

Seeking The Intercession Of The Prophet Of Islam:

A Scholarly Defense Of Its Legitimacy

Being the translation of a contemporary treatise which establishes that seeking the intercession of the Prophet is sanctioned by the Qur'an and the sunnah and refutes the claims of the Pseudo-Salafis that intercession is a heretical innovation (bid'ah)

إرغام المبتدع الغبي بجواز التوسل بالنبي في الرد علي الألباني الوبي

By the Azhari shaikh and *hadith* scholar Abdullah ibn Muhammad ibn al-Sadiq al-Ghumari
(d.??)

Translated by Muhammad William Chrales

Introduction

ﷺ (the peace and blessings of Allah be upon him)

ﷻ (exalted is He)

ﷻ (may Allah be pleased with him)

The topic of seeking the intercession of the Prophet (the peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), (*al-tawassul* / التوسل)¹ is not in itself a central issue of Islām, nor is it one of Islām's categorical injunctions (*al-farā'id* / الفرائض). A Muslim could, conceivably, live and die without knowing what intercession is, and yet, still die as a Muslim; although he would have deprived himself all his life on account of his ignorance of a tremendous blessing.

However, due to extraneous reasons, the issue of seeking the Prophet's intercession (*al-tawassul*) has become an issue of dire importance. That is because a very vocal sect of Muslims has appeared on the scene and made this issue an issue of belief (*īmān* / إيمان) and unbelief (*kufr* / كفر). Their claim, of course, is preposterous since seeking the intercession (*al-tawassul*) of the Prophet ﷺ is at most an issue of a point of law (*al-furā' / الفروع*) and has nothing to do with beliefs (*uāal al-dān / أصول الدين*) that it might ever become a question of somebody's belief or unbelief.

This very vocal and active sect calls itself *the Salafis* (*al-salafīyah / السلفية*). Their opponents usually call them pejoratively *the Wahhabis*; whereas, we prefer to call them *the Pseudo-Salafis* (Arabic: *al-mutasallifah / المتسلفة*) because we know they have no claim to be following the real *salaf* (i.e. the early predecessors) which is actually a term which was used by the Prophet ﷺ to designate the first three generations of Islām which, as he ﷺ testified,

¹ *Al-tawassul* means *to seek to get near*. Imām al-Jauharā (d. 393 h., Nishāpur), who is a great authority on Arabic language, said in his *Āiāā*, which al-Suyātā said in his *al-Muzhir* holds the place amongst the lexicons of the Arabic language that al-Bukhārā holds amongst the books of *āadāth*: "*Al-wasālah* refers to that by which one tries to come close to another. Its plural is *al-wasā'il*. *Al-tausāl* and *al-tawassul* have the same meaning. One can say: *Wasala fulānun ilā rabbihā wasālatan wa tawassala ilaihā biwasālatin ai taqarraba ilaihā bi'amalin*

. (So and so tried to get close to His Lord, and he tried to get close to Him by such a means; that is, he tried to get close to him by doing something.)

Ibn Āajr al-Haitamā mentioned in his *al-Jauhar al-Munazzam*, (Cairo, Dār Jawāmi' al-Kalim, 1992), pp. 149-153, that seeking intercession can have one of two implications. Either we can ask Allah through the Prophet ﷺ on account of the honor in which Allah holds him, or we can ask the Prophet ﷺ to pray for us because the Prophet ﷺ is alive in his grave and can hear the request of one who petitions him as various *āadāth* (prophetic reports) establish. Ibn Āajr mentioned some of those *āadāth* some of them, like the *āadāth* about Bilāl ibn al-Āarith al-Muzunā, will be mentioned presently in the present treatise. NB: Cross-reference and mention al-Qastalani and others.

are the best generations of his people: “The best generation is my generation, then the one which follows it, then the one which follows it.”

These Pseudo-Salafis have had the audacity to declare that seeking the intercession (*al-tawassul*) of the Prophet ﷺ is polytheism (*shirk* / شرك) claiming that those who seek the Prophet’s ﷺ intercession or the intercession of any prophet or saint set up gods other than Allah and that by calling to them in intercession they are in effect worshipping them. The Pseudo-Salafis compare the Muslims who seek the intercession (*al-tawassul*) of any of Allah’s creatures to the pagan Arabs who worshipped idols. Muslims answer them that they are not worshipping those whose intercession they seek; rather, they are worshipping Allah whom they understand to be the only being capable of causing us any benefit or harm. They explain that they ask Him for the sake of the love in which He holds the one whose intercession they seek to answer their prayer which they or make to Him or, alternately, they ask the one whose intercession they seek to pray to Allah on their behalf. The Pseudo-Salafis frequently reply derisively to such explanations by quoting the likes of the following Qur’anic verses (*āyāt* / آيات):

﴿وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَى﴾

(Those who take protectors other than He say, “We don’t worship them except that they might bring us closer to Allah.”)

﴿وَمَنْ أَضَلُّ مِمَّن يَدْعُو مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَنْ لَا يَسْتَجِيبُ لَهُ إِلَى يَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ وَهُمْ عَنِ دَعْوَانِهِمْ غَافِلُونَ وَإِذَا حُشِرَ النَّاسُ كَانُوا لَهُمْ أَعْدَاءً وَكَانُوا بِعِبَادَتِهِمْ كَافِرِينَ﴾

(And who is more misguided than those who call [on gods] other than Allah which will not answer them till the Day of Judgement and which are heedless of their calling. Then on the day that mankind is gathered they will be their enemies and they will disdain their worship [of them].)

What the Pseudo-Salafis fail to realize or choose to ignore, however, is that the pagan Arabs didn’t just *call* their protectors they *worshipped* them, as the above two *āyāt* explicitly mention; consider the words in the first *āyah* *we don’t worship them except*, and the words *they will disdain their worship* in the second. Indeed, they believed them to be gods capable of bringing them benefit or harm, and so they worshipped them. There is an enormous difference between seeking intercession (*al-tawassul*) while worshipping none but Allah, and worshipping a protector other than God believing that protector to have the power to benefit or harm independent of Allah.

Another *āyah* which the Pseudo-Salafis routinely quote in their attempt to show that seeking intercession (*al-tawassul* / التوسل) is polytheism is the following:

﴿قُلْ ادْعُوا الَّذِينَ زَعَمْتُمْ مِنْ دُونِهِ فَلَا يَمْلِكُونَ كَشْفِ الضَّرِّ عَنْكُمْ وَلَا تَحْوِيلًا أُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ يَدْعُونَ يَبْتَغُونَ إِلَى رَبِّهِمُ الْوَسِيلَةَ أَيُّهُمْ أَقْرَبُ وَيَرْجُونَ رَحْمَتَهُ وَيَخَافُونَ عَذَابَهُ﴾

(Say: Call those whom you presumed [are gods] other than He. They can neither remove your tribulation, nor avert it. Those whom they call upon are seeking the way to come near their Lord [vying with one another to see] which of them can get closest. They hope for His mercy and fear His punishment.)

The Pseudo-Salafis pretend that in this *āyah* Allah ﷻ (exalted is He) is addressing certain Arabs who were calling on their protectors in the manner of those who seek the intercession (*al-tawassul*) of the Prophet ﷺ or a prophet or the saints, but they thereby grossly distort the

meaning of the *ayah*. Their misinterpretation is not supported by any authority nor even by the rules of language. Al-Baghawá, who is a very famous and reliable commentator of the Qur'án, commented on Allah's words ﷻ: "Say: Call on those whom you presumed other than He." saying such a severe drought had afflicted the polytheists that they began to eat dogs and carrion and finally they came to the Prophet ﷺ seeking him to pray for them; whereupon, Allah ﷻ revealed: "Say [to the polytheists]: Call on those whom you presumed [are gods] other than He. They are not able to remove the affliction [of the drought and starvation from you] nor avert it [to others instead of you or change the state of affairs from hardship to ease]." All interpolations into the text of the Qur'án in the previous passage are al-Baghawá's. Al-Bukhàrá included in his *Āaääá* a chapter titled "Say: Call on those whom you presumed other than He..." He mentioned in that chapter a *äadäth*² from 'Abdulläh ibn Mas'äd (may Allah be pleased with him) concerning the words of Allah ﷻ *seeking the way to come near their Lord (yabtaghâna ilà rabbihim al-wasâlah)*: "Some of mankind used to worship some of the *jinn* (genies). Then the *jinn* became Muslims; whereas the people remained as they were [that is, pagans].' Äafiæ Ibn Äajr explained in his commentary on al-Bukhàrá that what Ibn Mas'äd means is that the people who used to worship the *jinn* continued to worship them; whereas, those *jinn* no longer approved of it because they had accepted Islâm. It was these *jinn* who started to seek the way to come close (*al-wasâlah*) to their Lord. The subsequent chapter of al-Bukhàrá titled "Concerning His word: *Those they call seek the way to get near to their Lord*," mentions the same *äadäth* of Ibn Mas'äd in abridged form. Ibn Äajr remarked there in his commentary on the *äadäth*: "The object of the verb *call* is omitted. We are to assume that the sentence means: *Those whom they call gods are seeking the way to get near their Lord*. Ibn Mas'äd's version (*qirâ'ah* / قراءة) of the Qur'án has *you call* instead of *they call* with the sense that Allah is addressing the unbelievers directly; that reading [that is, Ibn Mas'äd's] makes the meaning quite clear."

Al-Äaääawá included a chapter in his *Mushkil al-Äthàr* headed with the long title: "Concerning a solution to the problem raised by what is reported from the Prophet ﷺ concerning the reasons behind the revelation of the *ayah*. *Those on whom they call are seeking the way to come near to their Lord*...and [which report] is ascribed to 'Abdulläh, but since Ibn Mas'äd spoke knowledgeably, it is known that he didn't advance his own opinion but spoke with the authority of revelation (*taufiqan* / توفيقاً) from the Prophet ﷺ. He then reported the following *äadäth* with two chains or narration (*äuruq*) from Ibn Mas'äd: "I stayed with some people who used to worship some of the *jinn*. Meanwhile the *jinn* accepted Islâm; but those Arabs didn't realize it..." Then Ibn Mas'äd mentioned the above-mentioned passage from the Qur'án. Al-Äaääawá mentioned that somebody had contradicted him for his opinion that those referred to in the above-mentioned *ayah* are *jinn* saying that the *äadäth* of Ibn Mas'äd refer to another incident and that the reliable explanation of this verse is Mujähid's who said that those who sought the way to get near to their Lord were Jesus, Ezra ('Uzair), and the angels. However, al-Äaääawá answered that critic by saying: "Ibn Mas'äd's explanation is more worthy of acceptance than Mujähid's because Ibn Mas'äd was close to the Prophet ﷺ; [whereas, Mujähid was a companion of Ibn 'Abbäs]. Furthermore, the Book of Allah mentioned [explicitly] that some people used to worship *jinn*: On the day that We shall gather them all We shall say to the angels, "Are those the ones who used to worship you?" They will reply, "Hallowed are You. You are our protector not them. Rather, they used to worship the *jinn*. Most of them believed in them [that is, that they were gods]."

² *Äadäth* refers to a saying reported from the Prophet of Islâm ﷺ, or a report about his habit or deed or character or appearance.

Then, al-Āāwā remarked, "I am not aware that any Companion of the Prophet ﷺ had any interpretation other than [what can be inferred from] the two reports we have reported from Ibn Mas'ād. It is not proper [according to the principles of law]³ to give up the saying of Ibn Mas'ād for the opinion of Mujāhid especially when Ibn Mas'ād explicitly mentioned in one of the versions that were reported from him that he stayed with those people who were worshipping the *jinn*."

The Pseudo-Salafis insist that the object of *call* in the sentence *those whom they call are seeking the way to get near to their Lord* should be assumed to be *seeking the way to get near their Lord*, and so according to them the sentence means: *those whom they call seeking the way to get near their Lord*. Then they claim that the verse condemns those who seek intercession (*al-tawassul*) from other than Allah. Apart from the fact that the real authorities have construed this sentence otherwise, as we showed above, the Pseudo-Salafi interpretation is precluded by the first part of this verse which says, "Call on those whom you presumed [to be gods] other than He..." because the words *other than He* show that those Arabs were not seeking intercession (*al-tawassul*) since intercession is sought from Allah through an intermediate; whereas, those Arabs were seeking the direct succor of the *jinn* or the angels or whatever they considered to be their protectors. Furthermore, it should be kept in mind that the pagan Arabs did not practice seeking intercession (*al-tawassul* / التوسل), nor even have any idea what it is. All the *āyāt* and *ādāth* which describe their polytheistic practices show that they used to consider their protectors to have the power in themselves, and independent of Allah, to bring them benefit or harm; therefore, they worshipped them and prayed to them for the fulfillment of their needs. The above polytheism is certainly not implied by the term seeking intercession (*al-tawassul* / التوسل), neither from the point of view of language since as we have seen intercession means to seek to get near someone by doing something (*al-taqarrub ilā al-ghair bi 'amalīn*), nor from the point of view of the *sharā'ah* since according to the *sharā'ah* it means to approach Allah through the love in which He holds someone or something as we explained above.

Not only is the Pseudo-Salafi interpretation of the above *āyah* precluded by the first part of the *āyah*, as we have shown above, but it is also precluded by the last part of the *āyah* which, in fact, is another proof of the legitimacy of seeking intercession (*al-tawassul*) as we shall see. Imām al-Baghawā remarked commenting on the words of the Qur'an: *Those whom they call are seeking the way to get near to their Lord*:

That is, those whom the polytheists call gods and whom they worship—and Ibn 'Abbās and Mujāhid said that the ones they worshipped were Jesus, and his mother, and Ezra ('Uzair), and the angels, and the sun, and the moon, and the stars—they seek the means to come near (*al-wasālah* / الوسيلة) their Lord. It is also said that *al-wasālah* means rank (*al-darajah* / الدرجة); in other words, [the *āyah* means that] they humbly entreat Allah to grant them high rank. Again it is said that *al-wasālah* is any means by which one tries to come close to Allah. As for the words of Allah *which one of them is closest (ayyuhum aqrabu)* [which come after the above-mentioned words in the *āyah*] they mean that *they look to see which one of them is closest to Allah that they might intercede through him*.

³ There is a principle that two texts will not be considered to be contradictory unless they are of the same status because it is necessary to prefer the text which is of higher status than the lower. Thus a *ādāth* of the Prophet ﷺ will be preferred over a saying of a Companion, and the saying of a Companion over the saying of a Follower, that is, one who met a Companion but not the Prophet ﷺ.

So consider the statement of al-Baghawá: *they look to see which one of them is closest to Allah that they might intercede through him*. Al-Baghawá has been hailed by the people of Islám as *the Reviver of the Sunnah (Muääyu 'I-Sunnah)*. Even Ibn Taimáyah had the highest regard for al-Baghawá. Will the Pseudo-Salafis also write him off as another polytheist?

If one considers Allah's words ﷻ "Call on those whom you presume other than He." in the above-mentioned *ayah*, he should understand that something is omitted or understood because the sentence as it stands is incomplete: *presume* requires an object in English just as much as it does in Arabic. Omission (*hadhf* / حذف) is quite common in Arabic and occurs frequently in the Qur'an. When omission is used discreetly, it is considered a mark of eloquence. As we saw above al-Bukhàrà and al-Baghawá understood that the object of *presume* is understood; they understood that the words *to be gods* are implied. From the foregoing discussion it is seen that the Pseudo-Salafis have no basis for their claim that Allah ﷻ condemns those who call on His creatures seeking their intercession. Moreover, we see that they have interpreted the *ayah* in a way which agrees with their preconceived notions, with their persuasion. This is something very dangerous, for the Prophet ﷺ has sternly forbidden us to interpret the Qur'an according to our own opinions. In the *äadäth* of Ibn 'Abbàs, for example, which al-Tirmidhà and others have reported, he is reported to have said: "Whoever interprets the Qur'an according to his own opinion, let him prepare to take his seat in Hell." Shaikh al-Islám Zakaráyah al-Anäärà mentioned in his book *al-Taisár fi 'Ulâm al-Tafsár*, which is an introduction to the principles of Qur'anic commentary, that the person who ventures to explain the Qur'an without depending on the recognized authorities has to have mastered fifteen different sciences of the *shará'ah*; otherwise, whatever he will explain will be his mere opinion since he lacks the intellectual tools of commentary.

We have seen in the discussion above that the pagan Arabs used to believe that others than Allah could bring them benefit or cause them harm. They used to take their idols, or the *jinn*, of the angels, or Jesus, or Ezra ('Uzair) as protectors and worship them. We previously quoted the following verse: "Those who take protectors other than He say, 'We don't worship them except that they might bring us closer to Allah.'" When the Prophet ﷺ proposed to the chiefs of Quraish who had gathered at the house of his uncle, Abâ Äàlib, that they should say "There is no god but Allah" in order that they might become the masters of the Arabs and that the non-Arabs might pay them tribute (*jizyah*), they replied as the Qur'an describes:

﴿اجعل الآلهة إلها واحدا إن هذا لشيء عجاب وانطلق الملائمة منهم أن امشوا واصبروا على آلهتكم إن هذا لشيء يراد﴾

(Has he made the gods one God. That is something very strange! Their leaders walked away [saying]: Let's go. Continue to adhere to your gods. This is what is needed.)

Clearly, then, the Arabs used to believe in and worship other gods besides Allah. As simple as that might seem, the Pseudo-Salafis following Ibn Taimáyah pretend that the Arabs used to know that Allah was the one who created them and the only one who could benefit them or harm them; yet, in spite of knowing that, they used to worship others than Allah. The Pseudo-Salafis call the realization that Allah has created us and He alone has the power to benefit or harm us the unity of lordship (*tauääd al-rubäbäyah* / توحيد الربوبية). The realization that none deserves to be worshipped but Allah, they call the unity of godship (*tauääd al-ulähäyah* / توحيد الألوهية). Having divided the realization of unity into the unity of lordship and godship (*tauääd al-ulähäyah*), the Pseudo-Salafis then declare that the pagan Arabs realized the unity of

lordship (*tau'ād al-rubābāyah*), but not the unity of godhead (*tau'ād al-ulāhāyah*). That is why Allah denounced them, and for that reason they were unbelievers who were they to die without repentance would remain forever and ever in Hell. This division of the Islamic unity (*tau'ād*) into the unity of lordship and godhead is preposterous; it is a fiction of Ibn Taimāyah. Nobody ever came up with such a chimera before him. It was a gimmick he rigged to persuade the commoners that the Qur'ān supported his condemnation of intercession, for he argued that those who seek the intercession of the Prophet ﷺ, or a prophet, or saint, while they may realize the unity of lordship (*tau'ād al-rubābāyah*); yet, they do not realize the unity of godhead (*tau'ād al-ulāhāyah*) because, like the pagan Arabs who called on their protectors, they too call on protectors. The Pseudo-Salafis perversely insist that the call of one who seeks the intercession of the Prophet ﷺ is worship of the Prophet ﷺ, and for that reason anyone who seeks intercession is a polytheist just like the pagan Arabs. However, as we have already amply explained, there is all the difference in the world between one who asks Allah for something on account of something, or someone, that he knows Allah loves, believing that all power belongs to Allah and that thing, or person, has no power himself, and between one who asks an idol, or a *jinn*, believing that that idol, or *jinn*, has power to benefit or harm him independent of Allah. Making Muslims out to be polytheists is a very serious matter.

Al-Bukhārā quoted 'Abdullāh ibn 'Umar in his *Āa'āā* as saying that the most outstanding characteristic of the *al-Khawārij*⁴ is that they interpret the *āyāt* which were revealed concerning the polytheists to apply to Muslims. The great Hanafā *faqāh*, Ibn 'Ābidān remarked in his *Radd al-Mukhtār* that all those who rebel against the orthodox community are *Khawārij*. The Pseudo-Salafis should consider carefully how much they resemble the *Khawārij* and beware.

It is highly in order at this juncture to explain what is meant by the term worship (*'ibādah* / عبادة) because there appears to be a great deal of confusion about its correct meaning. No doubt, Pseudo-Salafis contributed to this confusion by wrongly teaching that to revere (*ta'āim* / تعظيم) anything means to worship it. This definition is manifestly wrong because reverence is something very central to Islām. Muslims are taught to revere their parents, Muslim religious scholars (*'ulamā*'), the written Qur'ān, the Ka'bah, and the Prophet ﷺ, for example. The Qur'ān proclaims:

﴿وَمَنْ يَعِظْ شَعَائِرَ اللَّهِ فَإِنَّهُ مِنْ تَقْوَى الْقُلُوبِ﴾

(Whoever honors the signs of Allah, verily, that pertains to the godfearingness of the hearts.)

Furthermore, the Qur'ān exhorts us to honor the Prophet ﷺ:

﴿إِنَّ اللَّهَ وَمَلَائِكَتَهُ يُصَلُّونَ عَلَى النَّبِيِّ يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا فَصَلُّوا عَلَيْهِ وَسَلِّمُوا تَسْلِيمًا﴾

⁴ *Al-Khawārij* is the name of an Islamic sect. They misinterpreted *āyāt* and thereby declared the mainstream Muslims to be infidels whose blood and property was considered lawful to themselves. Although the original *al-Khawārij* were those who fought against 'Alā ﷺ at the battle of Nahrāwand, the phenomena of the *Khawārij* is an ongoing phenomena as *ādāth* amply explain. The Prophet ﷺ said:

A people will come forth at the end of time who read the Qur'ān, but it will not get past their collar-bones. They will go out of Islām the way the arrow shoots through the quarry. Then they will never return [to Islām] until the arrow should return to the bow string. Their sign is the shaving of their heads (*al-ta'ālāq*).

After the battle of Nahrāwand somebody jubilantly said to: "We have finished them!" 'Alā relied: "Nay. Every time a section of them is cut down a section of them pops up somewhere else until the last of them should defect with *al-Masāā al-Dajjāl* (the Antichrist)." (NB: Source of this citation is needed.)

(Verily, Allah and his angels revere the Prophet ﷺ. O you who believe, revere him and seek peace for him.) The Arabic imperative verb *āallā* is usually translated as seek blessings, but in the present context that is not correct. The verb is derived from *āalāh* / صلاة whose meaning revolves around the ideas of honor and reverence as the specialists in Arabic language tell us. If worship simply meant to honor or revere, then the angels who prostrated to Adam at the command of Allah worshipped Adam. However, Allah could never order His creatures to commit polytheism. Furthermore, the Qur'an tells us that when the Prophet Jacob (*Ya'qāb*) with his ten sons entered the court of Joseph (*Yāsuf*) (on our Prophet and them be honor and peace), they fell down before him in prostration. Consider that Jacob was a prophet and so was Joseph, if that act of reverence had been worship, neither the first would have done it, nor the second permitted it. From these and other considerations, it becomes apparent that worship means something more than to reverence.

(NB: Document this issue.)

Getting back to the term worship, it has been defined as *showing the ultimate in humbleness* (*ghāyat al-tadhallul* / غاية التذلل).

(NB: Document this issue.)

As absurd as the claims of the Pseudo-Salafis might be, they have succeeded in misguiding and confusing many of the common people causing them to doubt the integrity and authority of orthodox Islam which has always advocated the legitimacy of seeking intercession (*al-tawassul* / التوسل). A person who believes that intercession which orthodoxy has always sanctioned is, in fact, polytheism (*shirk*) and unbelief (*kuff*) can easily be convinced that it has erred on other vital questions too, and induced to remove the tether of orthodoxy from his neck. Thus, what is really at stake in the controversy of intercession is the integrity of orthodoxy itself.

The Prophet ﷺ warned us emphatically to stick to the main and orthodox community. Numerous *āadāth* have come to us conveying a similar meaning. In fact, the number of such *āadāth* easily reaches the number which Muslim scholars (*'ulamā'*) who are experts in the principles of law (*usūl al-fiqh* / أصول الفقه) designated as the level of *superabundant recurrence* (*tawātur*) which level implies that the meaning of the recurrent report is certain. According to those whose opinion counts is a source of certain knowledge (*'ilm ḥurūrī* / علم ضروري). The obligation to stick to the main and orthodox community is a categorical obligation established by the *tawātur* we defined above. The wording in two of these recurrent *āadāth* whose number has reached the level of *tawātur* is as follows: "Stick to the main community (*al-jamā'ah* / الجماعة). Whoever separates from it, if only a hand-span, will be separate in Hell." "Whoever opposes the main community (*al-jamā'ah*), if only by a hand-span, has removed the tether of Islām from his neck."

The importance of the present treatise of ʿAbdullāh al-Ghumārā on intercession is not so much as a defense of a legitimate Islamic practice as it is a defense of the lofty Citadel of Islamic Orthodoxy.

Having said that, we may then insist that importance of intercession is not to be underestimated. Mankind has not seen real trouble yet. Real trouble is what mankind will face on the Plain of Judgement. Authentic tradition informs us that men will sweat puddles of anxiety as they wait to be judged and the sun will be near overhead. The ordeal will drag on and on until they start to ask one another what to do. Finally, some of them will suggest that they should go to Adam and seek his intercession. Adam will send them to Noah, and Noah will send them to Abraham and Abraham will send them to Moses and he will send them to Jesus who will send them to our Prophet (May Allah grant him and the other prophets peace and honor) who will then ask Allah to judge his servants and to show them mercy. Here I

wish to raise a question for the Pseudo-Salafis and for any who has been influenced or confused by their propaganda. Is not Allah closer to mankind on the Day of Judgement than their jugular veins? Why don't they pray directly to him rather than seek the intercession of the prophets? And what about the prophets like Moses and Jesus? Surely, they are not lacking in their belief in divine unity (*al-tauāād* / التوحيد); why don't they seek the succor of Allah who is closer to them than their jugular veins rather than seek the intercession of other prophets? Obviously, then, intercession is a divinely favored institution, one of the precious keys to the door of divine mercy, whether it be the intercession which the Prophet ﷺ will exercise on the Day of Judgement or whether it be the intercession he exercises for those who are in this world. Whoever, disdains it or ignores it, neither hurts nor deprives any but himself.

I have chosen to translate the present brief treatise on intercession by ʿAbdullāh al-Ghumārā because: firstly, it is brief; secondly, it is well-argued and riveted with proofs; thirdly, it competently exposes the deceitful and dishonest tactics of the Pseudo-Salafis; fourthly, it is a scholarly treatise; and fifthly, 'Abdullāh al-Ghumārā, its author is doubtlessly one of the greatest scholars of *āadāth* (*muāaddithān*) that have lived in this era, a man supremely qualified to speak on the topic. The reader who reads but a few lines becomes deeply impressed at al-Ghumārā's erudition, and mastery of the sciences of *āadāth* and *āadāth* criticism.

(NB: Introduction of al-Ghumari needed here.)

By [the grace of] the name of Allah, the Merciful, the Compassionate, [I begin].⁵

All praise is Allah's, the Lord of the Worlds. The last word will be for those who fear Allah. Enmity is only for those who transgress. I seek blessings and peace on our master, Muhammad, and on his noble house. May Allah be pleased with his Companions and their Followers.

To get to the point, I declare that Shaikh Albāni, may Allah forgive him, is a man who is motivated by ulterior purposes and desire. If he sees a *āadāth*⁶ or a report (*athar*⁷,

⁵ My authority for the interpolations in the above translation of the *basmalah* (that is, the Arabic name the sacred formula translated above) is the science called in Arabic *ma'ānā* requires that such meaning as I have interpolated are necessarily implied. See, for example, the introduction to the super-commentary on *Sharā al-'Aqā'id* called *al-Nabrās* by 'Abd al-'Azāz al-Farhari (Multān, Pakistan; Maktabah al-Āqqānāyah, n.d.), p. 3.

⁶ *Āadāth* refers to a saying reported from the Prophet of Islām ﷺ, or a report about his habit or deed or character or appearance.

⁷ *Athar* here refers to a report from a Companion; that is, one who lived to see the Prophet ﷺ, or from a Follower; that is, one who lived to see a Companion even if he didn't hear anything from him.

أثر) that does not accord with his persuasion⁸ he straightway proceeds to foist it off as weak (*ṣa'āf/ضعيف*). By using guile and deception he prevails upon his readers that he is right; whereas, he is wrong. Rather, he is a sinner and a hoodwinker. By such duplicity he has succeeded in misguiding his followers who trust him and think that he is right.

One of those who has been deceived by him is Äamdä al-Äalafi⁹ who edited *al-Mu'jam al-Kabär*¹⁰. He had the impudence to declare a rigorously authentic (*āāāā*) *äadäth* weak (*ṣa'āf/ضعيف*)¹¹ because it did not go along with his sectarian dogmas just as it did not concur with the persuasion of his teacher (*shaikh*). The proof of that is that what he says about the *äadäth's* being weak is just what his *shaikh* says.¹²

This being the case, I wished to present the real truth of the matter and to expose the falsity of the claims of both the deceiver [Albàni] and the deceived [Äamdä al-Äalafi].

I declare that I depend on none but Allah; He is my support and to Him do I consign myself.

Al-Äabaränä¹³ reported in his *al-Mu'jam al-Kabär*¹⁴ from Ibn Wahb from Shabäb from Rauä ibn al-Qäsım from Abä Ja'far al-Khatamä al-Madanä from Abä Umàmah ibn Sahl ibn Äunaif: 'Uthmàn ibn Äunaif

A man was going to 'Uthmàn ibn 'Affàn ﷺ¹⁵ trying to get something done for himself. However, 'Uthmàn ﷺ didn't pay any attention to him, nor did he look after his need. That man went to 'Uthmàn ibn Äunaif and complained about that to him. 'Uthmàn ibn Äunaif said to him, "Go and perform ablution (*wuṣūʿ/وضوء*), then go to the mosque and pray two cycles (*rak'ah/ركعة*) of prayer, then say: 'O Allah, I ask You and I approach You through your Prophet Muäammad, the Prophet of Mercy. O Muäammad, I approach my Lord through you that my need be fulfilled,' then mention your need. Thereafter come to me that I might go with you."

Then the man went away and did what he was told. After that he went to the door of 'Uthmàn ibn 'Affàn; whereupon the doorkeeper took him by the hand and ushered him into 'Uthmàn ibn 'Affàn who sat him down beside him on his mat and said to him, "What can I do for you?" He told him what he needed and 'Uthmàn had that done for him and then he said to him, "I didn't remember your problem until now. Whenever you need anything come to me." Thereupon the man left him and went to 'Uthmàn ibn Äunaif and said, "May Allah bless you, 'Uthmàn wouldn't look after me, nor even pay attention to me until you spoke to him about me." 'Uthmàn ibn Äunaif replied, "I swear by Allah that I didn't speak to him. Actually, I saw a blind man come to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and complain to him about losing his sight. The Prophet ﷺ said to him, "Wouldn't you rather show patience?" He

⁸ That is, sectarian beliefs.

⁹.

¹⁰ A famous collection of *äadäth* compiled by al-Äabaränä (d.). It is a huge collection comprising ? volumes.

¹¹

¹² Albàni that the *äadäth* is weak in his book: *al-Tawassul*, p. 88.

¹³ Note on al-Äabaränä.

¹⁴ ص 18، ج 9، طبعة...

¹⁵ 'Uthmàn ibn 'Affàn / was the third Caliph (*Khalāfah/*) of Islām. He succeeded 'Umar in the year 23 h./643 a.d., and was slain by conspirators on the 18th of Dhu 'l-Äijah, 35 h. (June 17th, 656 a.d.), aged eighty-two, and having reigned twelve years. The the Prophet ﷺ married him to his daughter Ruqayyah, and when she died he married him to his second daughter Umm Kulthām. For that reason 'Uthmàn is known fondly amongst the Muslims as *Dhā Nārāin (the Holder of the Two Lights)*.

replied, "O Messenger of Allah, I don't have a guide and the matter has become an ordeal for me." The Prophet ﷺ said to him, "Go and make ablution (*wuṣṣā*), then pray two cycles (*rak'ah*) of prayer, then make this supplication (*du'ā'* / دعاء)...."

I swear by Allah, we hadn't gone away, nor had we remained long time talk when the man returned as if he had never suffered any affliction.

Al-Āabarānā declared this report to be rigorously authentic (*āāāā* / صحيح)¹⁶; whereas, Āamdā al-Salafi contradicted him saying:

There is no doubt about the authenticity of that part of the *āadāth* [concerning the story of the blind man]¹⁷; the doubt concerns the [first part of] the story [concerning 'Uthmān ibn Āunaif 's instructions to the man who sought the help of 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān] which heretics (*mubtadi'ah*) adduce attempting to prove the legitimacy of their heretical practice of calling the Prophet ﷺ for his intercession. [That part of the story is in doubt for the reasons which we will explain.] Firstly, as al-Āabarānā mentioned, Shabāb [who is one of the narrators mentioned in the report's chain of narration (*sanad* / سند) is alone in reporting this *āadāth*. Then, Shabāb's narrations are not bad (*la ba'sa bihi* / لا بأس به) on two conditions: first, that his son Aāmad be the one who narrates from him; second, that Shabāb's narration be from Yānus ibn Yazād. However, in the present case, Shabāb's narration is reported by [three persons]: Ibn Wahb, and Shabāb's two sons Ismā'āl and Aāmad. As for Ibn Wahb, extremely reliable narrators (*al-thiqah* / الثقة) criticized Ibn Wahb's narrations from Shabāb, as they criticized Shabāb himself. And as for Shabāb's son, Ismā'āl, he is unknown. Although Aāmad also reports this *āadāth* from Shabāb, it is not Shabāb's report from Yānus ibn Yazād [which (as Āamdā pretends) is what the experts in narration stipulated as the condition for the correctness of Shabāb's narrations]. Furthermore, the experts in narration

¹⁶ **NB: Check to see if al-Tabarani claimed the mauquf version to be authentic or whether he simply said shabib was thiqah.** As did al-Haithami (d.) in his *Majma' al-Zawā'id*, p. 179, vol. 2; and al-Mundhārī in his *al-Tarḡhīb wa al-Tarḥīb*. Check it.

¹⁷ The recognized authorities in the field of *āadāth* and its criticism unanimously regard the *āadāth* of the blind man (*al-ṣarār* /) to be a sound *āadāth*. Al-Tirmidhī reported it and said that it is *āasan saāāā gharīb*, and he remarked that he didn't know this *āadāth* by any other chain of narration (*sanad*). Ibn Khuzaimah reported the *āadāth* with the same chain in his *āadāth*, and Aāmad reported it in his *al-Musnad*, p. 138, vol. 4; and al-Nisā'ā in his *'Amal al-Yaum wa al-Lailah*, p. 417; and Ibn Mājah in his *al-Sunan*, p. 441, vol. 1; and al-Bukhārā in his *al-Tārākh al-Kabār*, p. 210, vol.6; and al-Āabarānā in his *al-Mu'jam al-Kabār*, p.19, vol. 9; and also in his *Kitāb al-Du'ā'*, p. 1289, vol. 2; and al-Āakim in his *al-Mustadrak*, p. 313 and p. 519, vol. 1; he declared it to be a rigorously authentic *āadāth* (*āāāā*), and al-Dhahabā affirmed its authenticity [in his annotations on *al-Mustadrak*]. Al-Baihaqā reported the *āadāth* in his *Dalā'il al-Nubāwah*, p. 166, vol. 6, and in his *al-Da'wat al-Kubrā*.

In spite of al-Tirmidhī's disacknowledgement, **(Ibn Taimiyah also refuted al-Tirmidhi on the absence of any other chain. See Radd al-Muhkan, p.143-144. Check the source of his statement and mention it.)** there is another chain of this *āadāth*, which is what the specialists call *mutāba'ah* / . Shu'bah reported the same *āadāth* with the chain (*sanaḍ*) which Aāmad ibn Salamah reported from Abā Ja'far in al-Tirmidhī's version. 'Abdullāh al-Ghumārā mentioned the names of the authorities who reported this *āadāth* in his book *al-Radd al-Muākam al-Matān 'alā Kitāb al-Qaul al-Mubān*, (Cairo, Maktabat al-Qāhirah, 3rd ed., 1986), pp. 144-149, the different sources of the *āadāth*, and its alternate chains (*mutāba'ah*) as did Maāmād Sa'ād Mamdāā in his *Raf'u al-Manārah fi Takhrāj Aāād th al-Tawassul wa al-Ziyārah* (Amman, Jordan, Dār al-Imām al-Nawawā, 1st ed., 1995), pp.94-95. **NB: Add to this note the authentication of al-Nawawī, and al-Hafiz, and al-Suyuti, and Ibn Taimiyah as mentioned by al-Ghumari, p. 149.**

(*al-muäaddithân / المحدثون*) are at variance concerning the text of this *äadäth* which they narrate from Aämad [ibn Shabäb]. Ibn al-Sunnä reported the *äadäth* in his *'Amal al-Yaum wa 'l-Lailah / عمل اليوم والليلة* and al-Ääkim reported it with three different chains of narration (*sanaä*) neither of them mentioning the story [of 'Uthmàn ibn Äunaif and the man who wanted to see 'Uthmàn]. Al-Ääkim reported the *äadäth* by way 'Aun ibn 'Amàrah al-Basrá from Rauä ibn al-Qàsım My teacher (*shaikh*) Muäammad Näsir al-Dän al-Albàni: "Even though 'Aun is weak (*ça'if*), still his version of the *äadäth* (*riwäyah / رواية*) [without the story of 'Uthmàn ibn Äunaif] is preferable to Shabäb's since Rauä's narration agrees with the narrations of Shu'bah and Äamàd ibn Salamah through Abu Ja'far al-Khaämä [without the story of 'Uthmàn ibn Äunaif].

The foregoing discussion¹⁸ is misleading and distorted in several ways.

First Point

The story [of 'Uthmàn ibn Äunaif and the man who wanted to see 'Uthmàn] was reported by al-Baihaqä in *Dalä'ilü 'l-Nubäwah*¹⁹ by way of Ya'qäb ibn Sufyàn who said that Aämad ibn Shabäb ibn Sa'äd reported to me that his father reported to him from Rauä ibn al-Qàsım from Abu Ja'far al-Khatamä from Abu Usàmah ibn Sahl ibn Äunaif that a man was going to 'Uthmàn ibn 'Affàn and he mentioned the story in its entirety.

Ya'qäb ibn Sufyàn is [Abä Yusäf] al-Fasawä (d. 77 h.)²⁰, the *Ääfiä*,²¹ the *Imàm*,²² the utterly reliable transmitter (*al-thiqah / الثقة*),²³ rather, he is better than utterly reliable (*thiqah*).

¹⁸Which is a regurgitation of what Albàni has said in his *al-Tawassul*, p. 88.

¹⁹دلائل النبوة، ص 167-168، ج6، طبعة كذا و كذا...

²⁰ Ya'qäb ibn Sufyàn is mentioned in Ibn Äajr's reputed and authoritative dictionary of narrators: *Taqrīb al-Tahdhāb* (Beirut, Dār al-Rashād, 3rd ed., 1991), p.608.

²¹ A *ääfiä* was a scholar of *äadäth* who had prodigious powers of memory and had memorized, according to some, at least one hundred thousand *äadäths*.

²² *Imàm* was a *äadäth* scholar (*muäaddith*) whose integrity and mastery in the science was so outstanding and his opinion so apt that other scholars began to depend on him for guidance in the field. It was the *imäms* who established who were the weak narrators and who were the strong, and, likewise, it were they who established which version of a *äadäth* was correct and which, if any, were incorrect or weak. Once a man became established as an *imàm*, he was impeachable; nobody's criticism could impair his reputation and authority. This is an established principle in the science of the authentication and criticism of narrators (*'ilm al-jarä wa al-ta'däl /*) **NB: Reference this point and give the example of Abu Hanifah and al-Bukhari.**

²³ *Thiqah /* refers to a narrator of *äadäth* who is qualified both by integrity (*'adalah /*) and minute accuracy (*çabäl /*). The latter term means that the transmitter hears and remembers correctly what is transmitted to him the first time and, thereafter, can recall exactly what he remembered whenever he wishes to narrate; in other words, he gets it right the first time and every time thereafter. Integrity means that the narrator neither lies nor commits major sins (*al-kabä'ir /*).

The chain of narration (*sanad*) of this *āadāth* is utterly reliable (*āāāā / صحيح*).²⁴ Thus the story [about 'Uthmān ibn Āunaif] is quite authentic. Other [specialists in the science of *āadāth* and its narrators] also proclaimed the *āadāth* to be rigorously authentic (*āāāā*). Āāfiæ al-Mundharā (d.)²⁵ mentioned in his *al-Targhāb wa al-Tarhāb*: p. 606, vol. 2;²⁶ and Āāfiæ al-Haithamā (d.)²⁷ mentioned it in his *Mu'jam' al-Zawā'id*: p. 179, vol. 2.²⁸ NB: Check

Second Point

Aāmad ibn Shabāb (d.) is one of the narrators that al-Bukhārā (d.)²⁹ depended on; al-Bukhārā reported *āadāth* from Aāmad ibn Shabāb both in his *Āāāā* and in his *al-Adab al-Mufrad*. Abā Āātim al-Razā (d.)³⁰ also declared him to be utterly reliable (*thiqah*), and both he and Abā Zur'ah (d.) wrote down his *āadāth*.³¹ Ibn 'Adā (d.)³² mentioned that the people of Basrah [that is, the experts in the science of *āadāth* and criticism] considered him to be utterly reliable (*thiqah*) and 'Alā al-Madānā (d.)³³ wrote down his *āadāth*.

²⁴ *Āāāā* () is a technical term in the science of *āadāth*. It refers to a narration which has the following five qualifications:

- 1) A chain of narration (*sanad*) going back to the Prophet ﷺ.
- 2) A chain of narration (*sanad*) which is continuous in that every narrator (*rāwā*) heard directly from person he narrates from. This condition is called *ittisāl* .
- 3) Every narrator (*rāwā*) is considered by the authorities of the science of criticism of narrators (*'ilm al-jarā wa al-ta'dāl*) to be utterly reliable (*thiqah*). *Thiqah* was defined above in footnote 23.
- 4) Both the text of the *āadāth* and its chain of narrators (*sanad*) must be free of any hidden defect (*'illah*). *Hidden defect* (*'illah*) is defined as a factor which prejudices the soundness of the *āadāth* or its *sanad*. On account of its subtleness, it could only be recognized by a few masters of the art like al-Dāraqūnī, al-Tirmidhā, al-Āākim, and Ibn Rajab, for example.
- 5) The text of the *āadāth* must not contradict any principle established by recurrent *āadāth* (*mutawātīr*), or clear-cut texts of the Qur'an (*al-nusās al-qā'āyah*) . Neither may any of the narrators contradict those who are more reliable than he either in terms of the text of the narration or in the particulars of the *sanad*. In the case of any of the above the *āadāth* will be regarded as *irregular* (*shadh*), and therefore weak. NB: **Check this definition.** The recognition of such *irregularity* requires one to be familiar with the entire corpus of *āadāth*, and, as such, the only people qualified to recognize it are the early *imāms*. NB: **Mention an authority for this point, and for the conditions of *sahih*.**

²⁵ He is

²⁶ Publication data.

²⁷ He is

²⁸ Publication data.

²⁹ Note on al-Bukhārā and his two books mentioned here.

³⁰

³¹

³²

³³

Aämad's father, Shabáb ibn Sa'ád al-Tamámá al-Habatá al-Basrá (d.)³⁴ is also one of the narrators whom al-Bukhàrá depended on in both his *Āāāā* and his *al-Adab al-Mufrad*. Those who considered Shabáb to be *thiqah* include: Abâ Zur'ah, Abâ Äätim, al-Nisà'á, al-Dhahlá, al-Dàraquná , and al-Åabaràná³⁵.

Abâ Äätim related that Shabáb had in his keeping the books of Yânus ibn Yazâd (d.), and he said that Shabáb was reliable (*âaliâ / صالح*) in *äadâth* and that there was nothing wrong with him (*lâ ba'sa bihi / لا بأس به*).³⁶

Ibn 'Adá said: "Shabáb had a copy of the book³⁷ of al-Zuhrá. He had in his keeping sound *äadâth* which Yânus related from al-Zuhrá."³⁸

['Alá] ibn al-Madáná said about Shabáb: "He was utterly reliable (*thiqah*). He used to go to Egypt for trade. His book was authentic (*âāiā*)."³⁹

The foregoing relates to the authentication (*ta'dâl*) of Shabáb.⁴⁰ As you notice there is no stipulation that his narration be from Yânus ibn Yazâd in order to be authentic (*âāāā*).

34

³⁵ Al-Åabaràná mentioned this in his *al-Mu'jam al-Āaghār* (pub. Data), p. 184, vol. 1, and in his *al-Mu'jam al-Kabár* (pub. Data), p. 17, vol. 9. NB: Check it.

³⁶ Maämâd Sa'ád Mamdâä is one of the leading *äadâth* experts (*muä addithân*) of the present time, and a student of the author of this treatise, 'Abdullâh al-Ghumârâ, and a student of several of the renown *äadâth* specialists (*muäaddithân*) of the era, including the Meccan *Muäaddith* Yâsân al-Faydaná. Shaikh Maämâd Sa'ád in *Raf'u al-Manàrah*, p. 98, mentioned that Abâ Zur'ah, Abâ Äätim, and al-Nisà'á all said about Shabáb: *lâ ba'sa bihi* (*There is nothing wrong with him.*) Shaikh Mahmâd pointed out: "That is all that is required in order to authenticate a narrator and render what he narrates authentic (*âāāā*) and warrant its mention [by al-Bukhàrá and Muslim] in the two *Āāāā*'s. **NB: Give source of the original statement of Abâ Hatim.**

³⁷ Al-Zuhrá (d.) His book was monumental in that it was the first book of *ad th* to be written down. 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azâz, the scholar-prince whom posterity hailed as *the Fifth Righteous Caliph of Isl m*, ordered al-Zuhrá to write down the *äadâth* for he feared that the knowledge of *äadâth* would disappear were they not written down. Al-Zuhrá's book thus marked the beginning of the second era in the history of the science of *äadâth*. The first era was characterized by a conspicuous absence of anything written down. The earliest *muäaddithân* depended entirely on their prodigious powers of memory and were adverse to writing anything down.

³⁸ **Mention source of this quote.**

³⁹ Maämâd Sa'ád Mamdâä observed in his book *Raf'u al-Manàrah fi Takhráj Aäädâth al-Tawassul wa al-Ziyàrah*, p. 100, that Albàni in quoting the above statement of 'Alá al-Madáná in his *al-Tawassul*, p. 86, deliberately omitted the first part of his statement and the most important part of it; namely, that Shabáb was utterly reliable (*thiqah*). Albàni wrote in his *al-Tawassul*: "'Alá al-Madáná said: 'He used to go to Egypt on business. . .'" Nowhere did Albàni mention that 'Alá al-Madáná said that Shabáb was utterly reliable (*thiqah*). Given that the entire thrust of Albàni's argument is that Shabáb is not reliable, Albàni's omission of 'Alá al-Madáná's confirmation of Shabáb's reliability is a very serious matter. Keep in mind that the whole issue under consideration here is the examination of the evidence for one of the practices (*sunnahs*) of the Last of the Messengers ﷺ (that is, intercession /) and the scrutinization of the witnesses who tendered that evidence. Thus any tampering of the evidence, or misrepresentation of the witnesses is a grave breach of trust, an act of perfidy against the religion of Islâm.

⁴⁰ Shaikh Mahmâd mentioned in his *Raf'u al-Manàrah fi Takhráj Aäädâth al-Tawassul wa al-Ziyàrah*, p.98, that **Albàni is the first person to claim that Shabáb is a weak narrator.** Maämâd Sa'ád mentioned the opinions of nine *imams* in the sciences of *äadâth* and criticism (*'ilm al-jarä wa al-ta'dâl*) that

Rather, Ibn al-Madānā affirms that his book *was* authentic,⁴¹ while Ibn ‘Adā confined himself to commenting about Shabāb’s copy of al-Zuhrā’s book not intending to intimate anything about the rest of Shabāb’s narrations. So what Albāni claims [namely, that Shabāb’s narrations are authentic on the condition that he narrate from Yānus ibn Yazād] is deception and a breach of academic and religious trust.

What I have said [about Shabāb’s unconditional reliability] is further corroborated by the fact that [another *āadāth* which Shabāb related; namely] the *āadāth* about the blind man [who came to the Prophet ﷺ to plead him to pray for him] was declared to be authentic by the *āadāth* experts (*āufāḥ* / حفاظ)⁴² although Shabāb did not narrate this *āadāth* from Yūnus by way of al-Zuhrā. Rather, he related it from Rauā ibn al-Qāsim.

Furthermore, Albāni claims that since some narrators whose *āadāth* are mentioned by Ibn al-Sunnā and al-Āākim did not mention the story [about ‘Uthmān ibn Āunaif], the story is doubtful (*ḥa’īf*). This is another example of Albāni’s trickery. People who have some knowledge about the principles of the science of *āadāth* know that some narrators report a given *āadāth* in its entirety, while others may choose to abridge it according to their purpose at hand. Al-Bukhārā, for example, does that routinely in his *Āāāā* where he often mentions a *āadāth* in abridged form while it is given by someone else in complete form. Moreover, the person who has related the story [about ‘Uthmān ibn Āunaif] in al-Baihaqā’s report is an extraordinary *imām*: Ya’qāb ibn Sufyān. Abā Zur’ah al-Dimishqā says about him: “Two men from the noblest of mankind came to us; one of them, Ya’qāb ibn Sufyān the most widely-traveled of the two, , defies the people of Iraq to produce a single man who can narrate [as well] as he does.”

Albāni’s declaring the narration of ‘Aun, which in fact is weak, to be better than the narration of those who narrated the story [of ‘Uthmān ibn Āunaif] is a third aspect of Albāni’s duplicity and fraud because when al-Āākim related the *āadāth* of the blind man in an abridged form by way of ‘Aun, he remarked:

Shabāb ibn Sa’ād al-Āabaā has given the same *āadāth* by way of Rauā ibn al-Qāsim with some additions to the text (*matn* / متن) and the chain of narrators (*isnād* / إسناد). The decision in the matter is Shabāb’s since he is utterly reliable (*thiqah*) and trustworthy (*ma’mān*).

What al-Āākim says emphasizes a precept which is universally recognized by the experts in the science of *āadāth* (*al-muāaddithān*) and the principles of the holy law (*usūl al-fiqh* / أصول الفقه); namely, that additional wording related by a narrator who is utterly reliable (*thiqah*) is acceptable (*maqbalah* / مقبولة), and, furthermore, someone who remembered something is a proof against someone who didn’t remember it.

Shabāb is reliable. Those *imāms* are: ‘Alā al-Madānā, Muāammad ibn Yaäyā al-Dhahlā, al-Dāraqūnā, al-Āabarānā, Ibn Āibbān, al-Āākim, Abā Zur’ah, Abā Āātim, al-Nisā’ā .

⁴¹ Maāmād Sa’ād Mamdāā points out in *Raf’u al-Manārah fi Takhrāj Aāāḥ al-Tawassul wa al-Ziyārah*, pp. 99-100, that the accuracy (*ḥab* /) of a narrator [which along with integrity (*‘adālah* /) establishes reliability] is of two kinds: accuracy in respect of his memory (*ab al-if* /), and accuracy in respect of what he has written down (*ḥabā al-kitābah* / ضبط الكتابة). ‘Alā al-Madānā first declares that Shabāb is utterly reliable (*thiqah*) without stating any condition. Thereafter, he reinforces that by stating that his book is also authentic without making his reliability conditional on being from that book. Furthermore, Maāmād Sa’ād observes that Albāni..... **to be completed concerning Albāni’s deliberate omission and/or cross-referenced.**

⁴² **NB: Cross reference needed here.**

Third Point

Albàni saw al-Äàkim's statement but he didn't like it, so he ignored it, and obstinately and dishonestly insisted on the superiority of 'Aun's weak narration.

It has been made clear that the story [about 'Uthmàn ibn Äunaif] is rigorously authentic (*äaäää*) in spite of Albàni's [and Ibn Taimáyah's] deceitful attempts to discredit it. The story shows that seeking the Prophet's ﷺ intercession after his passing away is permissible since the Companion⁴³ who reported the *äadäth* understood that it was permissible and the understanding of the narrator *is* significant in the view of the holy law (*sharä'ah* / الشريعة), for it has its weight in the field of deducing (*istinbäa* / استنباط) the detailed rules of the holy law (*sharä'ah*).

We say *according to the understanding of the narrator* for the sake of argument; otherwise, in actuality, 'Uthmàn ibn Äunaif's instructing the man to seek the intercession of the Prophet ﷺ was according to what he had heard from the Prophet ﷺ as the *äadäth* of the blind man [which 'Uthmàn ibn Äunaif himself related] establishes.

Ibn Abä Khaithamah stated in his *Tärikh* [which is a genre of writing which deals with the history and reputation of narrators of *äadäth*]:

Muslim ibn Ibrähäm related to me that Äamàd ibn Salamah said: Abä Ja'far al-Khatamä related to me from 'Amàrah ibn Khuzaimah from 'Uthmàn ibn Äunaif ﷺ: A blind man came to the Prophet ﷺ and said: "I have lost my sight. Pray to Allah for me." He answered: "Go and make ablution and then pray two cycles (*rak'ah* / ركعة) of prayer, and then say: 'O Allah, I ask You and I approach you through my Prophet Muhammäd, The Prophet of Mercy. O Muäammad, I seek your intercession with Allah that my sight should be restored. O Allah, accept my intercession for myself and accept the intercession of my Prophet for the restoration of my sight.' **If ever you have any need do like that.**" (Find this reference and quote it.)

The chain of narration (*isnäd*) of this *äadäth* is rigorously authentic (*äaäää*). The last clause of the *äadäth* constitutes the express permission of the Prophet ﷺ to seek his intercession whenever there occurred any need.

Notwithstanding, Ibn Taimáyah objected on feeble grounds that this last clause comprehended some covert technical defect (*'illah* / علة) [which prejudices the authenticity of the *äadäth* or at least its last clause]. I have demonstrated the invalidity of those grounds elsewhere.⁴⁴ Indeed, Ibn Taimáyah is characteristically audacious in rejecting *äadäth* which do

⁴³ Companion (*al-Saäàbä* /) refers to one who saw the Prophet ﷺ during his lifetime and believed in him. **NB: Reference needed.**

⁴⁴ 'Abdulläh al-Ghumärä mentioned in his book *al-Radd al-Muhkam al-Matän 'alä al-Kitäb al-Mubän*, p. 141, that in his book *al-Qaul al-Mubän fä Äukm Du'à' wa Nidä' al-Mautà min al-anbiyà' wa al-äliän* / pretended that the story of 'Uthmàn ibn Äunaif and the man to whom he taught the prayer of intercession (*al-tawassul*) was forged (*makdhäbah* /) because the story, if it were true, requires that 'Uthmàn ibn 'Affàn was a tyrant (*ẖälim* /) who denied people their rights and didn't even listen to them. Moreover, Ibn Taimáyah claims that the none of the books of the *sunnah* contain this story.

'Abdulläh al-Ghumärä points out in his book, p.142; firstly, that 'Uthmàn ibn 'Affàn ﷺ apologized to the man for forgetting his business until the man appeared before him as is mentioned in

not conform with his purpose at hand even if those *äadäth* are rigorously authentic (*äääää*) . A good example of that is the following case: Al-Bukhàrá reported in his *Äääää*: "Allah existed and there was nothing other than Him." This *äadäth* is in agreement with the [clear-cut] evidence of the Qur`an, the *sunnah*, reason, and certain consensus (*al-ijmà' al-mutayaqqan / الإجماع المتيقن*) However, since it conflicts with his belief in the eternity of the world,⁴⁵ he turned to another version of this *äadäth* which al-Bukhàrá also reported: "Allah existed and there was nothing before Him." And he rejected the first version in favor of the second on the grounds that the second conforms with another *äadäth*. "You are the first; there is nothing before You." [He held that the implication was that created things *always* existed along with Allah.] Ääfiæ Ibn Äajr remarked concerning the correct manner of reconciling the apparent contradiction in the above-mentioned *äadäths*: "In fact the way to reconcile the two versions of the *äadäth* is to understand the second in light of the first, and not the other way around. Moreover, there is consensus on the principle that reconciliation of two apparently contradictory versions of a text (*nass / نص*) takes precedence over endorsing one version at the expense of revoking the other."⁴⁶

Actually, Ibn Taimáyah's prejudice blinded him from understanding the two versions of the *äadäth* which, in fact, are not mutually contradictory. That is because the version "Allah existed and there was nothing before Him." has the meaning which is contained in His name *the First*, whereas, the version "Allah existed and there was nothing other than Him." has the meaning contained in His name *the One*. The proof of this is still another version of the *äadäth* with the wording "Allah existed before everything."⁴⁷

Another example of Ibn Taimáyah's audacity in rejecting *äadäth* is the case of the *äadäth*: "The Messenger of Allah ﷺ ordered the doors which opened on the mosque from the street to be sealed, but he left 'Alá's door [open]." This *äadäth* is rigorously authentic (*sahih*). Ibn al-Jauzá (d.)⁴⁸ was mistaken by mentioning it in his collection of forged *äadäths*, *al-Maudu'ät*. Ääfiæ [Ibn Äajr] corrected him in his *al-Qaul al-Musaddad*: "Ibn Taimáyah because of his well-known bias against 'Alá was not content with Ibn al-Jauzá's declaration that the *äadäth* was forged, but took the initiative to add from his own bag [of fraud] ***the pretence that the hädith experts (al-muhaddithūn) are agreed that the äadäth is forged.*** Ibn Taimáyah has rejected so many *äadäth* simply because they are irreconcilable with his opinions that it is hard to keep track of the instances.⁴⁹ (Check to see which Ibn Hajr is referred to here; who published the book; where the quote ends; and who has authenticated the hadith apart from Ibn)

Fourth Point

the *äadäth* itself. Secondly, al-Ghumàrá observed that the claim that none of the books of *sunnah* contain this story is an outright lie because, as we have seen, it was mentioned by al-Äabaräná, al-Baihaqá, al-Mundhará, al-Haithamá, Moreover, as we have also seen, the *äadäth* has different chains of narration (*äuruq*), and their *sanads* are sound **NB: Complete the references with mention of al-Nawawi etc. Then find and quote the reference here from *al-Qaul al-Mubin*.**

⁴⁵ NB: Mention some statements of his with their sources.

⁴⁶ NB: Mention source.

⁴⁷ NB: Mention source of this *äadäth*.

⁴⁸ He is Abä al-Faraj

⁴⁹ 'Abdulläh al-Ghumàrá has mentioned in his numerous works a great number of such instances of Ibn Taimáyah's dishonesty. His book : *al-Radd al-Muhkam al-Matin 'alä al-Kitäb al-Mubän* contains a lot of examples. Many other '*ulamä'* (Muslim religious scholars) have complained about this trait in Ibn Taimáyah. Among them Taqá al-Dán al-Subká , Ibn Äajr al-Makká, Taqá al-Dán al-Huäná, 'Arabá al-Tibbaná, Aämad Zainá Daälän, Muäammad Zähid al-Kauthará.

In order to conciliate Albàni, let us suppose that the story [about ‘Uthmàn ibn Äunaif] is weak, and that the Ibn Abi Khaithamah’s version of the *hādīth* [with the addition: *Whenever you have any need do like that.*] is defective (*mu’alla*) as Ibn Taimāyah would have it; still the *āadāth* of the blind man is quite enough to prove the permissibility of seeking the intercession of the Prophet ﷺ since the fact that the Prophet ﷺ taught the blind man to seek his intercession on that occasion shows the propriety of seeking it in *all* circumstances. Moreover, it is not allowable to refer to such intercession as a heretical departure (*bid’ah* / بدعة), nor is it allowable to arbitrarily restrict such intercession to the lifetime of the Prophet ﷺ. Indeed, whoever restricts it to his lifetime is really a heretic⁵⁰ because he has disqualified a rigorously authentic *āadāth* and precluded its implementation, and that is unlawful (*āarām* / حرام). (Check the source of this hadith and give its text and also check the tashkil of the name Abu Burdah)

Albàni, may Allah forgive him, is bold to claim conditionality and abrogation simply because a text prejudices his preconceived opinions and persuasion. If the *āadāth* of the blind man was a special dispensation for him, the Prophet ﷺ would have made that clear as he made it clear to Abā Burdah that the sacrifice of a two year old goat would fulfill his duty; whereas, it would not suffice for others. Furthermore, it is not admissible to suppose that the Prophet ﷺ might have delayed explaining a matter in detail when his followers needed that knowledge at that time.

A Suterfuge and its Preclusion

Suppose somebody says that the reason we have to restrict the application of this *āadāth* to the lifetime of the Prophet ﷺ is that it involves calling (*nida’* / نداء) the Prophet ﷺ [whereas, it is not possible to call him after his death.] We reply that this objection is to be rejected because there are numerous reports (*mutawātir*) from the Prophet ﷺ concerning his instruction about what one should recite during the *tashahhud*⁵¹ of prayer, and that contains the greeting of peace (*salām* / سلام) for him with mention of him in the vocative form: *Peace be upon you, O Prophet!*⁵² That is the very formula which Abā Bakr, ‘Umar, Ibn Zubair, and Mu’āwiyah taught the people from the *mimbar*⁵³. Thereafter, it became an issue on which there was consensus (*ijmā’* / إجماع) as Ibn Äazm (d.)⁵⁴ and Ibn Taimāyah affirmed.

⁵⁰ Because such a person in effect declares impermissible something that the Prophet ﷺ has permitted and that precisely is what heresy is all about: changing or opposing the law (*sharā’ah*) of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ.

⁵¹ *Tashahhād* refers to certain formulas which are recited when one comes to sit after every two *rakats* of prayer. It is called *tashahhud* because it contains the formula of witnessing (*shahādah*) the uniqueness of the divinity, and the truth of the prophethood of Mu ammad ﷺ.

⁵² *Al-salāmu ‘ālaika ayyuha al-nabāyu* / .

⁵³ *Mimbar* is a step-like construction on which stands the person who delivers the Friday. exhortation (*khuābah* /).

⁵⁴ Ibn Äazm is famous for his strictness in claiming consensus, for he doesn’t consider any consensus valid except the consensus of the Companions. His book *Marātib al-‘Ijmā’* / .

reference.

Albàni, because he is prone to schism (*ibtidà'* / ابتداء), violated the consensus and insisted on following an opinion reported of Ibn Mas'âd: "Then when he died we said: *Peace be on the Prophet (al-salâmu 'alâ al-nabâyu)*." Indeed, violating the *âdâth* and consensus is the essence of heresy (*ibtidà'* / ابتداء).

Furthermore, there are authentic reports from the Prophet ﷺ which inform us that our deeds are presented to the Prophet ﷺ [in his blessed grave] as are our supplications for his peace (*al-salâm* / السلام) and honor (*al-âalâh* / الصلاة)⁵⁵. There are also authentic reports about angels which travel about the earth in order to convey to the Prophet ﷺ any greetings of peace and honor that anyone of his people might happen to make for him. Also definitive texts (*tawâtur* / تواتر)⁵⁶ and consensus (*'ijmâ'*) establish that the Prophet ﷺ is alive in his grave, and that his blessed body does not decay. After all that, how can anybody dare to claim that it is not allowable to call the Prophet ﷺ in seeking his intercession? After all, is that in any different than calling him in *tashahhud*?

Unfortunately, Albàni is perversely obstinate and opinionated, as are *the Albànîs*, [that is, his blind, fanatic followers].

So much for my rebuttal of Albàni. As for the person called Äamdâ al-Salafi, there's no need to refute him separately because he merely echoes Albàni.

Another thing which I should establish here is that Albàni is not to be depended on in his judgements about *âdâth* authenticity (*taâââ* / تصحيح), nor their weakness (*taç'âf* / تضعيف) because he routinely employs a variety of tactics to mislead, and he does not disdain to betray his trust in transmitting the opinions of the '*ulamâ'*' (religious scholars) distorting their words and meanings. Moreover, he has had the impudence to oppose the consensus and to claim the abrogation (*naskh* / نسخ) of texts (*naââ*) without proof. He commits such excesses because of his ignorance of the principles [of the science of *fiqh*] and the rules of inference and deduction (*al-istinbââ* / الاستنباط).

He claims he is struggling against heretical innovation (*bid'ah* / بدعة) by forbidding the practice of intercession, and by forbidding people to use the epithet *sayyidinâ* / سيدنا when mentioning the name of the Prophet ﷺ, and by forbidding them to recite the Qur'ân for the sake [of the souls] of the deceased. However, the fact of the matter is that by doing that *he* commits a real heresy (*bid'ah*) by forbidding what Allah has permitted, and by verbally abusing the Asharites⁵⁷ and the Sufis⁵⁸. In all this he is just like Ibn Taimâyah who denounced

⁵⁵ *Al-âalâh* is often translated as blessings, but that is not quite correct. Its actual meaning revolves around the words *âurmah* and *ta'âim* which mean sacredness and honor respectively. See *Mukhtâr al-Äiâââ*, *Miâbaâ al-Munâr*, or *Mufradât al-Qur'ân*.

⁵⁶ Which here means unambiguous texts of the Qur'ân and numerous *âdâth* which, while being from different sources, attest to a common meaning.

⁵⁷ The Asharites (*al-Ashâ'irah*) is the designation of the proponents of the theological school which evolved to rationally defend Islamic orthodoxy from deviations which heterodox schools like the school of the *Mu'tazilah*, and the Arabic philosophers, tried to foist off on Islâm. The Asharites accepted the Qur'ân and the *sunnah* as true beyond question and they regarded the authority of the two as supreme. Notwithstanding, they held that what the Qur'ân and the *sunnah* taught was agreeable to reason. They employed reason to arrive at a valid understanding of the sacred texts (*nuâââ*) and to establish certain principles of interpretation and priority. The Asharites maintained the absolute transcendence of Allah since that is what both reason requires and the unequivocal (*muâkamah*) and definitive (*qâ'âyah*) texts proclaim. They ably maintained that Allah alone is the Necessary Existent. His existence is known to be necessary because this universe, which is a work of exquisite wonder and mind-boggling perfection needs an originator who being the primal cause of all that exists is himself beyond cause. All else is contingent: it may exist, as it may also not exist.

Being Necessary, He is beyond all change, without beginning and without end; whereas, everything else has a beginning and is subject to change and annihilation. Moreover, the Necessary Existent is unique in both His being and His attributes. No originated thing shares with him any of his attributes, nor is He qualified by any of the attributes of originated things. Thus he does not possess body, nor is He compounded of parts, nor is he defined by any direction or limit, nor is He contained in time or space. Whatever we imagine Him to be, He is other than that. Neither is He in this world, nor is He outside it; neither is He contiguous with the world, nor is He separate from it. Although He exists, nay His existence alone is necessary, yet we cannot comprehend the nature of His existence.

The Asharites vehemently opposed the heretical school of extreme literalists, whose perspective was anthropomorphic. The Asharites called these antropomorphists the. The *Āshawāyah* maintained that Allah ascends His Throne in the sky in Person (*bidhātihā*); that He is described by the physical direction above (*al-‘ulā*); that He descends in Person to the lowest heaven during the last third of the night, that he is compounded of two hands, two eyes, two legs; that He literally becomes angry, forgets, laughs and speaks with audible sounds. Many of the *mu‘addithān* of the *Ānbalā* school adopted this extreme anthropomorphist stance, although Imām Aämad certainly never advocated such heretical views as Ibn al-Jauzi pointed out in his important book *Daf‘u al-Shubah al-Tashbāh bi Akaffi al-Tanzāh*. Ibn Taimāyah was an outspoken partisan of the *Āshawāyah*. Because the Asharite ‘*ulamā*’ consider anthropomorphism to be sheer unbelief (*kufri*), they denounced Ibn Taimāyah for his anthropomorphic views and eventually imprisoned him. Anthropomorphism was of little consequence after Ibn Taimāyah until the advent of Muäammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Najdá (d.) who revived his heretical teachings and the heresies of the *Āshawāyah* in the Najd Plateau in central Arabia. His followers were myrmidons of fanaticism: they considered all who differed with them to be polytheists outside the pale of Islām. Consequently, they held that the lives of other Muslims and their property were lawful for themselves “the true believers” and they overran the villages of Najd plundering and killing and spreading terror and lawlessness and perpetrating all kinds of sacrilege until they were decimated by an army sent from Egypt by the order of the Turkish Sultan. They again became a nuisance and were again wiped out by the Turks; thereafter, the influence of their heresies was largely restricted to the Najd. However, their influence was revived in this century, through the person of ‘Abd al-‘Azāz ibn Sa‘ād who used the Wahhābi’s to gain power in first the Najd, then the Hijāz and elsewhere. After ‘Abd al-‘Azāz ibn Sa‘ād consolidated his rule, petroleum resources were developed and his kingdom acquired great wealth. He supported the Wahhābi ‘*ulamā*’ and they busily went about declaring their doctrines to be the only true interpretation of Islām and all else to be invalid and heretical. They effectively suppressed the orthodox ‘*ulamā*’ from criticizing them, and they monopolized the educational system and the media. Soon they began to wield a formidable apparatus of propaganda for the insidious purpose of persuading the unwary that Islamic *orthodoxy* had well-nigh become eclipsed by a false and spurious Islām which comprised the mere teachings of ‘*ulamā*’ who insisted on blindly following the tradition of their respective schools, like the *Āanafī* and *Shāfi‘ī* and *Mālikī* schools which, as they falsely claimed had become corrupted, rather than directly follow the Qur‘ān and *sunnah*. Wahhābi zealots claim to follow the Qur‘ān and *sunnah* directly and for that reason they pretend that they are the truest representatives of the original Islām of the early Muslims who were called *al-salaf* and for this reason they call themselves *Salafis*; however, their opponents still call them Wahhābis for the justifiable reason that they blindly follow the ideas of Muäammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Najdá. These Pseudo-Salafis present Asharism as a heretical sect and they brand Asharite ‘*ulamā*’ as *Jahmiyān* meaning thereby to imply that Asharites follow the arch-heretic Jahm ibn Āafwān who denied the attributes of Allah. They refuse Asharite ‘*ulamā*’ teaching positions and all important religious functions, and woe to any Asharite scholar who dared to speak out publicly in denunciation of Wahhābi teachings, or the teachings of Ibn Taimāyah, or Muäammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb. They maintained a strict censorship on all Islamic literature entering the country and any material which was critical of Wahhābi beliefs or doctrines was out-rightly banned. The Wahhābis were just as active on the international scene. They support hundreds of Wahhābi schools, mosques and centers around the world as well as thousands of Wahhābi missionaries (*du‘āt*). They send

all kinds of people; some of them he declared to be unbelievers and others to be heretics; then, he went and committed two of the biggest heresies that one can commit. In the first instance, he maintained the eternity of the world [which means, in other words, that he maintained that the world has no beginning, but always existed along with Allah], and that is a heresy which constitutes categorical unbelief; we seek refuge in Allah ﷻ from that. Then in the second instance he was prejudiced against 'Alá ﷺ for which the 'ulamà' of his time accused him of hypocrisy. That is because the Prophet ﷺ told 'Alá: "No one loves you but a believer, and no

their literature around the world free and they presently train hundreds of persons in centers in Saudi Arabia to propagate Wahhâbi-ism in their respective countries. Among those centers is the Islamic University in Medinah, Umm al-Qurà University in Mecca, Imam Muâammad bin Sa'âd University in Riyadh.

However, these sectarians have overlooked the very considerable fact that most of the Muslims in the world presently as in the past are Asharite in the matter of beliefs because Asharism means transcendence, and transcendence is the essence of the divine unity (*al-tauâad*). Furthermore, most of the scholars on whose works the Pseudo-Salafis themselves depend like Ibn Âajr, al-Suyâtâ, al-Qurâubâ, Ibn Kathâr, al-Nawawâ, Ibn al-Jauzâ, Ibn al-Âalâä, Mulla 'Alâ al-Qârâ and hundreds of others were undeniably Asharites. The Prophet of Islâm ﷺ repeatedly warned us: "Stick with the community (*al-jamâ'ah*) and main body (*al-sawâd al-'a'æam*), for whoever separates from it, if even a handspan, will be separate in Hell."

⁵⁸ *Sufis* are those who engage themselves in following the *sharâ'ah* inwardly so that the effects of that are seen externally, and outwardly so that the effects of it are seen internally. That is the definition of *Sufism* which was given by Sharâf al-Jurjànâ in his *al-Ta'rifât*. It is a discipline whose goal is the purification of the soul and the reformation of the personality so that the Sufi should live with a true awareness of the presence of Allah ﷻ neither letting Him find him remiss in what He has charged him with, nor letting Him find him doing what He has forbidden him. As such, Sufism is a legitimate Islamic science; rather, it is one of the highest sciences, nonetheless it is complementary to and dependent on the other sciences like the science of beliefs (*aqâ'id*), *fiqh*, principles of *fiqh*, commentary of the Qur'ân (*tafsîr*), principles of *âadâth*, Arabic grammar, Arabic rhetorical sciences (*al-balâghah*), and so on. If Sufism was plagued by heterodox accretions, that didn't stop true Sufism from being a legitimate and noble science any more than the accretion of spurious lore from the Christians and Jews stopped Qur'anic commentary from being a legitimate and noble science. Just as *imâms* of *tafsîr* purged that science of false or dubious material and established correct principles, the *imâms* of Sufism purged it of what was illegitimate. 'Abd al-Qâdir al-Jilânâ is reported to have said: "I seek refuge in Allah from the Pseudo-Sufis of my time." With so much false Sufism about today, it was not difficult for the Pseudo-Salafis to convince the ignorant that all Sufism is heterodox, including the Sufism of men like Imâm al-Ghazâlî, Abâ 'I-Qâsim al-Qushairî and Jalâl al-Dân al-Râmâ, and in more recent times like the Sufism of Khâlîd al-Baghðadâ, Rashâd Aâmad al-Ghanghâhâ, and Aâmad Husain al-Madanâ who were paragons of strict orthodoxy and erudition.

One should not overlook the fact that, Pseudo-Salafis depend on many great scholars in the sciences of *âadâth*, *tafsîr*, and *fiqh* who were, nonetheless, well known for their affiliation with Sufism: like Ibn Hajr, al-Nawawâ, al-Suyâtâ, Ibn Rajab, 'Alâ al-Qârâ, al-Alâsâ, Ibn 'Âbidân, and so on. Even the principle student of Ibn Taimâyah, Ibn Qayyim al-Jauzâyah has written a famous book called *Mudârik al-Ââlikân* which is a text on Sufism. The fact that the Pseudo-Salafis can hardly do without the knowledge and guidance of 'ulamà' who were openly known for their affiliation with Sufism and good opinion of it, makes the Pseudo-Salafis' claim to be the true upholders of orthodoxy highly untenable. Their claim necessarily implies that orthodoxy is represented by a small minority; whereas, the Prophet ﷺ insisted that orthodoxy will always be represented by the main community: "Verily, the people of Muâammad will never agree all together on misguidance. Indeed, *the Hand* of Allah is over the main community (*al-jamâ'ah*). Whoever separates from them, if only a hand-span, will be separate in Hell."

one hates you but a hypocrite.”⁵⁹ No doubt, Ibn Taimáyah’s dislike of ‘Alá is a punishment which Allah has given Ibn Taimáyah. Yet Albàni insists on calling Ibn Taimáyah *Shaikh al-Islàm* [which is traditionally a title reserved for the greatest scholar of the time]. It amazes me that he should give Ibn Taimáyah such a title when Ibn Taimáyah has un-Islamic beliefs.

I think; rather, I am sure that if Ääfiæ Ibn Nääir had some idea of Ibn Taimáyah’s execrable beliefs, he would never have defended him in his book *al-Radd al-Wäfir* [from the scathing attack of ‘Alâ al-Dân al-Bukhârî⁶⁰ who wrote a book called *Man Qàla Ibn Taimáyah Shaikh al-Islàm fa huwa Kâfir* من قال ابن تيمية شيخ الإسلام فهو كافر (Whoever says Ibn Taimáyah is Shaikh al-Islàm he is an unbeliever)]. No doubt, when Ibn Nääir wrote his book, he was deceived by the praises he heard some people making of Ibn Taimáyah. Likewise, al-Alâsá, the son of the celebrated commentator [Maämâd Shukrá al-Alâsá wrote the voluminous commentary of the Qur’àn: *Râä al-Ma’âná* روح المعاني] would not have written his book *Jalâl al-‘Ainain* جلال العينين if he knew the reality of Ibn Taimáyah’s beliefs.

Albàni’s outlandish and heterodox opinions, which are the result of his impious resort to free thought, his deceit, his dishonesty in pronouncing *äadäth* to be authentic or weak according to what suits his persuasion [rather, than according to the dictates of the facts], his excoriations of the ‘*ulamà*’ and the illustrious personages of Islàm; all that is an affliction from Allah, yet he doesn’t realize it. Indeed, he is one of those [to whom the Qur’àn referred by its words:] *who thinks they are doing good; however, how wrong is what they think.*⁶¹

We ask Allah to preserve us from what He has afflicted Albàni with, and we seek refuge in Him from all evil. All praise is for Allah, the Lord of the Worlds. May Allah bless Our Master Muäammad and all his noble people.

Epilouge

Intercession is allowed according to our law.

It is a matter by none disputed in all of Muslimdom,

Except those who folly wedded and paid their dowry with insolence.

Their hearts are stone, by Muslims scorned goons of the Wahhàbi mob,

They prohibited it and denounced it

Without any reason why.

The case of one Uthmàn ibn Äunaif is a valid precedent;

It’s our proof; its quite conclusive, and it brooks no controversy.

May Allah guide them to concede the verdict of documentaion.

⁵⁹ Source

⁶⁰ He is Muäammad ibn Muäammad ibn Muäammad al-Bukhârâ (d. 841 h/1438 ad., Damascus). He was a theologian (*mutakallim*), and a Äanafî *faqih*, and an expert in the principles of *fiqh*. His commentary on *Usâl al-Bazdawâ* is a classic text on Äanafâ *usâl*. He was a student of Sa’d al-Dân al-Taftâzânâ. He emigrated from Bukhârâ in Transoxiana to India, then to Mecca, then to Damascus where he lived till he died. Ibn Äulân called him *the Imàm of His Times*. See *al-‘A‘lâm*, p. 47, vol. 7.

⁶¹ Ref. from Qur’àn

