al-Mālikī’s writings on the topic entitled *The Life of the Prophets in Their Graves*.

al-Lacknawī in his marginalia on Imām Muḥammad’s *Muwatta’* (chapter 49: On the Prophet’s ﷺ grave) said: “It is not forged as Ibn al-Jawzī and Ibn Taymiyya said, rather, a number of scholars consider its chain fair, and a number consider it weak.”

- He takes to task Imām al-Qaṣṭallānī, Allāh be well-pleased with him, for adducing the saying of Allāh Most High {*If they had only, when they wronged themselves, come unto you and asked the forgiveness of Allāh, and the Messenger had asked forgiveness for them, they would have found Allāh indeed Oft-Returning, Most Merciful*} (4:64) as a proof for the obligatoriness of visiting the grave of the Prophet ﷺ and not only in his lifetime the way the advocates of *ta’ṭīl* would have it. Yet the ruling cited by al-Qaṣṭallānī is the established understanding of the noble verse and found in the recognized sources for the Four Schools, among them:

**Shāfi’is:**

Al-Nawawī, *al-Adhkār* (Makka 1992 ed. p. 253-254), *Majmū’* (8:217),  
and *al-Īdāh*, chapter on visiting the grave of the Prophet ﷺ.

Ibn ‘Asākir, *Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq* (2:408).

Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr* (2:306) and *al-Bidāya wal-Nihāya* (Ma‘ārif ed. 1:180).

Ibn Jamā‘a, *Hidāyat al-Sālik* (3:1384).

Al-Samhūdī, *Khulāsat al-Wafā* (p. 121, from al-Nawawī).

Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī, *Shifā’ al-Siqām* (p. 52) and *al-Sayf al-Ṣaqīl fil-Radd ‘alā Ibn Zafīl* [= Ibn al-Qayyim];

Al-Haytamī, *al-Jawhar al-Munazzam fī Ziyārat al-Qabr al-Mukarram*.

Daḥlān, *Khulāṣat al-Kalām* (year 1204).

**Ḥanafis:**

Al-Nasafī’s *Tafsīr* and al-Alūsī’s *Tafsīr* (6:124-128).

Al-Shurunbulālī’s *Nūr al-Īdāh*.

Ibn al-Humām’s *Sharḥ Faṭḥ al-Qadīr* (2:337, 3:179-180).

Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī’s *Fayḍ al-Bārī* (2:433).

Ibn ‘Ābidīn, *Ḥāshiyā* (2:257).

**Mālikīs:**

Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ in *al-Shifā’*.

Al-Qurṭubī, *Tafsīr* of verse 4:64 in *Alḥkāṃ al-Qur’ān* (5:265).

Al-Nu‘mān ibn Muḥammad al-Tilimsānī’s (d. 683) *Miṣbāḥ al-Zalām*  
*fil-Mustaghīthīna bi-Khayr al-Anām* ‘Alayhi al-Ṣalāt wal-Salām.

Al-Zurqānī in *Sharḥ al-Mawāhib* and *al-Burhān fī ‘Ulūm al-Qur’ān*.

Ibn Qunfudh al-Qusanṭīnī in *Wasīlat al-Islām bil-Nabī* ‘Alayhi  
*al-Ṣalāt wal-Salām*.

**Ḥanbalīs:**

Ibn ‘Aqīl, *al-Tadhkira*.

Ibn Qudāma, *al-Mughnī* (3:556-557=3:298=5:465).

Ibn Mufliḥ, *Mubdi’* (3:259).

Shams al-Dīn Ibn Qudāma, *al-Sharḥ al-Kabīr* (3:494-495).

Al-Buhūtī, *Kashshāf al-Qinā’* (2:515=5:30).

Ibn al-Jawzī, *Muthīr al-Gharām al-Sākin ilā Ashraf al-Amākin* (p.  
490) and his *Tafsīr*.

Ibn al-Najjār, *Akhbār al-Madīna* (p. 147).

- Al-Khumayyis overtly lies about the commentary of the ḥadīth master al-Zurqānī – whom he calls a Ḥanafī! – on Imām al-Qaṣṭallānī’s denunciation of Ibn Taymiyya’s innovation in forbidding travel to visit the graves of the Prophet ﷺ. He cites al-Zurqānī’s citation of Ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī’s defense of his teacher but leaves out al-Zurqānī’s own words directly following Ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī’s citation in utter rejection of the latter’s excuses and in confirmation of the condemnation of Ibn Taymiyya as an innovator in the matter, per the *Jumhūr* of the Ulema of the Three Schools and many Ḥanbalīs including the Shaṭṭās of Damascus. This is the very *tahrīf* the Qur’ān and Sunna attribute to the Israelites who changed the meanings of the Book, leaving out what runs counter to their *hawā*.

- Al-Khumayyis quotes from al-Ālūsī’s Qur’ānic commentary that the latter supposedly criticized “al-Tāj al-Subkī for rebuking al-

Majd [Majd al-Dīn Ibn Taymiyya the grandfather], as is his habit” but [1] this is not Tāj al-Dīn but his father Taqī al-Dīn in *Shifā’ al-Siqām*, and [2] such a mistake is not from the hand of al-Ālūsī the Commentator but from his Wahhābī successors who tampered with his book as exposed by Imām al-Kawtharī in his *Maqālāt*, since the original author distinguishes effortlessly between al-Subkī father and son in over three dozen passages of his *Tafsīr*, and he calls the father “Mawlānā”! No doubt he would curse anyone who so offends *Ahl al-Sunna* as to call one of their foremost authorities a *qubūrī* since such disparagement is the unmistakable mark of heresy.

At any rate, the passage in question regards Imām al-Subkī’s rejection of Imām Majd al-Dīn Ibn Taymiyya’s endorsement of the position attributed to Imām Abū Ḥanīfa in prohibition of *tawassul* through the person of the Holy Prophet ﷺ. We addressed this misunderstanding in our *Four imāms and Their Schools* where we said:

Imām Abū Ḥanīfa nowhere objected to *tawassul* but only – as narrated from Abū Yūsuf in *Kitāb al-Āthār* – to the use of specific wordings in supplication, namely, “by the right You owe to So-and-so” (*bi-ḥaqqi fulāni ‘alayk*) and “by the joints of power and glory in Your Throne” (*bi-ma‘āqid al-‘izz min ‘arshik*).<sup>211</sup> The reason for this is that, on the one hand, Allāh owes no-one any right whatsoever except what He Himself condescends to state on His part as in the verse {*To help believers is incumbent upon Us (ḥaqqun ‘alaynā)*} (30:47). On the other hand, “by the right owed so-and-so” is an oath and is therefore a formula restricted to Allāh Himself on pains of *shirk*. Imām Abū Ḥanīfa said: “Let one not swear any oath except by Allāh alone, with a pure affirmation of *tawḥīd* and sincerity.”<sup>212</sup> A third reason is that the expression “the joints of power and glory in Your Throne” is a lone-narrator report and is therefore not retained

<sup>211</sup> Cf. al-Zabīdī, *Ithāf* (2:285), Ibn Abī al-‘Izz, *Sharḥ al-‘Aqīda al-Taḥāwīyya* (1988 9<sup>th</sup> ed. p. 237), *Durr* (2:630), *Fatāwā Hindīyya* (5:280), al-Qudūrī, *Sharḥ Mukhtaṣar al-Karkbī*, chapter on detested matters.

<sup>212</sup> Cf. al-Kāsānī, *Badā’i’ al-Ṣanā’i’* (3:8).

nor put into practice, in accordance with the rule for any such reports that might suggest anthropomorphism.

Those that claim<sup>213</sup> that the Imām objected to *tawassul* altogether are unable to adduce anything to support such a claim other than the above caveat, which is not against *tawassul* but against a specific, prohibitive wording in *tawassul*. A proof of this is that it is permissible in the Ḥanafī School to say “by the sanctity/honor of so-and-so in Your presence” (*bi-ḥurmatil/bi-jāhi fulān*). This is stated in the *Fatāwā Bazzāziyya* (6:351 in the margin of the *Fatāwā Hindiyya*) and is also the position of Abū al-Layth al-Samarqandī and Ibn ‘Ābidīn.

Even so, there is authentic evidence in [1] the ḥadīth of Fāṭima bint Asad,<sup>214</sup> [2] the ḥadīth “O Allāh, I ask You by the right of those

<sup>213</sup> Cf. Ibn Taymiyya, *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (1:202-203) and his imitators.

<sup>214</sup> Narrated from Anas by al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Kabīr* (24:351) and *al-Awsaṭ* (1:152) and Abū Nu‘aym in his *Ḥilya* (1985 ed. 3:121) with a chain containing Rawḥ ibn Ṣalāḥ concerning whom there is difference of opinion among the authorities. He is unknown according to Ibn al-Jawzī in *al-‘Ilal al-Mutanābiyya* (1:260-270), Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (3:146 §667), and al-Dāraquṭnī in *al-Mu’talif wal-Mukhtalif* (3:1377); Ibn Mākūlā in *al-Ikmāl* (5:15) declared him weak while al-Ḥākim asserted he was trustworthy and highly dependable (*thiqa ma’mūn*) – as mentioned by Ibn Ḥajar in *Lisān al-Miẓān* (2:465 §1876), Ibn Ḥibbān included him in *al-Thiqāt* (8:244), and al-Fasawī considered him trustworthy (cf. Mamdūḥ, *Raf‘* [p. 148]). Al-Haythamī(9:257) said: “Al-Ṭabarānī narrated it in *al-Kabīr* and *al-Awsaṭ*, its chain contains Rawḥ ibn Ṣalāḥ whom Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Ḥākim declared trustworthy although there is some weakness in him, and the rest of its sub-narrators are the men of sound ḥadīth.” I was unable to find Abū Ḥātim’s declaration of Rawḥ as trustworthy cited by Shaykh Muḥammad ibn ‘Alawī cf. *Mafāhīm* (10<sup>th</sup> ed. p. 145 n. 1). Nor does Shaykh Maḥmūd Mamdūḥ in his discussion of this ḥadīth in *Raf‘ al-Mināra li-Takbrīj Aḥādīth al-Tawassul wal-Ziyāra* (p. 147-155) mention such a grading on the part of Abū Ḥātim although he considers Rawḥ “truthful” (*ṣadūq*) and not “weak” (*da‘īf*), according to the rules of ḥadīth science when no reason is given with regard to a narrator’s purported discreditation (*jarḥ mubham ghayr mufassar*). Mamdūḥ (p. 149-150) noted that although Albānī in his *Silsila Ḍa‘īfa* (132-33) claims it is a case of explicated discreditation (*jarḥ mufassar*) yet he himself declares identically-formulated discreditation cases as unexplicated and therefore unacceptable in two different contexts! Al-Mālikī adds that the ḥadīth is also narrated from Ibn ‘Abbās by Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr – without specifying where – and from Jābir by Ibn Abī Shayba, but without the *du‘ā*. Imām al-Kawtharī said of this ḥadīth in his *Maqālāt* (p. 410): “It provides textual evidence whereby there is no difference between the living

who ask You (*bi-ḥaqqi al-sā'ilīna 'alayk*),”<sup>215</sup> [3] the ḥadīth: “O Allāh, I ask You by the joints of power in the Throne,”<sup>216</sup> and [4] the ḥadīth: “Do you know the right owed to Allāh by His slaves and the right owed by Allāh to his slaves?”<sup>217</sup> to support the permissibility of such a wording. If the above objection is authentically reported from Abū Ḥanīfa then either he did not deem these ḥadīths authentic by his standards, or they did not reach him. An illustration of this is that Abū

and the dead in the context of using a means (*tawassul*), and this is explicit *tawassul* through the Prophets, while the ḥadīth of the Prophet ﷺ from Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī [see next note] constitutes *tawassul* through the generality of the Muslims, both the living and the dead.”

<sup>215</sup> A ḥasan ḥadīth of the Prophet ﷺ according to Shaykh Maḥmūd Mamdūh in his monograph *Mubāḥathat al-Sā'irīn bi-Ḥadīth Allāhumma Innī As'aluka bi-Ḥaqqi al-Sā'ilīn* narrated from Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī by Aḥmad in his *Musnad* with a fair chain according to Ḥamza al-Zayn (10:68 §11099) – a weak chain according to al-Arna'ūṭ (17:247-248 §11156) who considers it, like Abū Ḥātim in *al-'Ilal* (2:184), more likely a *mawqūf* saying of Abū Sa'īd himself; Ibn Mājah with a chain he declared weak, Ibn al-Sunnī in *'Amal al-Yawm wal-Layla* (p. 40 §83-84), al-Bayhaqī in *al-Da'awāt al-Kabīr* (p. 47=1:47 §65), Ibn Khuzayma in *al-Tawḥīd* (p. 17-18=1:41) [and his *Ṣaḥīḥ* per al-Būṣīrī, *Zawā'id* (1:98-99)], al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Du'a* (p. 149=2:990), Ibn Ja'd in his *Musnad* (p. 299), al-Baghawī in *al-Ja'dīyyāt* (§2118-2119) and – *mawqūf* – by Ibn Abī Shayba (6:25=10:211-212) and Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *'Ilal* (2:184). Al-'Irāqī in *Takbrīj Aḥādīth al-Iḥyā'* (1:291) graded it ḥasan as a *marfū'* ḥadīth as did the ḥadīth Masters al-Dimiyāṭī in *al-Muttajir al-Rābiḥ fī Thawāb al-'Amal al-Ṣāliḥ* (p. 471-472), Ibn Ḥajar in *Amālī al-Adhkār* (1:272-273) and al-Mundhirī's Shaykh the ḥadīth Master Abū al-Ḥasan al-Maqdisī in *al-Tarḡīb* (1994 ed. 2:367 §2422=1997 ed. 2:304-305) and as indicated by Ibn Qudāma, *Mughnī* (1985 Dār al-Fikr ed. 1:271). Mamdūh in his monograph rejected the weakening of this ḥadīth by Naṣīr Albānī and Ḥammād al-Anṣārī.

<sup>216</sup> Narrated from [1] the Companion Qayla bint Makhrama by al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Kabīr* (25:12) with a fair chain according to al-Haythamī (10:124-125); [2] Ibn Mas'ūd by al-Bayhaqī in *al-Da'awāt al-Kabīr* (2:157 §392) – Ibn al-Jawzī in *al-Mawḍū'āt* (2:142) claimed that it was forged as cited by al-Zayla'ī in *Naṣb al-Rāya* (4:272-273) but this ruling was rejected by al-Suyūṭī in *al-La'ālī*' (2:68); [3] *maqṭū'* from Wuhayb by Abū Nu'aym in the *Ḥilya* (1985 ed. 8:158-159); [4] Abū Hurayra by Ibn 'Asākir with a very weak chain cf. Ibn 'Arrāq, *Tanzīh al-Sharī'a* (1:228); and [5] Abū Bakr in *al-Tadwīn* and *al-Firdaws*.

<sup>217</sup> Narrated from Mu'adh in the *Sunan* and Aḥmad save al-Nasā'ī.

Yūsuf permitted the formula “By the joints of power...”<sup>218</sup> Further, the opposite is also reported from Abū Ḥanīfa, namely, that he permitted *tawassul* using those very expressions. Ibn ‘Ābidīn said: “In the *Tatārkhāniyya*: The *Āthār* also report what shows permissibility.” Then he cites – from al-Qārī’s *Sharḥ al-Nuqāya*, al-Munāwī quoting Ibn ‘Abd al-Salām (cf. the very first of his *Fatāwā* in the printed *Risāla* edition), and al-Subkī – further explanations that it is permitted, then he cites the fatwa by Ibn Amīr al-Ḥajj in the thirteenth chapter of *Sharḥ al-Munya* that permissibility is not limited to *tawassul* through the Prophet ﷺ but extends to the *Ṣāliḥīn*.<sup>219</sup>

- Al-Khumayyis rages at Imām al-Qaṣṭallānī for stating that one faces the Noble Grave when making *du‘ā* during *ziyāra* although this, too, is a matter of the *Jumhūr* approving and condoning this as we have shown in our documentations of the exchange to that effect between Imām Mālik and the Caliph al-Manṣūr and the ensuing positions of the Four Schools in our *Four Imāms and Their Schools* where we said:

The position is held by some of the Ḥanafī Masters such as Abū al-Layth al-Samarqandī and those that followed him such as al-Kirmānī and al-Sarrūjī as well as al-Kamushkhānawī in *Jāmi‘ al-Manāsik*, his commentary on Raḥmat Allāh al-Sindī’s *Jamī‘ al-Manāsik*, that Abū Ḥanīfa forbade the facing of the Noble Grave during supplication. However, al-Qārī in *al-Maslak al-Mutaqassit* – his large commentary on the same work by al-Sindī – said: (1) Ibn al-Humām said that it is belied by Abū Ḥanīfa’s own narration in his *Musnad* from Ibn ‘Umar that it is part of the Sunna to face the Noble Grave and turn one’s back to the *Qibla*; (2) Ibn al-Humām also said, “This [narration of Ibn ‘Umar] is the sound position (*al-ṣaḥīḥ*) in the *madhhab* of Abū Ḥanīfa, and Abū al-Layth’s claim that his *madhhab* is the contrary, is untenable because the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ is alive, and whoever comes to someone who is alive,

<sup>218</sup> Cf. al-Kāsānī, *Badā‘i’ al-Ṣanā‘i’* (5:126).

<sup>219</sup> Ibn ‘Ābidīn, *Hāshiya* (6:396-397).

faces him”; (3) al-Qārī added, this is confirmed by al-Fayrūzābādī’s narration [in *Sifr al-Sa‘āda*?] from Ibn al-Mubārak that Abū Ḥanifa observed al-Sakhtiyānī do the same during the latter’s visitation.<sup>220</sup> Allāh knows best.

The same Khumayyis produced another 600-page brick entitled *al-Majmū‘ al-Mufīd fī Naqd al-Qubūriyyati wa-Nuṣrati al-Tawḥīd* which he published in 1997 at Riyadh’s Dār Aṭlas<sup>221</sup> and where he hurls insults and anathema at the Sunnis who visit graves and believe in the intercession of the righteous. He also wrote against *Tafsīr al-Jalālayn*, al-Shawkānī’s *Tafsīr Faḥ al-Qadīr*, collective *dhikr*, and al-Sahāranfurī’s .

12: MAḤMŪD ‘ABD AL-RA’ŪF AL-QĀSIM AL-MADKHALĪ

**Al-Madkhalī, Maḥmūd ‘Abd al-Ra’ūf al-Qāsim.** Like Dimashqīyya, an unknown whose claim to fame is a 1993 book written against Ṣūfis which he titled *al-Kashf ‘an Ḥaqīqat al-Ṣūfiyya* ("Unveiling the Reality of the Ṣūfis"). The book was refuted by the late Dr. ‘Abd al-Qadīr ‘Īsā in his 700-page *Ḥaqā’iq ‘an al-Taṣawwuf*.

13: RABĪ’ IBN HĀDĪ AL-MADKHALĪ

**Al-Madkhalī, Rabī’ ibn Hādī.** Another graduate of the universities of Madīna and Umm al-Qurā where he studied under Albānī and Bin Bāz among others and acquired pretensions of hadith scholarship earning him the obeisance of schoolless *Lā-Madhhabīyya* all the way to Benares, India. He burgeoned into a government “Salafī” whose role seems principally to depoliticize Wahhābism, writing against the Ikhwān al-Muslimūn and Sayyid Qutb. Among his several critiques of

<sup>220</sup> Al-Qārī, *al-Maslak al-Mutaqassit* (p. 282), Ibn al-Humām, *Faḥ al-Qadīr* (3:180).

<sup>221</sup> The name “Atlas” originates in Greco-Roman mythology and refers to a Titan or giant, son of Iapetus and brother of Prometheus and Epimetheus, condemned to support the sky on his shoulders and identified by the ancients with the Atlas Mountains.



the latter is the illuminating *Maṭāʿin Sayyid Qutb fī Aṣḥābi Rasūlillāh* ﷺ (“Sayyid Qutb’s Disparagements of the Prophetic Companions”). A Moroccan Qutbian by the name of ‘Azzābī lashed back with a book entitled *al-Kashf al-Jalī ‘an Zulūmāt Rabīʿ al-Madkhalī*. After al-Tuwayjirī and al-Wādiʿī, al-Madkhalī was the third of three to write against Jamāʿat al-Tabligh. He targets the Azharī Shaykh Muḥammad al-Ghazālī with a passion and even disparages fellow “Salafis” such as his nemesis Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī as well as Nāṣir al-Albānī, Bakr Abū Zayd, Ḥamza al-Mālībārī, and ‘Adnān al-Khalīfa. Against the latter three he wrote *al-Ḥadd al-Fāṣil, al-Tankīl bi-mā lil-Mālībārī min al-Abāṭīl*, and the cataclysmically titled *Inqīdād al-Shuḥab al-Salafiyya ‘alā Awwāk ‘Adnān al-Khalīfa* (“The Slamming of the Salaphitical Firebrands into ‘Adnān al-Khalīfa’s Lairs”). In the latter book he had the unmitigated gall to rank Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, Bin Bāz, Albānī, Khalīl Harrās, and Muḥammad al-Fiqqī among “the true Imāms of Islām and Sunna” alongside al-Awzāʿī and the Four Imāms (less Abū Ḥanīfa!). Like most Wahhābīs, he distills his worst venom for Sayyid Aḥmad Zaynī Daḥlān, Imām Muḥammad Zāhid al-Kawtharī, and the Sufis in general, the latter in his *Kashf Zayf al-Taṣawwuf*. Like al-Qaḥṭānī he authored a book entitled *al-Walāʾ wal-Barāʾ*. In his book *Jamāʿatun Wāḥīdatun Lā Jamāʿat* al-Madkhalī denies the truth of the landing of a man on the moon.

In Shawwal 1416 during his “Second Spring Camp” in Kuwait he relatedly said: “The Ikhwan al-Muslimin are more harmful to Islām than the clear *kuffār*, as the Muslims are not deceived by the *kuffār*; but they are deceived by these astray innovators.” When asked if the Ikhwan and Jamaat at-Tabligh were among the 72 sects destined for Hell, he replied “Yes.”

Al-Madkhalī edited and published Ibn Taymiyya’s *Qāʿida Jalīla fīl-Tawassul wal-Wasīla*, prompting his fellow “Salafi” Samīr ibn Khalīl al-Mālīkī to list his mistakes in Ḥadīth documentation along with those made by al-Qaḥṭānī in his edition of *al-Sunna* (attributed to ‘Abd Allah ibn Ahmed’) in a book entitled *Bayān al-Wahm wal-Īhām al-Wāqiʿayn fī Taʿlīqāt al-Shaykhayn*.

14: MUḤAMMAD AL-QAḤṬĀNĪ

Al-Qaḥṭānī is an Umm al-Qurā University graduate and author of the deviant book *al-Walā' wal-Barā'*. An English version of this book was widely disseminated in the US and Europe in which the Mu'tazilī statement can be read that among the “ten actions that negate Islām” is “[2] Relying on an intermediary between oneself and Allāh when seeking intercession.” This is contradicted by the literal meaning of intercession, the Sunnī creed in the *shafā'a* of the Prophet ﷺ, and the advice of all the great Prophets to humanity to seek out our Prophet's ﷺ intercession with Allāh ﷻ followed by the response of the Prophet ﷺ “I am the one that can undertake it” (*anā lahā*) in the ḥadīth of the Great Intercession (*al-shafā'at al-kubrā*).<sup>222</sup> Al-Qaḥṭānī is also responsible for the re-edition and recirculation of a compilation of anthropomorphist forgeries attributed to 'Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal under the title *Kitāb al-Sunna*.<sup>223</sup>

15: MASHHŪR ḤASAN SALMĀN

One of the most industrious and skillful of the list, Mashhūr Salmān authored a book against Imām al-Nawawī pompously titled, “The Refutations and Critiques of the Figurative Interpretations of the Divine Attributes Committed by Imām al-Nawawī in *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and Other Important Matters” (*al-Rudūd wal-Ta'aqqubāt 'alā Mā Waqa'a lil-Imām al-Nawawī fī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim min al-Ta'wīl fīl-Ṣifāt wa-Ghayrihā min al-Masā'il al-Muhimmāt*) which he begins with the words:

He [al-Nawawī] has committed [!] in his book certain lapses and a host of mistakes related to the Names and Attributes of Allāh, among other important matters, which are overlooked by his commentators, not to mention his readers, without any reference back

<sup>222</sup> Narrated by al-Bukhārī in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* from al-Ḥasan al Baṣrī, from Anas.

<sup>223</sup> See the analysis of this book in the chapter on Imām Aḥmad in our *Four Imāms*. See also section on Rabī' al-Madkhalī in this book.

to the school of the pious *Salaf* in those all-encompassing matters, which ought to be made as clear as the sun.<sup>224</sup>

Mashhūr Salmān then proceeds with three hundred pages in which he casts aspersions on Imām al-Nawawī’s explanations of the ḥadīths of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* pertaining to the attributes as wrong, rejected, unsound, and deviant according to himself and to Muḥammad Harrās – in his commentary on Ibn Taymiyya’s *‘Aqīda Wāsiṭiyya* –, at the same time specifying that al-Nawawī’s views are founded on al-Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ’s previous commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, and that the “refutations and critiques” apply to ‘Iyāḍ also, as well as Ibn Fūrāk, al-Khaṭṭābī, Ibn Mahdī al-Ṭabarī, al-Bayhaqī, al-Māzarī, al-Qurṭubī, and Ibn Ḥajar!<sup>225</sup>

One of the main reasons for Salmān’s attack against Imām al-Nawawī is in order to dispute the latter’s Sunni definition of *tafwīḍ*. In many passages of *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, al-Nawawī defines *tafwīḍ* as “committal of the meaning” (*tafwīḍ al-ma‘nā*) by which, according to him, we speak of “the Hand of Allāh” but we commit the meaning of this expression to Allāh Most High. Mashhūr Salmān, copying Ibn Taymiyya, defines *tafwīḍ* as “committal of the modality” (*tafwīḍ al-kayf*) and not that of meaning, thus asserting that when we speak of “the Hand of Allāh” we do understand its meaning but commit its modality to Allāh Most High, and that to say that we commit its meaning “is the way of nullification of the Divine Attributes (*ta‘ṭīl*)!”<sup>226</sup> In other words, according to the “Salafīs,” (1) those who commit the meaning to Allāh are like Mu‘tazilīs and Jahmīs who deny the reality of the Attributes of Allāh and (2) they – the “Salafīs” – **know the meaning of the Divine Attributes but do not know the “how” of this meaning.**

One can only surmise that the reason Mashhūr Salmān insists so much on such an aberration is because he is such an ardent lover of

<sup>224</sup> Mashhūr Ḥasan Salmān, *al-Rudūd wal-Ta‘aqqubāt* (Ryad: Dār al-Hijra, 1993) p. 8.

<sup>225</sup> Cf. section titled “Dwarves on the Shoulders of Giants” in the *Encyclopedia of Islamic Doctrine* (1:174-177) = *Islamic Beliefs and Doctrine* (p. 204-208).

<sup>226</sup> Salmān, *al-Rudūd wal-Ta‘aqqubāt* (p. 67-84).

Ibn Taymiyya and another one of his bumbling literalist imitators. In his attempt to force a particular error of the latter through the wall of correct doctrine, namely his claim that “Mālik did not say that the modality was inexistent but only that it was unknown,”<sup>227</sup> Salmān desperately tries to prove that committal must therefore consist only in the committal of modality (*kayfiyya*) and not that of meaning (*ma'nā*).

But the premise itself of the argument is entirely based on an inauthentic version of Imām Mālik's statement on *istiwā'*! For the authentic narrations of Imām Mālik's famous statement all have, “The modality is altogether inconceivable” (*al-kayfu ghayru ma'qūl*), **not** “unknown” as claimed by “Salafīs.” Therefore, as held by al-Nawawī in the Ash'arī School and by Imām al-Pazdawī in the Māturīdī – as the latter explained in the passage on the *mutashābih* of his monumental work on *uṣūl* – the meaning itself is the problem.<sup>228</sup>

- From Ja'far ibn 'Abd Allāh: “We were with Mālik when a man came and asked him: ‘Abū 'Abd Allāh! {*The Merciful established Himself over the Throne*} (20:5): how is He established?’ Nothing affected Mālik so much as that man's question. He looked at the ground and started prodding it with a twig he held in his hand until he was completely soaked in sweat. Then he lifted his head and said: ‘The “how” of it is inconceivable; the ‘establishment’ part of it is not unknown; belief in it is obligatory; asking about it is an innovation; and I believe that you are a man of innovation.’ Then he gave an order and the man was led out.”<sup>229</sup>
- From Ibn Wahb: “We were with Mālik when a man asked him: ‘Abū 'Abd Allāh! {*The Merciful established Himself over the Throne*} (20:5): how is His establishment?’ Mālik lowered his head

<sup>227</sup> Ibn Taymiyya, *al-Iklīl fil-Mutashābih wal-Ta'wīl* in his *Majmū'at al-Rasā'il* (13:309-310).

<sup>228</sup> Al-Nawawī, *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (Turāth ed. 3:19-20; 5:24-25; 6:36-37; 12:211-212; 16:166; 16:204; 17:3; 17:36; 17:129-132; 17:182-183); Pazdawī (d. 482), *Uṣūl al-Pazdawī* and *Kasbf al-Asrār* (1:55-60).

<sup>229</sup> Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar* (7:415).

and began to sweat profusely. Then he lifted up his head and said: ‘{*The Merciful established Himself over the Throne*} just as He described Himself. One cannot ask “how.” “How” does not apply to Him. And you are an evil man, a man of innovation. Take him out!’ The man was led out.”<sup>230</sup>

- From Yaḥyā ibn Yaḥyā al-Tamīmī and Mālik’s Shaykh Rabī‘a ibn Abī ‘Abd al-Raḥmān: “We were with Mālik when a man came and asked him: ‘Abū ‘Abd Allāh! {*The Merciful established Himself over the Throne*} (20:5): how is He established?’ Mālik lowered his head and remained thus until he was completely soaked in sweat. Then he said: ‘The establishment is not unknown; the “how” is inconceivable; belief in it is obligatory; asking about it is an innovation; and I do not think that you are anything but an innovator.’ Then he ordered that the man be led out.”<sup>231</sup> Shaykh al-Islām Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī pointed out that the inconceivability of the modality of *istiḥwā*’ proved that it precluded the meaning of sitting.<sup>232</sup>

Before Salmān, Nu‘mān al-Alūsī – the “Salafī” son of the famous commentator of Qur’ān– took the side of Ibn Taymiyya in an epistle titled *Jalā’ al-‘Aynayn fī Muḥākamat al-Aḥmadayn* and was refuted

<sup>230</sup> Narrated by al-Bayhaqī with a sound chain in *al-Asmā’ wal-Ṣifāt* (2:304-305 §866), al-Dhahabī in the *Siyar* (7:416), and Ibn Ḥajar in *Fath al-Bārī* (1959 ed. 13:406-407; 1989 ed. 13:501).

<sup>231</sup> Narrated by al-Bayhaqī with a sound chain in *al-Asmā’ wal-Ṣifāt* (2:305-306 §867), al-Baghawī in *Sharḥ al-Sunna* (1:171), al-Lālikā’ī in *Sharḥ Uṣūl al-‘Itiqād* (2:398), Ibn Abī Zayd al-Qayrawānī in *al-Jāmi’ fil-Sunan* (p. 123), Abū Nu‘aym in the *Hilya* (6:325-326), cf. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr in *al-Tamhīd* (7:151) and Ibn Ḥajar in the *Fath* (13:407). The wording that says: “The ‘how’ is unknown” (*al-kayfu majhūl*) is falsely attributed to Imām Mālik, although also cited from Rabī‘a with a sound chain by al-Bayhaqī in *al-Asmā’ wal-Ṣifāt* (2:306 §868) and without chain by Ibn al-‘Arabī in *‘Arīḍat al-Aḥwādī* (2:235), but is an aberrant narration (*riwāya shādhidha*). Yet it is the preferred wording of Ibn Taymiyya in *Dār’ Ta’aruḍ al-‘Aql wal-Naql* (1:278) and *Majmū’ al-Fatāwā* (17:373), as he infers from it support for his positions although he reports it as “The ‘how’ is inconceivable” in his *Ḥamawīyya* (p. 307).

<sup>232</sup> In *al-Sayf al-Ṣaqīl* (p. 128).

by Qāḍī Yūsuf al-Nabhānī who pointed out in his *Shawāhid al-Haqq* (p. 251) that “if the meaning of such verses were known it could not be other than in the sense in which the attributes of created entities are known, as in *istiwā’* in the sense of sitting (*al-julūs*) which we know in relation to ourselves, and this applies to the rest of the ambiguous terms.”

Salmān also defends Ibn Taymiyya against the charge of “brazen apostasy in the open daylight of the Muslim world” as leveled against him by al-Kawtharī for saying the following:

You [Ash‘arīs] say that [Allāh ﷻ] is neither a body, nor an atom (*jawhar*), nor spatially bounded (*mutahayyiz*), and that He has no direction, and that He cannot be pointed to as an object of sensory perception, and that nothing of Him can be considered distinct from Him. You have asserted this on the grounds that Allāh is neither divisible nor made of parts and that He has neither limit (*ḥadd*) nor end (*ghāya*), with your view thereby to forbid one to say that He has any limit or measure (*qadr*), or that He even has a dimension that is unlimited. But how do you allow yourselves to do this without evidence from the Book and the Sunna?<sup>233</sup>

Al-Kawtharī commented the above lines with the words: “The reader’s intelligence suffices to comment on these heretical statements. Can you imagine for an apostate to be more brazen than this, right in the midst of a Muslim society?”<sup>234</sup>

Salmān indirectly acknowledges the heresy of the Taymiyyan position by claiming that “he was merely paraphrasing the position of those who affirm the Attributes among the *mutakallimīn*.”<sup>235</sup> Yet, as he undoubtedly knows, this particular argument of Ibn Taymiyya comes up too frequently and too favorably under his pen not to be unreservedly attributed to him!<sup>236</sup> Furthermore the apology is entirely

<sup>233</sup> Ibn Taymiyya, *al-Ta’sīs* (1:101) = *Bayān Talbīs al-Jahmiyya* (1:444).

<sup>234</sup> Al-Kawtharī, *Maqālāt* (p. 350-353).

<sup>235</sup> Salmān, *al-Rudūd* (p. 21-22).

<sup>236</sup> Cf. Ibn Taymiyya, *Bayān Talbīs* (1:548, 1:600, 2:169); *Sharḥ Ḥadīth al-Nuzul*

inaccurate, as the position that Allāh ﷻ has no limit (*ḥadd*) pre-dates the Ash‘arīs and was held by ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib ؑ and the *Salaf* as well, such as al-Tustarī, Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Sufyān al-Thawrī, Shu‘ba, Ḥammād ibn Zayd, Ḥammād ibn Salama, Sharīk, Abū ‘Awāna, Ibn al-Mājīshūn, Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī, Ibn Kullāb, Abū Ḥātim, al-Ash‘arī, Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, Mālik, al-Ṭaḥāwī, Ibn Khafīf, Ibn Fūrāk, Ibn Hibbān, al-Khaṭṭābī, al-Qushayrī, and al-Bayhaqī.<sup>237</sup>

As mentioned before, Mashhūr Salmān is responsible for recirculating al-Qārī’s denounced book titled *Mu‘taqad al-Imām Abī Ḥanīfa* claiming that the parents of the Prophet ﷺ are in Hellfire. He is also responsible for reviving al-Bayhaqī’s *al-Khilāfiyyāt* (“The Divergences” [between al-Shāfi‘ī and Abū Ḥanīfa]),<sup>238</sup> essentially a refutation of the Ḥanafī school on *fiqh* divergences and a brilliant work but one which Ibn al-Subkī said “is appreciated only by experts in both *fiqh* and ḥadīth.” Undoubtedly, Mashhūr Salmān edited and printed such a book as part of the anti-Ḥanafī campaign being waged in the Indo-Pakistani subcontinent and elsewhere and not because it is a classic of *khilāf* literature, as the man is neither a Ḥanafī nor a Shāfi‘ī specialist.<sup>239</sup>

Salmān published a work titled *KutubunḤadhdhara al-‘Ulamā’u minhā* (“Books the Ulema Warned Against”), the “Salafi” equivalent of the Vatican’s *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* (a guide listing books that the Roman Catholic Church forbade its members to read – except by special permission – because they were judged dangerous to faith or morals). A proof that this is in part an indirect guide to Sunnī books deemed undesirable only by the supporters of innovation and

(69-76); *Majmū’ al-Fatawā* (3:306-310, 13:304-305); *Minhāj* (2:134-135, 192, 198-200, 527).

<sup>237</sup> See the chapter on Imām Aḥmad in our *Four Imāms and Their Schools*.

<sup>238</sup> Riyad: Dār al-Ṣumay‘ī, 1994.

<sup>239</sup> Al-Bayhaqī’s *Khilāfiyyāt* was counter-refuted by Imām ‘Alī ibn ‘Uthmān ibn Ibrāhīm ‘Ala’ al-Dīn al-Mārdīnī – known as Ibn al-Turkumānī – (d. 750) with his two-volume *al-Jawhar al-Naqī fīl-Radd ‘alā al-Bayhaqī* which exists in print in the margins of al-Bayhaqī’s *Sunan al-Kubrā* (Hyderabad 1316/1898) and awaits reissue. On Ibn al-Turkumānī see *al-Fawā’id al-Bahīyya* (p. 207) and *al-Durar al-Kāmina* (3:156-157).

misguidance is the fact that Salmān includes in it Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb’s (d. 1210/1795) classic refutation of his younger brother Muḥammad titled *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb min Kitābillāh wa-Ḥadīthi al-Rasūl ﷺ wa-Kalāmi Ulī al-Albāb fī Madhhabī Ibnī ‘Abd al-Wahhāb* (“The Final Word from the Qur’ān, the Ḥadīth, and the Sayings of the Scholars Concerning the School of Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb”), also known as *al-Ṣawā’iq al-Ilāhiyya fī Madhhab al-Wahhābiyya* (“The Divine Thunderbolts Concerning the Wahhābī School”). This valuable book is the first and earliest refutation of the Wahhābī sect in print, consisting in over forty-five concise chapters spanning 120 pages that show beyond doubt the fundamental divergence of the Wahhābī school, not only from the Consensus and *uṣūl* of *Ahl al-Sunna wal-Jamā’a* and the *fiqh* of the Ḥanbalī *madhhab*, but also from their putative Imāms, Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Qayyim on most or all the issues reviewed. The *Faṣl/Ṣawā’iq* received the following editions:

1<sup>st</sup> edition: Bombay: Maṭba‘at Nukhbat al-Akhbār,  
1306/1889.

2<sup>nd</sup> edition: Cairo.

3<sup>rd</sup> edition: Istanbul: Ishik reprints at Wakf Ihlas, 1399/1979.

4<sup>th</sup> edition: (Unannotated) Damascus, 1418/1997

(*al-Ṣawā’iq*).

5<sup>th</sup> edition: (Annotated) Damascus, 1420/1999 (*Faṣl*).

Even in his own edition of Imām Abū Shāma’s *al-Bā’ith ‘alā Inkār al-Bida‘ wal-Ḥawādith* (“Assault on All Innovations”), Mashhūr Salmān explodes in a footnote of disapproval because, when it comes to *Mawlid*, Abū Shāma instead of censoring it dares to say: “Truly it is a praiseworthy innovation and a blessed one”! Similarly, Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Fiqqī, an Egyptian Wahhābī, objects apoplectically to Ibn Taymiyya in his edition of the latter’s *Iqtidā’ al-Sirāt al-Mustaqīm* in the section entitled: “Innovated festivities of time and place” for his saying that “some people innovate a celebration out of love for the Prophet ﷺ and to exalt him, and Allah ﷻ may reward them for this love and striving,” with a two-page footnote exclaiming: “How can



they possibly obtain a reward for this?! What striving is in this?!” Not content to tamper with the motherbooks of *Ahl al-Sunna*, Wahhābīs object even to their own putative sources. This phenomenon illustrates the principle that each new generation of innovators rejects the previous one as too moderate.

Mashhūr Salmān was accused of plagiarizing a book on *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* written by a professor of ḥadīth at the university of Yarmūk in Jordan, Muḥammad al-Ṭawāliba, for his own book *Manhaj al-Imām Muslim fil-Ṣaḥīḥ*.

#### 16: MUḤAMMAD AL-SHUQAYRĪ

He wrote a book titled *al-Sunna wal-Mubtada‘āt* in which he violated the most elementary rules of the Arabic language and displayed thorough ignorance of the meanings of “Sunna” and *bid‘a*. He showed blind fanaticism and attacked the scholars of the Community as innovators on the misconceived basis of the ḥadīth of the Prophet ﷺ on *bid‘a*.<sup>240</sup> He was refuted by Sayyid ‘Abd Allāh Maḥfūz al-Ḥaddād in his book *al-Sunna wal-Bid‘a* in which the latter adduces more than three hundred and fifty narrations of the Prophet ﷺ and the Companions ﷺ illustrating the Sunnī understanding of “Sunna” and *bid‘a*.<sup>241</sup>

#### 17: ḤAMD IBN ‘ABD AL-MUḤSIN AL-TUWAYJIRĪ

He is the mufti who demanded that women caught driving in Saudi Arabia be labeled as prostitutes in the lawcourts. In his introduction to his edition of Ibn Taymiyya’s anthropomorphist manifesto – the *Fatwā Ḥamawīyya* – he states: “The proponents of the Ash‘arī school have named it, falsely and slanderously, the school of *Ahl al-Sunna wal-Jamā‘a*.” He mutters similar aspersions in his introduction to al-Harawī’s *Dhamm ‘Ilm al-Kalām*. This man also wrote a separate book declaring Mātūrīdīs heretics, and in his *‘Aqīdat Ahl al-Īmān fī Khalqī Ādama*

<sup>240</sup> Cf. Sayyid Yūsuf al-Rifā‘ī, *Naṣīḥa*, Advice §4, “Calling the Muslims: ‘Innovators’.”

<sup>241</sup> See our *Sunna Notes II: The Excellent Innovation*.

**Al-Wādi'ī:** We do not have the time and the facilities for Jihad.

**Q.** What about the British student who was murdered recently [in your school]?

**Al-Wādi'ī:** I understood they were cleaning or playing with the gun... a bullet came out of the gun towards his chest leading to his death... Guns, as I said, are prohibited for the use of unqualified students.

Unable to have himself treated in Yemen for a liver disease, al-Wādi'ī was taken to Saudi Arabia for care and, on his Saudi hospital deathbed, recanted the edict of apostasy he had pronounced against the Saudi government. He enshrined his final kowtow in a 32-page tract entitled with fanfare *Mushāhadātī fīl-Mamlakati al-'Arabiyyati al-Sa'ūdiyya* ("My Witnessings in the Arab Kingdom of Saudi Arabia"). Among his successors are Muḥammad and Aḥmad al-Waṣābī and the foul-mouthed Yaḥyā al-Ḥajūrī.

## 20: ZĀHIR, IḤSĀN ILĀHĪ

Zāhir<sup>272</sup> is a rabid anti-Sufi from Pakistan who wrote a pernicious book titled *al-Barelwiyya* in collaboration with the publishers of Maṭba'at al-Rashīd, a Saudi publishing house based in Madina. The book is prefaced by another Wahhābī, a certain Aṭiyya Muḥammad Sālim from Saudi Arabia (student of Ḥammād al-Anṣārī). In the beginning, some Deobandis were happy to see this book as it condemned the great Imām Aḥmad Riḍā. Later, however, the Wahhabis of Pakistan brought out a second book titled *al-Deobandiyya*, in which the Deobandis are unceremoniously labeled "the hypocritical little brothers of the Barelwis" and are also condemned as "*mushrik*" and "*bid'atī*." Zāhir was killed in a terrorist bombing in Pakistan. From his *Barelwiyya*:

<sup>272</sup> Quotations have been diacritically modified to standardize transliteration.

(1) *The claim that the name ‘Abd al-Muṣṭafā is shirk.*

“[Imām] Aḥmad Riḍā Khān al-Barelwī [Allāh have mercy on him] would refer to himself in many of his works as ‘Abd al-Muṣṭafā (Slave of al-Muṣṭafā – a name of the Prophet ﷺ). Such a name, obviously, is not allowed. However, this was not his only expression of *shirk*...”

Our liege-lord ‘Umar ؓ said on the pulpit, “I was with the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ and I was his slave and his servant (*kuntu ‘abdahu wa-khādīmahu*).”<sup>273</sup>

Furthermore, to say that the name ‘Abd al-Muṣṭafā is an expression of *shirk* shows a very bad opinion of Muslims – an unislamic trait, especially if one means rejection of the yoke of allegiance to the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ, *wal-‘iyādhu billāh!*

“Slave of the Prophet” is an unusual but not a forbidden name to bear. It does not signify worship, nor is it an expression of *shirk*. It refers to a bond of allegiance and respect which is required of every Muslim.

Imām Aḥmad Riḍā did name himself ‘Abd al-Muṣṭafā and would sign all his fatwas with that name. In a *na‘at* verse in Urdu, he said:

*Khauf Na Rakh Raza Tu To Hai Abdul Mustafa  
Teray Liyay Aman Hai Teray Liyay Aman Hai*

*Do Not have Fear O Raza You are the Slave of the Mustafa  
For You There is Safety For You There is Safety !*

There are several examples of such names for Sunni Ulema in Islamic history:

- Al-Sayyid ‘Abd al-Nabī ibn al-Sayyid al-Ṭayyib al-Bilkrāmī in the book of al-Sayyid Āzād al-Bakrī titled *Ma’āthir al-Kirām Tārīkh Bilkrām* as cited in Shaykh Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān al-Qinnawjī’s *Abjad al-‘Ulūm* in his notice on Shaykh Yāsīn al-Qinnawjī.

<sup>273</sup> Narrated by al-Ḥakīm (*ṣaḥīḥ* with a strong chain), al-Bayhaqī in *al-I‘tiqād*, Ibn Bishrān in his *Fawā‘id* (cf. *Kanz al-‘Ummāl*), and Ibn ‘Asākir (44:264).

- “*Al-Imām al-‘Allāmat al-Ḥujjat al-Qudwat al-Fahhāma Muftī al-Sādat al-Mālikīyya bi-Dimashq*” ‘Abd al-Nabī ibn Jamā‘a al-Mālikī al-Maghribī the student of the Moroccan Sufi *Mujāhid* and *Walī* al-Sayyid Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Maymūn al-Hāshimī al-Qurashī al-Tabbāsī (d. 917), teacher of Qāḍī al-Quḍāt Abūl-Khayr Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Qādir ibn Gibrīl al-Ghazzī al-Mālikī, and son of the Shāfi‘ī Imām of Maṣjid al-Aqṣā Shaykh Muḥyī al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Qādir ibn Jamā‘a al-Maqdisī al-Qādirī (d. 931) as mentioned in their respective biographies in *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* while the author of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Buṣrawī in his *Tārīkh* describes Shaykh ‘Abd al-Nabī ibn Jamā‘a as “one of people of learning and Religion who is trusted” and the author of *al-Dāris fī Tārīkh al-Madāris* names him “Shaykh al-Islām ‘Abd al-Nabī al-Maghribī al-Mālikī.”

- The true *shahīd* and learned Imām “*al-‘Allāmat al-Mutafannin al-Ṣāliḥ al-Shaykh*” ‘Abd al-Nabī al-Ṣadr Shayda (d. 990) who died strangled in the Sultan’s jail on the night of 12 Rabi` al-Awwal – as cited in al-‘Aydarūsī’s *al-Nūr al-Sāfir*.

- The *Mufasssir*, *Muḥaddith* and *Uṣūlī* Sayyid Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Rasūl ibn ‘Abd al-Sayyid ibn Qalandar al-Ḥusaynī al-Shāfi‘ī al-Shahrazūrī al-Madanī (d. 1103/1691)<sup>274</sup> the author of (1) *Sadād al-Dīn wa-Sidād al-Dayn* on the proofs that the parents of the Prophet ﷺ are in Paradise; (2) *al-Ishā‘a li-Ashrāt al-Sā‘a* (on the preconditions of the Final Hour) in which he stated, “Allāh taught the knowledge of the Hour to the Prophet ﷺ and forbade him to divulge it due to its terrible nature and enormous importance.” Imām Aḥmad Riḍā quotes this passage of the *Ishā‘a* in the Breilly edition of his masterpiece *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyya fil-Māddat al-Ghaybiyya* (Breilly p. 378-380).

Qāḍī Yūsuf al-Nabhānī (d. 1350/1931) described himself as the slave of the slaves of the Prophet ﷺ in the following poem from his great volume of poetry in praise of the Best of creation ﷺ entitled *Sa‘ādat al-Dārayn*:

274 Cf. *Mu‘jam al-Mu‘allifin* (3:409 §14044).

*anā ‘abdun li-sayyid al-anbiyā’i  
wa-walā’i lahu al-qadīmu walā’i*

I am the slave of the Master of Prophets  
And my fealty to him has no beginning.

*anā ‘abdun li-‘abdihi wa-li-‘abdi al-‘abdi  
‘abdun kadhā bi-ghayri intihā’i*

I am slave to his slave, and to his slave’s slave,  
And so forth endlessly,

*anā lā antahī ‘anil-qurbi min  
bābi riḍāhu fī jumlati al-dukkhalā’i*

For I do not cease to approach the door  
Of his good pleasure among the guests.

*anshuru al-‘ilma fī ma‘ālīhi lil-nās  
wa-ashdū bihi ma‘a al-shu‘arā’i*

I proclaim among people the teaching of his high attributes,  
And sing his praises among the poets.

*fa-‘asāhu yaqūlu lī anta salmānu  
walā’i ḥassānu ḥusni thanā’i*

Perhaps he will tell me: “You are the Salman  
Of my allegiance, the Hassan of my excellent homage!”

*wa-birūḥī afdī turāba ḥimāhu  
wa-lahu al-faḍlu fī qabūli fidā’i*

Yes, I would sacrifice my soul for the dust of his sanctuary.  
His favor should be that he accept my sacrifice.

*fāza man yantamī ilayhi wa-lā  
ḥājata fīhi bi-dhālika al-intimā’i*

He has triumphed who ascribes himself to him  
– Not that he needs such following,

*huwa fī ghunyatin ‘ani al-khalqī turran  
wa-hum al-kullu ‘anhu dūna ghinā’i*

For he is not in need of creation at all,  
While they all need him without exception.

*wa-huwa lillāhi waḥdahu ‘abduhu  
al-khālīṣu mujallā al-ṣifāti wal-asmā’i*

He belongs to Allāh alone, Whose purified servant he is,  
As his attributes and names have made manifest;

*kullu faḍlin fil-khalqī fa-huwa  
min Allāhi ilayhi wa-minhu lil-ashyā’i*

And every single favor in creation comes from Allāh  
To him, and from him to everything else.

Apparently, our liege-lord ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb ؓ did not think that it was *shirk* to call himself ‘Abd al-Nabī. Nor did Ibn Maymūn, nor the Imām of Masjid al-Aqṣā, nor Qāḍī al-Quḍāt Abul-Khayr al-Ghazzī, nor Ibn ‘Imād al-Ḥanbalī, nor al-Buṣrawī, nor the author of *al-Dāris* think that Imām ‘Abd al-Nabī al-Mālikī should have changed his name before being allowed to be a *Qudwa* for Muslims. Apparently, the entire Barzanjī family of “Sayyid” Ulema thought well of the name “Slave of the Prophet ﷺ” and used it from father to son. If only all those supposedly stray souls, ‘Abd al-Nabī Shayda, al-‘Aydarūsī, and the Qāḍī Yūsuf al-Nabhānī (*rahimahum Allāh*) could have met Ismā‘īl Dihlawī and Iḥsān Ilāhī Zāhir, who could have taught them about *shirk* and real *tawḥīd*! Instead, alas, they and all the Sunni Muslims associated with them all over the world died in complete ignorance that they were committing or abetting the gravest of all possible sins.

*Subḥān Allāh ‘ammā yaṣifūn!* Allāh Most High said: {*And speak not, concerning that which your own tongues qualify (as clean or unclean), the falsehood: “This is lawful, and this is forbidden,” so that ye invent a lie against Allāh. Lo! those who invent a lie against Allāh will not succeed*} (16:116). And Allāh knows best. Allāh send

blessings and peace on the Master of creation, his Family, and his Companions. Praise be to Allāh, Lord of the worlds.

(2) *The claim that “Seeking Help from Other Than Allāh” is “an un-Islamic belief” and “words of kufr”*

“The Barelwīs call upon other than Allāh in times of need, this is clear in their books, [Imām] Aḥmad Riḍā Khān al-Barelwī said: “There are servants of Allāh whom He has singled for fulfilling the needs of the people who flee to them with their needs.” [*Al-Amn wal-Ulā* p. 29] He also said: “Seeking help and aid from anyone besides Allāh is lawful and desired. No one denies it except one arrogant and obstinate.” [*Ḥayāt al-Mawāt, included in al-Fatāwā al-Riḍāwiyya*, Pakistan edition 4:300] He also says in *al-Amn wal-Ulā* (p. 10): “The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ is the remover of calamity and bestower of the donation.” And he also says in *Malḥūzāt* (p. 99): “Gibrīl ﷺ is the supplier of needs and the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ is the supplier of needs, for the Prophet ﷺ fulfils the needs of Gibrīl too.” He also said the following words of *kufr* in the *Malḥūzāt* (p. 307): “During my life I did not seek help from anyone and I did not ask for aid except Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir. Whenever I seek help, I seek it only from him. Whenever I ask for aid, I ask him alone. Once I tried to ask for aid and seek help from another saint, Ḥaḍrat Maḥbūb Ilāhī. When I intended to utter his name for seeking help, I did not utter the words but ‘*Yā Ghawthan*’ (O one whose help is sought)! My tongue refused to utter the words for seeking help from anyone except him.” [Imām] Aḥmad Riḍā Khān also said in *al-Amn wal-Ulā* (p. 44): “When you are confused and helpless in matters, seek help from the inmates of the graves.” All this is refuted by Islām. We say many times in our prayer: “{*You alone do we worship and You alone do we ask for help*} [1:5].”

Those who make such objections do not understand the meaning of {You alone do we worship} because none of the contested statements pertains to worship; nor do they understand the meaning of {You alone do we ask for help} if they consider that it contradicts *tawassul*, because then it would contradict {the path of those whom You have shown favor} which is *tawassul*!

Assuming the above quotes from the Imām are accurate, their meaning is as follows:

(a) Concerning the statement “There are servants of Allāh whom He has singled for fulfilling the needs of the people who flee to them with their needs”: If this were not true then it would be *shirk* to visit a doctor’s clinic, ask for a loan, or ask someone for a glass of water. Allāh Most High mentioned {*the ships which run upon the sea with that which is of use to men*} (2:164) because it is allowed or rather obligatory to use normal material means and seek one another’s help to fulfill one’s needs. This is a patent truth in the Religion and the underlying wisdom of the Pillar of *zakāt* (cf. 6:165, 16:71) although it is Allāh alone Who gives and withholds, as illustrated by the narration, “Creatures are all the dependents (*‘iyāl*) of Allāh, those among them most beloved to Allāh are those most helpful to His dependents.”<sup>275</sup>

<sup>275</sup> Narrated [1] from Ibn Mas‘ūd by al-Ṭabarānī in the *Kabīr* (10:105 §10033) and *Awsaṭ* [cf. al-Haythamī (5:210)], al-Shāshī in his *Musnad* (1:419 §435), Abū Nu‘aym (4:237, 2:102 *gharīb*), and Ibn ‘Adī (5:1810, 6:2340, 7:2610-2611) with a chain al-Haythamī said contains ‘Umayr Abū Hārūn al-Qurashī whose narrations are not retained; [2] from Anas by Abū Ya‘lā (6:65 §3315), al-Bazzār (2:398 §1949), Abū Nu‘aym, al-Ṭabarānī, Ibn Abī al-Dunyā in *Qaḍā’ al-Hawā’ij* (p. 35-36 §24), al-Ḥārith ibn Abī Usāma (p. 278 §914=2:857 §911), al-Qudā’ī in *Musnad al-Shihāb* (2:255 §1306) cf. al-Ghumārī, *Faṭḥ al-Wahhāb* (2:313-314 §799) [see also his *Mudawwī* §4135], and al-Mundhirī in his *Arba‘ūn* with a chain which al-Haythamī (8:191) said contains Yūsuf ibn ‘Aṭīyya al-Ṣaffār who is discarded and who al-Nawawī in his *Fatāwā* said was unanimously considered weak by the Imāms of ḥadīth; [3] from Ibn ‘Abbās by al-Khaṭīb in *Tārīkh Baghdād* (6:333-334) and through him Ibn al-Jawzī in *al-‘Ilal al-Mutanābiya* (2:28-29 *lā yaṣīḥḥ*) cf. Aḥḍab, *Zawā’id Tārīkh Baghdād* (5:323-326 §950 *isnāduhu ḍa’if jiddan*); [4] from Abū Hurayra by Ibn al-Daylamī in *Musnad al-Firdaws* cf. *Faṭḥ al-Wahhāb*; and [5] al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī in *mursal* mode by ‘Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad in *Zawā’id al-Zuhd* cf. *Faṭḥ al-Wahhāb*. Al-Bayhaqī in the *Shu‘ab*



(b) Concerning the statement, “Seeking help and aid from anyone besides Allāh is lawful and desired. No one denies it except one arrogant and obstinate.” This is true and actually more than lawful and desirable, it is obligatory to follow causes and means in this world of causes and means and it is prohibited to refrain from them on the pretext that Allāh has no need of them or by invoking the foreordained Decree (*qadar*) like the Jabriyya sect. To ignore or pretend to ignore this rule is not part of the Religion. However, most relevant here is the truth that Allāh has also singled out some wretched servants for creating difficulties in the path of Muslims, spreading doubts, levelling accusations of *shirk* and *kufr* at them, calling *Awliyā’* bad names, etc.

(c) Concerning the statement, “The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ is the remover of calamities and bestower of donations.” This is proven by his being a God sent mercy and his saying in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*: “I am the Eraser (*al-māḥī*) by whom disbelief is erased,” this erasure being the greatest mercy and gift for which He was sent, hence he said – in al-Bazzar’s *Musnad* and others through trustworthy narrators: “I am nothing but a mercy bestowed,” and in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*: “I distribute (*aqsimu*) what comes to you.”

(d) Concerning the statement, “Gibrīl ﷺ is the supplier of needs and the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ is the supplier of needs, for the Prophet ﷺ fulfils the needs of Gibrīl too.” This is proven by the ḥadīth in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* in which Allāh Most High said: “O Gibrīl, go to Muḥammad and tell him: Verily We shall satisfy you fully concerning your Community and We shall never displease you.” Gibrīl ﷺ is part of the Community of the Prophet ﷺ as are all the angels by Consensus. There are also reports in the *Shifā*, the *Mawāhib*, its *Sharḥ*, and elsewhere to the effect that the angels said they obtained security and learned thankfulness to their Lord only because of the Holy Prophet ﷺ.

(6:42-44 §7444-7449 *isnāduhu ḍa’if*) narrates it through all but the last two chains. Al-Haytamī, *Fatāwā Hadīthiyya* says the chains of the ḥadīth are all weak. Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad al-Sulamī said its chains strengthen each other. Al-‘Askarī said its meaning is metaphorical. Allāh knows best.

So it is as the Imām of Hind and Sind said; as Imām al-Būṣīrī said, “How could need attract towards this world such a one had it not been for whom this world would not have come out of inexistence?”; as Qāḍī Yūsuf al-Nabhānī said, “Every single favor in creation comes from Allāh to the Prophet, and from him to everything else”; as Shaykh al-Islām al-Taqī al-Subkī said in his *Fatāwā*: “Truly Allāh knows that every goodness in my life which He has bestowed upon me is on account of the Prophet and that my recourse is to him, and my reliance is upon him in seeking a means to Allāh in every matter of mine, in this world and the next, and the gifts of Allāh I owe to him are too many to count, both the hidden and the visible”; and as the Caliph and Commander of the Believers, the Walī and *Mujaddid*, Sulṭān ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd said, “You [*Sayyidinā* Muḥammad] are in truth the helper of all creation!” Allāh have mercy on them and on all the *Ahl al-Ḥaqq*. None can withhold the gift made by Allāh Most High to the Prophet ﷺ with regard to all creation, despite every envier of mankind and jinn.

(e) Concerning the words, “During my life I did not seek help from anyone, and I did not ask for aid except Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir, whenever I seek help I seek it only from him; whenever I ask for aid, I ask him alone.” This concerns not one iota more than what Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir is entitled to provide by the grace of Allāh and according to the criteria already mentioned in the previous answers. As mentioned elsewhere in this book, the Najdī leader Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb himself conceded: “We do not deny nor reject the invocation of help from the creature insofar as the creature can help.” Knowledge of the capacity of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir to help, even from his position in *Barzakh*, is established through mass transmission.

(f) Concerning the statement, “When you are confused and helpless in matters, then seek help from the inmates of the graves.” This is a forged ḥadīth cited in some late Sufi works. Its meaning (as a non-Prophetic saying) illustrates the Prophetic command to visit the

grave to remember the hereafter and the Prophetic command to Ibn ‘Umar to consider himself one of the dwellers of the graves. Meaning: Seek lessons, by visiting the dead whom you will very soon join, in remembering Allāh Most High and submitting to His will so as to extract yourselves from the confusion and helplessness created by your attachments to this fleeting world. So its meaning is true.

(3) *The claim that “The Barelwīs believe that the Prophets and the righteous slaves and saints know the unseen” and that “All this [is] kufr refuted by the Qur’ān and the Sunnah”*

The above claim shows reckless proclivity to *takfīr* and ignorance of the Qur’an and Sunna.

“In *al-Dawlat al-Makkiyya* (p. 58) of [Imām] Aḥmad Riḍā Khān it is written: ‘The Prophets know, rather they see and watch over all that which happened and all that which will happen from the first day to the last.’”

The *Dawla al-Makkiyya* is extremely clear in stating that the Prophetic knowledge of *ghayb* is God-given (*‘atā’ī*), not inherent (*dhātī*), and that it is partial (*juz’ī*), not all-encompassing (*muḥīṭ*). Imām Aḥmad Riḍā was very clear in saying that it is established that the Prophet’s ﷺ knowledge, in relation to the Divine knowledge, was like a drop in the ocean or less, but that such a drop was an ocean in relation to the knowledge of the rest of creation. His sole critique against the Wahhābis is directed at their practice of reducing the importance of the Prophet’s ﷺ knowledge: instead of proclaiming *ta‘zīm* like the Muslim *Umma*, they promote *tanqīs*, which is *kufr*.

This said, the fact that the Prophet ﷺ knows “all that which happened and all that which will happen from the first day to the last” is proven by the ḥadīth of Abū Kabsha al-Anmārī which we cite further down as well as by the verse: {*But how (will it be with them) when we bring of every people a witness, and We bring you (O Muḥammad) a witness against these*} (4:41). Thus, each Prophet is the witness of his people, which means that he sees everything in

connection with those people from beginning to end – which is the precondition of witnessing – and our Prophet ﷺ is a witness over all of them put together. The claim that he can be witness over what he neither saw nor knows is too absurd to need refutation.

“In the book of Ahmad Yār, *Mawā’iz Na’imiyya* (p. 192) it is written: ‘The Prophets know the unseen from their birth.’”

Assuming this quote is accurate, this is established by the doctrine of [the real] *Ahl al-Ḥadīth* that Prophets are Prophets from birth, and the meaning of *nabī* is one who informs others about the unseen, conditional upon the meaning of *ghayb* defined in the *Dawla Makkiyya* which we already mentioned.

“[Imām] Aḥmad Riḍā Khān al-Barelwī said in *Khāliṣ al-Itiqād* (p. 38): ‘The knowledge of the Guarded Tablet, the knowledge of the Pen, and the knowledge of whatever existed and of whatever will exist are part of the knowledge of the Prophet ﷺ.’”

Assuming the accuracy of the above quote, this is proven by the fact that all of the above concern what takes place until the Rising of the Hour, and al-Bukhārī and Muslim narrated from Ḥudhayfa, Abū Zayd al-Anṣārī, and other *Ṣaḥāba* that “The Prophet ﷺ stood among us [speaking] for a long time and did not leave out one thing from that time until the rising of the Final Hour except he told us about it. Whoever remembers it remembers it and whoever forgot it forgot it. All those who are present know this.”

“[Imām] Aḥmad Riḍā Khān al-Barelwī also said in *Mawā’iz Na’imiyya* (p. 364-365): ‘If the Prophet ﷺ places his foot on an animal, it will have knowledge of the seen and the unseen. How then can a saint on whom the Prophet ﷺ put his hand not know the seen and the unseen?’”

Shaykh Khalīl Aḥmad al-Sahāranfūrī in *al-Muḥammad* drew the hyperbole that “it would be praiseworthy even to celebrate the Mawlid of the Prophet’s ﷺ donkey and even its urine.” Similarly,

assuming it is accurately quoted, the first sentence above is a hyperbole to stress the point illustrated by the ḥadīth that the Knowers of Allāh are the inheritors of Prophets. Since knowledge of the unseen is a *mu'jiza* of the Prophet ﷺ, it follows naturally that it is also a *karāma* of the *Awliyā'* of his *Umma*, both of them by the gift of Allāh Most High which none can prevent. Something to this effect was stated by Shaykh Ashraf 'Alī al-Tahānawī himself in his chapter on the benefits of the shoe of the Prophet ﷺ and by Shaykh Muḥammad Zakariyyā al-Kāndihlawī in his praise of that chapter in his translation of Imām al-Tirmidhī's *Shamā'il*.

“All this kufr is again refuted by the Qur'ān and the Sunna: {Say (O Muḥammad): none in the heavens and the earth knows the unseen except Allāh, nor can they perceive when they shall be resurrected} [27:65] {And they say: 'How is it that not a sign is sent down on him from his Lord?' Say (O Muḥammad): The unseen belongs to Allāh Alone, so wait you, verily I am with you among those who wait (for Allāh's Judgement)} [10:20]. The Messenger ﷺ once heard a young girl say: 'Among us is a Prophet who knows what will happen tomorrow.' So he said to her: 'Leave this and return to that which you were saying before' [Bukhārī].”

'Allāma al-Ṣāwī al-Mālikī wrote in his *Hāshiyat Tafsīr al-Jalālayn*, in his commentary on Sūrat al-A'rāf: {They question you (about the Day of Judgment) as if you could be well informed thereof. Say: Knowledge thereof is with Allāh only, but most of mankind know not. Say: For myself I have no power to benefit, nor power to hurt, save that which Allāh wills. Had I knowledge of the unseen, I should have abundance of wealth, and adversity would not touch me} (7:187-188): “Its knowledge being with Allāh only is an emphasis for what precedes, namely, that it is part of hidden matters, knowledge of which Allāh Most High has reserved for Himself exclusively, so that He does not show it to anyone except those whom He pleases among the Messengers. What is required of us is to believe that the Messenger of Allāh, upon him blessings and peace, did not leave this earth until Allāh Most High informed him of all

that the hidden and unseen matters of this world and the next so that he knows them with the certitude of seeing them, according to what was narrated that he said: ‘The whole world was brought up before my eyes and I can see it [and all that shall exist in it until the Day of Resurrection] as if I were looking at the palm of my hand,’<sup>276</sup> and according to what the narration that he saw Paradise and what was in it and he saw Hellfire and what was in it, among other revelations in the mass-transmitted reports. However, he was ordered to conceal some of it.... If you say that {*Had I knowledge of the unseen* etc.} clashes with what we just said concerning his acquaintance with all the unseen matters of this world and the next, the reply is that he said out of humbleness, or that his knowledge of the unseen is as zero knowledge since he is unable to change whatever Allāh Most High decrees to pass. The meaning, then, would be: ‘If I had real knowledge in the sense that I can cause what I want to happen, I would have had abundance etc.’”

We clarify elsewhere in this book the meaning of the Prophet’s ﷺ admonition in the ḥadīth of the young girl’s poetry. It is the characteristic of the *Yahūd* to {*believe in part of the Book and disbelieve in another*} (2:85). *Ahl al-Sunna* believe in all of the above and also believe that Allāh Most High shows His *ghayb* to whomever He pleases, just as He said: {*The Knower of the Unseen, and He reveals unto none His secret save unto every messenger whom He has chosen*} (72:26-27). This is the meaning of *nabī*, “speaker of the Unseen.” Have you not read that the Prophet ﷺ described himself as “a man from among yourselves who announce to you of what took place before your times and what shall take place in the future?”<sup>277</sup> Have you not read the poetry of the great

<sup>276</sup> A very weak report narrated from Ibn ‘Umar by Nu‘aym ibn Ḥammād in the *Fitan* (1:27) and, through the latter, Abū Nu‘aym in the *Ḥilya* (1985 ed. 6:101) both through Abū Mahdī Sa‘īd ibn Sinān al-Kindī who is discarded as a narrator and accused of forgery cf. al-Haythamī (8:287, 2:189, 4:272). Cited by al-Suyūṭī in *Ziyādat al-Jāmi‘ al-Ṣagħīr* (§1312) and the *Khaṣā’iṣ* (2:185) as well as al-Qaṣṭallānī in the *Mawāhib* (3:559) cf. Kanz (§31810, §31971). In addition, “Nu‘aym is disclaimed in his narrations (*munkar al-ḥadīth*) despite his standing as an Imām.” Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Amālī al-Ḥalabiyya* (p. 40).

<sup>277</sup> Narrated from Abū Kabsha al-Anmārī by Aḥmad with two sound chains, al-

makes it different from everything else, as the Throne is the best of all things and the most elevated of them. Allāh therefore praised Himself by saying that He {*established Himself over the Throne*}, that is, He exalted Himself over it (*'alayhi 'alā*). It is impermissible to say that He established Himself with a contact or a meeting with it. Exalted is Allāh beyond that! Allāh is not subject to change, substitution, nor limits, whether before or after the creation of the Throne.”<sup>318</sup>

The creed “Allāh existed eternally without a place, and He is now as He ever was” is related from [1] our liege-lord ‘Alī ﷺ by ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī in *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* (p. 321=p.256); [2] Ibn Kullāb by al-Ash‘arī in *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* (p. 298); [3] Imām al-Māturīdī in *al-Tawḥīd* (p. 69, 75, 105-106); [4] Imām al-Ash‘arī himself by Abū al-Qāsim Ibn ‘Asākir in the *Tabyīn* (Saqqā ed. p. 150); [5] Ibn Fūrak as per al-Qushayrī in his *Risāla* (beginning, “Doctrine of the Sufis”); [6] Ibn al-Bāqillānī in *al-Inṣāf* (p. 37) cf. also his *Tambīd al-Awā’il* (p. 300); [7] al-Qushayrī himself in *al-Mi‘rāj* (p. 70); [8] Imām al-Ḥaramayn Ibn al-Juwaynī in his entries in *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyya al-Kubrā*, *Tabyīn Kadhib al-Muftarī*, and *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’*; [9] Abū Ishāq al-Shīrāzī in *al-Ishāra ilā Madhhab Ahl al-Ḥaqq* (p. 236); [10] Ibn ‘Aṭā’ Allāh in his *Ḥikam* (§34); [11] Al-‘Izz Ibn ‘Abd al-Salām in *al-Mulḥa*; [12] Badr al-Dīn Ibn Jamā‘a in *Īdāḥ al-Dalīl* (p. 104); [13] Ibn Jahbal al-Kilābī in his Refutation of Ibn Taymiyya’s *Jihawiyya*. *Wal-Ḥamdu lil-Lāhi Rabbi al-‘Alamīn*.

## 21: MUḤAMMAD JAMĀL ZAYNŪ & ṢĀLIḤ AL-FAWZĀN

Muḥammad Jamāl Zaynū is sometimes identified as Zīnū or Zīno, an O-level equivalency holder who taught elementary school in Syria and evolved into a collector of tidbits from here and there out of which he devised books he attributed to himself. He is responsible for works published by Dār al-Ṣumay‘ī and Darussalām out of Riyadh, among them a book titled *Get your belief from the Quran and the Authentic Prophetic Tradition*, which would be more aptly titled *Get*

<sup>318</sup> Ibn Abī Ya‘lā, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila* (2:296-297).

*your belief from Zaynū and Wahhabism reinterpreting the Qurʾān and the Prophetic Tradition.*

Zaynū attacked one of the living Scholars of *Ahl al-Sunna*, Dr. Muḥammad ‘Alī al-Ṣābūnī and his *Tafsīr* with a tract replete with risible mistakes entitled *Akhṭā’ Muḥammad ‘Alī al-Ṣābūnī* and re-edited under the revised title *Tanbīhāt Hāmma ‘alā Kitāb Ṣafwat al-Tafāsīr* (“Important Warnings about the Book ‘The Quintessence of Qurʾanic Commentaries’”) which he co-authored with a Saudi government cleric by the name of Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān, the proud author of Saudi religious-curriculum books in which he advocates the legalization of slavery.<sup>319</sup> He is one of those who wrote a foreword in recommendation of ‘Alī al-Shiblī’s *al-Mukhālafāt al-‘Aqdiyya fī Fath al-Bārī* along with Bin Bāz, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Aqīl, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Manī’, and ‘Abd Allāh al-Ghunaymān. He also wrote an angry rebuttal to the *Naṣīha* of al-Rifā‘ī and al-Būṭi editions of Wahhābī source-texts and various attacks on sunni authors and books, including even the Saudi Minister Muḥammad ‘Abduh Yamānī’s book “*Teach Your Children Love of the Prophet ﷺ and His family*”.

In their *Tanbīhāt* Zaynū and Fawzān commit the following blunders:

1. They claim that al-Ṣābūnī violated the view of the *Jumbūr* by “interpreting figuratively” the “shin” in the verse, {**The Day that the shin shall be bared**} (68:42) whereas it is precisely the view of the massive majority that the baring of the shin is a metaphor for hardship, which al-Ṭabarī references to Ibn ‘Abbās, Ibn Mas‘ūd, Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī, Mujāhid, ‘Ikrima, al-Ḍaḥḥāk, Qatāda, and Ibrāhīm al-Nakha‘ī. Ibn ‘Abbās explained: “This is a day of affliction and hardship” and in another version: “It means the Day of Resurrection due to its hardship.”<sup>320</sup>

<sup>319</sup> Saudi Information Agency, “Author of Saudi Curriculums Advocates Slavery”.

<sup>320</sup> Narrated by al-Ṭabarī in his *Tafsīr* (28:38-42), al-Ḥākim (2:499-500 *isnād ṣaḥīḥ* =1990 ed. 2:542), al-Bayhaqī in *al-Asmā’ wal-Ṣifāt* (Kawtharī ed. p. 345-346=Ḥāshidī ed. 2:183-185 §746-748) with two fair chains and one sound chain according to Ibn Ḥajar in *Fath al-Bārī* (1959 ed. 13:428), Ibn Ḥibbān (16:382) with a fair chain accord-



Ibn Qutayba in *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth* states that the baring of the shin is a metonymy for travails in which one hitches up one's lower garments, baring the legs. Ibn al-Jawzī cites him and relates from Ibn 'Abbās, Mujāhid, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī, Qatāda, "and the vast majority of the scholars," the same meaning<sup>321</sup> as do al-Qushayrī in his *Tafsīr*, Ibn Fūrak in *Mushkal al-Ḥadīth*, al-Khaṭṭābī, Ibn Baṭṭāl, al-Rāzī, Ibn Ḥazm in the *Fiṣal*, Abū al-Su'ūd in his *Tafsīr*, al-Bayḍāwī in his, Ibn Kathīr in his, al-Wāḥidī in his, the *Jalālayn*, al-Suyūṭī in *al-Durr al-Manthūr*, al-Karmī al-Ḥanbalī in *Aqāwīl al-Thiqāt*, al-Zarkashī in *al-Burhān* who cites it as an example of a metaphor which it is extremely offensive to interpret literally, and others such as Ibn 'Aṭīyya, Abū Ḥayyān in the *Baḥr*, al-Fakhr al-Rāzī, al-Nasafī, al-Ālūsī, al-Qāsimī....<sup>322</sup>

This explanation applies to the ḥadīth of Abū Hurayra and Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī on the sight of Allāh in al-Bukhārī and Muslim. When Sa'īd ibn Jubayr (d. 94) was asked about it he became very angry and said: "Some people claim that 'Allāh uncovers His Shin'!! Rather, He but uncovers affliction and hardship."<sup>323</sup> As Imām al-'Izz Ibn 'Abd al-Salām said in *al-Ishāra ilā al-Ījāz fi Ba'ḍ Anwā' al-Majāz*: "It is a metaphor for His aggravation of the judgment of His enemies and their humiliation, defeat, and punishment. The Arabs say of one that acts earnestly and intensely that he has bared his shin."

By objecting to the *Jumbūr*, Zaynū and al-Fawzān revealed their affiliation to other than *Ahl al-Sunna* as did the anthropomorphist

ing to al-Arna'ūt, al-Qurṭubī (18:248-249), al-Ṣan'ānī (3:310) and al-Shawkānī (5:275-278) and other *Tafsīrs*. Cf. Pickthall's *ad sensum* translation: "On the day when affliction befalls them in earnest."

<sup>321</sup> In *Daḥ' Shubah al-Tashbīh* (p. 15) and *Zād al-Masīr* (8:341).

<sup>322</sup> Al-Qushayrī in *Laṭā'if al-Ishārāt* (6:189), Ibn Fūrak in *Mushkal al-Ḥadīth* (p. 442), al-Khaṭṭābī, Ibn Baṭṭāl, al-Rāzī, Ibn Ḥazm in *al-Fiṣal* (2:129), Abū al-Su'ūd in his *Tafsīr* (9:18), al-Bayḍāwī in his, Ibn Kathīr in his (4:408-409), al-Wāḥidī in his (2:1124), *Jalālayn* (p. 760), al-Suyūṭī in *al-Durr al-Manthūr* (8:254-256), al-Karmī al-Ḥanbalī in *Aqāwīl al-Thiqāt* (p. 174), al-Zarkashī in *al-Burhān* (2:84, 2:179).

<sup>323</sup> Narrated by 'Abd ibn Ḥumayd in his *Musnad* and Ibn al-Mundhir as cited by al-Suyūṭī in *al-Durr al-Manthūr* (8:255).

Zāhirī Abū ‘Āmir Muḥammad ibn Sa’dūn al-‘Abdarī (d. 524) about whom Ibn ‘Asākir said:

He held deviant views and believed that the ḥadīths of the Divine Attributes were meant in their external sense. I have heard that he once said in the souk of Bāb al-Azaj: “{*The Day that the shin shall be bared*} (68:42)” then he slapped his shin and said: “A shin just like this shin of mine!” I also heard that he said: “The people of innovation claim as a proof the verse {*There is nothing whatsoever like unto Him*} (42:11), but it means in Godhood. As for image (*al-ṣūra*), He is like me and you!”<sup>324</sup>

2. They do not know that the authorities of *Tafsīr* allow the adducing of non-canonical (*shādhdh*) readings for certain verses within the discussion of their meaning and are oblivious to the well-known fact that the Ulema of Islām make a difference between the *shādhdh* and baseless falsehood.

3. They accuse Imām al-Ṣāwī of *shirk* for saying in his *Tafsīr* that the Prophet ﷺ “became the wellspring of mercies and the wellspring of bestowals” (*manba‘ al-raḥamāt wa-manba‘ al-tajalliyyāt*) but omit the rest of his text which al-Ṣābūnī had quoted and which shows that what is meant by those expressions is that the Prophet ﷺ is the place par excellence where the Divine mercies descend, not that he is their ultimate origin. Al-Ṣāwī said:

In this verse [{*Lo! Allāh and His angels shower blessings on the Prophet*} (33:56)] is the greatest proof that the Prophet ﷺ is the locus (*mahbaṭ*) of mercies and the best of the first and the last without exception, for the *ṣalāt* from Allāh on His Prophet is His Mercy coupled with His magnification, while the *ṣalāt* from Allāh on other than the Prophet is His Mercy in absolute terms, as in the saying of the Most High, {*He it is Who blesses you and His*

<sup>324</sup> In al-Dhahabī, *Siyar* (Fikr ed. 14:469).

*angels (bless you)* (33:43). Observe the difference between the two kinds of *ṣalāt* and the difference in merit between the two levels. Thus has he become the wellspring of mercies and the wellspring of bestowals.

As Dr. al-Ṣābūnī said in his rebuttal, “His claim that this is exaggeration and *shirk* is a strange, laughable claim! For the matter of *shirk* is a very grave matter, and to impute it to one of the expert Ulema among the Qur’anic commentators, such as Imām al-Ṣāwī in his marginalia on the *Jalālayn*, calls for doubting the orthodoxy of all the Ulema of *Tafsīr* and Ḥadīth in the Community of the Prophet Muḥammad ﷺ – the inheritors of the Prophets!”<sup>325</sup>

4. They call the attribution of the verses {*that he (my lord) may know that I betrayed him not in secret, and that surely Allāh guides not the snare of the betrayers. I do not exculpate myself. Lo! the (human) soul enjoins unto evil, save that whereon my Lord has mercy*} (12:52-53) to Yūsuf ﷺ “a gross mistake” (*khata’ fāḥish*) although it is the sound position and that of the overwhelming majority of the Scholars according to al-Ṭabarī, al-Jaṣṣāṣ, al-Shawkānī, and others!

5. They deny the existence of metaphors in the Qur’ān on the pretense that “the words of Allāh in the Qur’ān must be understood literally”! This is one of the strangest claims ever to pass for knowledge since it is a pre-requisite of exegesis (*tafsīr*) to know the language of the Arabs, in which metaphor holds such a pre-eminent place that it could be said to form most of its beauty. Hence the emphasis of the people of *Tafsīr* on knowledge of rhetoric and style (*al-badī’*), metaphors (*isti’āra*), and figures of speech (*kināya*) which abound in the Qur’ān and are an integral part of its stunning inimitability (*i’jāz*). Even would-be deniers of Qur’anic metaphor such as Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Qayyim admitted it, as demonstrated by Shaykh ‘Īsā al-

<sup>325</sup> Al-Ṣābūnī, *Kashf al-Iftirā’at fī Risālat al-Tanbihāt Ḥawla Ṣafwat al-Tafsīr* (p. 23).

Himyarī in his four hundred-page book *al-Ijhāz liman Ankara al-Majāz* (“Preparation for Those Who Deny Figurative Meanings”).

Instead, as al-Šābūnī quipped, the Zaynūs and Fawzāns of this *Umma* want us to understand {**They are raiment (libāsun) for you and you are raiment for them**} (2:187) to mean that “women are shirts and trousers for men and men are shirts and trousers for them”! It is fair to say that the reason for this obscurantism is banal ignorance and unintelligence. Al-Ḥabīb ‘Alawī ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥaddād – the author of *Sharḥ Rātib al-Ḥaddād* – in his book *Miṣbāḥ al-Anām* challenged the Wahhābīs of his time to find the following figures of speech in Sūrat al-‘Ādiyāt (100). The challenge still stands:

- Legal literalism (*ḥaqīqa shar‘iyya*)<sup>326</sup>
- Lexical literalism (*ḥaqīqa lughawiyya*)<sup>327</sup>
- Customary literalism (*ḥaqīqa ‘urfiyya*)<sup>328</sup>
- Figure of speech and synecdoche (*majāz mursal*)
- Hypallage and conceit, or figure of thought (*majāz murakkab*)<sup>329</sup>
- Literalistic metaphor (*isti‘āra ḥaqīqiyya*)
- Metaphor showing conformity of tenor and vehicle (*isti‘āra withāqiyya*)<sup>330</sup>
- Metaphor showing disparity of tenor and vehicle (*isti‘āra ‘inādiyya*)<sup>331</sup>
- Generalized metaphor (*isti‘āra ‘āmmiyya*)
- Particularized metaphor (*isti‘āra khāṣṣa*)
- Concretive metaphor (*isti‘āra aṣliyya*)

<sup>326</sup> Al-Zarkashī, *al-Burbān fī ‘Ulūm al-Qur’ān* (2:167).

<sup>327</sup> *Burbān* (2:167).

<sup>328</sup> *Burbān* (2:167); al-Munāwī, *al-Tawqīf ‘alā Muḥimmāt al-Ta‘arīf* (p. 680); al-Jurjānī, *Ta‘rīfāt* (p. 302).

<sup>329</sup> Al-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān fī ‘Ulūm al-Qur’ān* (2:753).

<sup>330</sup> *Itqān* (2:779).

<sup>331</sup> *Itqān* (2:785).

- Continuous metaphor (*isti'āra taba'iyya*)<sup>332</sup>
- Absolute metaphor *i.e.* a continuous metaphor where neither vehicle nor tenor are connected to the metaphor itself (*isti'āra muṭlaqa*)
- Simple metaphor *i.e.* a continuous metaphor connected to the tenor (*isti'āra mujarrada*)
- Applied metaphor *i.e.* a continuous metaphor connected to the vehicle (*isti'āra murashshaḥa*)<sup>333</sup>
- The point where the “simple” and the “applied” metaphors meet (*mawḍi' ijtimā' al-tarshīḥ wal-tajrīd*)<sup>334</sup>
- The point where metonymy takes place (*mawḍi' al-isti'āra bil-kināya*)<sup>335</sup>
- Allusive metonymy (*al-isti'āra al-takhyīliyya*)<sup>336</sup>
- Alternate and chiasmic simile (*al-tashbīḥ al-malfūf wal-mafrūq*)<sup>337</sup>
- Single and two-tiered simile (*al-tashbīḥ al-mufrad wal-murakkab*)<sup>338</sup>
- Generalized and detailed simile (*al-tashbīḥ al-mujmal wal-mufaṣṣal*)
- Brachylogy (*al-ijāz*) [concision, ellipsis]<sup>339</sup>
- Circumlocution and periphrasis (*al-iṭnāb*)<sup>340</sup>
- Equivoque (*al-musāwāt*)<sup>341</sup>

<sup>332</sup> *Itqān* (2:783-784); *Ta'rifāt* (p. 35-36).

<sup>333</sup> *Ta'rifāt* (p. 36).

<sup>334</sup> *Itqān* (2:917-918); *Tawqif* (p. 160, 172); *Burbān* (2:437, 449); *Ta'rifāt* (p. 73).

<sup>335</sup> *Burbān* (3:434, 3:438, 3:441); *Ta'rifāt* (p. 35); Ṭāsh Kubrā Zādah (d. 968), *al-'Ināya fī Tahqīq al-Isti'āra bil-Kināya*, cf. Ḥajji Khalīfa, *Kashf al-Zunūn* (2:1173).

<sup>336</sup> *Itqān* (2:784-789); *Burbān* (3:434); *Tafsīr Abī al-Su'ūd* (5:72).

<sup>337</sup> *Itqān* (2:929-930); *Tawqif* (p. 623); *Ta'rifāt* (p. 247).

<sup>338</sup> *Itqān* (2:775); *Tafsīr Abī al-Su'ūd* (2:75; 4:137; 6:106); Ibn al-Qayyim, *al-Amtḥāl* (p. 49).

<sup>339</sup> *Burbān* (3:55, 3:102, 3:105, 3:220, 3:225); *Tawqif* (p. 105); *Ta'rifāt* (p. 59).

<sup>340</sup> *Tawqif* (p. 72-73); *Ta'rifāt* (p. 46).

<sup>341</sup> *Itqān* (2:808); *Burbān* (4:357).

- Literal predicate (*isnād ḥaqīqī*)
- Figurative predicate (*isnad majāzī*) also called an aphoristic figure of speech (*majāz ḥikmī*)
- Syllepsis or zeugmatic construction (*al-muḍmar*) instead of expressed [repetition] (*al-muḏhar*) and vice versa<sup>342</sup>
- The point where the personal pronoun of prestige is used (*mawḍi‘ damīr al-sha’n*)
- The point of sudden transition (*iltifāt*)<sup>343</sup>
- The point of connection and disconnection [between a final consonant and the initial consonant of the following word] (*mawḍi‘ al-waṣl wal-faṣl*)<sup>344</sup>
- Completely related subordination and completely unrelated subordination (*kamāl al-ittiṣāl wa-kamāl al-inqitā‘*)<sup>345</sup>
- Co-ordination and apposition (*al-jam‘ bayna jumlatayn muta‘āṭifatayn*)<sup>346</sup>
- Proportion between sentences and its types (*maḥall tanāsub al-jumal wa-wajh al-tanāsub*)<sup>347</sup>
- Aspects of the perfection of beauty and eloquence in that proportion (*wajh kamālih fil-ḥusn wal-balāgha*)
- Conciseness (*ījāz taqṣīr*) and ellipsis (*ījāz ḥadhf*)<sup>348</sup>
- Precautionary overstatement (*iḥtirās*) and contrastive emphasis (*tatmīm*).<sup>349</sup>

<sup>342</sup> *Itqān* (2:864); *Ta’rīfāt* (p. 46); Makkī, *Mushkil I’rāb al-Qur’an* (1:221, 2:726); Ibn al-Jawzī, *Zād al-Masīr* (4:433).

<sup>343</sup> *Itqān* (2:902); *Tawqīf* (p. 87); *Ta’rīfāt* (p. 51); *Burbān* (3:318, 3:331, 3:334); Yāqūt, *Mu’jam al-Buldān* (5:147).

<sup>344</sup> Al-Muḥāsibī, *Fahm al-Qur’an* (p. 260); *Itqān* (2:1175); *Burbān* (p. 344); *Tafsīr Abī al-Su’ūd* (4:201).

<sup>345</sup> *Burbān* (1:51); al-Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr* (4:50); al-Shawkānī, *Fath al-Qadīr* 4:567).

<sup>346</sup> *Itqān* (2:860f.).

<sup>347</sup> *Burbān* (1:60); *Tafsīr Abī al-Su’ūd* (2:107); al-Suyūṭī, *Asrār Tartīb al-Qur’an* (p. 95)

<sup>348</sup> *Itqān* (2:809, 2:829).

<sup>349</sup> *Itqān* (2:871); *Burbān* (3:67, 3:70); *Tawqīf* (p. 39, 159); *Ta’rīfāt* (p. 25, 72); al-Qurṭubī, *Tafsīr* (2:242); al-Mubārakfurī, *Tuḥfat al-Aḥwadhī* (8:150).

6. They take issue with the claim that the Prophet ﷺ saw his Lord with his eyes on the night of Isrā' and Mi'rāj when it has long been considered an issue of divergence after which it is poor *adab* and ignorance to fault the view of others. As al-Ṣābūnī wrote in his rebuttal: the view that the Prophet ﷺ saw his Lord literally is that of Ibn 'Abbās, Anas, 'Urwa ibn al-Zubayr, and all the students of Ibn 'Abbās among the *Tābi'in* as well as that of Imām Aḥmad; while the view that the Prophet ﷺ did not see his Lord literally is that of 'Ā'isha and Ibn Mas'ūd – Allāh be well-pleased with all of them and with whoever knows his limit and takes care not to trespass it.

7. They object to al-Ṣābūnī's calling the Prophet ﷺ *Sayyid al-Kā'ināt* – the Master of all creatures – as outlandish exaggeration (*ghulū wa-itrā'*) and claim that he is the Master of human beings only. However, the Prophet ﷺ himself said, “*wa-anā akramu al-awwalīna wal-ākhirīna 'alā rabbī walā fakhr* – and I am the most honorable of the first and the last before my Lord, and this is not to boast!” as narrated in al-Tirmidhī and al-Dārimī. Furthermore, it is the agreement of *Ahl al-Sunna* that the Seal of Prophets ﷺ was not sent to human beings only – the Qur'ān names him a Mercy to the worlds – and whosoever he was sent to besides human beings, he is surely superior to them also! This is a typical objection in which no-one preceded the Wahhābīs in Islām other than some Mu'tazilīs as mentioned in the commentaries on *Jawharat al-Tawhīd*.

8. They object to the interpretation of the Divine *wajh* in the verse {*Everything will perish save His countenance*} (28:88) to mean the Divine Essence as an invalidation of the attribute of Face when this interpretation is authentically transmitted from both the *Salaf* (Abū al-'Āliya, al-Ṭabarī) and the *Khalaf* (Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn Kathīr, al-Shawkānī). The *Salaf* also interpreted the “Face” to mean the Divine dominion or sovereignty (*mulk*) as shown by al-Bukhārī's statement in the book of *Tafsīr* in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*: “Except His *wajh* means except His *mulk*, and it is also said: Except whatever was for the sake of His