

Hakikat Kitabevi Publications No: 10

ANSWER TO AN ENEMY OF ISLAM

THIS IS A REFUTATION
OF THE LIES AND SLANDERS WHICH THE
LÂ-MADHHABÎ
RASHÎD RIDÂ OF EGYPT, WHO APPEARED IN
THE DISGUISE OF A RELIGIOUS MAN AND WROTE
AGAINST THE SCHOLARS OF ISLAM IN HIS BOOK

MUHÂWARÂT

EIGHTEENTH EDITION



Hakikat Kitâbevi

Darıüşşefeka Cad. 53/A P.K.: 35

34083 Fatih-İSTANBUL/TURKEY

Tel: 90.212.523 4556-532 5843 Fax: 90.212.523 3693

<http://www.hakikatkitabevi.com>

e-mail: bilgi@hakikatkitabevi.com

NOVEMBER-2012

The hadîth ash-sherîf reported by ad-Dârimî:

“KNOW THAT THE WICKED ‘ULAMÂ’ ARE THE WORST AMONG THE WICKED! AND THAT THE GOOD ‘ULAMÂ’ ARE THE BEST AMONG THE GOOD!”

This hadîth sherîf is explained in Hadrat al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî’s **Maktûbat, I**, 53rd letter (**Endless Bliss, Second Fascicle**, Chapter 10).

Publisher’s Note:

Those who wish to print this book in its original form or to translate in into another language are permitted to do so. We pray that Allâhu ta’âlâ will bless them for this beneficial deed of theirs, and we thank them very much. However, permission is granted with the condition that the paper used in printing will be of a good quality and that the design of the text and setting will be properly and neatly done without mistakes. We would appreciate a copy of the printed book when completed.

A Warning: Missionaries are striving to advertise Christianity, Jews are working to spread out the concocted words of Jewish rabbis, Hakîkat Kitâbevi (Bookstore), in Istanbul, is struggling to publicize Islam, and freemasons are trying to annihilate religions. A person with wisdom, knowledge and conscience will understand and admit the right one among these and will help to spread out that for salvation of all humanity. There is no better way and more valuable thing to serve humanity than doing so.

TYPESET AND PRINTED IN TURKEY BY:

İhlâs Gazetecilik A.Ş.
29 Ekim Cad. No. 23 Yenibosna-İSTANBUL/TURKEY
Tel: 90.212.454 3000

Bismi'llâhi'r-rahmâni'r-rahîm

P R E F A C E

Allâhu ta'âlâ pities all the people on the earth. He sends useful and necessary things to everybody. He shows the ways of keeping away from harm and attaining happiness. In the next world, He will forgive whomever He likes of those guilty Believers who are to go to Hell, and He will bring them to Paradise. He, alone, is the One who creates every living being, who keeps every being in existence every moment, and who protects all against fear and horror. Trusting ourselves to the honourable name of Allâhu ta'âlâ, we begin to write this book.

We offer up our prayers and salâms for Hadrat Muhammad ('alaihi's-salâm), the most beloved Prophet of Allâhu ta'âlâ. We offer auspicious prayers for the pure Ahl al-Bayt of that exalted Prophet and for each of his just and devoted Companions (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum).

Allâhu ta'âlâ is very merciful to His creatures. He wills the entire mankind to live in ease and peace in this world and to have an eternal life in favors and blessings after they die. To attain this bliss, He orders them to believe, to become Muslims, to join the path of His Prophet Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) and his Companions, to love and help one another. Our Prophet (sall-allâhu alaihi wa sallam) stated, **“As the stars guide throughout dark nights, my As-hâb are the guides along the way leading to felicity. Follow any one of them, and you will attain to felicity.”** All of the As-hâb-i-kirâm learned the Holy Qur'ân from the Messenger of Allah. As they travelled later on, they propagated what they had learned. They did not insert their personal ideas into what they had heard from the Messenger of Allah. The Islamic scholars, in their turn, wrote in their books whatever they had heard from the As-hâb-i-kirâm. These scholars are called **“Scholars of Ahl as-sunna(t).”** Afterwards, there appeared some scholars who interpolated into these teachings. These people conglomerated ideas from the ancient Greek philosophers, concoctions from Jews and Christians, and, especially, lies fabled by British spies. Also, adding their personal impressions and whatever they had acquired of the

scientific teachings of their times, they invented new religious teachings. Speaking in the name of 'Islamic Scholars' they tried to demolish Islam from within. Of these people, those who changed âyats and hadîth-i-sherîfs with clear meanings — âyats and hadîths of this sort are called Nass— became **Kâfirs** (disbelievers). Those who misinterpreted the ones with hidden meanings were termed **Groups of Bid'a(t)**. There appeared a number of heretical groups of bid'a carrying the name of Muslims. Exploiting this situation, the British are inventing groups of disbelief and heresy and trying to annihilate original Islam. Today, Muslims in the world have separated into three groups: Ahl as-Sunna, the Shi'ites and the Wahnâbîs. Their beliefs are different from one another. Since this difference originates from the mistakes made in the interpretation of nasses [âyats and hadîths] whose meanings cannot be understood clearly and since they do not deny nasses with clear meanings, they do not call one another 'disbeliever.' Yet, they hate one another. True Muslims, who are called Ahl as-sunna(t), should love and help one another, speak and write mildly to one another, and even when they have to warn one another, they should not harm one another; they should help one another and gently counsel one another in their oral and written transactions. They should help one another and entire mankind, obey the beautiful morals of Islam, and refrain strictly from causing fitna (disunion). They should not rebel against the laws of the countries they live in or attack anybody's life, property or chastity. A Muslim has to bear these qualities. All our words, writings and actions have to be meliorative and cooperative. Sad to say, some degenerate people who are the enemies of religion and mankind and only think of their own advantages and desires are struggling to separate Muslims by disguising themselves as Muslims and even as men of religious positions. They are propagating lies concocted by British spies. Saying that they will make reforms in the religion, they want to defile Islam. On the other hand, two other great enemies, namely ignorance and laziness, act as encumbrances against being wise and following Islam, and, thus, differentiating between right and wrong, good and bad. Muhammad Âlî Pasha, for example, was a good and pious person who served as an Ottoman Governor in Egypt. Those who succeeded him were not so. Religious affairs were left in incompetent hands. A freemason named 'Abduh was brought to the board of management of Jâmi' al-Azhar Madrasa, which had been educating Muslims for centuries. Scotch freemasons began to destroy Egyptian Muslims economically and spiritually. Through these freemasons, the British demolished the Ottoman Empire from the inside. The Grand Vizier

Âlî Pasha, a disciple of the freemason Mustafa Rashîd Pasha, handed the key of the Belgrade fortress to the Serbs in 1284 A.H. (1868). The Vizier brought his fellow-mason Jamâl ad-dîn al-Afghânî to Istanbul, and they together strove to demolish Islam from the inside. They wrote subversive books.

Rashîd Ridâ, a disciple of 'Abduh, a muftî of Cairo, wrote the book **Muhâwarât al-muslih wa 'l-muqallid**, which was published in Egypt in 1324 (1906).^[1] In this book, he writes about the conversation between a wâ'iz (Muslim preacher) who was educated in a madrasa and a modernist religion reformer, by which he gives his own ideas through their tongues. He represents the religion reformer as young, cultured, modern and powerful in discernment and logic, while introducing the preacher as a bigoted, imitative, stupid and slow-thinking man, advises the preacher through the religion reformer's mouth and puts on an air of awakening him from unawareness. He says he gives advice, but in fact he attacks the Islamic scholars, while misrepresenting heretics, zindîqs and mulhids as scholars of Islam with extensive knowledge. The book, which was written shrewdly and completely through a freemasonic mouth, bears the danger of easily hunting the credulous, pure youth. The chief of Religious Affairs, Hamdi Akseki, one of those Turks who read and were influenced by such books prepared cunningly by 'Abduh and his novices, translated the book into Turkish, adding a long preface to it and giving it the name **Mezâhibin Telfiki ve Islâmin Bir Noktaya Cem'i**, and published it in Istanbul in 1334 (1916).^[2] Professor Ismâil Hakki of Izmir, another reformer, very much praised and vastly propagandized the translation, yet, the true religious scholars during the time of Sultan 'Abd al-Hamîd Khan II saw that the book would be harmful and prevented it from spreading. And today, we feel very much worried that the youth will read this poisonous book and the like and begin to doubt about the greatness of Islamic scholars and the imâms of the four madhhabs. We have already wrote in our various books that it is right to follow (taqlîd) one of the four madhhabs and that lâ-madhhabism means to follow what is wrong.

Disbelievers, that is, non-Muslims, imitate their parents and teachers and do not follow the rules, i.e., the commands and prohibitions of Islam because of the wrong beliefs they hold. But Muslims hold fast to these rules. Likewise, the lâ-madhhabî, because

[1] Including the supplement, 143 pages; with call number 810 of the Izmirli section at the Süleymâniyye Library, Istanbul.

[2] 407 pages; with call number 810 of the Izmirli section at the Süleymâniyye Library, Istanbul.

of the wrong beliefs they have acquired by following their parents and teachers, do not adapt themselves to one of the four madhhabs, which are the explanations of these rules. But the true Muslims, who are called Ahl as-Sunna, owing to their correct îman which they have acquired from the knowledge coming from the Sahâbat al-kirâm (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum) and the îmâms of madhhabs, adhere to one of the four madhhabs. Muslims of Ahl as-Sunna have attained the imitation (taqlîd) which is right. We thought of exposing to our pure, young brothers the lies and slanders in the book **Muhâwarât**, which was prepared very insidiously to distract Muslims from the imitation which is right and to drift them into the imitation which is wrong, by answering each of them from the books of the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna, thus performing a humble service to protect Muslims from being led to endless perdition. Thus the book **Answer to an Enemy of Islam** came about. We regard our sincere intention in preparing this book and this insignificant service to Muslim brothers as a means for the forgiveness of our sins and as our only stock for our debt of gratitude for the infinite blessings of Allâhu ta'âlâ.

We wish that our pure, young men of religious post will attentively read Rashîd Ridâ's lies and slanders and the refutations of the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna, judge fairly with their pure conscience, realize the truth, cling to it, know the wrong, and will not believe in its false decorations and advertisements.

We owe hamd (praise) and thanks to Allâhu ta'âlâ who has vouchsafed us the present edition of this book, which we prepared to do this sacred service and this exalted admonition.

A hadîth-i-sherîf reported by Dârimî reports:

“BE IT KNOWN THAT THE EVIL ONES AMONG MEN OF RELIGION ARE THE WORST AMONG THE EVIL PEOPLE. AND THE GOOD ONES AMONG MEN OF RELIGION ARE THE BEST AMONG THE GOOD PEOPLE.”

An explanation of this hadîth-i-sherîf is written in the fifty-third letter of the first volume of **Mektûbât**, by Hadrat Imâm Rabbânî.

A glossary of Arabic and other non-English terms foreign to the English reader is appended.

**Mîlâdî
2001**

**Hijrî Shamsî
1380**

**Hijrî Qamarî
1422**

ANSWER TO AN ENEMY OF ISLAM

This book answers the lies and slanders written by a lâ-madhabî Egyptian, Rashîd Ridâ, who disguised himself as a religious man, against the 'ulamâ' (scholars of Islam) in his book titled **Muhâwarât**, in which he defends the unification (talfiq) of the four madhhabs.

1- "During the 'Asr as-Sa'âda, there was no difference of opinion either on îmân or on the rules pertaining to practices (a'mâl)." [1]

And a few lines further below, he says,

"When there was no nass, as-Sahâba reached a decision with their own ijtihâd,"

Thus, refuting his own above-quoted words. He writes the truth in the second quotation. On matters about which there was no nass, as-Sahâbat al-kirâm (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum) made decisions with their own ijtihâd, and there were differences on such matters.

2- "In the first and second centuries [of Islam] people did not follow a certain madhhab; they did not affiliate with the madhhab of a certain imâm. When they had a new problem, they would solve it by asking any muftî they would come across, without looking for this or that madhhab. Ibn Humâm wrote so in his **Tahrîr**."

These words do not agree with what the 'ulamâ' wrote. Dâwûd ibn Sulaimân quotes Ibn Amîr Hâj as saying: "My master Ibn Humâm said it was necessary for a non-mujtahid to follow one of the four madhhabs." [2] Ibn Nujaim al-Misrî wrote: "As explained clearly in **Tahrîr** by Ibn Humâm, it is unanimous among the 'ulamâ' that anything that does not agree with any of the four madhhabs is wrong." [3] 'Abd al-Ghanî an-Nabulusî quotes Ibn Humâm on this subject and adds: "Hence, it is understood that it

[1] (Quotations 1-4) the preface to the Turkish version (by Hamdi Akseki) of **Muhâwarât**.

[2] Dâwûd ibn Sulaimân, **Ashadd al-jihâd**, p. 16.

[3] **Ashbâh**, "Ijti'hâd," the first chapter of the second part.

is not permissible to follow any madhhab other than the four madhhabs. Today, following Hadrat Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salâm) religion is possible only by following one of the four madhhabs. '**Taqîd**' means to accept somebody's word without searching for his proof (dalîl). And this is done by intending with the heart. Anything done without an intention becomes wrong (bâtil). It is a mujtahid's duty to understand the proof. A muqallid has to follow one of the four madhhabs in everything he does. According to the majority of the 'ulamâ', it is permissible for him to follow different madhhabs in different affairs. So did the book **Tahrîr** write. But it has been reported unanimously that something which he began doing in accord with a madhhab has to be finished as required in the same madhhab, without uniting the other madhhabs.^[1] There have been also those scholars who have said that when a person begins following one madhhab, he should not follow another madhhab in any other thing he does unless there is a strong necessity."^[2]

The a'immat al-madhâhib's doing 'ibâda according to one another's madhhab, contrary to what the reformers think, was not with the intention of following one another's madhhab. They did so by following their own ijtihâd on that matter at that moment. It is not right to say that everybody did so by putting forward the fact that the mujtahids did so. It is not worthy of a man of a religious post to say this word without giving a true example.

3- "The political controversies which appeared later and which were claimed to be for the benefit of the religion caused the real purpose of the madhhabs to be forgotten."

This statement is a very loathsome error which can never be forgiven. He imputes to the 'ulamâ' of fiqh the guilt of those who, like himself, went out of the madhhabs and attempted to defile the madhhabs. Very old and recently printed books of the scholars belonging to the four madhhabs are obvious; none of them contains any statement or fatwâ that will change the ijtihâd of the a'immat al-madhâhib. The lâ-madhhabî people such as 'Abduh and his followers are certainly outside the circle of those scholars. They are the people who want to undermine the madhhabs. However, none of the words of these lâ-madhhabî people exists in current fiqh books. "Fiqh books" are written by fiqh scholars. Books written by the ignorant, the lâ-madhhabî or

[1] See below, article 33.

[2] **Khulâsat at-tahqîq.**

those who mix Islam with politics are not called “fiqh books.” Their corrupt writings cannot be grounds for blemishing the scholars of fiqh.

- 4- It is astonishing that he tells an unforgivable lie: “All the a’immat al-madhâhib say, ‘Do not immitate us. Make use of our documents, instead. Those who do not know the basis of our words are not allowed to follow our words.’”

Not the a’immat al-madhâhib but the lâ-madhhabî say these words. The a’immat al-madhâhib say, “The follower (muqallid) does not have to know the documents of the mujtahid. The words of the imâm al-madhhab are documents for him.”

- 5- “As humanity evolved, men’s intellects changed in the process of time.”^[1]

This statement is an expression of his belief in evolution, which is held by masons. Early people had little intellects, and today’s disbelievers are very intelligent, he means. He implies that early prophets (‘alaihimu ’s-salâm) and their companions were unintelligent. He who believes so becomes a kâfir. Adam, Shit, Idrîs, Nûh (Noah) and many other prophets (‘alaihimu ’s-salâm) were among the early people. All of them were more intelligent than all of today’s human beings. A hadîth sherîf says that each century will be worse than the one preceding it. Rashîd Ridâ contradicts this hadîth sherîf.

- 6- “Open the history books and read about the fights that took place between Ahl as-Sunna and the Shî’a [Shî’ites] and Khârijîs, and even among those who were in the Ahl as-Sunna madhhabs! Enmity between the Shâfi’is and the Hanafîs caused the Mongols to assault the Muslims.”

The lâ-madhhabî people like Rashîd Ridâ, in order to attack the four madhhabs of Ahl as-Sunna, choose a tricky way. For doing this, first they write about the assaults of the seventy-two groups [for whom the Hadîth says will go to Hell] against the Ahl as-Sunna, and about the bloody events which they caused, and then they basely lie by adding that the four madhhabs of Ahl as-Sunna fought one another. The fact, however, is that not a single fight has ever taken place between the Shâfi’is and the Hanafîs at any place at any time. How could they ever fight despite the fact that both belong to the Ahl as-Sunna! They hold the same belief. They have always loved one another and lived brotherly. Let us

[1] (Quotations 5-9) the Arabic preface to **Muhâwarât** by Rashîd Ridâ.

see if the lâ-madhhabî people, who say that those people fought, can give us an example after all! They cannot. They write, as examples, the jihâds which the four madhhabs of Ahl as-Sunna co-operatively made against the lâ-madhhabî. They try to deceive Muslims with such lies. Because the name “Shâfi’î” of the Ahl as-Sunna and the word “Shî’a” sound alike, they narrate the combats between the Hanafîs and the lâ-madhhabî as if they had taken place between the Hanafîs and the Shâfi’îs. In order to blemish the Muslims who follow the madhhabs, those who reject the four madhhabs slander them by misinterpreting some special terms. For example, referring to the dictionary **Al-munjid** written by Christian priests, they define the word ‘ta’assub’ as ‘holding a view under the influence of non-scientific, non-religious and irrational reasons’, in order to give the impression that the teachings of madhhabs as ta’assub, and say that ta’assub, has caused conflicts between madhhabs. However, according to the scholars of Islam, ‘**ta’assub**’ means ‘enmity that cannot be justified.’ Then, attaching oneself to a madhhab or defending that this madhhab is based on the Sunna and on the sunnas of al-Khulafâ’ ar-râshidîn (radiy-Allâhu ’anhum) is never ta’assub. Speaking ill of another madhhab is ta’assub, and the followers of the four madhhabs have never done such ta’assub. There has been no ta’assub amongst the madhhabs throughout Islamic history.

The lâ-madhhabî, who are the followers of one of the seventy-two heretical groups, endeavoured much to sidetrack the Umayyad and Abbasid caliphs from the Ahl as-Sunna. Those who achieved it caused bloody events. It is a base slander against the scholars of Islam to accuse them of ta’assub because they, to prevent the harm of the lâ-madhhabî, counselled these caliphs and invited them to follow one of the four madhhabs of Ahl as-Sunna. A newly developed method for attacking the four madhhabs is: first pick up a smattering of Arabic, then scan a few history books in a haphazard manner and with a narrow-minded personal sentiment, then evaluate the various past events fortuitously encountered, and finally piece them together as the evidences for the harms of ta’assub, which you somehow attribute to the Sunni Muslims. To find justification, some of those who are against the madhhabs say that they are against not the madhhabs but the ta’assub in madhhabs. However, by misinterpreting ‘ta’assub,’ they attack the fiqh scholars defending their madhhabs and claim that these scholars caused the bloody events in the Islamic history.

Thereby they try to alienate the younger generations from the madhhabs.

As it is written in **Qâmûs al-a'lâm**, Amîd al-Mulk Muhammad al-Kundurî, the vizier of Seljuqî Sultan Tughrul Beg, issued a rescript stating that the lâ-madhhabî should be cursed at minbars^[1] and, therefore, most of the 'ulamâ' in Khurasan emigrated to other places during the time of Alb Arslân. Lâ-madhhabî people like Ibn Taimiyya distorted this event as "The Hanafîs, and the Shâfi'îs fought each other, and the Ash'arîs were cursed at minbars." They spread these lies and their own false translations from as-Suyûtî's books among young people to deceive them and to destroy the four Ahl as-Sunna madhhabs and to replace it with lâ-madhhabism.

The following story is one of those related to ta'assub as it is unjustly attributed to the madhhabs and is claimed to have caused fights between brothers in Muslim history: Yâqût al-Hamawî visited Rayy in 617 A.H. and, seeing that the city was in ruins, asked the people whom he met how it happened; he was told that there had arisen ta'assub between the Hanafîs and the Shâfi'îs, that they had fought, and that the Shâfi'îs had won and the city had been ruined. This story is referred to in Yâqût's book **Mu'jam al-Buldan**. However, Yâqût was not a historian. As he was a Byzantine boy, he was captured and sold to a merchant in Baghdad. He travelled through many cities to do the business of his boss, after whose death he began selling books. **Mu'jam al-Buldan** is his geographical dictionary in which he wrote what he had seen and heard wherever he had been. He profited much from this book. Rayy is 5 km south of Tehran and is in ruins now. This city was conquered by Urwat ibn Zaid at-Tâ'î with the command of Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) in 20 A.H. It was improved during the time of Abû Ja'far Mansûr, and it became a home of great scholars and a centre of civilization. In 616 A.H., the non-Muslim Mongol ruler Jenghiz, too, destroyed this Muslim city and martyred its male inhabitants and captured the women and children. The ruins seen by Yâqût had been caused by the Mongol army a year before. The lâ-madhhabî asked by Yâqût imputed this destruction to the Sunnîs, and Yâqût believed them. This shows that he was not a historian but an ignorant tourist. The lâ-madhhabî, when they cannot find a rational or historical support to blemish the followers of madhhabs and the honourable

[1] Pulpits in mosques.

fiqh scholars, make their attacks with the writings and words based on Persian tales. Such tales do not harm the superiority and excellence of the scholars of Ahl as-sunna; on the contrary, they display the lâ-madhhabî men of religious post are not authorities of Islam but ignorant heretics who are enemies of Islam. It is understood that they have been endeavouring to deceive Muslims and thus to demolish the four madhhabs from the inside by pretending to be men of religious post. To demolish the four madhhabs means to demolish Ahl as-Sunna, for Ahl as-Sunna is composed of the four madhhabs with regard to practices (a'mâl, fiqh). There is no Ahl as-Sunna outside these four madhhabs. And to demolish Ahl as-Sunna means to demolish the right religion, Islam, which Hadrat Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) brought from Allâhu ta'âlâ, for, the Ahl as-Sunna are those Muslims who walk on the path of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum). The path of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm is the path of Hadrat Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm), who, in the hadîth, **“My Companions are like the stars in the sky. If you follow any one of them you will find the right way,”** orders us to follow as-Sahâbat al-kirâm.

Taqlîd (following, adapting oneself to) is done in two respects. First is the following in respect of belief ('itiqâd, îmân). Second is the following in respect of actions to be done (a'mâl). To follow as-Sahâbat al-kirâm means to follow them in respect of the facts to be believed. In other words, it is to believe as they did. Those Muslims who believe as as-Sahâbat al-kirâm did are called **Ahl as-Sunna**. In respect of practices, that is, in each of those actions that are to be done or avoided, it is not necessary to follow all as-Sahâbat al-kirâm since it is impossible. It cannot be known how as-Sahâbat al-kirâm did every action. Moreover, many matters did not exist in their time and appeared afterwards. The father of Ahl as-Sunna was Hadrat al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa (rahmatullâhi 'alaih). All the four madhhabs have believed what he had explained and what he had learned from as-Sahâbat al-kirâm. Al-Imâm al-a'zam was a contemporary of some Sahâbîs. He learned much from them. And he learned further through his other teachers. That al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î and Imâm Mâlik had different comments on a few matters concerning belief does not mean that they disagreed with al-Imâm al-a'zam. It was because each of them expressed what they themselves understood from al-Imâm al-a'zam's word. The essence of their words is the same. Their ways of explaining are different. We believe and love all the

four a'immat al-madhâhib.

A snide trick which the lâ-madhhabî people often have resort to is to write about the badness of the difference in those subjects concerning belief and try to smear this badness on to the difference among the four madhhabs. It is very bad to be broken into groups concerning îmân. He who dissents from Ahl as-Sunna in îmân becomes either a kâfir (disbeliever) or a heretic (a man of **bid'a** in belief). It is stated in the hadîths of the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) that both kinds of people will go to Hell. A kâfir will remain in Hell eternally while a heretic will later go to Paradise.

Some of those who have dissented from the Ahl as-Sunna have become disbelievers, but they pass themselves off as Muslims. They are of two kinds. Those of the first kind have depended upon their mind and points of view in interpreting the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf so much so that their errors have driven them to kufr (disbelief). They think of themselves as followers of the right path and believe that they are true Muslims. They cannot understand that their îmân has gone away. They are called "**mulhids.**" Those of the second kind have already disbelieved Islam and are hostile to Islam. In order to demolish Islam from within by deceiving Muslims, they pretend to be Muslims. In order to mix their lies and slanders with the religion, they give wrong, corrupt meanings to âyats, hadîths and scientific teachings. These insidious unbelievers are called "**zindîqs.**" The freemasons occupying religious posts in Egypt and the so-called Socialist Muslims, who have appeared recently, are zindîqs. They are also called "bigots of science" or "religion reformers."

The Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf declare that it is bad to be broken into groups in respect of îmân and prohibit this faction strictly. They command Muslims to be united in one single îmân. The faction prohibited in the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf is the faction in respect of îmân. As a matter of fact, all prophets ('alaihimu 's-salâm) taught the same îmân. From Âdam ('alaihi 's-salâm), the first prophet, to the last man, the îmân of all Believers is the same. Zindîqs and mulhids say that those âyats and hadîths which condemn and prohibit breaking in îmân refer to the four madhhabs of Ahl as-Sunna. However, the Qur'ân al-kerîm commands the differentiation of the four madhhabs. The Hadîth ash-sherîf states that this difference is Allâhu ta'âlâ's compassion upon Muslims.

It is an utterly loathsome, very base lie and slander to twist the

Mongolian invasion of the Muslim countries and the destruction of and bloodshed in Baghdad into the “Hanafi-Shâfi’î disputes,” which never took place in the past and which will never take place in future. These two madhhabs have the same î mân and love each other. They believe that they are brothers and know the insignificant difference between them concerning a’mâl (acts) or ’ibâdât (practices) is Allâhu ta’âlâ’s compassion. They believe that this difference is a facility. If a Muslim belonging to a madhhab encounters a difficulty in doing an act in his madhhab, he does it in accordance with one of the other three madhhabs and thus avoids the quandary. Books of the four madhhabs unanimously recommend this facility and note some occasions. Scholars of the four madhhabs explained and wrote the evidences and documents of their own madhhabs not in order to attack or –Allah forbid– to slander one another, but with a view to defending the Ahl as-Sunna against the lâ-madhabî people and preserve the confidence of their followers. They wrote so and said that one could follow another madhhab when in difficulty. The lâ-madhabî, that is, the mulhids and zindîqs, finding no other grounds for attacking the Ahl as-Sunna, have been meddling with and misinterpreting these writings which are right and correct.

As for the Tatars’ and Mongols’ invading Muslim countries, history books write its causes clearly. For example, Ahmad Jawdad Pasha wrote:

“Musta’sim, the last ’Abbâsid Caliph, was a very pious Sunnî. But his vizier, Ibn Alqamî was lâ-madhabî and disloyal to him. The administration of the State was in his hands. His sheer ideal was to overthrow the ’Abbâsid state and establish another state. He wished for Baghdad to be captured by the Mongol ruler Hulago, and he himself become his vizier. He provoked him into coming to Iraq. Writing a harsh reply to a letter from Hulago, he incited him. Nasîr ad-dîn Tusî, another lâ-madhabî heretic, was Hulago’s counsellor. He, too, incited him to capture Baghdad. The intrigues were played in the hands of these two heretics. Hulago was made to advance towards Baghdad. The Caliph’s army of about twenty thousand could not stand against the arrows of two hundred thousand Tatars. Hulago assaulted Baghdad with naphtha fires and catapult stones. After a fifty-day siege, Ibn Alqamî, under the pretext of making peace, went to Hulago and made an agreement with him. Then, coming back to the Caliph he said that if they surrendered they would be set free. The Caliph believed him and surrendered to Hulago on the twentieth of

Muharram in 656 A.H. (1258). He was executed together with those who were with him. More than four hundred thousand Muslims were put to the sword. Millions of Islamic books were thrown into the Tigris. The lovely city turned into a ruin. The **Khirkat as-Sa'âda** (the mantle of the Prophet)^[1] and the **'Asâ an-Nabawî** (the short stick the Prophet usually had with him) were burned and the ashes were thrown into the Tigris. The five-hundred-and-twenty-four-year-old 'Abbâsid State was annihilated. Ibn Alqamî was not given any position and died in abasement the same year. That year, 'Uthmân Ghâzî, founder of the Ottoman Empire, was born in the town of Söğhüt.^[2] As it is seen, the Mongols' ruining the Muslim countries was caused by a lâ-madhhabî's treachery against Ahl as-Sunna. There has been no dispute between the Hanafîs and the Shâfi'îs; Muslims belonging to the four madhhabs have loved one another as brothers. This base slander, which was made against Ahl as-Sunna by Rashîd Ridâ, was repeated by the reformer named Sayyid Qutb, too, yet he is given the necessary answer with perfect documentary evidences in the book **The Religion Reformers in Islam**.

7- "In many countries, it is seen that the Hanafîs do not perform salât together with the Shâfi'îs. Saying 'âmin' loud behind the imâm and moving the finger up when reciting the Tahiyya have been causing enmity."

The books of all the madhhabs clearly write that a Muslim who belongs to a madhhab can perform salât behind one belonging to another madhhab. The idea that the small differences concerning the 'Ibâdât of the four madhhabs will cause enmity originates from the day-dreams and slanders of the enemies of the madhhabs, that is, the mulhids and zindîqs. In every part of the world Muslims of the four madhhabs have been performing salât behind one another, for, they all know and love one another as brothers. The great Walî, profound 'âlim Hadrat Mawlânâ Diyâ' addîn Khâlîd al-Baghdadî (d. 1242/1826) was a Shâfi'î. His murshid (guide, 'âlim, ustadh) Hadrat 'Abdullah ad-Dahlawî, who gave him faid (the outpouring that flows from the murshid's heart to the disciple's heart which thus attains motion, purity and exaltation) and the khilâfa [(certificate of) authority to instruct

[1] The Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) gave some of his mantles to some Muslims, from whom the caliphs bought them for large sums of gold. Two of them still exist in Istanbul.

[2] **Qisâs-i Anbiyâ'** (History of the Prophets), p. 890.

others], was a Hanafî. Hadrat 'Abd al-Qâdir Al-Jîlânî (d. 561/1165) was a Shâfi'î. Seeing that the Hanbalî madhhab was about to be forgotten, he became a Hanbalî in order to protect and strengthen it. Jalâl ad-dîn Muhammad Mahallî (d. 864/1459), writer of the tafsîr book **Al-Jalâlain**, was a Shâfi'î; Ahmad ibn Sâwî (d. 1241/1825), who was a Mâlikî, wrote a commentary (sharh) on this tafsîr book and facilitated its spreading far and wide. While interpreting the sixth âyat of Sûrat Fâtir in this commentary, he wrote: "The lâ-madhhabîs who live in the Hijaz, in Arabia, claim that they alone are Muslims. They say that the Muslims of Ahl as-Sunna are polytheists, though Ahl as-Sunna are the true Muslims. They are liars. We wish that Allâhu ta'âlâ will annihilate these heretical people." Hadrat Ahmad ibn Sâwî's annotation (hâshiya) on the tafsîr book **Al-Baidâwî** won a great fame, too. The famous 'âlim al-Baidâwî (d. 685/1286) was a Shâfi'î. His tafsîr is one of the most valuable tafsîr books. Most 'ulamâ' of the four madhhabs praised it and wrote commentaries on it. For example, the commentary by Shaikhzâda Muhammad Efendî, a Hanafî 'âlim, is famous and very valuable. As all Muslims know, the number of the books written by the 'ulamâ' of the four madhhabs, in which they express their praise and love for one another, exceed thousands.^[1]

8- "Of the Islamic umma, many became profound scholars. Such murshids as Hujjat al-Islâm Imâm al-Ghazâlî and Shaikh al-Islâm Ibn Taimiyya were of these."

He represents such a lâ-madhhabî person as Ibn Taimiyya, who said that Allâhu ta'âlâ was an object, who disbelieved the fact that non-Muslims would be tormented eternally in Hell, who claimed that it was not necessary to perform an omitted fard salât, and who tried to demolish Islam from within through many other similar corrupt ideas, as an Islamic scholar and murshid, and introduces him as a mujtahid like the great Islamic scholar al-Ghazâlî. Writing these two names together is a misleading invention like putting a piece of black stone by the side of a diamond. The Mâlikî scholar Ahmad ibn Sâwî wrote: "The scholars of Ahl as-Sunna reported that Ibn Taimiyya deviated from the right path himself and also caused many Muslims to deviate. It is a lie that he had had companionship with the Mâlikî scholar Imâm Ashhab."^[2]

[1] See below, the 36th article, for "moving the finger up."

[2] The tafsîr book **Al-Jalâlain**, in the interpretation of the 230th âyat of Sûrat al-Baqara.

9– Rashîd Ridâ says:

“I wrote that the taqlîd was wrong in the periodical **Al-Manâr**, which I published in 1315 [1898]. I had taken some of those writings from Imâm 'Allâma Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya. Gathering them, I published the book **Muhâwarât**.”

By writing that the taqlîd (following, being a member of, one of the four madhhabs) is wrong, the religion reformer blemishes billions of the Ahl as-Sunna Muslims who have appeared for fourteen hundred years. He means that they will go to Hell. It must be because the lâ-madhhabî, mulhids and zindîqs, that is, religion reformers, themselves know about their own defects that they cannot attack the Ahl as-Sunna openly. By using false, deceptive, evasive words, they always play behind the curtain. How could it ever be said to be wrong to follow an imâm al-madhhab? Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the sûras an-Nahl and al-Anbiyâ', **“Learn by asking those who know!”** and **“Adapt yourselves to Ulû 'l-amr ('ulamâ')!”** It is for this reason that it has been wâjib to follow an imâm al-madhhab. By saying that it is wrong to follow him, this lâ-madhhabî heretic means to say, **“Follow me, not him!”** He tries to make Muslims give up imitating the right way so that they imitate his own wrong way. The lâ-madhhabî are the imitators of error.

There are two kinds of taqlîd. The first one is the non-Muslims' following their parents and priests and remaining in the state of disbelief. Taqlîd of this kind is certainly wrong (bâtil). The Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf prohibit this kind of taqlîd. And it is not enough for a Muslim to say that he is Muslim just by imitating his parents. A person who knows, approves and believes the meanings of the six fundamentals of îmân is a Muslim. It is obvious that imitating somebody in respect of îmân is wrong. Likewise, it is a wrong imitation to believe the lâ-madhhabî and to dissent from the Ahl as-Sunna. Further, it is incorrect to liken this to the taqlîd in respect of a'mâl (acts or practices). The Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf command this second kind of taqlîd. The hadîth, **“My umma do not agree on deviation!”**^[1] shows

[1] This hadîth sharîf is quoted in the book **Khulâsât at-tahqîq fî bayâni hukmi 't-taqlîd wa 't-talfîq** by 'Abd al-Ghanî an-Nabulusî (d. 973/1565), in the preface to **Al-mizân al-kubrâ** by 'Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha'rânî, in various letters in **Maktûbât** by al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî Ahmad al-Fârûqî as-Sirhindî (d. 1034/1624) and at the end of **Hujjat-Allâhi 'ala 'l-âlamîn** by Yûsuf an-Nabhânî.

that all of what the scholars of the right path have written is correct. Those who are against this are unjust and wrong. By the consensus of millions of the Ahl as-Sunna and thousands of Awliyâ', who have appeared for thirteen hundred years, it is wâjib for a Muslim who is not a mujtahid to follow a mujtahid whom he believes, trusts and likes so that he can do his actions and 'ibâdât correctly. He who disbelieves this consensus will be disbelieving this Hadîth sherîf. This consensus also shows that a mujtahid should act in accordance with his own ijtihâd, and he is not permitted to follow another mujtahid. Each Sahâbî (Muslim who saw the Prophet at least once) was a mujtahid. For this reason, they disagreed with one another on some actions. Likewise, Imâm Yûsuf's not renewing his ablution on a Friday and al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î's not raising his hands after bowing during salât as he visited al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa's grave were in no way the taqlîd of others; they followed their own ijtihâds on these occasions.

10- At the beginning of the First Dialogue, the religion reformer says:

“The virtuous young reformer, in order to make Muslims attain happiness, wants to rescue them from the nuisance of taqlîd, which appeared later, and to help them to follow the Book, the Sunna and the path of the Salaf. In the first century [of Islam] even shepherds used to get their religious knowledge directly from the Book and the Sunna.”

See the buffoonery of Rashîd Ridâ's! He says “virtuous” for the one who is a heretic like himself. Through the mouth of an ignorant religion reformer, he attempts to advise the old reverend preacher. He says “nuisance “ about the blessing of the taqlîd which is commanded by Allâhu ta'âlâ and Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) and which is necessary in the unanimous inference of Islamic scholars. He does not realize that imitating one of the four madhhabs is an imitation which is right, and dissenting from a madhhab by following a lâ-madhhabî is an imitation which is wrong. He makes fun of the respectable preacher and of the blessed word 'wâ'iz' (preacher). He does not know that he who makes fun of the blessed words peculiar to men with religious responsibilities becomes a non-Muslim. If we had not known the Hadîth ash-sherîf, “**The most atrocious, the basest people will come to preside over Muslims,**” we would have been astonished at the unfortunate fact that this man occupied a position of issuing

fatwâs in such a Muslim country as Egypt. O you the base heretic! Instead of making fun of Muslims and having preachers act in plays, why don't you come forward honestly and challenge Jews, Christian missionaries, freemasons and communists? No, you cannot even look askance at them. Masons are your masters, patrons.

Who do you think you are being deceitful with the words, "to rescue Muslims from the nuisance of taqlîd... and to help them to follow the Book (the Qur'ân al-kerîm), the Sunna and the way of the Salaf"? Your words contradict each other. Isn't it taqlîd to cling to the Book, to the Sunna and to the path of the Salaf? And this taqlîd that you wish for is possible only by following one of the four a'immat al-madhâhib. To abandon that taqlîd, which you call "nuisance," will mean to abandon the taqlîd of the book, of the Sunna and of the path of the Salaf, thus to go out of Islam; what you want is this wrong taqlîd. Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) declared: **"He who interprets the Book and the Hadîth according to his own view becomes a non-Muslim."** You want to drive Muslims to the taqlîd which is wrong. Take the mask off your face! Reveal the fact that you are an enemy of Islam so that we may answer you. For the time being we quote one line from one of your fellow freemasons:

"Do you think of everybody as blind, and all the people as stupid?"

Do not insult the Muslims of the first century by calling them "shepherds"! Don't represent them as ignorant! They were all learned, whether they were shepherds, fighters or commanders. They were all mujtahids. Certainly they could get knowledge directly from the Book.

Since 1150 (1737), lâ-madhhabism, that is, the bid'a of disapproving the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna, has been spread over the world. The ignorant in Saudi Arabia have been the leaders of this destructive and disunionist activities which harm Islam from the inside and makes brothers-in-Islam enemies to one another. The lâ-madhhabî, who came to power by attacking the Ahl as-Sunna Muslims and plundering and killing under torture thousands of innocent women and children, founded a state with the help of the British in 1350 (1932) and began propagandizing through the organizations in various countries which they established with diplomatic power and the financial support of hundreds of thousands of gold coins annually. Through the publications that are full of lies and slanders, they deceive ignorant

people and try to annihilate Islam from within.

Wahhâbism was founded by Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb. He was born in Najd in 1111 [1699], and died in 1206 [1792]. His father and his brother Sulaimân ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb were pure Muslims and Ahl as-Sunna scholars. Like other scholars in the Hijaz, they, too, explained to Muslims that Wahhâbism was a false path. Many books were written to protect Ahl as-Sunna, which was true Islam. For example, Sulaimân ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb, in order to admonish his brother, wrote at the beginning of his work:

“Allâhu ta'âlâ sent Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) as the Prophet for all human beings. He explained everything that was necessary for men in the Book, **Al-Qur'ân al-kerîm**, which He sent to him; He created whatever He had promised him. He declared that He was going to protect the religion of Islam, which He sent through him, against alteration and corruption until the end of the world. He said also that Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salâm) umma was the best of mankind; and the Prophet gave the glad tidings that this umma would never become corrupt until the end of the world and commanded men to hold fast to his path. Allâhu ta'âlâ, in the 114th âyat of the Sûrat an-Nisâ', declares: **'We will throw the one who deviates from the Believers' path into Hell.'** Therefore, the **ijmâ'** (agreement, unanimity) among the 'ulamâ' of Islam has become a hujja (document) and a dalîl (proof, evidence) for religious knowledge. Deviation from this ijmâ' has become a prohibition. Those who do not know this path of ijmâ' should learn it by asking those who know, which is a command stated in the 43rd âyat of the Sûrat an-Nahl. This âyat is explained in the Hadîth ash-sherîf, **'Ask those who know about what you do not know. The cure for ignorance is to learn by asking.'**

“As the 'ulamâ' of Islam say unanimously, a **mujtahid** is a person who has memorized the Arabic vocabulary; who knows the different, literal and allegorical meanings of words; who is an 'âlim of fiqh; who has committed the Qur'ân al-kerîm to his memory and knows the ways it is read (qirâ'a); who knows the tafsîrs of all the âyats of the Qur'ân al-kerîm; who can distinguish between muhkam and mutashâbih, nâsikh and mansûkh, qasas and other âyats and sahîh, muftarî, muttasil, munqati', mursal, musnad, mashhur and mawqûf hadîths; who also is a possessor of wara', whose nafs has attained tazkiya (rescuing the nafs from its (harmful desires); and who is sâdiq (sincere in his word) and amîn (trustworthy). Only such a personage who has all these excellences

can be followed (taqlîd) and can issue fatwâs. If he lacks one of these qualities, he cannot be a mujtahid and should not be followed. He himself should follow a mujtahid. Hence, a Muslim is either a **mujtahid** or a **muqallid** (one who practises taqlîd). There is not a third alternative. It is fard for muqallids to follow a mujtahid. This has been said unanimously. Even Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya [d. 751/1350], whom the Wahhâbîs praise as an 'allâma whose every word is a document, said in his **I'lâm al-muqi'în**, 'A person who does not fulfil the requirements of ijtihâd is not permitted to draw any conclusions from the Qur'ân al-kerîm or the Hadîth ash-sherîf.' Today people who recite âyats and hadîths and interpret them in accord with their points of view are looked on as scholars. People who quote Ahl as-Sunna scholars in their speeches and books, on the other hand, are taken no heed of. The ignorant and heretical people who do not fulfil even a single requirement of ijtihâd are considered as men of religious authority today. May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect Muslims against this calamity! Âmin!"^[1]

As quoted in the preceding article, Rashîd Ridâ praises Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya as the "Imâm 'Allâma" and means that he follows in his footsteps. And Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya, as quoted above, prohibits non-mujtahids to draw conclusions from the Book and the Sunna. However, Rashîd Ridâ opposes his words, and this openly shows that he is insincere in the cause of Islam and that he is an enemy of Islam, who tries to annihilate Islam from behind the scene.

11– Rashîd Ridâ, with the pen in his own hand, goes on having the religion reformer and the preacher converse with each other. While praising the religion reformer and lauding him to the skies, he belittles and abhors the preacher in every respect. He ascribes his own hasty, stupid statements to the preacher.

In this book, we shall not deal with what Rashîd Ridâ wrote as a religion reformer. But we shall write down the answers which suit the preacher's tongue, instead of the answers which he deems worthy of the preacher. We believe that after reading with attention our dear readers and pure, true men with a religious duty will understand well the inner nature of the freemasonic ruse.

[1] Sulaimân ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb, **As-sawâ'iq al-ilâhiyya fî 'r-raddî 'alâ 'l-Wahhâbiyya**, Nuhbat al-Ahbar, Baghdad, 1306 (1889); photographic reproduction, Istanbul, 1395 (1975).

A preacher cannot be so ignorant as to think that the definitions of *îmân* in logic, sociology, anatomy, and even in *fiqh* and *tasawwuf*, are the same, for, he has to be a man of knowledge who has studied and understood them during his advanced studies in the madrasa. But, if he, instead of being educated in a madrasa, has been educated in the *Jâmi' al-Azhar* after the reformations were made there by the *Muftî of Cairo, Muhammad 'Abduh* (d. 1323/1905) and his novices, he will confuse these definitions with each other, since the freemasons abrogated scientific and advanced religious courses at the madrasas both in the Ottoman Empire and in Egypt. They produced modernist religion reformers who were ignorant in Islam.

A preacher is a Muslim who knows what backbiting (*ghîba*) means. He knows that a word which is said about a group is not backbiting, though the religion reformer may not know the fact.

12– The religion reformer says:

“Is it compatible with reason to deny what we see for the sake of the groundless words which we call ‘*ijmâ'*’ or ‘unanimity’?”

He makes fun of the basic teachings of Islam and claims that the word ***ijmâ'*** does not have a foundation. Scholars of *fiqh* learned it from the *Hadîth ash-sherîf*, “**My umma will not have *ijmâ'*** (that is, they will not agree) **on heresy!**” But how could the religion reformer know this fact! He has not heard it from his so-called modern masters!

Ijmâ' (consensus) was the agreement of the *ijtihâds* of contemporary *mujtahids* of a century with one another. There has been no *mujtahid mutlaq*^[1] after the fourth century, and there has been no *ijmâ'* since then. The *ijmâ's* in the preceding centuries were to be used as proofs and documents by the *mujtahids* of the later centuries. Unanimity among the *muqallids*, the ignorant or especially among the religion reformers cannot be called *ijmâ'*. The soundest, the most valuable *ijmâ'* was the *ijmâ'* of *as-Sahâbat al-kirâm*. The scholars who succeeded them collected information about those matters which had been communicated as *ijmâ'* and wrote them in their books. The information on those matters on which there had been no unanimity and the words of non-*mujtahids* were strictly prevented from being called *ijmâ'*.

According to the scholars of *Ahl as-Sunna*, **al-adillat ash-**

[1] See page 74.

Shari'iyah, that is, the sources from which Islamic rules were derived, are four: the Book, the Sunna, qiyâs al-fuqahâ' and ijmâ' al-Umma. The Book is the Qur'ân al-kerîm. The Sunna is the Hadîth ash-sherîf. These two are also called "**Nass.**" Qiyâs al-fuqahâ' is composed of the ijtihâds of the scholars who were mujtahids. One who says that ijmâ' is not a dalîl (documentary evidence) does not become a disbeliever. He becomes a man of bid'a, for he says it out of explaining away (ta'wîl) the dubious nasses. The Khârijites and other lâ-madhhabî people are in this group. Their words opposing ijmâ' do not result in disbelief. However, it causes disbelief for those ignorant people who are unaware of ta'wîl to express their ideas and thoughts unbecomingly to ijmâ'.

A preacher does not talk out of imagination or supposition. He does not base his decision on possibilities. He knows that it is not permissible to talk without sufficient knowledge or to decide through supposition. He does not deny what he sees, but he studies and experiments, for, the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf order Muslims to think, to study and to experiment, and commend those who do so. The book '**Aqâ'id an-Nasafi**, which he should have read in a madrasa and which the religion reformer should not even have heard of, writes about the means for acquiring knowledge on its very first page.

13- He represents the preacher as a man who does not believe in geography or newspapers and who does not accept what disbelievers report. See the slander against the preacher! Muslims do believe in scientific knowledge, but they do not get deceived by the lies which non-Muslims say under the mask of science. Trying to deceive Muslims and blemish Islamic religion, those kâfirs, who are not aware of science, and pretending as scientists, saying lies in the form of scientific knowledge are called (**Science bigots**), or (**Religion reformers**) or (**Zindîqs**). These are separatists who slander both Islam and the science. If Muslims had not believed in geography, would they have studied this branch of knowledge? The names and authors of the geography books that make known Muslims' studies and discoveries in this field are written in the books **Kashf az-zunûn** and **Mawdû'ât al-ulûm** and also in Brockelmann's German **Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur**. Let us ask the religion reformer: who measured first the length of one meridian on the Sinjar Desert? Weren't they the Muslims of Ahl as-Sunna who belonged to one of the four madhhabs? Won't a Muslim who follows their path

and who is like them believe in scientific knowledge?

Moreover, it is a squalid slander against Muslims to ascribe the statement, “Geography is a branch of knowledge belonging to non-Muslims, so it is not acceptable,” to a preacher. An ignorant person, a heretic or a religion reformer who disguises himself as a preacher may speak so nonsensically. But it would be enmity against Islam to say that an honourable Muslim following one of the four madhhabs spoke so.

The madhhabs do not prohibit science, technology, calculation or experimentation; why, then, should a person who follows a madhhab prohibit them? The madhhabs commend them and order muqallids to learn them. A person who does not believe or learn them cannot be a follower of an imâm al-madhhab. It befits the enemies of the madhhabs to attribute such words to a follower of a madhhab.

14– A preacher could not be so ignorant as to take the humble, poor and contemptible state Muslims are in as a sign of the imminence of Doomsday, for, the imâm al-madhhab whom he follows reported that there would be wealth, excessiveness, many buildings and much fornication towards Doomsday. A muqallid should know this fact, too. If he does not know it, he is the follower of no madhhab. The a’immat al-madhâhib said that people would become evil after Hadrat al-Mahdî^[1] and before him there will be many days of happiness. Muslims should live these happy days and, therefore, work and make progress materially and spiritually. Allâhu ta’âlâ will certainly reward the one who works.

15– The religion reformer uses the term “the concept of the Mahdî” about Hadrat al-Mahdî. He says he does not believe that Hadrat al-Mahdî will come in the future. The religion reformer, a zindîq, may not, but Muslims should believe that he will come since all the ’ulamâ’ of Islam unanimously write that he will come. Such great scholars as al-Imâm as-Suyûtî and Ibn Hajar al-Makkî (d. 974/1566) wrote books about Hadrat al-Mahdî. They quoted what more than two hundred hadîths uttered about him and the alâmât (signs) of his coming in the future.

16– The religion reformer says:

“Concerning any matter on which there has been no

[1] See the books **Endless Bliss** and **Belief and Islam** for detail information about Hadrat al-Mahdî.

ijmâ', everybody should follow a documentary evidence that satisfies him. As a matter of fact, to follow a mujtahid means to follow his proofs."

Yes, to follow (taqlîd) a mujtahid means to follow his documentary proofs, namely the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf. But it was the mujtahid who found out the proofs for the matter. As a matter of fact, the madhhabs differed from one another in finding out the proofs. Finding out a proof for any matter required being an 'âlim in the grade of ijtihâd, a mujtahid. Indeed, such an 'âlim could not imitate another person; he had to act in accord with his own ijtihâd.

17- Rashîd Ridâ writes that the preacher believes the kashf of the Awliyâ' concerning the time of Doomsday. The fact, however, is that the a'immat al-madhâhib said that it was not made known when Doomsday would come, that no one but Allâhu ta'âlâ knew it, and that the kashfs of the Awliyâ' could not be proofs or documents for anybody. Those who follow these 'âlims will certainly say so. It would be a mendacity, an abominable slander to impute any words other than these to the preacher.

18- The religion reformer is right to say that there are made-up hadîths in tafsîr books like the tafsîr book **Kalbî**, yet his statement, "So is the tafsîr book by al-Baidâwî," is absolutely wrong. The great scholar Hadrat 'Abdulhakîm-i Arwâsî (d. 1362/1943) said, "Qâdî al-Baidâwî (Bayyad-Allâhu wajhah, May Allâhu ta'âlâ make his face luminous) was as suitably high as his name and the blessing invoked on him. He was loved and honoured above all by the mufasssirs ('âlim authors of tafsîr books). He reached the highest grade in the knowledge of tafsîr. He was a sanad (authority) in every branch of knowledge. He was prominent in all madhhabs and a guide in every thought. He has been known as an expert in every branch of science, as a guide in every kind of usûl, and as dependable, powerful and distinguished by early and late 'ulamâ'. It is a great dare to say that there are made-up hadîths in the book of such a profound 'âlim. It is to make a deep precipice in Islam. The tongue of the person who utters such words, the heart of the one who believes them, and the ears of the one who listens to them deserve to catch fire. Could not this great man of knowledge distinguish made-up hadîths from the true ones? What should be said to those who say that he could not? Or, did he lack religious strength and fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ so far as to write made-up hadîths and to take no notice of the heavy punishments which our Prophet (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa

sallam) had told about those who would do so? It would be so wicked, so loathsome to say that he did. Because the meanings of these hadîths are too lofty for the narrow mind and the thick head of the person who would say so, he finds no other way than saying that they are mawdû'."

19- The religion reformer says:

"We have not seen the next world; then how can we associate ash-Sha'rânî's words about the geographical position of the place named 'Mawqif' and his map of the Sirât, the Mîzân, Hell and Paradise with the next world? We have not seen any proof in the Book, the Sunna, 'Aql (reason) or Hikma (wisdom) about such things. It is strange that your shaikhs (masters) turn away from the world's most famous and useful geography and draw maps of the next world which cannot be seen."

With these words, he attacks the great Awliyâ' (the elect loved and protected by Allâhu ta'âlâ) and their karâmât (miracles worked by Allâhu ta'âlâ through Awliyâ') and tries to undermine Muslims' belief in them. However, he has no right to behave so, for, Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the Qur'ân al-kerîm, **"Perform the dhikr (remembrance of Allâhu ta'âlâ) continually. Through the dhikr the heart attains itminân (tranquillity)."** A hadîth sherîf declares, **"The symptom of loving Allâhu ta'âlâ is to remember Him very much."** The 'ulamâ' of hadîth said, "Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) performed the dhikr every moment." It is for this reason that the great ones of this umma performed the dhikr so much, and thus strived to carry out this command of Islam, too. By performing the dhikr constantly, their blessed hearts attained tranquillity, and, as it is stated in the hadîths, **"There is a cure for every disease. The cure for the heart is the dhikr of Allah,"** and **"The sources of taqwâ (piety, abstention from harâms) are the 'ârif's hearts,"** they were saved from the disease of the heart, from sins. They attained Allâhu ta'âlâ's love. And these very scholars, who had taqwâ and whose hearts were pure, said that while performing the dhikr constantly they forgot about the world, about everything, that their hearts became like mirrors, and that, like a dream when everything has been forgotten in sleep, something was manifested in their hearts. They gave these manifestations such names as **"kashf," "mukâshafa"** or **"shuhûd."** Thousands of Awliyâ' in every century said so. It is an 'ibâda to perform the dhikr very much. Allâhu ta'âlâ loves those who do it very much, and their hearts become the sources of

taqwâ. The Book and the Sunna reveal these facts. These facts are called the **“umûr at-tashrî’iyya”** (Islamic matters). He who disbelieves them will have disbelieved the Book and the Sunna. It has been revealed by true Muslims, whom Allâhu ta’âlâ loves, that there occurs kashf and shuhûd in the heart. A hadîth sherîf declares, **“No discord remains in one’s heart who perform the dhikr very much.”** Those who revealed these facts were not munâfiqs, but Muslims true in thought and in words. Kashf and karâma have been reported by such people as tawâtur (the state of being widespread, which is a proof of authenticity and against denial). Moreover, though these are the **umûr al-wijdâniyya** or **umûr ad-dhawqiyya** (matters not shown in Islam but done upon one’s own judging with one’s conscience) and they cannot be documents for others. Muslims have been neither commanded nor prohibited to believe them. It is better to believe than disbelieve what the pious Muslims loved by Allâhu ta’âlâ have reported as tawâtur. One should have a good opinion of a Muslim and trust his conduct, even his words concerning ’ibâdât (Islamic rites). The proverb, “He who denies will be deprived,” has always shown inevitability.

Hadrat ’Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha’rânî was a profound ’âlim and a great Walî. He is one of the archstones of the Shâfi’î madhhab. He is loved and admired by the Ahl as-Sunna. The books he read and memorized are beyond count. Some of them are mentioned in the preface of his **Al-mîzân al-kubrâ**. Hundreds of his works are listed in **Kashf az-zunûn**. Each of his books is a monument exhibiting his greatness. Hanafî scholars, too, have been admirers of his deep knowledge, his kashfs and shuhûds. They have reported that he is one of the “stars on the earth.” It was declared in a hadîth sherîf, **“On the Day of Resurrection, first the prophets and then the ’ulamâ’ and martyrs will intercede.”** Holding fast to this hadîth sherîf, we expect his intercession. It is obvious that those who attack such eye-apples of the Ahl as-Sunna are zindîqs. Zindîqs and disbelievers attacked also Muhammad (’alaihi ’s-salâm), the guide of Muslims. Voltaire, the famous disbeliever hostile to Islam, stooped to making the Master of Mankind, Muhammad (’alaihi ’s-salâm), a topic for his repulsive plays. So will such base attacks be certainly made upon the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna, who are the inheritors of the exalted Prophet (’alaihi ’s-salâm). These great people will certainly not be blemished by being a subject for the filthy mouths and cracked pens of the enemies. Falling down on the ground does not

decrease the value of a jewel.

Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha'rânî and similar great people, who were loved by Allâhu ta'âlâ very much, said not that they saw the Mawqif, Sirât, Paradise or Hell with their eyes, but that they could not be seen in this world and that they were shown like a dream and were revealed to their hearts in a manner that could not be known or understood or described. They revealed this secret to those whom they loved, to their intimate friends. They said, "Man lam yadhuq lam yadri," (He who has not tasted cannot understand). It is ignorance or stupidity to deny something which cannot be understood, and the comment "impossible, can never be" about something which one cannot understand is an expression of regression, stubbornness and fanaticism. That is why we call the religion reformer "a bigot of science." What else could it be, if not being a zindîq or enemy against Islam, to make fun of Muslim 'ulamâ's subtle knowledge which is beyond the limits of reason and science, by saying that they drew maps?

20- Rashîd Ridâ quotes the ahâdith ash-sherîf about Doomsday in his book. But he has the preacher always utter those words concocted by zindîqs in the name of hadîth. And, having the religion reformer prove that those words are not hadîths, he has him tell the facts that are written in the books of the 'ulamâ' of Ahl as-Sunna. Through this trick which he plays, he endeavours to belittle preachers and Muslims, who are the followers of the madhhabs, to misrepresent them as ignorant, while introducing himself and other religion reformers as intelligent, learned men of Islam. No doubt, those Muslims who have read and understood Islamic books well will not believe these abominable slanders. But we are writing these lines lest those who do not know the fact should be deceived by thinking that these writings of the religion reformer are true. We would suggest, with emphasis, that our young brothers read the books of the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna so that they shall not be tricked by the religion reformers' lies.

21- Rashîd Ridâ has the preacher say the words of the Hurûfîs, Durzîs (Druzes) and Bâtînîs,^[1] who have nothing to do with Islam, and thus misrepresents these to be the preacher's knowledge of Islam, and has the religion reformer say that these things have no place in Islam and, hence, presents the preacher as an ignoramus. He tries to establish the readers' confidence in the

[1] See the chapter "Corrupt Religions" in the book **Endless Bliss, II**.

religion reformer and to represent the Ahl as-Sunna men of religious post as ignorant.

22– The religion reformer says:

“Recently most of those who call themselves Ahl as-Sunna wa ’l-Jamâ’a have not been able to escape the bid’a made up by the Bâtinîs and others. They are different in name only. If you compare the words of the Bâtinîs with those of the men of tasawwuf of the fourth and later centuries, you will find little difference between them.”

Here again the religion reformer reveals his ignorance in Islam. Contrary to what he writes, the term **Ahl as-Sunnat wa ’l-Jamâ’a** was not invented after Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wa sallam), who had referred to this term and called Muslims to unite under this name. The hadîths, “**Hold fast to my sunna,**” and “**Do not depart from the Jamâ’a,**” are the evidence of this call. With his insolent lie above, the reformer attacks the superior scholars of Ahl as-Sunna and the great Awliyâ’ and attempts to vilify them. The books of Ahl as-Sunna scholars are still the same just as they were written a thousand years ago. There may be ignorant or heretical people in every branch of science and knowledge, among every class of people, and it is a great injustice to attack the word Ahl as-Sunna by taking a few such people as examples. And likening the great men of tasawwuf to the Bâtinîs is one of the tactics of the religion reformers which they have used most frequently. Mistaking the scholars of bâtin (interior, hidden knowledge) for the zindîqs called Bâtinîs is like misrepresenting light as dark, right as wrong, and honest as crooked. Rashîd Ridâ’s book is very far from being a scientific work; it is more of a writing prepared by a conjurer in order to deceive and hoodwink the readers.

23– Rashîd Ridâ says through the preacher’s mouth:

“I do not see why the scholars of kalâm and fiqh keep silent against the instigation of the subversive Shî’ites, who have both deviated themselves and caused others to deviate from the right path, nor can I explain it to myself. Men of kalâm have always been against the Mu’tazila, refuted and vehemently resisted against their beliefs. The Mu’tazila doctrine and its devotees, therefore, have faded away from history. As for the scholars of fiqh, though all of them belong to Ahl as-Sunna wa ’l-Jamâ’a, they have been struggling against one another, refuting one another.”

Obviously, these slanders against the scholars of kalâm and fiqh, which Rashîd Ridâ writes through the preacher, will not convince anyone. Libraries are full of books of refutation written by the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna. Those written in Persian are not fewer than the Arabic ones. If Rashîd Ridâ knew Persian and had read the book **Tuhfa-i Ithnâ 'ashariyya** by Hadrat 'Abd al-'Azîz ad-Dahlawî, he could not help being astonished at how the great scholar rebuts and puts to rout the lâ-madhhabî. Those who read Hadrat Al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî Ahmad al-Fârûqî as-Sirhindî's **Radd-i Rawâfid**, which explains the cause of the Uzbek Sultan 'Abdullah Shah's war against them and his conquering them, and any man of knowledge who sees the book **Hujaj-i Qat'iyya**,^[1] which narrates as-Suwaidî's debate with Nâdir Shah's men and his overpowering them, will fully understand that the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna did overcome them. At the end of the eightieth letter, the translation of the book **Maktûbât** gives the names and the books of thirty-two of those scholars who wrote that the lâ-madhhabî are heretical and that they strive to demolish Islam from within. Also, the idea that the scholars of fiqh have been struggling with one another is one of the slanders which the religion reformers have been repeating constantly. This has been already answered in the sixth article.

24– The religion reformer says:

“The scholars’ refuting and struggling against one another originated mostly from falling for the desires of the nafs. The one and only cause of the birth of the knowledge of kalâm was the Mu'tazila. They [scholars of kalâm] dived into some matters which the pious Salaf had not. They put forward some objections to them. And the others stood against their arrows of objection. With the disappearing of the real scholars of knowledge, of ideas and deduction, the posterity began to repeat word for word that they had said. In the process of time these, too, came to no use. These imitators kept silent against those matters, bid'as and superstitions, which appeared after such scholars as al-Imâm al-Ash'arî and his followers, and accused those who asked questions about them of blasphemy. Yet, when these bid'as and heresies were put forward in a religious guise and colour and had a number of partisans and supporters,

[1] Please see our book **Document of The Right Word**, available from **Hakikat Kitâbevi**.

this time the men of kalâm also attempted to defend them by explaining them away. Moreover, the direction of the weapon of accusing one of blasphemy was changed to turn against those who had objected to these bid'as and heresies, and they accused them of disbelief and heresy. It is possible to see this in every generation and in every nation.

“As for men of fiqh, let us listen to al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî about their attitudes: Hujjat al-Islâm al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî wrote under the topic ‘Kitâb al-’ilm’ in his book **Ihyâ’**: ‘The reason why the men of fiqh quarrelled, struggled with one another was to ingratiate themselves with rulers and governors, thus to obtain ranks and to be qâdîs. For this reason, when carefully observed, it will be seen that the greatest struggle was between the Shâfi’îs and the Hanafîs. For, these ranks and posts were always occupied by these two...’ ”

In this passage, Rashîd Ridâ confuses the evil people who learned fiqh in order to obtain worldly advantages with the ‘ulamâ’ of fiqh who tried to correct the world and the wicked, and thereby tries to belittle and defame the ‘ulamâ’ of fiqh and the a’immat al-madhâhib and prepares grounds for the war which he would make in order to demolish Islam from within by abolishing the madhhabs and their taqlîds. Also, he attempts to interpolate Hadrat al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî’s (d. 505/1111) writing to render the great ‘âlim a false witness for himself. Contrary to what he writes, Hadrat al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî never blamed the ‘ulamâ’ of fiqh. In the fourth chapter of the subject “ ‘ilm,” he wrote the distinction between the ‘ulamâ’ of fiqh and the wicked people who used the knowledge of fiqh as a means for their worldly advantages. He wrote: “The ‘ulamâ’ of fiqh kept away from rulers and governors. They would be asked to issue qadâs and fatwâs, but they would refuse. Upon seeing the greatness and honour associated with these posts, the wicked people wanted to approach the rulers as muftîs. Because the rulers esteemed the madhhabs and had been trying to find out whether the Hanafî or the Shâfi’î madhhab was suitable, those who were not learned began to learn the matters of difference between the two madhhabs. They were wound up into contraventions and debates. These wicked men of religious post busied themselves with whatever the rulers and governors were inclined to.” The religion reformer distorts this passage of al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî’s, which was about the wicked scholars (‘ulamâ as-sû’),

and twists it into animadversion against the 'ulamâ' of fiqh; he does not feel shame for having raised the outcry that the Shâfi'is and the Hanafîs fought one another.

Another lie peculiar to the religion reformers is to say that the 'ulamâ' of Islam followed their nafses. The 'ulamâ' of fiqh and the a'immat al-madhâhib said nothing in opposition to the Qur'ân al-kerîm or the Hadîth ash-sherîf. Because what they all said was based on the Book and the Sunna, the nafses of their followers got redeemed of the state of ammâra and became mutma'inna. Since those who followed them were so, is it possible that their own nafses would not have been mutma'inna? The nafses of the four a'immat al-madhâhib and of all the mujtahids were mutma'inna. Each of them was a Walî who had advanced in the zâhirî (exterior) knowledge and had reached perfection in the bâtinî (interior, hidden) knowledge. To say that they followed their nafses means to vilify all Muslims as well as Islam itself. One should realize how ugly the accusation is.

The religion reformer, by speaking ill of the later men of religious duty, denies the Hadîth ash-sherîf, "**A mujaddid (strengtheners, renewers, of Islam) will come every hundred years. He will strengthen this religion.**" It is true that many Muslims have deviated and seventy-two heretical groups have appeared. But the deviation of Muslims does not mean that Islam itself was defiled. There have always been those true pious Muslims who have not given up following as-Sahâbat al-kirâm. These Muslims are called **Ahl as-Sunnat wa 'l-Jamâ'a**. The 'ulamâ' of Ahl as-Sunna have guided the people to the right path in every part of the world in every century. They have not left any question unanswered. They have protected Muslims from believing in the lies and slanders of zindîqs, men of bid'a, and religion reformers. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares that Islam will not be corrupted till the end of the world.

25- The religion reformer praises himself and extols the magazine **Al-Manâr** to the skies, which he himself edited, a case justly pertinent to the saying, "The Hurûfî's miracle is related by himself only." On the other hand, in this magazine he represents freemasons and religion reformers as Islamic scholars and, by saying that they will renew Islam, he means that the task of restoring Islam to its honourable early state will be done by them. Islam was defiled and Islamic books were changed, he alleges, and they will correct it. But the venom vomited by the snake lying under his insidious words is directed to destroy Ahl as-Sunna, to

annihilate the books of Ahl as-Sunna, which guide to the path of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm, and to replace these books with the books of freemasons and the enemies who have been trying to destroy Islam from within. In short, it is to corrupt Islam, the path of Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) and as-Sahâbat al-kirâm, and thereby to eradicate Islam. This is the very purpose of religion reformers, of those who say that they will reform the religion. Their attacking the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna, who show us the footsteps of the as-Sahâbat al-kirâm, reveals clearly their ignoble motives. Such insidious disbelievers who strive to demolish Islam from within by masqureading as Muslims are called “**zindîqs.**” Zindîqs can deceive and corrupt Muslims, but they cannot corrupt Islam; Allâhu ta'âlâ promises that He will protect Islam.

26– Through the religion reformer, Rashîd Ridâ, says:

“I do not deny the virtue and knowledge possessed by the imâms who were mujtahids. Their virtue and knowledge were beyond praise and glorification. Yet, before the mujtahids, every Muslim used to ask for documentary evidence. Those who came later ignored the documentary evidence and exalted the mujtahid imâms to the grade of prophets. They even preferred the mujtahid's word to a hadîth. They said that the hadîth could be mansûkh (said by the Prophet at his early age, but changed by himself later) or there could be another hadîth in their imâm's view. The mujtahids did not find it right to act in accordance with the words of the persons who could possibly go wrong or who could not know the matter and who were not safe from errors, and to lay aside the hadîth of the Prophet, who was free from error. The muqallids dissented from the Qur'ân, too, which is the evident guide and the absolute document. They said that it was not permissible to learn the religion from the Qur'ân and that only mujtahids could understand the meaning of the Qur'ân. They claimed that it was not permissible to ignore the mujtahid's word and to act in accordance with the Qur'ân. They said that it was not permissible to say, ‘Allah says so,’ or ‘Rasûlullah says so,’ and that we should say, ‘The fiqh scholar has understood it as such.’ There is not a branch of knowledge which might exceed, with all its subjects, the capacity of most people and which can be understood only by certain people of certain times. It is a requirement of the Divine Law that the later scholars

should be more advanced than the earlier ones, for, the starting point of the later ones is where the earlier ones have left off. The Qur'ân and the Hadîth are more understandable than the books of fiqh. A person who has learned Arabic well understands them more easily. Isn't Allâhu ta'âlâ able to explain His religion more explicitly than the men of fiqh? Rasûlullah understood what Allah meant better than anybody else, and he explained it clearly and communicated everything.

“If most people had been incapable of deriving rules from the Book and the Sunna, all the people would not be held liable for these rules. One should know what one believes together with its proofs. Allah disapproves of the taqlîd and muqallids. He declares that they will not be forgiven by imitating their fathers and grandfathers. To understand that part of the religion concerning fiqh from its documents is easier than understanding the part concerning îmân. Allâhu ta'âlâ holds us liable for the difficult one. Is it ever possible that He will not hold us liable for the easy one?

“Prophets did not err, but mujtahids might have made errors. Mujtahids expanded the religion and made it several times as much as it was. They drove Muslims into trouble. There cannot be employed any qiyâs in the field of 'ibâdât; nor can one add anything to 'ibâdât. [However], qiyâs and istihsân (approval of facility) can be employed in judicial decisions. The mujtahids, too, prohibited men from taqlîd.”

In his sophisms, the religion reformer contradicts himself time and again. Employing logic in any branch of knowledge requires having some knowledge of that branch. The intrigues played with a bare reasoning by those who do not understand the basic knowledge of Islam do not give any result but rather bring disgrace upon themselves. It is true that those Muslims preceding the mujtahids, that is, as-Sahâbat al-kirâm, asked for documents; they did not follow one another. But they were all mujtahids. They were the people of the first century praised and lauded by Rasûlullah (sall-allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam). All as-Sahâbat al-kirâm and many of the Tâbi'ûn were mujtahids. It was necessary for a mujtahid to act in accordance with what he understood, and it was not permissible for him to follow another mujtahid. A Muslim simply does not say, “Those who came later exalted the mujtahids

to the grade of prophets,” nor does he claim that they even held them superior. For this statement stigmatizes billions of Muslims who have belonged to the four madhhabs as disbelievers. He who says or writes that a certain Muslim is a disbeliever becomes a disbeliever himself. It is even a greater slander to accuse muqallids of dissenting from the Qur’ân al-kerîm. The religion reformers should know very well that a madhhab means the way of the Book and the Sunna. He who follows an imâm al-madhhab believes that he follows the Qur’ân al-kerîm and Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ‘alaihi wa sallam). No Muslim says, “It is not permissible to ignore the mujtahid’s word and to act in accordance with the Qur’ân,” nor has any Muslim ever said so. This is one of the abominable slanders made by religion reformers, freemasons and zindîqs against pure Muslims. Every Muslim says, “I want to adapt myself to the Qur’ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf, but I myself cannot draw conclusions from them. I cannot depend on or follow the rules which I understand. I depend on and follow what the imâm al-madhhab understood, for, he was more learned than I am. He knew the eight main branches of knowledge and the twelve subsidiary branches better than I do. He feared Allâhu ta’âlâ more than I do. He did not draw conclusions from the Qur’ân al-kerîm out of his own understanding but learned from as-Sahâbat al-kirâm the meanings which had been given by Rasûlullah (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm). I fear much on account of the hadîth ash-sherîf, **‘He who derives meanings out of his own understanding becomes a disbeliever.’** In fact, there were differences between the rules derived from the Qur’ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sharîf by those great scholars whose knowledge, goodness and taqwâ, as declared in many hadîths, were very superior to those of their successors. If it had been easy to derive rules, they all would have inferred the same.” How could an ignoramus ever be right to say, “Allâhu ta’âlâ says so,” or “Rasûlullah says so”? Allâhu ta’âlâ prohibited us to talk so. Even the ‘ulamâ’ of tafsîr and the a’immat al-madhhab did not dare to say these words; after explaining what they understood, they always said, “This is what I understand. Allâhu ta’âlâ knows the truth of it.” Even as-Sahâbat al-kirâm used to have difficulty in understanding the meaning of the Qur’ân al-kerîm and asked Rasûlullah (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm). So it is clear how ignorant and stupid a day-dream the religion reformer has been pursuing.

The statement, “Later scholars should be more advanced than the earlier ones,” is true when we refer to experimental sciences.

Concerning the knowledge of Islam, however, Rasûlullah's (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) hadîth sherîf is valid: **“Each century will be worse than the one preceding it. This will be the case until Doomsday.”** This hadîth sharîf is valid also when the scientists' personality and their ways of using the science and its products are in question. This principle is certainly true for the majority, and there have been exceptions in every century. The religion reformer not only mistakes experimental knowledge and religious knowledge for each other but also supposes that science and scientist are the same. Science has surely made advancements, but this does not mean that scientists also are advanced. Among the later ones, those who are more retrogressive, more corrupt and baser than the earlier ones are not less in number.

Arabic is necessary for understanding the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf, yet Arabic alone is not enough. If it were enough, each of the Arab Christians in Beirut would have consequently been an Islamic scholar since among them there were those who had a deeper knowledge of Arabic than the Egyptian religion reformers and those who were experts in Arabic, as well as those who compiled dictionaries like **Al-munjid**. None of them was able to understand the Qur'ân al-kerîm or even to attain to the honour of being a Muslim. The Qur'ân al-kerîm summons people to happiness, to îmân, to Islam. If they had understood this invitation, they would have accepted it. Their disbelief does not show that Allâhu ta'âlâ's invitation is not clear or eloquent. The Qur'ân al-kerîm addresses as-Sahâbat al-kirâm, their lightsome hearts, and unerring reason. It invites by means of the Quraish language. It does not speak the Arabic taught in the Jâmi' al-Azhar or Beirut. As-Sahâbat al-kirâm matured in Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) suhba (companionship, company) and attained to the perfection which could not be reached by others among the Umma; yet their understanding (some parts of) the Qur'ân al-kerîm was different from one another's. There were also points they could not understand. Since those great people were incapable, how will the case be with such people like us who understand slang Arabic? Our a'immat al-madhâhib did not attempt to derive meanings from the Qur'ân al-kerîm, but, regarding themselves as incapable of doing this, strived to learn, by asking as-Sahâbat al-kirâm, the way Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) had explained the Qur'ân al-kerîm. Also, they preferred what as-Sahâbat al-kirâm had understood to what they themselves understood. Al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa (d.

150/767, rahmatullâhi `alaih) would prefer the word of any Sahâbî to his own understanding. When he found no information coming from Rasûlullah (`alaihi `s-salâm) or from as-Sahâbat al-kirâm, he had to employ ijtihâd. Islamic scholars in each century have trembled before the greatness, superiority, wara' and taqwâ of their predecessors and have held fast to their words as proofs and documents. Islam is a religion of manners (âdâb) and modesty (tawâdu'). An ignoramus behaves daringly and thinks of himself as an Islamic scholar, but a scholar humbles himself. He who humbles himself will be exalted by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Each of the chiefs of the seventy-two groups, who will go to Hell as it was stated by Rasûlullah (`alaihi `s-salâm), was a profound scholar, too; yet, they depended on their knowledge too much and attempted to derive meanings from the Book and the Sunna. Therefore, they could not attain to the honour of adapting themselves to as-Sahâbat al-kirâm and deviated from the right path. They caused millions of Muslims to go to Hell. The `ulamâ' of the four madhhabs did not use their deep knowledge in deriving rules from the Qur'ân al-kerîm; they did not dare to do this. They used it in understanding what Rasûlullah (`alaihi `s-salâm) as-Sahâbat al-kirâm had said. Allâhu ta'âlâ does not command people to derive rules from the Qur'ân al-kerîm. He commands them to obey and accept the rules brought by His Messenger (`alaihi `s-salâm) and as-Sahâbat al-kirâm. The religion reformers' incapacity in understanding this subtlety has driven them to perdition. Allâhu ta'âlâ's commands, **“Obey My Messenger!”** and **“Adapt yourselves to My Messenger!”** and Rasûlullah's (`alaihi `s-salâm) command, **“Hold fast to the way of my companions!”** are the documents of our argument. If following the a'immat al-madhâhib meant to abandon Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Messenger (`alaihi `s-salâm) and to become a slave of another slave, following as-Sahâbat al-kirâm would have meant the same. Since it was not so, Rasûlullah (`alaihi `s-salâm) commanded it. He commanded people to believe briefly and to perform `ibâda as much as they saw him do. He did not even suggest that they should know the proofs.^[1] Allâhu ta'âlâ disapproves of disbelievers imitating their parents, and He commands them to give up disbelief and to have belief. He does not disapprove of imitating His Messenger (`alaihi `s-salâm), but commands it. And

[1] Hadrat al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî explained this in detail in his work **Kimyâ' As-sa'âda**.

Rasûlullah (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm) commands us to imitate his companions. It is bad to follow the wicked, but this should not prevent us from following the good people. As explained above, if it were easy to understand the documents of the part pertaining to î mân, the Christian Arabs in Beirut would necessarily have î mân easily. Since it was not easy to understand the documents of the principles that are to be believed, we were ordered to have î mân without the need to understand the documents, and those who believed in this manner were called **“Mu‘minûn”** (Believers, Muslims). If Allâhu ta‘âlâ had made Muslims liable also for learning and understanding the documents of the rules concerning ‘ibâdât, His Messenger (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm), too, would have suggested it. Indeed, as explained above, he never did.

By saying that prophets (‘alaihimu ‘s-salâm) never erred but mujtahids might have made mistakes, he supposes that the rules revealed by mujtahids are different from those revealed by the Prophet (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm). On the contrary, a mujtahid or an î mân al-madhhab was a great ‘âlim who spent his whole life studying day and night, searching and finding out the rules that had been conveyed by the Prophet (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm) and by as-Sahâbat al-kirâm and who transmitted them to Muslims. No mujtahid ever added anything to any kind of ‘ibâdât. They said unanimously that it was a bid‘a and a great sin. There cannot be another slander as ugly and loathsome as accusing the mujtahids of something which they themselves prohibited. It is crass ignorance and idiocy to say that mujtahids expanded the religion. It is answerable in no way but with a sneer. The religion does not expand, but the number of cases increases. It is a great service to Islam and a very valuable ‘ibâda to apply Islam to those cases which have appeared and developed during the course of time. And this has been and is still being the lot of the mujaddid imâms.

A mujaddid does not have to be a mujtahid mutlaq. It is true that the four a‘immat al-madhâhib prohibited taqlîd. But they prohibited it for those scholars who were educated among their disciples and who had reached the grade of ijtihâd. It is never permissible for any mujtahid to follow another mujtahid. This rule will be valid till Doomsday. But it does not apply to the ignoramuses and religion reformers who think of themselves as mujtahids. If a mouse thinks of itself as a lion and then meets a cat, it will realize that it has been wrong. But its mistake will cost it its life.

27– In the seventh dialogue the religion reformer says:

“Who demoted the religion into this state of theoretical philosophy are the later Islamic scholars. They put some definitions and limitations. They divided it into sections. In fact, there were those who said that becoming a scholar of fiqh required twenty years of study. However, it had taken that much time to establish all the branches or the rules of the religion. It had not taken even two years to establish the fiqh. I want modern Muslims to be like the Muslims of the time of the Four Caliphs. Therefore, it is the duty of every Muslim to perform the 'ibâdât on which there has been unanimity. It is not necessary to perform the controversial ones even if they were said to be fard. On such matters, you should act upon your studying its evidences or act in accord with a narration (qawl), if you prefer this narration because it suits your case. But you should not blame others for not doing as you do. It is not proper to perform salât behind different imâms belonging to different madhhabs in the same mosque at the same time. In short, we should do what as-Sahâba did, and we should not do what they did not do. We should exercise an option in doing controversial matters. We should employ qiyâs on what as-Sahâba did not explain. On controversial matters everybody should act in accordance with the hadîths which they believe to be sahih.”

He attacks Islamic scholars with the accusation that they turned Islam into philosophy by dividing it and introduced definitions and limitations into it. Yet the fact is that, the scholars of kalâm had nothing to do with philosophy, for, they were much higher than philosophers. However, during the time of the Umayyads, Muslims who spread over the three continents met various groups of non-Muslims, and also such groups as the Khawârij and the Mu'tazila appeared, who tried to mislead the new Muslims. The scholars of Ahl as-Sunna had to protect Muslims' faith and to answer various religions, philosophers and zindîqs. Preparing answers refuting their philosophy as they should deserve, they promulgated the knowledge of kalâm far and wide, thus preventing the youth from being deceived. While it is an obligation for us to praise them for their glorious and honourable services and to thank them and invoke blessings on them, does it become a Muslim to attempt to speak ill of them for this reason? Because as-Sahâbat al-kirâm were very wise and

intelligent and had such a guide as Rasûlullah (‘alaihi ’s-salâm), the Islamic religion was established in twenty years. After the second century of Islam, the Muslims who had then spread over the three continents did not have either of these advantages. The time a disciple would need to learn from his master became longer. Yet, it was said by the scholars that it was still possible to learn in a short time if the master would be tender and skillful and the disciple intelligent and diligent, and history books reveal that there came those who could fulfil these conditions. In addition, the darkness of bid’as and sins blackened the hearts and weakened the memories and, consequently, caused the duration of education to become longer. Even Hadrat al-Imâm ash-Shâfi’î complained to his master Waki’ about the weakness of his memory. The answer he was given as stated in the following distich reveals this fact:

***“Shakawtul Waki’a min sû-i hifzî,
Fa-awsânî ilâ tark-il ma’âsî.”***^[1]

The religion reformer says, on the one hand, that every Muslim should perform the ‘ibâdât which have been declared unanimously and, on the other hand, that he may not perform the controversial ones or he may perform them in accordance with any madhhab he likes, that is, he may unify or mix the madhhabs. His words contradict each other, for, it was declared unanimously that it was wrong to mix the madhhabs. Mixing the madhhabs is disobedience to this unanimous declaration. Therefore, the religion reformer’s worship will not be correct and acceptable according to himself, either. Also, it is incorrect to say that as-Sahâbat al-kirâm did not do the controversial matters and that there would not have been any controversial ones if they had done them; for, there were also those matters on which there was disagreement because the way as-Sahâbat al-kirâm had done them was not understood. Moreover, it is incompatible with the unanimous declaration of the scholars to say that one should lay imâm al-madhhab’s words aside and follow one’s own interpretation of a Hadîth ash-sherîf, which causes one to think of oneself as a mujtahid superior to imâm al-madhhab, an attribute peculiar to the Devil.

28– The religion reformer says in the eighth Dialogue:

[1] “I complained to Waki’ of my bad memory. He recommended me to cease from sinning.”

“The men of taqlîd are the greatest enemies of the lights of thinking, research and documenting, which make for the indispensable part of the natural disposition created [in man] by Allah.”

Such an open lie and slander is very puzzling, indeed. Which faqîh prohibited thinking, researching and looking for documentary evidence? Which Muslim is hostile against these? He should have given an example. Which of his lies or slanders from the beginning of his book has he documented so that he would document his one now? It is the religion reformer’s very self which is hostile against documentation. It would be illogical to ask such a person, who puts forward what he has planned with his short sight and false reasoning in the name of religious knowledge, to think or to furnish proofs. Though it would be proper to think of the saying, “Silence is the best answer to be given to an idiot,” and to hold one’s tongue, a brief answer is necessary to protect young brains against the harms of such a person: All the ‘ulamâ’ of fiqh have said that it is not necessary for a muqallid to look for documentary evidences, for, the new Muslims among the Tâbi’ûn used to do everything by asking as-Sahâbat al-kirâm, never demanding any proofs. Moreover there has been no scholar who prohibited searching for proofs. For this reason, all the a’immat al-madhhâhib wrote documents at full length and made it easy for those who wanted to see the documents.

29– He says:

“The ignorant, as the Muslims of the first century did, shall ask any matter they do not know from a person they trust. They shall ask about an âyat or hadîth which is related to it, learn its meaning, and act in accordance with it.”

Good Gracious! How deep a learning! What reasoning! It was true that as-Sahâbat al-kirâm used to do so, but they all had become higher than the a’immat al-madhhâhib by being matured in the suhba of Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ‘alaihi wa sallam). They were praised and glorified in the hadîth ash-sherîf, **“My companions are like the stars in the sky. You will attain to the right path if you follow any of them!”** They all could understand the Divine Meaning. In case of a matter not stated clearly in the Book or in the Sunna, they used to search through âyats and hadîths for a documentary solution, employ ijtihâd and draw a conclusion. It was not necessary or permissible for them to follow

(taqlîd) one another. Our a'immat al-madhâhib also did as as-Sahâbat al-kirâm had done. Like them, they searched for and found out evidences and drew conclusions from them. Thus, they parted into madhhabs in respect of 'ibâdât. In this way, they carried out Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) command, for, he had declared, **“Adapt yourselves to my companions!”** Since the new Muslims among the Tâbi'ûn did not ask as-Sahâbat al-kirâm for documentary evidences, it is not necessary for the ignorant like us to look for the proofs of the a'immat al-madhâhib. We learn the commands of Allâhu ta'âlâ by reading the books written by the a'immat al-madhâhib. These books are the explanations of the Qur'ân al-kerîm. See this man with a religious post who likens an ignorant village shepherd to a Sahâbî and recommends him to go to town frequently, look for âyats and hadîths, interpret them by himself and employ ijtihâd! While there is the facility of following an imâm al-madhhab, he gets the poor man into such difficulties!

30– The religion reformer, slighting thousands of Islamic scholars, continues as follows:

“The usûl scholars' deducing the necessity of the taqlîd from the âyat, **‘If you do not know, ask those who know!’** is a fruitless and unsound deduction and reasoning. The âyat should not be commanding the taqlîd to everybody since the taqlîd was not permissible in the events or for the person that caused the âyat's revelation. In this âyat, Allâhu ta'âlâ commanded the polytheist Arabs to ask the Ahl al-kitâb (Believers in Holy Books) if prophets were angels or human beings. Why should this question be taqlîd while it does not mean to act in accordance with someone else's opinion or ijtihâd without evidences? Furthermore, this matter pertains to belief. You, too, admit the fact that taqlîd is not permissible in this respect. The Qur'ân prophesies that on the Day of Resurrection the chiefs of the disbelievers will run away from those who followed them. Isn't this information a sign of the fact that those who follow the persons whom Allah has not ordered us to follow will not be excused by Allah? Because Muslims considered some people as witnesses and turned away from the Qur'ân, we suffered disasters. The imâms whom they followed will run away from them on the Day of Resurrection, for, the great imâms and mujtahids prohibited taqlîd. You have been accustomed to taking the words of human beings, not the words of Allah and the

Prophet, as proofs.”

After writing these through the mouth of the religion reformer, Rashîd Ridâ, in order to deceive his readers, writes that the preacher likes the words of the religion reformer, that he has been wrong to think of religion reformers as ignorant, and that now he appreciates the religion reformer after seeing that he is so well learned.

Our Prophet (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) deduced from this âyat that the taqlîd of a mujtahid was necessary when carrying out every kind of action or 'ibâda. And as-Sahâbat al-kirâm taught the new Muslims among the Tâbi'ûn only how to carry out the 'ibâdât the way they themselves had learned from Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam). They did not command them to search for proofs. They deemed it sufficient for them to imitate without knowing proofs. Our a'immat al-madhâhib, who followed in the footsteps of the as-Sahâbat al-kirâm in everything they did, followed them in this respect, too. There is no difference between saying that the a'immat al-madhâhib prohibited taqlîd and saying that they deviated from the path of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm. It was true that the as-Sahâbat al-kirâm and the a'immat al-madhâhib looked for documentary evidences, and they did not follow others' ijtihâd. But they permitted the non-mujtahids to follow mujtahids. The reformer's claim that the âyat did not command disbelievers to practise taqlîd is to smother the matter in sophistry. Islamic scholars have not said that disbelievers were commanded to practise taqlîd; why, then, should the religion reformer be acknowledged to be right for these words of his? Allâhu ta'âlâ commanded those who did not know to ask from those who knew. And Islamic scholars, by inferencing from the âyat, have said that Muslims should ask those who know about how to do what they are going to do. This is the whole subject. There is no such thing as taqlîd or searching for evidences here. The religion reformer, inserting these into the matter, endeavours to prove himself right. It is a different subject to follow an 'âlim without seeing the documentary evidences in something which one will do. And this different subject automatically originates from the former subject: asking someone who knows about the things that should be done or that should not be done, and doing as one learns from him, means to follow (**taqlîd**) him. On the other hand, the case is not so with the imitation concerning îmân. Since îmân does not settle in the heart right after asking and learning the facts to be believed, it is not called the taqlîd. After learning

îmân, one thinks over, approves and admits it, and then it gets established in his heart. This is the îmân which Islam requires. The unconsidered îmân that is formed after learning without thinking or approving is imitative and without proof. Such is the case with the disbelievers who become disbelievers by imitating their parents. Islam requires people to have îmân by thinking it over, seeing its evidences and deciding for themselves. Disbelievers' disbelief is not formed by themselves; it has been adopted from their parents and it has become their own quality. As it is seen, taqlîd has no connection with îmân. Because taqlîd is not permissible in îmân, those who have been followed in this respect will run away on the Day of Resurrection from those who have followed them. Because taqlîd in 'ibâdât is a requirement of Allâhu ta'âlâ's command, both those who teach and those who learn will go to Paradise.

The religion reformer's saying that Muslims considered some people as witnesses and turned away from the Qur'ân al-kerîm is a very base and disgusting demeaning. It means to display Muslims as disbelievers. Since his statement is mendacious and slanderous, and since he calls Muslims disbelievers, he himself becomes a disbeliever.

Muslims do not follow the a'immat al-madhâhib themselves. Learning from them what Allâhu ta'âlâ and the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) meant, they cling to the commands of Allâhu ta'âlâ and Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm). Mujtahids themselves are each a medium, a transmitter. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares, **“Look for a medium to attain to My Love!”** Muslims, following Allâhu ta'âlâ's command, make use of the a'immat al-madhâhib as mediums. To follow the a'immat al-madhâhib, to adapt oneself to them does not mean to do their personal commands, but it means to follow what they conveyed from the Book and the Sunna.

How could the discordant matters among the four madhhabs ever be abandoned? It is impossible. One of the discordant opinions on a matter certainly coincides with Allâhu ta'âlâ's command. For example, bleeding breaks a wudû' (ritual ablution) according to the Hanafî madhhab, but it does not according to the Shâfi'î madhhab. One of these inferences is, for sure, what Allâhu ta'âlâ meant. We should always do one of them and say that it is what He meant. The one who does what Allâhu ta'âlâ meant hits the right way and wins. The Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) declared that the mujtahid who could not understand exactly what Allâhu ta'âlâ meant would also be given thawâb. During the time of our

master Rasûlullah (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm), there were many such matters of ijtihâd. There are many hadîths stating that the mujtahid who could not hit the right way will also be given thawâb. The important thing here is that this thawâb is meant for mujtahids only. According to the above âyat, which is in Sûrat an-Nahl, those who follow mujtahids will be given that much thawâb, too. Religion reformers who do not follow mujtahids will not be given this thawâb. They do not obey Allâhu ta’âlâ’s command. They will go to Hell. The hadîth ash-sherîf, **“None of the ‘ibâdât of a holder of bid’a is acceptable,”** is the proof of our argument.

Some scholars of usûl al-fiqh said, “Following a mujtahid requires one’s trust and belief in his knowledge; the âyat, **‘Ask those who know,’** reveals this fact. A person who follows a mujtahid in one matter and follows another mujtahid in another matter will not have believed or trusted in the former mujtahid. Nor will his performance of the former matter be acceptable. If he says that he believes and trusts in both of them, his words are not believable.”^[1] As in many respects, Rashîd Ridâ’s attitude and conduct have contradicted his words in this respect, too. So says the poet:

***“Action is man’s mirror, words don’t ever count;
In his work appears the extent of his mind.”***

31– The religion reformer quotes the conversation between Hadrat al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî and an eccentric member of the Bâtiniyya. He reports al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî as having said:

“The person whom I will advise should not be attached to a heretical group, nor should he have dived into discordant subjects. In ‘ibâdât, dwell upon the matters on which there has been agreement. Don’t deal with the discordant matters. On a discordant matter, do the prudent solution! Those [‘ulamâ’] who did not say that it was fard said that it was mustahab. At times when it is difficult to do what is prudent employ ijtihâd yourself, that is, do the way of the mujtahid that you think is superior. Follow the ‘âlim whom you have decided to be superior and more hitting in his point of view! If that exalted person hit the right way in his opinion and ijtihâd or in the conclusion and decision which he deduced, there shall be two rewards, two thawâbs

[1] See for detail the passage translated from **Al-mîzân al-kubra** below, p. 82.

for him. As a matter of fact, Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) declared that if a person employed ijtihâd and hit the right way he would win two prizes, and if he erred he would win one prize. And Allâhu ta'âlâ referred the job to those who are capable of ijtihâd. The eighty-third âyat of the Sûrat an-Nisâ' declares, **'Those who are capable of inferring conclusion from them know the matter.'** Hadrat Prophet (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) explained in a hadîth to Ma'âdh that he liked and approved the ijtihâd of those who were capable of doing it. Ma'âdh ibn Jabal's saying, 'If I cannot find in the Book or the Sunna, I judge according to my own opinion and employ ijtihâd,' took place before Hadrat Prophet's (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) commanding and permitting ijtihâd. Both mujtahids and those who follow them are excusable. Some of them have hit the right way, the Divine Meaning, while others have won one out of the two rewards. Since it is not known who has hit the right way, they are not obstinate for fanatical against one another. Only, each of them thinks that he has hit the right way. I admit that it is wrong for everybody to draw rules through his own opinion and qiyâs. If you abandon Bâtinism, which you have been imitating blindly, I can teach you the knowledge in the Qur'ân al-kerîm. Which would you prefer, learning from me or your Bâtinî comrades?"

He adds that the preacher, upon hearing this, says,

“Now we see that al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî admits taqlîd and considers it necessary for all people.”

These words of al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî as reported by the religion reformer shows clearly that he agreed with what the 'ulamâ' of Ahl as-Sunna and a'immat al-madhâhib said unanimously. There is no need to explain the above-quoted words of the great imâm of Ahl as-Sunna (rahmatullâhi 'alahim ajma'in). Our purpose, too, is to tell our brothers-in-Islam what Hadrat Imâm said. Al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî's words rebut the religion reformer's claims by the roots. They show that taqlîd is compatible with Islam.

32- The religion reformer writes in the ninth dialogue:

“I have already explained my views on how Muslims will slip out of the obscurities of discordance, the cause and virus responsible for the disease which they caught. My opinion is in agreement with that of the great Islamic scholar al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî. He says that it will be enough for them

[Muslims] to believe in the Qur'ân al-kerîm only, in addition to doing what Muslims have heretofore agreed on. What damages Islam is the parting of Muslims into groups and each group's following only the imâm which they prefer and those scholars who follow him, and being bigoted against those who follow other mujtahid imâms. This breaking into groups may go as far as abandoning the Book and the Sunna. I have shown more facility in these sort of matters. I have given the liable person the freedom to accept whichever point of view he wishes, provided he will not follow the desires of the nafs and he will be as cautious as he can. But, al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî, though deeming it permissible to abandon these matters completely, puts a limit to the field of activity for those who want to follow religious practices. He almost compels them to employ ijtihâd."

The religion reformer's greatest error is his confusing the breaking of Muslims into groups in i'tiqâd (belief) with the parting of Ahl as-Sunna into madhhabs. He speaks ill of the four madhhabs as he does of the groups of bid'a and blemishes Muslims as if they have dissented from the Book and the Sunna. All the seventy-two groups who have deviated in i'tiqâd are certainly heretical. It is stated in a hadîth sherîf that they will all go to Hell. Yet, if not hostility against Islam, what else may his attacking the four a'immat al-madhâhib of Ahl as-Sunna be, who were praised in the Hadîth ash-sherîf and who won Allâhu ta'âlâ's Love and Approval because they obeyed Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm)? Such an enemy of Islam who appears as a man of religious ranking is called a **zindîq**. Our religion declares that zindîqs and munâfiqs are worse and more harmful than the non-Muslims with or without a Book. The religion reformer does not feel shame for changing al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî's words quoted in the previous article and adapting them to his personal point of view. Deeming himself an 'âlim and a mujtahid like Hadrat al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî, he attempts to direct Islam as he wishes. He is not aware that this stupid behaviour of his is worse than that of the seventy-two groups he blames.

33- The religion reformer opposes the unanimity of the a'immat al-madhâhib, too, and says:

"It is impossible to admit the claim that there was an *ijmâ'* (unanimity) on the decision that the *talfîq* (unification, combination) of the madhâhib was wrong. There are

different opinions on this subject. How could the author of **Durr al-muhtâr** ever say this, which was said by none of the imâms of his own madhhab, despite the fact that his own madhhab is the combination of the ijtihâds of the three imâms. Also, we understand from Ibn Humâm that it is not true that the Hanafîs do not admit talfîq. Moreover, there are quite a lot of fatwâs issued in unity with more than one madhhab. One of the most well-known of them is about ‘one’s donating one’s movables to oneself,’ which has been deemed permissible by unifying the ijtihâds of Imâm Abû Yûsuf and Imâm Muhammad. Ibn ‘Âbidîn’s saying that it would not be unification of the madhhabs to unify the ijtihâds of the scholars belonging to the same madhhab is an arbitrary idea which a wise person could not say. No person, not even a muqallid, will admit the two contradictory opinions at the same time. I, too, admit the fact that the authors of fiqh books could not say anything from themselves, for a muqallid does not have the knowledge to enable him to assert something from himself. What he is to do is to convey somebody else’s words. As a matter of fact, he conveyed this from ‘Allâma Qâsim, who had conveyed it from **Tawfiq al-hukkâm**. Somebody, not knowing the fact that there is disagreement on the matter and that there are various points of view, just says that there is ijmâ’, and others convey this. It is incorrect to think that truth will always be on the side of the majority. **‘No matter how heartily you wish, the majority of the people will still not believe you,’** declares Sûra Yûsuf.”

In this passage, the religion reformer clearly reveals his ignorance and the fact that he is an enemy of the Ahl as-Sunna. His saying that the Hanafî madhhab is the unification of the ijtihâds of the three imâms shows that he knows nothing of ‘ilm al-usûl al-fiqh. The evidences which he puts forward, thinking with his short sight that they are proofs, are quite irrelevant. We shall say shortly that the methods (usûl) and principles (qawâ'id) of the Hanafî madhhab were established by al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa (rahmatullâhi 'alaih). Imâm Abû Yûsuf (d. 182/798) and Imâm Muhammad ash-Shaibânî (d. 189/804) were al-Imâm al-a'zam's disciples. Educating and training them for many years like hundreds of his other disciples, he enabled them to reach the grade of ijtihâd. These two and many other mujtahids who were their friends measured what they had learned from their master

with the methods and principles they had learned again from their master, and they gave different fatwâs on the new cases they encountered. Since the fatwâs of these two imâms have not been unified in the Hanafî madhhab, there is no question of the talfîq of them. In the Hanafî madhhab, al-Imâm al-a'zam's words should be acted upon. In those matters on which he has no ijtihâd, Imâm Abû Yûsuf's ijtihâd is to be acted upon. If this cannot be found, either, Imâm Muhammad's ijtihâd should be acted upon. Only in indispensable (darûra) situations it is permissible to change this succession or to unify the two. For example, concerning the liability to sacrifice sheep during the 'Iyd of Qurbân^[1] ('Îd al-adhâ), a person who cannot meet his needs and debts with the rents he gets is considered poor according to Imâm Muhammad, while, according to the Shaikh'ain (al-Imâm al-a'zam and Imâm Abû Yûsuf), he is considered rich. If such a person does not sacrifice a sheep or give the fitra,^[2] he will escape the sin according to Imâm Muhammad. If he gives the fitra and sacrifices a sheep, he will get the thawâb of a wâjib according to the Shaikh'ain. He who does something which is not wâjib for him will get only the thawâb of a supererogatory (nâfila) 'ibâda, but not the thawâb of a wâjib. The thawâb of a wâjib is much greater than this. As it is seen, the difference in ijtihâds is Allâhu ta'âlâ's Mercy upon Muslims. It is not talfîq to unite the ijtihâds of the imâms belonging to one madhhab. It does not show that talfîq is permissible. **Talfîq** is to unite two or more of the four madhhabs. Also, his reference to Ibn Humâm is a lie, since Ibn Humâm wrote in his book **Tahrîr**, "When imitating another madhhab, one should not do anything which is wrong according to either of the two madhhabs he is following. If a person, by following the Shâfi'î madhhab, does not rub his limbs with his hands while performing a wudû' (ritual ablution), and if he touches a woman [he is/was permitted to marry with an Islamic nikâh] thinking that his ritual ablution will not break with this touch according to the Mâlikî madhhab, the salât which he performs with this ablution will be invalid (bâtil) according to both madhhabs." The book **Khulâsat at-tahqîq** puts forth these words of Ibn Humâm as an evidence for proving the fact that it is not permissible to unify madhhabs. The enemy of Islam who comes forth as a man with religious duties

[1] The tenth, eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth days of the month of Zu'lhijja. Please see the fourth chapter of **Endless Bliss**, V.

[2] A kind of alms, explained in the third chapter of **Endless Bliss**, V.

changes Ibn Humâm's words in order to deceive Muslims, and thus abominably slanders this great imâm. Moreover, it was Shaikh Qâsim, Ibn Humâm's disciple, who wrote that talfîq was not acceptable and that there was even *ijmâ'* on it. Shaikh Qâsim wrote about this *ijmâ'*, which he learned from his master, Ibn Humâm, in his book **At-tas'hîh**, which is a commentary on **Al-Qudûrî**.

It is written also in **ad-Durar** that it will not be against the Hanafî madhhab for a Hanafî muftî to issue a fatwa in accordance with the *ijtihâd* of Imâm Abû Yûsuf or Imâm Muhammad ash-Shaibânî, since both the imâms told that each of their *ijtihâds* disagreeing with al-Imâm al-a'zam was a report which they had heard from al-Imâm al-a'zam. For this reason, Ibn 'Âbidîn wrote in the marginalia of **Waqf al-manqûl**, "The difficulty stated in the book **Naf' al-wâsâ'il** by al-Imâm at-Tarsûsî and in the fatwâs of 'Allâma Ibn ash-Shalbî has been eradicated. It is permissible according to Imâm Abû Yûsuf and not permissible according to Imâm Muhammad for a person to donate something to **himself**, while the donation of something **movable** is not permissible according to Imâm Abû Yûsuf but permissible according to Imâm Muhammad. Since neither of the two imâms had said that it would be permissible for a person to donate something **movable** to **himself**, the *ijtihâds* of both imâms were brought together and a fatwa was issued stating that this was also permissible. And this is the subject in relation to which at-Tarsûsî wrote in his book **Munyat al-muftî** as "Hukmu mulaffaq jâ'izun."^[1] Further, it was the unification of (different) madhhabs which was prohibited unanimously. In my book **Al-'uqûd ad-durriyya fî tankîhi 'l-Hâmidîyya**, I explained this thoroughly." Also, the permission to donate money by bringing together the *ijtihâds* of Imâm Abû Yûsuf and Imâm Zufar does not show that the unification of *ijtihâds* of different madhhabs is permissible, since both the Imâms were in the Hanafî madhhab. By distorting these clear statements of fiqh books shamelessly without fearing Allâhu ta'âlâ, the religion reformer attempts both to deceive the youth and to defame the most valuable fiqh books, such as **Durr al-mukhtâr** and **Radd al-muhtâr**, and thus to demolish Ahl as-sunna from within. This base scheme clearly reveals the fact that Rashîd Ridâ is not a man of

[1] "The unifier's conclusion is justifiable," by which "The unification of *ijtihâds* [of mujtahids belonging to the same madhhab] is permissible," is meant.

religious authority, but an enemy of Islam disguised as a man of religious authority, that is, a **zindîq**.

Because the scholars of fiqh did not state the rules of Islam out of their own opinions or intellects but conveyed the knowledge coming from as-Sahâbât al-kirâm, the reformer abases himself so far as to stigmatize the 'ulamâ' as ignoramuses. But the ignoramuses are these very religion reformers who do not know this knowledge or the cases to which it is to be applied and who lie. They are vulgarly ignorant. Because of their ignorance, which is peculiar to a person who is unaware of his ignorance, they think they know something, feeling no shame at spreading their mendacious and corrupt words under the name of knowledge. The hadîth ash-sherîf, "**Al-hayâ'u min al'îmân,**" (**Modesty originates from îmân**) which is written in the **Sahîh** of Muslim, also shows the fact that the enemies of Islam do not have a sense of shame. The scholars of fiqh have written the matters on which there was ijmâ'a as well as the discordant ones. Those who know the deep science of fiqh will distinguish them from one another. The ignorant reformers think that the scholars of fiqh were like themselves. The Arabic saying, "Al-kalâmu sifât al-mutakallim," (One's words reveal who he is) points to the inner purpose of these zindîqs.

The scholars of fiqh, according to him, have been saying that there was ijmâ' without knowing the matter. This exalted religion, Islam, to him, has been a plaything throughout the centuries in the hands of ignorant people, and these zindîqs will now restore Islam on to its rails. He, too, says that the person who denies the unanimity of the 'ulamâ' becomes a disbeliever. If the 'ulamâ' of Islam did not know or find out ijmâ', whence will he himself find it? No need to be surprised by him: "Al-jâhîlu jasûrun," (An ignoramus behaves daringly!) He always says what he fabricates. What else would be easier for him, while it is a mere nothing for him to write out hundreds of books full of lies and slanders like this book of his? There is no longer any need to look for the putrid asses prophesied in, "**As Doomsday draws near, men of religious post will be more rotten, more putrid than putrefied donkey flesh,**" the hadîth ash-sherîf of our master, the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm), whose each word was full of wisdom; they show themselves. Their venomous, noisome smell has been spreading from Egypt to all over the entire world. May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect our young men of religious post from being infected with these fatal disease germs! May He deign to protect us all against the

evils of these parvenus! May He not separate us from the right path of the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna, who guided us to Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) path and who were declared to be his inheritors! If those blessed men of Allâhu ta'âlâ had not written the books of fiqh and 'ilm al-hâl, we would have perished by being clawed by these parvenu zindîqs, believing their false words. May thousands of salâms and benedictions be on the blessed souls of the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna, who have protected us against disbelief and bid'a.

By saying that truth will not always be on the side of the majority, he denies the hadîth ash-sherîf, **“My umma do not agree on heresy.”** The scholars of Ahl as-Sunna have held fast to ijmâ' and to the majority because it was commanded by Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm). A hadîth sherîf, which is written in the section “Fitan” of the **Sahîh** of al-Bukhârî, declares, **“He who deviates from the community as far as a span and dies in that state will have died with the death of jâhiliyya.”**^[1] This hadîth sharîf explains the 114th âyat of the sûrat an-Nisâ'. Another hadîth sherîf, written after the above one in the **Sahîh** of al-Bukhârî, declares, **“Allâhu ta'âlâ, to take knowledge away from you, will take away the 'ulamâ' who live up to their knowledge. The ignorant will remain. By answering religious questions out of their own reason, they will cause Muslims to deviate from the right path.”** This hadîth sherîf calls attention to the harm of religion reformers who blame Ahl as-Sunna by saying that it is imitation to convey the words of the 'ulamâ' and who demolish the religion from the inside with their short reasonings and addle heads.^[2] Another hadîth sherîf, which is quoted at the section about “'Ilm” in the **Sahîh** of al-Bukhârî, declares, **“One of the foreshadows of Doomsday is that knowledge will vanish; the ignoramuses of religion will increase in number; there will be more of those who have alcoholic drinks and who commit fornication.”** Religion reformers' attempts to annihilate Ahl as-Sunna and coming forward as men of religious post reveal the fact that this hadîth sherîf has proved one of the miracles that informed about what would happen in the future.

34- The religion reformer says:

[1] “nescience” or “disbelief” of the pre-Islamic era.

[2] This hadîth is written more thoroughly at the beginning of the **Sahîh** of al-Imâm al-Muhammad ibn Ismâ'il al-Bukhârî, who was born in 194 (809) and passed away in Samarkand in 256 (869).

“Taqlîd is a result of ijtihâd. It does not exist where there is no ijtihâd. It is not necessary for those who have done completely all the matters that had been agreed on to do the discordant `ibâdât. They are permitted to give up all of them. Would it be conscientious and judicious to follow (taqlîd) someone whom one does not know? Getting a fatwâ is not taqlîd, but it is something like communication (naql) and narration (riwâya). The superiority looked for in a mujtahid whose opinion is to be followed or whose ijtihâd is to be adopted is not like the superiority which is in question among the Caliphs or other Sahâbîs. That is, it is not a superiority in Allâhu ta`âlâ’s view. It is [with respect to] the strength of [his] faculty of judging, knowledge, research and insight. He who comes later may be superior. Among the imâms, al-Imâm ash-shâfi`î was the strongest. When I cannot find documentary evidences, I follow the madhhab whose evidences I deem superior. That is, I become both a mujtahid and a muqallid. Thus, I get rid of being solely a muqallid. Today’s Muslims know neither a madhhab nor imân. Religious knowledge which the majority have is only that Allah is in heaven and that the Prophet ascended to heaven and saw Allah.”

The statements of Rashîd Ridâ are again the expression of his personal opinions. Since he is not an Islamic scholar — as a matter of fact, his statements that have been quoted before have shown the kind of way he has been following — these hastily collected statements are not worth answering. Yet, as required by the proverb, “The fly is small, but it nauseates,” it will be suitable to write a few words in order to protect the youth against his harm.

It is incorrect to say that taqlîd does not exist in the case when there is no ijtihâd; Allâhu ta`âlâ declared, “**Obey My Messenger!**” and following this command, as-Sahâbat al-kirâm (‘alaihimu `r-ridwân) did whatever Rasûlullah (‘alaihi `s-salâm) told them to do, and they even threw themselves into death. They did not look for any evidences or proofs. They followed him unconditionally. His commands were revealed through wahy and were not mixed with ijtihâd. But in those matters that would be done through ijtihâd, as-Sahâbat al-kirâm employed ijtiḥad and told him what their ijtiḥads were. Sometimes their ijtiḥads disagreed with that of Rasûlullah (‘alaihi `s-salâm). Then the wahî would come to confirm the correct ijtiḥad. Sometimes the wahy would be in

agreement with the ijtihâd of a Sahâbî. After Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) death, as-Sahâbat al-kirâm did not follow one another. Hence, it was understood that it was not permissible for a mujtahid to follow another mujtahid; and a muqallid had to follow a mujtahid in all matters, but he did not have to search, find out or learn the unanimous and discordant matters among the thousands of matters. If he had had to do so, the as-Sahâbat al-kirâm would have commanded the Tâbi'ûn to do so. Compelling Muslims to do so would have caused difficulties for the Ummat al-Muhammadiyah. Our religion wants us not to cause difficulties, but to provide facilities.

In the view of the religion reformer, each Muslim shall learn and distinguish the unanimous ones and the discordant ones among thousands of matters, do the unanimous ones, go into the discordant ones carefully, look for and find out their documentary evidences and estimate the most dependable evidence, and then it will be up to his wish to do it or not. What kind of reasoning or suggestion is this? He himself writes the fact that Muslims know nothing and that they are as ignorant as to say that Allâhu ta'âlâ is in heaven. Which is more suitable, to teach such people a madhhab, or to heap these difficulties before them. A wise and reasonable person, i.e., a person who speaks for the sake of Allâhu ta'âlâ and Islam, will certainly answer this immediately. But, as it has been understood from many of his words from the beginning of his book to the end, what the religion reformer intends is not to serve Muslims and Islam, but to frighten Muslims, to alienate them from Islam and to demolish Islam from the inside. He is answerable in no way, but saying, "Shut up, you zindîq! You cannot deceive Muslims!"

According to him, in inquiring about others' opinion and asking about their ijtihâd, as-Sahâbat al-kirâm would take into consideration their superiority in Allâhu ta'âlâ's view, but would not look at their faculty of judging, knowledge or research. This, again, is one of his factious, subversive ideas. He attempts to blemish as-Sahâbat al-kirâm. He means that they did not make use of criteria or knowledge. The Four Caliphs would ask as-Sahâbat al-kirâm "Which of you knows this?" and would learn from the one who knew, for, all as-Sahâbat al-kirâm were superior in Allâhu ta'âlâ's view. They did not ask about the difference in their superiorities, but their knowledge and opinions. So did the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna. In everything they did they followed in the footsteps of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm.

It is not a guilt to believe that al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î was the highest of the imâms. But he himself said that al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa was higher.^[1]

Religion reformers, in order to demolish the four madhhabs and thus to demolish Ahl as-Sunna, whereby to demolish Islam, dwell very much upon the **talfîq** (unification) of the madhhabs, that is, gathering the facilities and discarding the rest. In all their books, they put forward — it can be seen from the examples which they give of the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna — that the ijtihâds of the three imâms in the Hanafî madhhab have been unified or the ijtihâds of different madhhabs have been unified **when there was difficulty**. We, too, say that both the cases are permissible. As explained in detail in the preceding article, the ijtihâds of imâms belonging to a madhhab mean the ijtihâd of the imâm who founded that madhhab. To unify them does not mean to go out of the imâm al-madhhab's ijtihâd. Religion reformers, in a clever way with their own logic, write the things that are permissible and, by putting them forward, want to have their own corrupt and destructive thoughts be accepted as faith and 'ibâdât.

35– Rashîd Ridâ wants to clinch his ideas by repeating his assertions. He says again:

“I do not admit qiyâs in 'ibâdât. Every Muslim who looks at the documentary evidences and admits the opinions accordingly is a mujtahid, too. Also those scholars who were attached to maddhabs have disagreed with them in some matters. Al-Baghawî, al-Awzâ'î and al-Ghazâlî disagreed with their imâm though they were in the Shâfi'î madhhab, and az-Zamakhsharî disagreed with Abû Hanîfa. After the Four Caliphs began the time of sovereign rulers; religious teachings were corrupted.”

According to the religion reformer, there is no qiyâs in Islam; all Muslims are mujtahids; by observing the documentary evidences of discordant matters, they will find out the correct way; in other words, they will employ qiyâs! His two assertions contradict each other. If he had been able to understand the meanings of ijtihâd and qiyâs in the books of usûl al-fiqh, he would not have fallen into this contradiction. The Egyptian religion reformer is rather strong in Arabic, his mother tongue, and he is educated to some extent. Certainly, he can easily read

[1] See below, p. 86, for al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î's such comments about al-Imâm al-a'zam.

the books of the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna and can understand something within his own limits. But 'ilm al-usûl al-fiqh is like a large ocean. Being specialized in this branch of knowledge requires having studied the eighty preliminary branches thoroughly. A person who does not know these eighty branches, and who even denies them, is ignorant in this branch, even if he were very powerful in Arabic. This is the age of specialization. Only in the field of medicine, or in physics or chemistry, many new branches of specialization are being born. A doctor specialized in internal diseases sometimes has to refer his patient to a doctor specialized in neurology, who may have to send his patient to a psychology doctor, who may have to hand over a patient of his to a psychiatrist. The specialization branches of physiotherapy are even greater. While there are these various branches of specialization in science, how could it ever be right to slight, or to go so far as to deny, the branches of specialization and their experts in religious knowledge which is higher and more extensive? This should never be admissible, especially on the part of a person who speaks in the name of knowledge. It is easily understandable that the religion reformer is very ignorant in 'ilm al-usûl al-fiqh. It can be of no value at all if an ignoramus speaks ill of an 'âlim, an expert. An 'âlim, not an ignoramus, can recognize an 'âlim. The words of an ignoramus, whether favourable or unfavourable, will not be esteemed. An ignoramus who writes the words of scholars without understanding them and who thus fills many pages can deceive only those who are ignorant like him. While writing these lines, we do not ever claim to be authorized in this exalted branch of knowledge. We see that we are, let alone being scholars, a mere nothing in comparison with the profound knowledge of the great scholars. We deem it impertinence on our part to speak or write from ourselves on this branch of knowledge. But what else could we do, while the ignorant and the enemies of Islam have come forth and have been moving about freely? They have been competing with one another in attacking Islam. Not a hero gifted with perfection to answer them has been seen. Islam has been going away, collapsing. Lots of infinite thanks be to our Allâhu ta'âlâ that we have been honoured with seeing a profound scholar of Islam, an expert of this branch of knowledge, who had seen the situation long before and had been worrying about it ever since, but had been deprived of saying and writing about it. For this very great endowment of His, may thanks be to our Allâhu ta'âlâ again!

Even if every hair on our bodies began to speak, we could not fulfil one-millionth of the gratitude due to this blessing of our Allâhu ta'âlâ. Had we not heard a few facts from the treasure of hikma and ma'rifa of that great expert in Islam, who was Hadrat Sayyid 'Abdulhakîm-i Arwâsî, we, let alone writing books on this sublime, very advanced and very dangerously subtle subject, could not even dare to open our mouths. But we have deemed it a duty, even a debt for ourselves to convey the leaks of knowledge from that source to our brothers-in-Islam. In order to escape the threat in the hadîth ash-sherîf, **“When fitna arises and bid'as are spread, he who knows the truth should say it! If he does not, may he be accursed by Allâhu ta'âlâ, by angels and by all people,”** we have been striving to tell our brothers-in-Islam what we heard and learned. May Allâhu ta'âlâ bless us with writing the truth! May He bless it with influencing those who read it! May He forgive us the mistakes which we may make! May He protect the Ummat al-Muhammadiyya against the fitnas peculiar to the last days of the world!

None of the scholars following a madhhab has ever disagreed with his imâm al-madhhab's usûl, even if he had reached the grade of ijtihâd. The scholars who promulgated the teachings of a madhhab were of various grades. Most of them were arbâb at-tarjîh who studied the documentary evidences of tradition coming from the imâm of the madhhab closely and then preferred one of them. A tradition which was not preferred can not be said to have been refused. Such traditions are acted upon when there is difficulty. The preference of one of the traditions coming from the imâm does not mean to disagree with the imâm. Hadrat al-Awzâ'î, al-Baghawî and al-Ghazâlî, too, were mutlaq mujtahids like al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î. In many matters their ijtihâds were in agreement with those of al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î. The ignorant think that they were in the Shâfi'î madhhab and that they disagreed with the imâm al-madhhab. As for az-Zamakhsharî, let alone being a Hanafî, he was not even a Sunnî. He belonged to the Mu'tazila, one of the seventy-two heretical groups. Because the 'ibâdât of the Mu'tazila resembled those of the Hanafî madhhab, the ignorant think that they were Hanafis.

Saying that the religion was altered after the Four Caliphs will astonish not only a man of religious post but also anybody who has read books; it is something which anybody, religious or irreligious, will refuse. Both the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the hadîth ash-sherîf state that religious knowledge will continue without

being altered until Doomsday. A community on the right path will be continuing until Domsday. In every hundred years, an 'âlim to strengthen the religion will be created. It is true that the seventy-two heretical groups appeared and those with heretical beliefs have been on the increase and there are many ignoramuses and sinners also among Ahl as-Sunna, but still there are also those who are on the right path. The right path is obvious; the religion has been keeping its same purity as it had in the first century of Islam.

The scholars of the four madhhabs have unanimously said that the hadîth book **Mishkât al-masâbîh** is a reliable, genuine one. The hadîth ash-sherîf quoted in the chapter **Kitâb al-fitan** of this book on the authority of Sawbân (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) says, **“There will come a time when a part of my umma will join polytheists. Like them, they will worship idols. There will appear liars. They will think of themselves as prophets. But, I am the last Prophet. There will come no other prophet after me. Among my umma, there will always be those who are on the correct path. Their opponents will not be able to do any harm to them until Allâhu ta'âlâ's order comes.”** This hadîth sherîf shows that religion reformers or zindîqs will never be able to defile this blessed religion until the Last Day. Though corrupt, destructive and factious ones among Islamic books teem in the libraries all over the world and they have been increasing day by day, there are also the right ones among them. They will never be annihilated, and nobody will be able to eradicate them. They are under Allâhu ta'âlâ's protection and preservation. How lucky for those who will attain to happiness by searching for, finding and reading these books! Couplet:

***“I give you the key to the treasure you want!
You may attain to it, though we have not!”***

36– The religion reformer says,

“People are of two categories: learned people and ordinary people. The former ones will find out the documentary evidences and follow them. The latter ones will follow mujtahids and faqîhs provided that they will not follow a certain one. Ordinary people do not have a certain madhhab. This is the meaning of the saying, ‘Their madhhab is the madhhab of the muftî.’ Early scholars, again, say that it is not necessary to attach oneself to a certain muftî. One will understand the matter by asking

anyone he wishes. Ordinary people are also permitted to act upon hadîths. Imâms did not disagree with one another in this respect. It is written in **al-Hidâya** about the fast of a person who undergoes cupping that if a person eats something after going through a cupping operation because he supposes his fast has been broken, he will perform both the qadâ' and the kaffâra, since this supposition of his is not based upon any religious document. If the muftî gives such a fatwâ, it will be a document for him. If he has followed a hadîth, the case will be the same and he will not do the kaffâra (al-Kâfi and al-Hâmidî). Rasûlullah's words would not be inferior to a muftî's. All the four imâms said, 'Leave aside our words and take the hadîth.' But some people say that he who wants to act upon the Book and the Sunna becomes a zindîq. Abû Hanîfa said, 'It is not permissible for anyone who does not know my documentary evidences to issue fatwâ according to my ijtihâd.' He meant that he did not employ ijtihâd so that people would turn away from the Book and the Sunna and follow his words, but his ijtihâds were intended to show people how to derive rules from the Book and the Sunna. To say, by following the words of the posterity, such as Ibn 'Âbidîn, that it is harâm to infer rules from the Book and the Sunna will mean to disagree with Abû Hanîfa. These imitators conveyed the saying, 'A'mâl should be based upon fiqh, not upon hadîths,' from other imitators. Though the book **Zahiriyya** writes that the saying was intended for ordinary people, it comes to mean that it is not permissible to act upon the Book and the Sunna while there is fiqh, and it is obvious that the saying is wrong. Those who say so are ignorant and stubborn. Al-Kaidânî said that the tenth of the harâm actions was to raise the finger while performing salât. 'Alî al-Qâri' said that this statement was sinful and that if it could not be explained away, he [al-Kaidânî] would be considered as a disbeliever, for it was certain that Rasûlullah raised his finger."

Yes people are of two categories. The first ones are the scholars of Islam who have reached the grade of ijtihâd. The second ones are those scholars who have not reached the grade of ijtihâd and ordinary people. In the statement that ordinary people will ask a muftî about what they want to know, 'the muftî' means 'a muftî in their own madhhab'. Ibn 'Âbidîn wrote in the preface

to **Radd al-muhtâr** on the authority of the book **Hazânat ar-riwâyât**: “Those scholars who were able to draw meanings from âyats and hadîths were ahl ad-dirâya. They were in the grade of ijtihâd. It was permissible for them to act upon a marjuh (not preferred) report or a da’îf of which the transmitters were not trusted in) narration coming from their own imâm al-madhhab, even though it might not agree with the madhhab they belonged to. When there was difficulty in doing something, they could issue a fatwâ upon it for ordinary Muslims, too.” As it is seen, it is always permissible for a mujtahid fi ’l-madhhab to follow an ijtihâd showing an easy way in his madhhab which is permissible for an ordinary Muslim only when there is difficulty.^[1] Ibn ’Âbidîn writes again in the preface, “The ordinary Muslims do not have a madhhab and their madhhab is their muftî’s madhhab. The commentary on **Tahrîr** of Ibn Humâm writes in the explanation of this statement that following a madhhab is for a person who knows and understands what a madhhab is or who has understood the fatwâs of the imâms of a madhhab by reading a book of this madhhab, and that the claim of a person who is not so to be a Hanafî or a Shâfi’î does not show that he belongs to either madhhab. As it is understood from this, an ordinary person’s saying that he has changed his madhhab has no value; upon asking a muftî of another madhhab he will have changed his madhhab. Ibn Humâm writes in his book **Fat’h al-qadîr**, ‘A muftî has to be a mujtahid. A scholar who is not a mujtahid is called “nâqil” (transmitter), but not a “muftî.” Those muftîs who are not mujtahids are muqallids, too. These, as well as ordinary Muslims, cannot draw correct meanings from hadîths. They, therefore, have to adapt themselves to what mujtahids understood, that is, they have to follow them. The imâms did not disagree with one another in this respect.”

As for cupping when one is fasting, certainly it does not break a Hanafî’s fast. If he eats something thinking that his fast has been broken, qadâ’ and kaffâra will be compulsory. A person who is as ignorant as not to know that he has not broken his fast after cupping is an ordinary person. If a Hanbalî muftî says that it breaks his fast, or if he hears a hadîth stating that it does and cannot explain it away, the unbrokenness of his fast becomes uncertain and, when he eats afterwards, the kaffâra will not be compulsory, for the madhhab of an ordinary Muslim is the

[1] See the chapter on “ghusl” in the book **Endless Bliss, IV**.

madhhab of the muftí whom he asks. This example is an ijtihâd of al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa. It shows that a Hanafî has to obey the ijtihâd of al-Imâm al-a'zam. The religion reformer, by giving this example, proves that he is not right. Ibn Humâm explains the phrase “depending on a religious proof” in **al-Hidâya** as “likening to one of the things that break a fast.” This explanation and the report that the muftí’s fatwâ is a documentary evidence also prove that the reformer is wrong. The reformer falls into the trap that he sets for Muslims. Each imâm al-madhhab’s statement, “Leave my word aside, follow the hadîth,” was intended for his disciples, who were mujtahids, too. A mujtahid had to follow his own ijtihâd.

No faqîh (scholar of fiqh) has ever said, “He who wants to act upon the Book and the Sunna will become a zindîq.” These words are invented by the reformer. The statement “He who wants to act upon what he understands from the Book and the Sunna will become a zindîq,” which was said by the ‘ulamâ’ of Islam, is the truth of the matter, for, a person who has not reached the grade of ijtihâd cannot deduce correct meanings from the Book or the Sunna. Our Prophet (sall-Allâhu ‘alaihi wa sallam) said that he who would draw wrong meanings would become a kâfir. Because of this great danger, even the a’immat al-madhâhib learned the meanings in the Book and the Sunna from as-Sahâbat al-kirâm and employed ijtihâd in accordance with these correct meanings. Dislike for these correct meanings and correct ijtihâds means dislike for Islam, which in turn means being a zindîq. Al-Imâm al-azâm’s saying, “It is not permissible for anyone who does not know my documentary evidences to issue fatwâ according to my ijtihâd,” shows that Ibn ‘Âbidîn has adopted his statement from al-Imâm al-a'zam. It proves that Ibn ‘Âbidîn’s book is dependable and very sound. The taqlîd of an imâm al-madhhab does not mean to turn away from the Book and the Sunna. It means to adapt oneself to the correct meaning deduced by the imâm al-madhhab and not to attempt to draw wrong meanings from the Book and the Sunna. The a’immat al-madhâhib established methods and principles showing how to deduce meanings from the Book and the Sunna and each of them taught them to the mujtahids in his own madhhab. Muqallids, especially the ordinary people among muqallids, like the reformer, are very far from knowing or understanding these methods and principles and from performing ijtihâd. Ibn ‘Âbidîn (rahmatullâhi ‘alaihi) never said that it was harâm for mujtahids to infer rules from the Book and the Sunna,

but he said that, for the ignoramus like the reformer who have not reached the grade of *ijtihâd*, it was *harâm* to infer rules. Our Prophet (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) declared, “**He who infers rules from the Qur’ân al-kerîm through his own opinion becomes a kâfir.**” Al-Imâm al-a’zam Abû Hanîfa, too, said that it was not permissible for the ignorant who are not in the grade of *ijtihâd* to issue *fatwâs*. The religion reformer, too, writes this fact as quoted above. Then, Hadrat Ibn ‘Âbidîn is absolutely right. Hadrat Sayyid ‘Abdulkhâim-i Arwâsî, al-Walî al-kâmil wa ‘l-mukammil, the profound ‘âlim cognizant of the four *madhhabs* down to their subtle particulars, said, “Of the books of *fiqh* in the Hanafî *madhhab*, **Radd al-muhtâr** [by Ibn ‘Âbidîn] is the most useful and valuable one. Its every word is a proof; its every decision is a document.” What else can a person who speaks ill of and slights such a basic book of Islam be, if he is not a *zindîq*? Ibn ‘Âbidîn was a great ‘âlim of *fiqh* in the Hanafî *madhhab*. He took his every word, his every decision from the *mujtahids* who had taken them from al-Imâm al-a’zam, and, this great imâm from the Book and the Sunna. As it is seen, any Muslim who follows the rules conveyed by Ibn ‘Âbidîn, in fact, follows the Book and the Sunna. But he who does not want to follow Ibn ‘Âbidîn follows not the Book or the Sunna, but his own fancies, the desires of his *nafs*. The Qur’ân al-kerîm and *hadîth ash-sherîf* say that a person who does so will go to Hell. Let us say again that the statement, “It is not permissible to act upon the Book and the Sunna while there is the *fiqh*,” has been fabricated by religion reformers. Neither an ‘âlim nor a Muslim has said or written so. It is written in religion reformers’ books only.

As for raising the finger in *salât*, it is explained in detail in the third volume of **Ma’ârif as-sunan**. Giving examples from many books, the book prefers the raising of the finger. However, Hadrat al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî, in the 312th letter of the first volume of his **Maktûbât**, alluded to his deep penetration into the methods and principles of *madhhabs* and the superiority of *mujtahids*, and after quoting the *hadîths* showing that the finger was to be raised, he listed also the valuable *fatwas* informing that it was *harâm* and *makrûh*. With strong documentary evidences, he proved that it would be more prudent not to raise the finger. In this conclusion, he depended, again, upon the *hadîth ash-sherîf* of Rasûlullah, the Master of Mankind (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam). This letter in **Maktûbât** fully exposed to view how meticulously the imâms of Islam observed the matter for adapting themselves to a *hadîth ash-*

sherif. Hadrat Ahmad Sa'îd al-Fârûqî ad-Dahlawî, one of the 'ulamâ' of Islam and great men of tasawwuf of India, explained fully the comments of the 'ulamâ' of fiqh on the raising of the finger. He wrote in his sixty-third letter, "Some 'ulamâ', seeing that there were many narrations about it, said that it was a sunna. Some others, seeing that the narrations were incongruous, said that the finger should not be raised. When there are two fatwâs on a matter, one may do it according to either of them. The person who does the one way should not belittle or censure those who do the other way." As it is seen, the 'ulamâ' of fiqh ordered Muslims to respect one another's madhhabs. 'Alî al-Qârî's speaking ill of al-Kaidânî's fiqh book is not surprising; it is written in the book **Al-fawâ'id al-bahiyya** that he was presumptuous against even such arch-stones of Islam as al-Imâm ash-Shafi'î and Imâm Mâlik, and that he was answered in a manner he deserved by Shaikh Muhammad Miskîn. 'Alî al-Qârî wrote a separate booklet to accuse Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) parents of disbelief and boasted about this booklet in his commentary on **Shifâ'**, and it is obvious that the commentaries and marginalias written by him on many valuable books are not worthy of making him an authority in Islam. Being an authority in Islam requires being a mujtahid. A non-mujtahids' attempting to judge the great personages of Islam means to overflow the measures of decency.

Ahmad Ridâ Khan al-Barilawî (d. India, 1340/1921) wrote: "Alî al-Qârî denied in his book **Minah ar-rawd** that Rasûlullah's (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) blessed mother and father had died as Believers, and said, 'To refute it, I wrote a separate booklet. In this booklet, showing proofs from the Book, the Sunna, qiyâs and ijmâ' al-Umma, I refuted what al-Imâm as-Suyûtî wrote in his three booklets.' Al-Imâm as-Suyûtî (rahmatullâhi 'alaih) wrote six booklets to prove that Rasûlullah's (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) blessed parents had died as Believers. This is not a subject of fiqh, that is, it is not a teaching that can be included in **af'âl al-mukallafîn** and defined as halâl, harâm, sahîh or fâsid. Therefore, there is not any qiyâs or ijmâ' about it. The disagreement between the 'ulamâ' on this matter is obvious. The great 'âlim of Islam al-Imâm as-Suyûtî was thoroughly right. It is also surprising that 'Alî al-Qârî said he had shown proofs from the Book. The Qur'ân al-kerîm does not mention it, neither openly nor figuratively. Furthermore, for pointing out any similarity between such matters and the things that were the causes of the revelation of some ayâts, one has to document it with hadîths. Al-Imâm as-Suyûtî was such

a profound 'âlim of Islam that he can never be compared to 'Alî al-Qârî' and the like. He was much more gifted in distinguishing hadîths from one another and in knowing their 'illa, rijâl and ahwâl than 'Alî al-Qârî' and the like, who had no other way than keeping quiet or surrendering to his writings. This great imâm documented his writings with overwhelming and silencing evidences. If mountains understood the soundness of his documentation, they would melt."^[1]

37- The religion reformer, at the beginning of the Eleventh Dialogue, writes on behalf of the preacher:

“We were prohibited from looking at and acting upon what we would see in any books other than the books of the scholars of our own madhhab. In fact, we were told that those writings of Kamâl Ibn Humâm, who was a mujtahidi fi 'l-madhhab, which disagreed with the rules of the madhhab, were not to be acted upon even if they would be based upon sound evidences.”

It is ever possible that a preacher of Islam would say such absurd and mendacious things? Yet the religion reformer becomes so furious, so vindictive when attacking the Ahl as-Sunna that he overflows not only beyond knowledge and decency but also beyond reason and becomes unconscious with rage. Here, he touches upon one of the subtle matters of 'ilm al-usûl al-fiqh, which could be explained briefly as follows: There have been seven grades for the fuqahâ' (scholars of fiqh) of the four madhhabs. The first grade belonged to **mujtahidi fi 'sh-shar'**. In this grade were the four a'immat al-madhhab. They established

[1] **Al-mustanat al-mu'tamad.** The author, Ahmad Ridâ Khan al-Barilawî, as an 'âlim in the Hanafî madhhab, shows that 'Alî al-Qârî' (d. Mecca, 1014/1606), who was also a Hanafî, was wrong and had no authority in Islam, and defends and praises al-Imâm as-Suyûtî, who belonged to the Shâfi'î madhhab. The 'ulamâ' of Islam have always done the same and defended the right, paying no attention to the difference of madhhabs. The upstart reformers, however, attack the Ahl as-Sunna by attributing the groundless stories in the books of their lâ-madhhabî friends and the slanders in the books of the enemies of the Ahl as-Sunna to the Ahl as-Sunna. And, with a view to blemishing the scholars of fiqh and the most valuable books of the madhhabs, Rashîd Ridâ calls on such a person as 'Alî al-Qârî', who was as excessive as to say “disbelievers” about the blessed parents of our master Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam), as a witness for himself.

the methods (usûl) and principles (qawâ'id) of their own madhhab. In the second grade were the **mujtahidi fi 'l-madhhab**, the mujtahids belonging to a madhhab, such as the mujtahids among al-Imâm al-a'zam's disciples, who deduced rules from documents by following the principles set by him. In the third grade were the scholars called **mujtahidi fi'l-masâ'il**, who deduced the rules for the matters that had not been mentioned by the imâm al-madhhab and his disciples. They could not disagree with them. The 'ulamâ' such as at-Tahawî, Abû'l-Hasan al-Karkhî, Shams al-a'imma al-Halwânî, Shams al-a'imma as-Sarahsî and Qâdî Khân were in this grade. In the fourth grade were the **as-hâb at-takhrîj**, who were not mujtahids. They explained the brief statements and unclear rules of the mujtahids. Ar-Râzî was one of them. In the fifth grade were the **as'hâb at-tarjîh**, who classified the narrations in the order of their soundness. So were al-Qudûrî and al-Marghinânî, the author of **al-Hidâya**. In the sixth grade were the **as'hâb at-tamyiz**, who distinguished the qâwî, da'îf, zâhir and nâdir narrations from one another. The authors of the books **Kanz**, **Mukhtâr** and **Wiqâya** were among them. Those who were in the seventh grade could not do any of these; none of them could issue a fatwâ disagreeing with the madhhab unless there was urgency or difficulty.

The religion reformer distorts this and claims that it was prohibited to read or to act upon a book that did not belong to one's own madhhab. On the contrary, any Muslim, like the scholars mentioned above, may read and learn the book of any madhhab he wishes. He may transfer himself to another madhhab if he wants to. When there is difficulty, that is, urgent necessity, everybody can do the easy ways (rukhsas) permitted in his own madhhab. If he cannot, he may do the easy ways in another madhhab, thus getting out of the difficult situation. However, when doing an affair in accordance with another madhhab, he has to do the commands and abstain from the prohibitions pertaining to that affair in that madhhab. For this reason, he has to have learned the points which are necessary in that madhhab. Ibn 'Âbidîn writes at the beginning of the third volume of **Radd al-muhtâr** that Ibn Humâm was one of the as'hâb at-tarjîh. That is, contrary to what the religion reformer says, he was, let alone being a mujtahid mutlaq, not a mujtahid at all. Like any muqallid, he, too, had to follow a madhhab. The religion reformer said before that such scholars as Ibn 'Âbidîn were the imitators of the imitators because they followed such muqallids as Ibn Humâm.

And now he attempts to blame them by saying that they did not follow them. He does not know what to do to belittle Ahl as-Sunna! The books written by the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna tell everything plainly. For example, the great scholar Hadrat Ahmad ibn Hajar al-Makkî, in his **Al-fatâwâ 'l-hadîthiyya**, explained whether a person who follows a madhhab may follow another madhhab or not:

“Imâm Abu 'l-Hasan 'Alî as-Subkî (rahmatullâhi 'alaih) says that there are seven different cases of following another madhhab: 1) If a person believes that the ijtihâd of another madhhab on a certain matter is more dependable than that of his own madhhab, it is permissible for him to do that matter in accordance with that madhhab. 2) A person who cannot know which of the two imâms of madhhabs is more hitting in his ijtihâd on a certain matter may do that matter in accord with either of these madhhabs. If he prefers the madhhab other than his with the purpose of a religious precaution, for example, for the purpose of avoiding the harâm, his action will be permissible without any karâha (anything disliked by the Prophet). If he has a different intention, it will be makrûh. 3) Though it is permissible to follow another madhhab showing an easy way in something which one needs to do, it is wâjib for him to follow one of the two imâms whose documentary evidence, he believes, is stronger. 4) It is not permissible to follow another madhhab without any need and because of the desire to do the easy way without knowing which of them is stronger. If one does so, one will have obeyed not Islam but one's own desire. 5) It is not permissible to do one's affairs in accord with the collection of the rukhsas of madhhabs since it is against Islam to do so. 6) By consensus, it is not permissible to do an affair in accord with more than one madhhab if it is not sahîh in one of these madhhabs. It is da'if (not probable) that Kamâl ibn Humâm said it was permissible. 7) While the effects of something which one has done in accordance with one madhhab are still going on, one is not permitted to follow another madhhab. For example, if a person, because there is the right of shuf'a^[1] in the Hanafî madhhab, follows the Hanafî madhhab and buys his neighbor's house from the person who has bought it before, he cannot follow the Shâfi'î madhhab in doing

[1] 'Shuf'a' is the right or claim of pre-emption in respect of a house or land of which one is part-owner or which adjoins one's own property. For more detail, see 39th chapter of **Endless Bliss, II**.

anything concerning this house.”

38– The religion reformer says:

“It is harâm to follow a muqallid. A person who has heard a sahih hadith cannot be told to compare this hadith with so and so’s ijthâd and to act upon it if it is in agreement with it. He can be told to investigate if it is mansûkh. But this is a job for an expert. Those who are not experts should obey the âyat, **“Those who do not know should ask those who know!”** and ask those who are experts. It is good for a person to love all the mujtahid imâms and to follow each of them in cases when he is sure they agree with the Sunna.”

Certainly it is harâm to follow a muqallid. But, believing and acting upon the information given by a Muslim who is muqallid does not mean following him. A person cannot be told, “Compare this hadith with so and so’s ijthâd and act upon it if it is in agreement with it.” But he can be told, “Compare what you understand from this hadith sheriif with the ijthâd of your madhhab’s imâm. If they are unlike each other, act in accord not with what you understand but with what your madhhab’s imâm understood.” Sanâullâh-i Pâniputî (rahmatullâhu ta’âlâ ’alaih), a great Islamic scholar of India who died in 1225 A.H. (1810), said in the tafsîr of the 64th âyat of Sûrat âl ’Imrân in **Tafsîr-i mazharî** written by him in 1197: “If one encounters a sahih hadith, and if it is known that it is not mansûkh, and if a fatwâ of al-Imâm al-a’zam Abû Hanîfa (rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ ’alaih), for example, is not consistent with it while one of the other three madhhabs has an ijthâd consistent with this hadith, one who is Hanafî has to practise not the fatwâ of his imâm but this hadith by following the other madhhab which employed ijthâd according to this hadith,^[1] because Abû Hanîfa said, ‘If you see a hadith or a saying of a Sahâbî, avoid my fatwâ and follow it!’ Thus, one will have not ignored ijmâ’ since the scholars of the Ahl as-Sunna have had solely the four madhhabs since the fourth century. There is no madhhab other than these four for Sunnî Muslims to follow in ’ibâdât. By ijmâ’, words which do not conform with one of these madhhabs are bâtil (wrong). The hadith says, **‘The statement**

[1] Abû Hanîfa (rahmatullâhi ’alaih), seeing that this hadith had ta’wil (implicit meanings), followed another hadith with a clear meaning. If one of the four madhhabs has followed a hadith, we have to follow it, too.

reported unanimously by the Umma cannot be heretical or false.' The 115th âyat of Sûrat an-Nisâ declares, **'We will throw into Hell the dissenter from the Believers' path.'** It is improbable and impossible for the imâms of the four madhhabs and the great scholars trained by them to have skipped even one hadîth. By ijma', a hadîth is of mansûkh or ta'wîl if none of them has followed it." Hence, when one sees that an ijtihâd of an imâm al-madhhab is inconsistent with a hadîth, one should say, "The imâm concluded that it was either mansûkh or ta'wîl," rather than saying, "He did not hear or follow it." The religion reformer, as quoted in the 30th article, said, "The usûl scholars' deducing the necessity of taqlîd from the âyat, **'If you do not know, ask those who know!'** is a fruitless and unsound deduction and reasoning." Here, however, he says, "Those who are not experts should obey the âyat, **'Those who do not know should ask those who know!'** and ask those who are experts."

39- By making puns upon the words in the twelfth dialogue, the religion reformer tries to deceive Muslims:

"When al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î said to a person who asked him a question, 'Rasûlullah said so,' the person said, 'And you, too, admit this decision, don't you?' Al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î said, 'If I do not venerate the statement that comes from Rasûlullah down to me, which part of the earth will accept me?' Therefore, imâms prohibited taqlîd and showed the door to ijtihâd. An ijtihâd disagreeing with a hadîth will be put aside. Al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î always said, 'If you find any sahîh hadîth, let me know so that I can practise it!' It is not permissible to attribute a statement disagreeing with a hadîth to al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î. 'Izz ad-dîn ibn 'Abd as-Salâm, well-known as Sultan al-'ulamâ', said, 'It is so astonishing for a faqîh to persist in following his own madhhab instead of another madhhab whose leader obviously hit the right point [in his ijtihâd], though he has realized that his madhhab is weak. He supposes that reality, hittingness, is in his own imâm only. Such people have been blindfolded with the taqlîd so much that they are in this state now. There is no similarity between these and the Salaf.' "

And he says through the preacher's mouth:

"This great scholar's words are reasonable. But most fuqâhâ' were fixed on their madhhabs. These fellows preferred being a Hanafî or Shâfi'î to being a

Muhammadi.”

The religion reformer himself affirms his own statement. Certainly, so should be the freemasonic tactics! How have the freemasons spread all over the world? Haven't they achieved it because of this mendacious, deceitful policy of theirs? But they cannot deceive Muslims who have read the books of 'ilm al-hâl. The scholars of Ahl as-Sunna wrote necessary answers to their tricky writings and despised them all. One of these valuable books is Hadrat Yûsuf an-Nabhâni's **Hujjat-Allâhi 'ala 'l-'âlamîn**.^[1] But it is feared that those who do not know these answers or who have not read them may get deceived and fall down into the abyss. That is why we took to writing. In order to prevent young men of religious profession from being carried away by this destructive gale and being led into calamity, we had to answer these lies. For doing this, we deemed it suitable to translate passages also from the books **Shawâhid al-haqq** and **Sihâm as-sâ'iba li as'hâbi 'd-da'âwi 'l-kâdhîba** in our various books.

As Hadrat al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î said, every Muslim certainly obeys every sahih hadith. There is not a Muslim unaware of this. It is surprising that the religion reformer writes this as a support for his allegations; in fact, he uses it as a mask, and it has nothing to do with taqlid or ijthad. It is a statement which any Muslim would say.

Another slander of the religion reformer which he repeats frequently is: "An ijthad disagreeing with a hadith should be put aside." When ijthads were employed by the a'immat al-madhhab, there were some hadiths that were not known to them. When such hadiths appeared, the mujtahids who were their disciples put aside their masters' ijthads that disagreed with these hadiths. For, all the four 'aimmat al-madhhab had commanded them to do so. As quoted above, the religion reformer also writes some such commands of al-Imâm ash-Shafi'î. No new hadith could be found now, so there is not the question of any hadith disagreeing with ijthads. All the hadiths have been reported. Basic books of Islam do not contain any hadith disagreeing with the hadiths which are sahih. There have been those hadiths left now from which mujtahids did not deduce rules because they were mansukh or because there were not sufficient witnesses for their soundness. There might certainly be disagreement between ijthads and them, but all of such ijthads were deduced from

[1] See the translation from this book in **Belief and Islam**, pp. 45-50.

hadîths that are sahîh.

Hadrat Sanâ'ullâh-i Paniputî wrote in 1197: "Allâhu ta'âlâ declares, **'Obey the Ulû 'l-amr.'** For this reason, it is wâjib to obey the commands which are compatible with Islam, of 'âlims, Walîs, sultans and governments. To obey them in those cases not compatible with Islam means to make them partners with Allâhu ta'âlâ. Al-Bukharî, Muslim, Abû Dâvud and an-Nasâ'i told that Hadrat 'Alî (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) said, 'Nobody should be obeyed in anything which is sinful. One should obey in cases compatible with Islam.' A hadîth sherîf declares, **'The creature should not be obeyed in something which is disobedience to the Creator.'** It is not permissible to oppose or revolt against those orders and laws of the government which are disobedience to the Creator. It is a grave sin to cause disunion (fitna). A Muslim disobeys neither the Creator nor the government. He does not commit a sin or a crime. It is always very easy to achieve this. If, for instance, a Hanafî learns a sahîh hadîth which has not been abrogated, and if he finds out that the ijtihâd of al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa disagrees with this hadîth, and if one of the four madhhabs has an ijtihâd compatible with this hadîth, it will be wâjib for him to follow this hadîth. If he did not follow the hadîth, he would have made the imâm al-madhhab a partner with Allâhu ta'âlâ. Al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa said, 'I venerate every hadîth of Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) highly. I respect the words of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm, too. The words of the Tâbi'ûn are like our words.' Al-Baihakî quotes these comments of al-Imâm al-a'zam in his book **al-Madkhal**. Al-Imâm al-a'zam is reported in **Rawdat al-'ulamâ'** as having said, 'If there is a hadîth or a saying of a Sahâbî, give up my word.'

"As we were explaining above that it was necessary to give up the imâm al-madhhab's ijtihâd and to follow a hadîth, we said, 'If one of the four madhhabs has an ijtihâd compatible with this hadîth,' for, one will have deviated from the ijmâ' al-Umma if there is no ijtihâd compatible with that sahîh hadîth. After the third or fourth Islamic century, only four of the madhhabs of **Ahl as-Sunnat wa 'l-Jamâ'a** have survived, others being forgotten. Islamic scholars have reported unanimously that a statement which disagrees with one of these four madhhabs is not sahîh. A hadîth sherîf declares, **'A word which is said through ijmâ' by my Umma cannot be heresy,!'** Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the 114th âyat of the Sûrat an-Nisâ', **'We will drag the person who deviates from the Believers' path along the direction to which he has deviated,**

and then We will throw him into Hell. It should be known very well that it is impossible that the four a'immat al-mahâhib and the great scholars among their disciples might have not heard of one of the hadîths which are sahîh. If none of those scholars based his ijtihâd on such a hadîth, then it had been abrogated by another hadîth or it was a kind of hadîth that had to be explained away. None of the great men of tasawwuf deviated from the four madhhabs. To deviate from the four madhhabs means to deviate from Islam. When visiting the graves of Awliyâ' and martyrs, it is not permissible to prostrate towards their graves, to go around their graves, to light candles on them, to perform salât there or to gather around the graves every year like celebrating a kind of feast, which are sinful actions ignorant people do. These have been prohibited in many hadîths."^[1] Every Muslim has to follow one of the four madhhabs.^[2] If a hadîth disagreeing with an ijtihâd of an imâm al-madhhab is encountered, it should be known that it was seen by him or by the mujtahids who were his disciples and that it was found to be mansûkh or its soundness was not certain because it lacked documentation. It should be thought that the ijtihâd was deduced from another sahîh hadîth. Then, there exists no sahîh hadîth today which is not written in the books of Ahl as-Sunna. It should not be forgotten that for erroneous ijtihâds and those who follow them, too, there will also be given thawâb. During the present time there is no ijtihâd disagreeing with any sahîh hadîth, in any of the four madhhabs. Ibn 'Âbidîn, at the beginning of the chapter on wudû', wrote, "It is not necessary to seek the documentary evidences for the narrations coming from mujtahids." Muslims are not commanded to seek or learn the documentary evidences of the mujtahid. They are commanded only to follow him. The âyat above shows this fact clearly. For this reason, it is not permissible to disapprove of any ijtihâd. To disapprove of any ijtihâd means to disapprove the âyat or the hadîth from which it was deduced. Everybody should believe that his own madhhab is correct. A scholar who understands that his

[1] Sanâ'ullâh-i Paniputî, **Tafsîr al-Mazharî**, in the tafsîr of the 64th âyat of the Sûrat âl 'Imrân.

[2] It is written in the books **Bahr ar-râ'iq**, **Hindiyya** and **Al-basâ'îr** that it is wâjib for every non-mujtahid to follow one of the four madhhabs, that he does not belong to Ahl as-Sunna if he does not follow one of them, and that he is a heretic or a disbeliever if he does not belong to the Ahl as-Sunna. The related passages from these books have been reprinted in Istanbul.

own madhhab is weak and another madhhab is more hitting should transfer to the other madhhab. As a matter of fact there has been no scholar who did not do so; no faqih has been seen to be “fixed” on his own madhhab.^[1]

As a doctor’s taking such titles as neurologist or internist does not mean for him to give up being a doctor, so being a Shâfi’î or a Hanafî does not mean to give up being a Muhammadî, for both the Shâfi’îs and the Hanafîs are Muhammadîs. To be Muhammadî, it is necessary to be Shâfi’î, or Hanafî, or Mâlikî, or Hanbalî. In fact, among members of the heretical seventy-two groups, the ones with uncontaminated îmân (belief) are Muhammadîs. He who is not Muhammadî is a disbeliever. With the quoted statement of his, the religion reformer says “disbelievers” about millions of Muslims. It would be insufficient however much could be written to tell about the baseness of the person who uttered those words. It must be understood that he who says so against Muslims is either vulgarly ignorant or a zindîq hostile to Islam.

40– The religion reformer, in a fury which drives him into a loss of words, says:

“People who care for no one who tells the truth have said that taqlîd exists because of discussions, desire for fame, personal advantages and being accustomed to it.

“Al-Imâm as-Suyûtî said that ijtihâd was fard kifâya in every century. It is fard that there be a mujtahid in every century. They should be absolute (mutlaq) mujtahids. It is wrong to say, ‘There came no absolute mujtahid after the fourth [Islamic] century. There came a few absolute mujtahids later, yet because their ijtihâds coincided with the ijtihâd of the imâm al-madhhab who educated them, they were considered to be in his madhhab.’ Therefore, if a person follows an independent way of ijtihâd without following any of the four madhhabs, no one will have the right to object to him. One of the absolute mujtahids educated in this manner was Hadrat Imâm Muhammad ash-Shawkânî, who died in 1250 A.H. [1834]. His madhhab is the strongest of the madhhabs that are known, and his words are the soundest.”

[1] See the preface to **al-Mîzân al-kubrâ** for the name of many of those scholars who changed their madhhabs.

The religion reformer claims that the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna were afraid of telling the truth. He slanders; they always told the truth in every century. As everybody knows, many of them were martyred for this reason. There is no partisanship in Islam; why should we search for its causes, then? There are the four madhhabs today. None of them belongs to anybody. Each Muslim follows the madhhab he likes, for, all four of them are right. All four are true. All four are Ahl as-Sunna. All four are Muhammadī. All of those who follow the four madhhabs consider one another as brothers. The îmân, the beliefs, of all of them are the same. Most of their acts of worship are the same, too. They are different in doing a few discordant matters. However, this difference is a compassion, a blessing of Allâhu ta'âlâ for Muslims.

There are no men of religious duty who do not know the high religious status of Hadrat 'Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha'rânî, who was a great scholar, expert in bâtinî and zâhirî knowledge. Only religion reformers refuse to accept his status. This exalted scholar wrote:

“The îmâms of the four madhhabs and all scholars who followed them said that every Muslim was free to adapt himself to any of the four madhhabs, that it was permissible to transfer oneself from one madhhab to another, and that one could follow another madhhab when there was haraj (compulsory necessity). Allâhu ta'âlâ decreed and predestinated in the eternal past that Muslims would part into four madhhabs and that this would be useful for His slaves. If He had not decreed so, it would not have been so, and His Messenger ('alaihi 's-salâm) would not have said that this parting was of the Divine Compassion, and as He prohibited parting in belief (i'tiqad), so He would have prohibited parting in actions (a'mâl). Every business has an 'azîma (difficult way) as well as a **rukhsa** (easy way). A business has its 'azîma in one madhhab, while its rukhsa is permitted in another madhhab. A person who can do the azîma is not permitted to pick out the rukhsas of the four madhhabs. Doing so means making a game of Islam. Rukhsas are for those who are unable to do 'azîmas. Moreover, it is better for the able person not to do the rukhsa in his own madhhab, either. One should act upon 'azîmas as much as one can. Non-mujtahids have to choose one madhhab and follow it in everything they do. When they reach a grade to infer rules from the Nass (âyats and hadîths) by way of nazar (careful examination) and istidlâl (reasoning, convincing oneself with

reasonable evidences), they must follow their own ijthâds. This is stated in Imâm Ahmad ibn Hanbal's saying, 'Obtain your knowledge from the source your imâms did. Don't go on with the taqlîd.' Abû Muhammad al-Jawîni (d. 478/1085) wrote in his book **Muhîd**, 'It is wara' and taqwâ for capable people to do the 'azîmas of the four madhhabs and it is very good. It is permissible for incapable people to do the rukhsas of the four madhhabs, but all the requirements of a rukhsa in a madhhab should be fulfilled.'

"Al-Imâm as-Suyûfî says: 'There are two kinds of mujtahids: **mujtahid mutlaq** and **mujtahid fi 'l-madhhab**. A scholar who is a mujtahid fi 'l-madhhab does not follow the imâm of his own madhhab; he issues a fatwâ as a result of his own inference, but he has to look for the documentary evidence according to the principles (qawâ'id) of the imâm of the madhhab. He cannot go beyond these principles. No mujtahid mutlaq came after the imâms of the four madhhabs. That is, no scholar claimed to be a mujtahid mutlaq. Only Muhammad Jarîr at-Tabarî claimed to be so, yet no scholar admitted his claim.'

"When Shaikh 'Izz ad-dîn ibn Jamâ'a issued a fatwâ for a matter in accordance with another madhhab, he would always include all the conditions concerning that matter required in that madhhab and state that the conditions were to be fulfilled, and would add, 'If you do not do them, it will not be sahîh as an 'ibâda,' for, doing the rukhsas of madhhabs is permissible only when there is hardship in doing 'azîmas, and with proviso that one shall fulfil all their conditions.

"If one's hand touches a woman [he is and/or was permitted to marry with nikâh], his ablution breaks according to the Shâfi'î madhhab but it does not in the Hanafî madhhab. When it is possible for a Shafi'î who has touched [such] a woman to perform an ablution again, it will not be sahîh (valid, lawful) for him to perform salât with his broken ablution by following the Hanafî madhhab. His following the Hanafî madhhab in this respect requires the existence of a compulsory hardship; that is, it must be impossible for him to perform an ablution again, and he has to do all the things that are fard and wâjib in an ablution and salât according to the Hanafî madhhab."^[1]

The religion reformer, taking the scholars' comment that there may come mujtahidi fi 'l-madhhab in every century, claims that absolute (mutlaq) mujtahids who will not follow the four

[1] 'Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha'rânî, **Al-mîzân al-kubra**, the preface.

madhhabs will come. By saying that “hadrat” ash-Shawkânî brought a new madhhab in this manner, he praises another religion reformer like himself. The great scholar Hadrat Sayyid Abdulhakîm-i Arwâsî (quddisa sirruh) explained ash-Shawkânî’s real purpose in a letter, saying, “Ash-Shawkânî and many other people like him were far from being authorities in Islam. Ash-Shawkânî’s words cannot be documents in religious matters. You write that ash-Shawkânî said that the tafsîr of Ibn ‘Abbâs was not a tafsîr at all. There is not a book in the name of tafsîr of Ibn ‘Abbâs. ‘Abdullâh ibn ‘Abbâs (radiy-Allâhu ‘anhumâ) did not write any book. Having attended the valuable suhba of the Prophet, Master of the Universe (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm), and having seen Jabrâ’il (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm), and being one of the most learned among as-Sahâbât al-kirâm (‘alaihimu ‘r-ridwân) he made some explanations on some âyats as well as on some hadîths. Our scholars of tafsîr adopted these explanations and embellished their books of tafsîr with them. One of them is the tafsîr by al-Baidâwî. Islamic scholars unanimously said that such tafsîrs were of a very high grade. Ash-Shawkânî’s words should be corrected, and a person who is to do it must know the subtle principles of ‘ilm al-usûl al-hadîth. However, it is not known that ash-Shawkânî reached such a high status in knowledge, for if he had reached it, he would not have said anything disagreeing with the principles of the great scholars.” In fact, ash-Shawkânî belonged to the Zaidî heresy.^[1]

When ash-Shawkânî’s books, for example, **Irshâd al-fuhûl**, are studied carefully, it will be concluded that he disguised himself in **tâqiyya**, that is, he made himself known as a Sunnî though he was a Zaidî; for, such heretics had to disguise themselves in tâqiyya while they lived among the Ahl as-Sunna. Throughout his book, among the names of Ahl as-Sunna scholars, he wrote the names of and gave quotations from the scholars belonging to old heretical groups whose names and books had been forgotten and whose instigations had been suppressed, and he had them debate and tried to prove reformers and lâ-madhhabî ones among them to be right. For example, he claimed that absolute ijtihâd would be employed till the end of the world. He wrote that Ibn ‘Abd as-Salâm, and his disciple Ibn Daqîq al-‘îd (d. 702/1302), and his disciple Ibn Sayyid an-nâs, and his disciple Zain ad-dîn al-‘Irâqî (d. 806/1404) and his disciple Ibn Hajar al-Asqalânî and many others

[1] Muhammad ibn Ahmad Khalaf, Muftî of Kuwait, **Jawâb as-sâ’il**. p. 69.

were absolute (mutlaq) mujtahids; thus, he surreptitiously attempted to abolish Ahl as-Sunna and to make himself known as a mujaddid superior to all of them and as a mediator between 'ulamâ'. Today, young men of religious profession, seeing that he had read hundreds of books in Arabic, his mother tongue, and that he seemed to play the role of a mediator between the 'ulamâ', suppose this heretic to be a mujtahid and, following him, dissent from the Ahl as-Sunna.

Muhammad ash-Shawkânî wrote in his book **Irshâd al-fuhûl**:

“Taqlîd means to admit someone’s ra’y (opinion) or ijtihâd without knowing his documents. To admit someone’s narration (khabar) means to admit the words of the person whom you quote. According to the majority of scholars, taqlîd is never permissible in a’mâl. Ibn Hazm said that there was unanimity on this. Al-Qurâfî said that it was so in the Mâlikî madhhab. Ash-Shâfi’î and Abû Hanifa each said, ‘Do not follow me!’ There is the unanimity that it is not permissible to follow the dead. It is suprising that the scholars of usûl had not conveyed this. Many muqallids of the four a’immat al-madhâhib say that taqlîd is wâjib for the ’amî (ordinary Muslim). Since those who say so are muqallids, their words cannot be documents. There was no taqlîd during the time of as-Sahâba and the Tâbi’ûn. They learned the Book and the Sunna by asking one another. In fact, the âyat, ‘**Ask those who know!**’ means ‘Ask what the Divine Rule is.’ It does not mean to ‘ask about the opinions of those who know.’ The âyat, ‘**Refer the things on which you disagree to Allah and to His Messenger,**’ prohibits taqlîd. Rasûlullah, whenever he sent a Sahâbî to another place, would say, ‘**When you cannot find [the solution of] something in the Sunna, judge about it by finding it out through your own ra’y!**’ A person who follows a mujtahid will have made him the possessor of Islam, which belongs to Rasûlullah.”

Ash-Shawkânî’s statement “According to the majority of scholars, taqlîd is never permissible in a’mâl,” is his own opinion, in which he misinterprets the fact that the mujtahids’ taqlîd of one another is not permissible. He gives reference from such a separatist as Ibn Hazm (d. 456/1064). The four a’immat al-madhâhib never said that ordinary Muslims should not imitate others. We have written about this already. And the idea “It is not permissible to follow the dead,” is one of the beliefs in Shi’ism to

which as-Shawkânî belonged. That he is surprised at Ahl as-Sunna scholars' not holding the same idea shows that he was a heretic who held much to this Shī'ite belief. And his reference that since the scholars of fiqh belonging to the four madhhabs "are muqallids, their words could not be documents," shows that he is confused because of his own heresy and excessive bigotry. However, he admits in his first two sentences that a scholar of fiqh who is a muqallid follows the imâm al-madhhab and does not speak from himself, and his words are the imâm al-madhhab's words, which, as he himself means in his tenth sentence, are documents. It was certainly true that the taqlîd was unnecessary during the time of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm, since they all were mujtahids. But there are thousands of examples, listed in many books, showing that the muqallids among the Tabi'ûn were much greater than mujtahids. By writing that Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) commanded the Sahâbîs whom he sent as judges to other places to judge in accordance with their own ra'y, ash-Shawkânî rebuts his own claims. Allâhu ta'âlâ makes him, too, prove that Ahl as-Sunna is right.

As it is seen, the lâ-madhhabî and religion reformers speak through the tongue of ash-Shawkânî. In order to deceive Ahl as-Sunna, the reformer represents a heretic, an enemy of Ahl as-Sunna, as a mujtahid mutlaq. It is written in **Al-usûl al-arba'a** that ash-Shawkânî did not belong to a madhhab, that he said "disbeliever and polytheist" about one who followed a madhhab, and that the lâ-madhhabî regard him as a mujtahid.

41- In the Thirteenth Dialogue the reformer says:

"Imâm Ahmad said to Abû Dâwud, 'Do not follow anybody in the religion! Take what is conveyed from as-Sahâba! You are free to adapt (tâbi') yourself to those who came after as-Sahâba.' 'Adaptation' does not mean to 'follow' (taqlîd). Taqlîd means to follow a person's words or opinions without knowing where he has taken it from, without seeing his proofs. The Hanbalî madhhab is the madhhab of the hadîth. None of the scholars who adapted themselves to this madhhab gave up the hadîth in return for their imâm's opinions. Taqlîd makes intellect useless. He who compares the deductions (ra'y) or ijtihâds of scholars with the Nass and then gives up the ones disagreeing with the Nass will not have given up the words of scholars. Neither it is fard to follow ijtihâds, nor will those who do not follow them be sinners or disbelievers.

The imâms or their disciples did not say that it was necessary to admit their deductions or ijtihâds. Imâm Abû Hanîfa said, 'This is my ijtihâd. If there should be anyone to say the better I will follow him.' When Hârûn ar-Rashîd wanted to command everybody to follow the ijtihâds of Imâm Mâlik, the imâm said, 'Do not do that! A hadîth which is not known at some place is known at some other place.' A hadîth reported by only one person denotes supposition. Such a hadîth, even if it is sahîh, is to be given up if it is against the public advantage. The Sunna will not be abandoned by doing so. It will have been omitted because strong evidence against it has been seen. So is the case with Hadrat 'Umar's ijtihâd upon divorce and mut'a. Hadrat 'Umar cannot be said to have opposed to the hadîth."

He boasts of himself by writing through the preacher's tongue:

"O you virtuous young man! I now appreciate your deep and extensive knowledge."

He writes again through the preacher's tongue:

"The harm of taqlîd, even if it were only getting stuck into the books of one's own madhhab and neglecting the books of hadîth, will prove it [taqlîd] wrong."

Not only Imâm Ahmad but also the other a'immat al-madhâhib said to their disciples, "Do not follow anybody, not even me. Take what is conveyed from as-Sahâba," because there were mujtahids among their disciples. Mujtahids had to do so. And the statement, "You are free to adapt yourself to those who came after as-Sahâba" is a lie, for, a mujtahid was not permitted to follow another mujtahid. Hadrat 'Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha'rânî wrote in **Al-mîzân al-kubrâ:**

"An 'âlim in the grade of ijtihâd, that is, a scholar who can find out the **adilla** and infer rules from them, is not permitted to follow somebody else. However, according to the 'ulamâ', it is wâjib for an ordinary Muslim to follow a mujtahid. They said that if a non-mujtahid Muslim did not follow a mujtahid, he would deviate from the right path. All mujtahids inferred rules from the documentary evidences they found in Islam. No mujtahid has ever talked out of his own opinion concerning the religion of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Each madhhab is like a tissue woven with the threads of the Book and the Sunna. Anybody who is not in the grade enabling him to employ ijtihâd has to choose and follow any one he likes of the

four madhhabs, because they all show the way leading to Paradise. A person who speaks ill of any of the a'immat al-madhâhib shows his ignorance. For example, it was said unanimously by all the early 'ulamâ' and their successors that al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa Nu'mân ibn Thâbit (rahmatullâhi 'alaih) had had very great knowledge and wara', had worshipped much, and had been very meticulous and prudent in deducing rules. One should trust oneself to Allâhu ta'âlâ against saying, 'He mixed Allâhu ta'âlâ's religion with words disagreeing with the Book and the Sunna by inferring from his own opinion and point of view,' about such an exalted imâm. Every Muslim should be reverent towards the a'immat al-madhâhib. The high status of al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa was fully realized only by the great Awliyâ' who were the possessors of kashf."

Claiming that the Hanbalî scholars did not give up the hadîth is a vituperation against the other three a'immat al-madhâhib. As we have quoted before, the religion reformer, too, said, "Each imâm al-madhab said that his ijtihâd should be given up when a sahih hadîth was found." Now he denies it. And the statement, "Taqlîd makes intellect useless," reflects the vulgar ignorance of the person who says so. Allâhu ta'âlâ's religion is above intellect, comprehension and realization. If intellect is compelled to go up into it, its wings will fail and it will then become useless. The most effective medicine to protect the intellect in religious matters is to follow mujtahids. Comparison between scholars' ra'y or ijtihâd and the Nass is a task which can be done by mujtahids only. For us, the ignorant, who know nothing of ijtihâd or of the knowledge of tafsîr or hadîth, there is no other way than admitting and believing the greatness of an imâm al-madhab and to follow him. It was said unanimously by the 'ulamâ' of Islam that it was wâjib for us ordinary people to follow an imâm al-madhab.^[1] The one who does not adapt himself to an imâm al-madhab's ijtihâd becomes a sinner. It is written in the books of fiqh that the one who does not admit a decree which has been given unanimously by the four madhhabs and which has spread over every country will become a non-Muslim.^[2] Al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa

[1] 'Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha'rânî, **Al-mizân al-kubra**, p. 68, with references added.

[2] Ibn 'Âbidîn, **Radd al-muhtâr**, the beginning of the salât al-witr. It is for this reason that religion reformers attack against this valuable book and Hadrat Ibn 'Âbidîn (rahmatullâhi 'alaih), who is one of the arch-stones of the Hanafî madhab.

(rahmatullâhi 'alaih) said about his own ijtihâds, “This is my ijtihâd. I have done what I could. If anyone does better than this, it is more probable that he is right.” But he did not say, “I will follow him.” There are those things which were decided to be halâl, harâm or wâjib by the a'immat al-madhâhib, though they were not explained clearly in the Qur'ân al-kerîm or the hadîth ash-sherîf. They did not give any decision when they could not find hints in the Qur'ân al-kerîm or the hadîth ash-sharîf. They were like the stars in the sky. Others are like the people walking about on the earth. The latter, seeing the former's reflection on the surface of water, think that they know them. Harûn ar-Rashîd, the Khalîfa, visited Imâm Mâlik and said, “I want to spread your books everywhere so that the whole Umma should follow only these books.” Hadrat Imâm said, “O Amîr al-mu'minîn (the Head of Muslims)! The disagreement between the disagreement of scholars is Allâhu ta'âlâ's compassion upon the Umma. Every mujtahid will follow the evidence which he knows as sahîh. The rules deduced by them all guide to the right path. They are all in the way of Allâhu ta'âlâ.” Thus, he meant that all the madhhabs and mujtahids were on the right path. Strange to see, the religion reformer, who insists on saying that not hadîths but ijtihâds should be given up, claims now that hadîths which are da'if should be given up in mu'âmalât. Al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa, when employing ijtihâd, would prefer a hadîth da'if, and even the words of any Sahâbî, to his own ra'y. A dâif hadîth can be a document (dalîl) only for supererogatory (fadâ'il) 'ibâdât; in other words, the supererogatory 'ibâdât can be performed also according to such hadîths. For the 'ibâdât that are fard, wâjib or sunnat mu'akkada, only those hadîths that are mashhûr and sahîh can be documents. While looking for such a document for a matter, or while employing ijtihâd on a matter which had not been explained in an âyat or in such hadîths, in other words, while looking for the document of a matter similar to the matter in question, al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa would prefer a da'if hadîth to his own ra'y; that is, he would prefer the document shown by a da'if hadîth to his own deduction. For, the hadîth ash-sherîf written in **al-Madkhal** by Imâm al-Baihakî declares, “**It is fard for all of you to follow the Qur'ân al-kerîm. It is not excusable for any of you to abandon it. In those matters which you cannot find in the Qur'ân al-kerîm, follow my sunna! If you cannot find them in my sunna, either, follow the words of my Companions! For, my Companions are like the stars in the sky. You will find guidance to the right**

path if you follow any of them. Disagreement among my companions is [Allâhu ta'âlâ's] compassion upon you." This hadîth sherîf shows that the one who follows any of the four a'immat al-madhâhib will find guidance to the right path. And this documents the fact that all the four madhhabs guide to the right path. The religion reformer's referring the ijtihâd on divorce and mut'a^[1] to Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) is untrue, for no Sahâbî disagreed with him, hence it was the unanimous decision of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm.

It is also appalling that, to him, taqlîd of a madhhab means to give up reading books of hadîth. All of those who wrote, explained and published thousands of books of hadîth filling up the world's libraries today, were the Ahl as-Sunna, each of whom followed a madhhab. Imâm Hamdân ibn Sahl (rahmatullâhi 'alaih) wrote: "If I were a qâdî (judge), I would imprison two kinds of people: one is he who reads books of hadîth but does not read books of fiqh, and the other is he who reads books of fiqh but does not read books of hadîth. Don't you see how fast our a'immat al-madhâhib held to the knowledge of hadîth and how hard they studied fiqh, or that they did not content themselves with only one of them?" All the scholars of the Ahl as-Sunna disapproved and prohibited speaking from one's own angle of comparison (qiyâs) and deduction (ra'y) on Allâhu ta'âlâ's religion. Who disapproved of it most was al-Imâm al-'azam Abû Hanîfa (rahmatullâhi 'alaih). He and the other a'immat al-madhâhib are quoted on this subject in **al-Mizân al-kubrâ**. Does it befit a Muslim to say, "In their ijtihâd they disagreed with the Nass and employed ijtihâd incompatible with the hadîth through deduction and comparison," about these scholars who said quite the opposite? It is not permissible even to think so about our a'immat al-madhâhib, who were Rasûlullah's (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) inheritors. Those who say so, in fact, deny the hadîths declaring that they were his inheritors, and thus contradict the hadîth ash-sherîf. Furthermore, by doing so they think ill of and slander Muslims. Both of them are grave sins. Because they perpetrate harâm, they should repent before Allâhu ta'âlâ.

42- The religion reformer says at the end of his book:

"The taqlîd of someone is a huge obstacle against knowledge and intellect. Not all the rules deduced through

[1] "Mut'a" is an un-Islamic form of nikâh, explained in detail in **Endless Bliss**.

ijtihâd by mujtahids originated from the same source. Some were deduced from the Book, while others from the Sunna. Therefore, there are different views on some matters.”

Having involved himself in a great matter which he could never cope with, the religion reformer now gets confused. The poor man, who can never tolerate Muslims’ following the a’immat al-madhâhib by obeying the above-quoted hadîth sherif and the âyat quoted several times before, being unable to find any reason based on knowledge and intellect for blaming taqlîd, says that taqlîd obstructs knowledge and intellect. We answered this claim of his in the previous article. Is he a Muslim or an enemy of Islam who says that obeying the commands in the âyat and the hadîth causes such harms? We leave the answer to the understanding and reason of our dear readers. Hadrat ‘Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha’rânî wrote in his work **al-Mîzân al-kubrâ**:

“O my Muslim brother! Meditate well! If Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ‘alaihi wa sallam) had not explained what had been revealed briefly and symbolically in the Qur’ân al-kerîm, the Qur’ân al-kerîm would have remained concealed. If our a’immat al-madhâhib (rahmatullâhi ‘alaihim ajma’în), who were Rasûlullah’s (sall-Allâhu ‘alaihi wa sallam) inheritors, had not explained the brief hadîths, the Prophet’s Sunna would have remained concealed. Therefore, the scholars of each century, by following Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ‘alaihi wa sallam), explained all the brief hadîths. Allâhu ta’âlâ declares in the 44th âyat of the Sûrat an-Nahl, **“You (the Prophet) shall explain (bayân) to mankind what I send down for them.”** ‘Bayân’ means ‘to express the âyats of Allâhu ta’âlâ in other terms, in a different way.’ If the scholars among the Umma had been able to explain âyats and to interpret brief âyats and to infer rules from the Qur’ân al-kerîm, Allâhu ta’âlâ would have said to His Prophet, ‘Tell them what is sent to you through the Angel,’ and He would not have commanded him to explain. Shaikh al-Islâm Zakariyyâ (rahmatullâhi ‘alaihi) said, ‘If Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ‘alaihi wa sallam) had not interpreted what had been declared briefly in the Qur’ân al-kerîm and if the a’immat al-madhâhib had not explained what had been communicated symbolically, none of us could have understood them. For example, if the Shâri’ (sall-Allâhu ‘alaihi wa sallam) had not explained how to perform a ritual ablution in his hadîths, we would not have been able to deduce from the Qur’ân al-kerîm how to perform it. Similarly, the

number of rak'as in each salât, the rules, cases and amount of nisâb, the conditions and fard and sunna acts of fasting, pilgrimage and zakât could not have been inferred from the Qur'ân al-kerîm. None of the symbolically revealed Qur'anic rules would have been understood if they had not been explained in the hadîth ash-sherîf.

“It is a symptom of faction (nifâq) to struggle against the 'ulamâ' of Islam since it means to struggle to oppose and reject their proofs (dalâ'il). Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the 46th âyat of the Sûrat an-Nisâ of the Qur'ân al-kerîm, **'For having believed, they have to appoint you to be an arbitrator to settle the disputes among them, admit your decision and surrender.'** This âyat signifies that those who are not pleased with Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) decision or with the commandments of Islam do not have î mân. A hadîth sherîf declares, **'Do not quarrel or dispute in the Messenger's presence!'** Since the 'ulamâ' are Rasûlullah's (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) inheritors, to quarrel or to dispute with the 'ulamâ' of his religion, to attempt to criticize their ijtihâds, which are correct, means to dispute with him. As we have to believe and confirm all the revelations which he brought even if we cannot understand their ultimate divine causes and evidences, so we have to believe and confirm the knowledge conveyed from our aimmat al-madhâhib, even if we do not understand their documentary evidences, since they are not against Islam. Despite the fact that there are different, even opposite principles in the religions of all prophets ('alahimu 's-salâtu wa 's-salâm), we Muslims have to believe and acknowledge all of them as Prophets of Allâhu ta'âlâ, since the 'ulamâ' declared it unanimously. The case is the same with the madhhabs. Non-mujtahids have to believe and acknowledge all the four madhhabs though they see that there are differences between them. A non-mujtahid's finding a madhhab as erroneous does not show that the madhhab is erroneous. Instead, it shows that he understands little and that he himself is erroneous. Al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î said, 'To surrender oneself is half of î mân.' Upon this, Hadrat Rabî' said, 'Nay, it is the whole of î mân,' and al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î admitted it. Again, al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î said, 'A person with perfect î mân does not speak on the knowledge of usûl. That is, he does not ask why it is that way and not this way.' When asked what was the knowledge of usûl, he said it covered the Book, the Sunna and ijma' al-Umma. This remark of his shows that we have to say that we believe all knowledge that has come from Allâhu ta'âlâ and the Prophet as

He has revealed. So should be the case with what has been conveyed through the 'ulamâ' of Islam; that is, we should say that we believe the words of our a'immat al-madhâhib without pronouncing on them, without arguing. Therefore, Imâm Ibn 'Abd al-Birr (d. 463/1071) said, 'None of our a'imma has been heard to command his disciples to follow a certain madhhab. They told them to follow fatwâs of any madhhab they liked, for all the madhhabs are Allâhu ta'âlâ's compassion. It was not stated in any hadîth, sahîh or da'îf, that our Prophet (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) commanded anybody of his umma to recommend a certain madhhab.'

“Al-Imâm al-Qurâfî says, ‘As it was witnessed unanimously by as-Sahâbat al-kirâm, a person who followed Hadrat Abû Bakr and Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anhumâ) by adopting their fatwâs would also ask other Sahâbîs about his other manners and would act upon what he learned. Nobody would ask for witnesses or documents.^[1] And by the unanimous declaration of the 'ulamâ', it is necessary today for a new Muslim to learn and do by asking the scholars of a single madhhab without asking for proofs, and if he cannot find scholars of the same madhhab, to ask any scholar but later, to learn one of the four madhhabs and follow it. A stubborn person who refuses this unanimity has to find proofs for his refutation.’”^[2]

'Allâma Sayyid Ahmad at-Tahtâwî, a great Hanafî fiqh scholar of Egypt, wrote in the subject of 'Zabâyah' in his **Hâshiyatu Durr al-mukhtâr**: “According to the majority of the scholars of tafsîr, the âyat, **‘They parted into groups in the religion.’** referred to the people of bid'a who would arise in this umma. In a hadîth sherîf reported by Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) said to Hadrat 'Â'isha (radiy-Allâhu anhâ), **‘The âyat about the partition into groups in the religion refers to the people of bid'a and to the followers of their nafses who would arise in this**

[1] In other words, it was not possible for the new Muslims among the Tâbi'ûn to follow the madhhab of only one Sahâbî, since the madhhabs of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm were not codified or compiled in books as great madhahbs. It was to a few persons' lot to be in company with a Sahâbî all the time and to ask him about everything, thus to act upon what they heard. They needed to ask any Sahâbî they met and to listen and act accordingly. When there is darûra (compulsory necessity), one can follow any madhhab. The Tâbi'ûn never asked for proof.

[2] **al-Mizân al-kubrâ**, p. 41.

umma. Allâhu ta'âlâ declared in the 153rd ayat of the Sûrat al-An'âm, **'This is the right path. Be on this path! Do not part into groups!'** (that is, Jews, Christians and other heretics departed from the right path; you should not part like them!) In the 103rd âyat of the Sûrat âl 'Imrân, Allâhu ta'âlâ declared, **'You all should hold on to Allâhu ta'âlâ's rope! Do not part into groups!'** Some scholars of tafsîr said that 'Allâhu ta'âlâ's rope' meant 'jamâ'a, unity'. The command, **'Do not part into groups,'** shows that it is so and the jamâ'a are the possessors of fiqh and 'ilm. One who dissents from fuqahâ' (scholars of fiqh) as much as a span falls into heresy, becomes deprived of Allâhu ta'âlâ's help and deserves Hell, because the fuqahâ' have been on the right path and have held on to the Sunna of Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) and on to the path of the Khulafâ' ar-râshidîn, the Four Caliphs (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum). The As-siwâd al-a'zam, i.e., the majority of Muslims, are on the path of the fuqahâ'. Those who depart from their path will burn in the fire of Hell. O Believers! Follow the unique path which is protected against Hell! And this group is the one that is called **Ahl as-Sunnat wa 'l-Jamâ'a**. For, Allâhu ta'âlâ's help, protection and guidance are for the followers of this group, and His wrath and punishment are for those who dissent from this group. Today, this group of salvation come together in the four madhhabs, namely the **Hanafî, Mâlikî, Shâfi'î** and **Hanbalî**. In the present time, one who does not adapt himself to one of these four madhhabs is a man of bid'a and is destined for Hell. All people of bid'a claim that they are on the right path. This subject can be judged not by mere claim or imagination but by the reports of the specialists in this path and of the scholars of hadîth, whose reports are based on the right path."^[1]

43- The four a'immat al-madhâhib are the archstones of the Islamic faith. The 'ulamâ' of Islam have written numerous books on their biographies and superiority, for example, the section **"Ashadd al-jihâd fî ibtâlî da'wa 'l-ijtihâd"** of the Arabic book **al-Minhat al-Wahbiyya fî raddi 'l-Wahhâbiyya**, and the books

[1] This passage from at-Tahtâwî reports openly and definitely that the Wahhâbîs, the Shî'ites and other lâ-madhhabî people are the people of bid'a, dalâla and Hell. The one-page Arabic original of this passage is appended photostatically in the book **Radd al-Wahhâbî** published in Istanbul in 1399 (1979). Edited first in India in 1264 (1848), this book proves with authentic references that the four madhhabs are right and that following one of them is necessary to escape Hell.

Hidâyat al-muwaffiqîn and **Sabîl an-najât**, which were published in Istanbul. The following is the translation from **Ashadd al-jihâd** to be a souvenir for the youth:

1) First of the four a'immat al-madhâhib of the Ahl as-Sunna was al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa Nu'mân ibn Thâbit (rahmatullâhi 'alaih). He was born in 80 A.H. (699) and died in Baghdad in 150 (767). He was the founder of the Hanafî madhhab. The Ottomans, Muslims in India, Siberia and Turkistan have been performing 'ibâdât in accordance with the Hanafî madhhab. A hadîth declares: "**Abû Hanîfa is the light of my umma.**" There is no need to repeat about his wara', zuhd, generosity, keen sight and sagacity, which are well known. Three-fourths of the knowledge of fiqh belongs to him. And he shares the remaining one-fourth with the other a'immat al-madhâhib. Al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î said, "The sources of men's knowledge on fiqh are Abû Hanîfa and his disciples. He who wants to learn fiqh should resort to Abû Hanîfa's knowledge and his disciples. When I asked Imâm Mâlik if he had seen Abû Hanîfa, he said, 'Yes, I have seen Abû Hanîfa. He was such a man that if he had claimed that this pillar were made of gold he would have proved it right. No one could oppose him.' " Men had been asleep concerning the knowledge of fiqh, and Abû Hanîfa woke them all. When 'Isâ ibn Mûsâ, one of the 'âbids (worshippers, devotees) and zâhids (ascetics) of the time, was in the company of Abû Ja'far Mansûr, who was the Amîr al-Mu'minîn [Head of the Faithful], Abû Hanîfa entered the room. 'Isâ said to Mansûr that the visitor was a world-wide great 'âlim. Mansûr asked the imâm from whom he had acquired knowledge. He said he had learned from the disciples of Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh). And Mansûr said, "Indeed, you have got a very sound support."

Al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa performed salât every night. Once, while he was sleeping in the Ka'ba, he was wakened by a voice: "O Abû Hanîfa! Thou hast served Me faithfully. Thou hast known Me well. On account of this faith and acknowledgement of thine, I have forgiven thee and those who will follow thee until Doomsday." What good news for Abû Hanîfa and for the followers of his madhhab! His beautiful moral character and good qualities could exist only in an 'ârif and imâm who was a mujtahid. Of the mujtahid-imâm and mature 'âlims whom he educated, 'Abdullah ibn Mubâarak, Imâm Mâlik, Imâm Mis'ar, Abû Yûsuf, Muhammad ash-Shaibânî and Imâm Zufar are the witnesses of his high status. Though he wished to keep away from the people and

go into retirement because he had much modesty and bashfulness, he began to issue fatwās when he was commanded by Rasūlullah (sall-Allāhu 'alaihi wa sallam) in his dream to promulgate his madhhab. His madhhab spread far and wide. His followers increased in number. Those who envied him appeared, yet they all were routed and disgraced. Many scholars learned the usūl and furū' of his madhhab and wrote many books. Those who could observe and understand his naqlī (narrated, traditional) and 'aqlī (mental) documentation wrote about his superiority. Though Abu 'l-Faraj ibn al-Jawzī quotes some stories belittling al-Imām al-a'zam in his book, he wrote them not to belittle al-Imām al-'azam but to show that there were those who were jealous of him. In the same book he praises al-Imām al-a'zam more than others. Al-Imām al-'azam's father, Thâbit, had visited Hadrat 'Alī (radiy-Allāhu 'anh), who had invoked for a blessing on him and his children. The prayer manifested on al-Imām al-a'zam. Attaining the suhba of some of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm, particularly of Hadrat Anas ibn Mâlik (radiy-Allāhu 'anh), he was honoured with being one of the Tâbi'ûn.

['Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha'rânî wrote:

“Before writing my book **Adillat al-madhâhib**, I studied the ijtihâds of Abû Hanîfa and his disciples very minutely. I saw that each of them was based on an âyat kerîma, hadîth sharîf or khabar (narration) reported from as-Sahâbat al-kirâm. Such great mujtahids as Imâm Mâlik, Imâm Ahmad and al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î praised al-Imâm al-a'zam very much. Others speaking favourably or unfavourably about him is not of any importance, for, those who are in the Mâlikî, Hanbalî or Shâfi'î madhhab have to love and praise someone whom their imâm al-madhhab praised. If they do not love him they will have not obeyed their madhhab. It is wâjib for anyone who adapts himself to a madhhab to follow his imâm al-madhhab and praise al-Imâm al-a'zam. One day, while I was writing al-Imâm al-a'zam's biography, a man came in and showed me a piece of paper. It wrote ill of al-Imâm al-a'zam. I told him that it had been written by somebody who had not understood al-Imâm al-a'zam's ijtihâds. He said he had taken it from Fakhr ad-dîn ar-Râzî's book. 'Fakhr ad-dîn ar-Râzî (d. 606/1209) is like a student when compared to al-Imâm al-a'zam. Or he is like a villager compared to a sultan, or like a star which cannot be seen in a sunny sky. As it is harâm for a villager to blame the sultan without any evidence, so it is harâm for us, the muqallids, to disagree with the imâm al-madhhab's ijtihâd or to

say groundless words against him unless there is a clear âyat that cannot be explained away,' I said.^[1] It is wâjib for a muqallid who cannot understand one of the decisions which al-Imâm al-a'zam made through ijtihâd to act in accordance with it unless its opposite is proved.

“Abû Mutî” related that while he was with al-Imâm al-a'zam in the Kûfa Mosque, Sufyân ath-Thawrî, Imâm Muqâtil, Hammâd ibn Salama, Imâm Ja'far as-Sâdiq and some other 'ulamâ' came in. ‘We have heard that you employ qiyâs in religious matters. This will harm you very much, for it was the Devil who employed it first,’ they said. Al-Imâm al-a'zam answered them from morning till the time of the Friday prayer. He explained his madhhab. ‘First I look in the Qur'ân al-kerîm. If I cannot find in it, I look in the hadîth ash-sherîf. If I cannot find it again, I look in the ijma' of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm. If I cannot find it, either, I prefer one of [their opinions about] those [matters] on which they disagreed. If I cannot find it, either, I then employ qiyâs,’ he said and showed some examples. They all stood up, kissed his hand and said, ‘You are the master of the 'ulamâ'. Forgive us, please! Inadvertently, we have bothered you.’ And he replied, ‘May Allâhu ta'âlâ forgive me and you.’

“O my brother! Refrain from speaking ill of al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa and the 'ulamâ' of fiqh who have been following his madhhab! Do not believe what the ignorant say or write! If you follow religion reformers who do not know the ahwâl, zuhd, wara' and the prudence and strictness in religious matters of that exalted imâm and say that his documentation is unsound, you will suffer perdition with them in the next world. If you, as I do, study his documentation, you will realize that all the four madhhabs are sahih (valid)! If you want to see the correctness of the four madhhabs as clearly as the noon sun, cling to the path of the men of Allâhu ta'âlâ! Advance on the way of tasawwuf, thus guarantee your knowledge and worship to be only for Allâhu ta'âlâ's sake. Then you will see the source of the teachings of Islam. You will

[1] Please note how Hadrat 'Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha'rânî, who was a Shâfi'î, censured Fakhr ad-dîn ar-Râzî, who also was a Shâfi'î, because ar-Râzî spoke ill of al-Imâm al-a'zam. We suggest that religion reformers who have tried to deceive Muslims by saying that the Hanafîs and the Shâfi'îs fought each other and caused Islam to go backwards shall read the lines above carefully and wake up from unawareness.

realize that all the four madhhabs have spread by originating from this same source and that none of them contains any rule outside of Islam. How lucky for those who behave properly and respectfully towards the a'immat al-madhâhib and the 'ulamâ' who have followed them! Allâhu ta'âlâ made them guides (imâms) to show His human creatures the way to happiness. They are His great blessings upon people. They are the pioneers of the way leading to Paradise."^[1]

2) Imâm Mâlik ibn Anas (rahmatullâhi 'alaihi) was born in Medina in 95 A.H. [715] and died there in 179 [795]. He said that he had begun to issue fatwâ after seventy imâms had urged him. "Of my masters from whom I learned, there are very few who have not taken fatwâs from me," he said. As al-Imâm al-Yâfi'î said, this statement of the imâm was not intended for boasting. It was intended to reveal Allâhu ta'âlâ's blessings. Az-Zarkânî wrote in his commentary on **Muwatta'**: "Imâm Mâlik is a well-known imâm al-madhab. He was the highest of the high. He was a man of perfect intellect and obvious virtue. He was the inheritor of Rasûlullah's (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) hadîths. He spread Allâhu ta'âlâ's religion among His human creatures. He had been in the company of nine hundred 'ulamâ' and had gained much. He collected and wrote 100 000 hadîths. He began to teach when he was seventeen years old. Those who attended his lectures were more than those who attended his masters' lectures. They would assemble before his door in order to learn hadîth and fiqh. He had to hire a doorkeeper. First his disciples and then all other people would be admitted. He would go to the water-closet once every three days. 'I feel ashamed to stay too long in the water-closet,' he would say. When he wrote his book **Muwatta'**, he began to doubt his own faithfulness. He put the book into water. 'If the book gets wet, I will not need it,' he said. Not a bit of the book got wet." 'Abd ar-Rahmân ibn Anas said, "There is nobody on the earth now who is more dependable than Mâlik in the knowledge of hadîth. I have seen no person wiser than he. Sufyân ath-Thawrî is an imâm in hadîth, but he is not an imâm in the Sunna. Al-Awzâ'î is an imâm in the Sunna but not in hadîth. Imâm Mâlik is an imâm both in hadîth and the Sunna." Yahyâ ibn Sa'îd said, "Imâm Mâlik is Allâhu ta'âlâ's witness on the earth for His human creatures." Al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î said, "Wherever hadîth is

[1] **Preface to al-Mîzân al-kubrâ** in the Arabic work '**Ulamâ' al-Muslimîn wa Wahhâbiyyûn**, p. 62, Istanbul, 1973.

studied, Mâlik is like a celestial star. Nobody could be like Mâlik in memorizing, understanding and preserving knowledge. To me, in the knowledge about Allâhu ta'âlâ nobody is as trustworthy as Mâlik. The witness between Allâhu ta'âlâ and me is Imâm Malik. Had it not been for Mâlik and Sufyân ibn 'Uyaina, knowledge would have gone from the Hijâz by now." When 'Abdullah asked his father Ahmad ibn Hanbal who was the most learned among Zahrî's disciples, his father said that Mâlik was the most learned in every branch of knowledge. Ibn Wahab said, "If it weren't for Mâlik and Laith, we all would deviate." Al-Awzâ'î, whenever he heard the name of Imâm Mâlik, would say, "He is the most learned of the learned, the greatest 'âlim of Medina, and the Muftî of al-Haramain." Upon hearing of Imâm Mâlik's death, Sufyân ibn 'Uyaina said, "The world does not have anybody like him now. He was the imâm of the world, the 'âlim of the Hijâz, the witness of his time and the sun of the Ummat al-Muhammad (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam). Let us be on his way." Ahmad ibn Hanbal said that Imâm Mâlik was superior to Sufyân ath-Thawrî, Laith, Hammâd and al-Awzâ'î. Sufyân ibn 'Uyaina said that the hadîth ash-sherîf, "**When people are in urgent need [of someone], they will find no one surpassing the scholar in Medina,**" signified Imâm Mâlik. Imâm Malik said that he dreamt of Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) every night. Mus'âb said that he had heard his father say, "Mâlik and I were in Masjid an-Nabawî. Someone approached and asked which of us was Abû 'Abdullah Mâlik. We showed him who he was. He came near him, threw his arms round his neck and kissed him on the forehead. He said, 'I dreamt of Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) sitting here. Call Mâlik, he said. You came, trembling. Relax yourself, O Abû 'Abdullah! Sit down and open up your chest, he commanded. Your chest opened and radiated fragrant scents everywhere.' Imâm Mâlik wept and said that the dream was to be interpreted as knowledge."

3) Al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î's (rahmatullâhi 'alaih) name was Muhammad ibn Idris ibn 'Abbâs ibn 'Uthmân ibn Shâfi'. His descent traced back to Hâshim ibn 'Abd al-Muttalib as his eighth father, whose uncle, Hâshim, was among Rasûlullah's ancestors. His fifth father, Sâ'yib, was in the enemy army in the Battle of Badr, but later he and his son Shâfi' became Sahâbîs. The imâm, therefore, was called "ash-Shâfi'î." His mother was a Sharîfa, a descendant of Hadrat Hasan (radiy-Allâhu 'anh). He was born in Gazza in 150 A.H. [767] and died in Egypt in 204 [820]. When he

was two years old, he was taken to al-Makkat al-mukarrama, where he memorized the Qur'ân al-kerîm in childhood and Imâm Mâlik's hadîth book **Muwatta'** at the age of ten. He began to issue fatwâs at the age of fifteen. He went to al-Madînat al-Munawwara in the same year and acquired knowledge and faid from Imâm Mâlik. He came to Baghdad in 185. Two years later he went to Mecca for hajj. He returned to Baghdad in 198 and settled in Egypt in 199. Long after his death, there were those who wanted to take his body to Baghdad, and when his grave was dug, it emanated a musky scent, intoxicating the people there. They gave up digging. With respect to knowledge, worshipping, zuhd, ma'rifa, intelligence, memory and pedigree, he was the most superior of the imâms of his time, and superior also to most of those who came before him. His madhhab spread far and wide. All of the inhabitants of al-Haramain and al-Ard al-Muqaddas [Palestine] became Shâfi'î. The hadîth ash-sherîf, "**The scholar of Quraish will fill the world with knowledge,**" appeared on al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î. When 'Abdullah inquired of his father, Ahmad ibn Hanbal, the reason why he prayed very much for al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î, his father said, "O my son! Al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î's place among people is like that of the sun in the sky. He is a healer of souls." In those days, **Muwatta'** contained 9500 hadîths, and later it was abbreviated to the present one which contains some 1700 hadîths. He won the nickname **Nâsir as-Sunna** (helper of the religion). It was astonishing that he founded a new madhhab in such a short time as four years. More than 40 books have been written revealing his biography and his superiority.

4) Imâm Ahmad ibn Hanbal ash-Shaibânî al-Marûzî (rahmatullâhi 'alaih) was born in Baghdad in 164 A.H. [780] and died there in 241 [855]. He was an imâm in both the sciences of hadîth and fiqh. He was also skillful in the subtleties and inner essence of the Sunna. He was famed for his zuhd and wara'. He went to Kûfa, Basra, the blessed cities of Mecca and Medina, Yemen, Damascus and Mesopotamia in order to collect hadîths. He learned fiqh from al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î, who learned hadîth from him. Ibrâhîm al-Harbî said, "I saw Ahmad ibn Hanbal. Allâhu ta'âlâ has given him every branch of knowledge." Qutaiba ibn Sa'id said, "If Imâm Ahmad had lived during the time of ath-Thawrî, al-Awzâ'î, Mâlik and Laith ibn Sa'd, he would have surpassed them all." He memorized a million hadîths. Al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î sent him a letter from Egypt. He wept when he read it. When he was asked why he wept, he said, "He dreamt of

Rasûlullah (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm) who commanded him, ‘Write a letter including my greetings to Abû ‘Abdullah Ahmad ibn Hanbal. He will be asked if the Qur’ân al-kerîm is a creature. Tell him not to answer the question.’ ” 800 000 men and 60 000 women attended his funeral. On the day he passed away, 20 000 Jews, Christians and Magians embraced Islam.

These four a’imma of Ahl as-Sunna were the best ones of the second century of Islam as praised in the hadîth ash-sherîf. All of them are among “those” in the âyat, “**Allâhu ta’âlâ loves those who follow them** [as-Sahâbat al-kirâm] **in goodness.**” If a person, instead of following them, follows someone among ignorant and base people in the worst of all times, this will show his idiocy. Allâhu ta’âlâ declared: “**Obey Ulû ‘l-amr!**” Ulû ‘l-amr are the ‘ulamâ’ or the governments which practise the fatwâs of ‘ulamâ’. According to both the interpretations, it is wâjib to follow the a’immat al-madhâhib. Fakhr ad-dîn ar-Râzî inferred from this âyat that qiyâs was a document and that it was wâjib for a muqallid to follow the ‘ulamâ’. And for the unanimity of the ‘ulamâ’ of usûl, those ‘ulamâ’ who are not absolute mujtahids are muqallids, too. It is understood from the 114th âyat of Sûrat an-Nisâ’ that it is harâm to dissent from the unanimity of the mujtahids.^[1]

44– ‘Abd al-Ghanî an-Nabulusî wrote:

“An Âyat kerîma declares, ‘**Allâhu ta’âlâ wishes His human slaves to be shown facility. He does not want them to suffer difficulty.**’ A hadîth sherîf declares, ‘**As Allâhu ta’âlâ likes us to do ‘azîmas, so He likes us to do rukhsas.**’ In other words, He likes us to do the rukhsas which He has permitted. This should not be misunderstood. Al-Imâm al-Manâwî wrote in his commentary on **al-Jâmi’ as-saghîr**, ‘It is not permissible to collect the rukhsas of madhhabs and make up a new madhhab of rukhsas, which means to dissent from Islam.’ Ibn ‘Abd as-Salâm said that it would be permissible provided you will not diverge from Islam. Al-Imâm as-Subkî said, ‘It is permissible to transfer oneself to another madhhab which comes easier to one when there is a need and strong necessity (darûra). But it is not permissible without a strong

[1] There is detailed information about **ijmâ’** and **qiyâs** in al-Husâmî’s book **al-Muntahâb fî usûl al-madhhab**, which was edited the second time together with its commentary-index titled **Hâmî** in Pakistan. Muhammad ibn Muhammad Husâm ad-dîn al-Husâmî passed away in Farghana in 644/1246. See also the end of the thirty-third article.

necessity, for, in that case it will be for the advantage of one's self, not for protecting one's religion. It is not permissible to change one's madhhab frequently.' I have given detailed information on the taqlîd of a madhhab in my book **Khulâsat at-tahqîq fî bayâni hukmi 't-taqlîd wa 't-talfîq**^[1].

"It is not permissible to make up **hîlat Shar'iyya**^[2] in order to make the halâl harâm or to make the harâm halâl, that is, it is not a rukhsa approved by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Ibn al-'Izz, in the explanation of the taqlîd of another madhhab, wrote, 'One should avoid making hîlat Shar'iyya a means for one's own desires without understanding the words of the a'immat al-madhâhib or knowing hîlat Shar'iyya.' It is obvious that muqallids do not know hîlat Shar'iyya, and they use the word 'hîla,' which they have heard from the a'immat al-madhâhib, in the line of their own desires. Al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa said that those muftîs who taught hîlat Shar'iyya were to be punished.

"The rukhsas which Allâhu ta'âlâ likes are the facilities which He has permitted for those who get into straits while doing His command. However, it is not permissible to escape doing the commands or to look for facilities suitable for one's own reasoning and understanding. Najm ad-dîn al-Ghazzî wrote in the book **Husn at-tanabbuh**, 'The Devil does not let one do the rukhsas permitted by Allâhu ta'âlâ. For example, he does not let him apply masah on the mests. He has him wash his feet. One should act upon the rukhsas but not look for the rukhsas of the madhhabs all the time, for, it is harâm to gather the facilities of the madhhabs together. It is a devilish way.'

"Most of the Salaf as-sâlihîn (Muslims of the first two centuries of Islam) suffered inconveniences. They performed hard 'ibâdât. You should not do like them! Take the way of the rukhsas stated clearly in the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the hadîth ash-sherîf! But do not slander those great people! They were much more learned and intelligent than you are. You do not know what they knew. Do not meddle with things you do not know or understand, and do not follow them. And protect yourself from opposing those great

[1] Photographic second edition of the Arabic original by Hakîkat Kitâbevi, Istanbul, 1974.

[2] Doing something suitably with a less-known rule of Islam when it cannot be done suitably with a well-known rule. See **Al-basâ'ir li munkiri 't-tawassuli bi ahli 'l-maqâbir** and the sixth part of **Fatâwa al-Hindiyya** for more detail.

people by depending on what you understand from the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the hadîth ash-sherîf! They understood the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the hadîth ash-sherîf better than you do. Having been closer to the time of Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) than you are; their intellect having been enlightened with the Ma'rifat-Allah (knowledge about Allâhu ta'âlâ); having clung to the Sunna fully; and their ikhlâs (quality of doing everything only for Allâhu ta'âlâ's sake), imân, tawhîd (belief in the oneness, unity, of Allâhu ta'âlâ) and zuhd (not setting one's heart on worldly things) having been much greater, they knew much better than you and the like. O you poor man with a religious post! Day and night you have been thinking of and running after the desires of your stomach and nafs. You have acquired some religious information in order to satisfy them. Relying on your smattering, you think of yourself as an authority on Islam. You attempt to compete with the Salaf as-sâlihîn. Do not slander those great people of Islam who spent their lives learning and teaching knowledge and who purified their hearts with pious actions and who strictly abstained from mushtabihât in order to consume halâl food and escape from the harâm! They were much higher than you are. This state of yours is like that of a sparrow competing with a falcon in eating and drinking. The mujâhada, riyâdât, 'ibâdât, ijtihâds and words of those great people were all in a manner as to suit with the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the hadîth ash-sherîf. The Salaf as-sâlihîn themselves acted upon 'azîmas, but issued fatwâs for Muslims to act upon rukhsas.

“The majority of the 'ulamâ' of Ahl as-Sunna said that imân by mere acceptance was sahîh (valid, lawful), even though such a muqallid of imân was disobedient and sinful because he had given up istidlâl (reasoning, convincing oneself with reasonable evidences). In other words, a person who believes only by learning from somebody without thinking or understanding is a Believer, a Muslim. The karâmât of Awliyâ' are true. They may have karâmât when they are dead as well as when alive. The karâmât of Hadrat Mariam, of the As'hâb al-kahf and of the Âsaf ibn Barhiyâ, and of the Prophet Hadrat Sulaimân's ('alaihi 's-salâm) vizier are revealed in the Qur'ân al-kerîm. **Karâmât** are the things that happen from the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna and which cannot be comprehended through reason or science. Because karâmât did not happen from those who were not Ahl as-Sunna, none of the seventy-two groups believed in karâmât.

“A mujtahid does not err while searching for and choosing one

of the âyats or hadîths as a document. But he may err while deducing rules from the document which he has found. Therefore, a mujtahid who has not erred will be given ten thawâbs and a mujtahid who has erred will be given one thawâb. Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) commanded Hadrat 'Amr ibn al-Âs: **'You yourself deduce rules! If you do not err you will get ten thawâbs; if you err you will get one,'** concerning matters whereon he could not find a nass. The one thawâb is not for his painstaking in ijtihâd but for his hittingness in finding the document. If he errs in finding the document, too, he will not be given any thawâb, but those who follow such ijtihâds will not be tormented. To Allâhu ta'âlâ, only one of various ijtihâds [on a particular matter] is right. Others are wrong. According to the scholars of the Mu'tazila, a mujtahid never makes a mistake, and what is right varies. Ijtihâd is detailed in **Mir'ât al-usûl**, a commentary on **Mirqât al-wusûl**, both by Molla Khusraw.

“It was declared in a hadîth sharîf that lies and slanders would increase after the third century [of Islam]. Bid'as and heresies will increase. Those who deviate from the path of the Salaf as-sâlihîn in faith and worship will increase in number. The 'ulamâ' of fiqh and the pilgrims (sâlikûn) on the way of tasawwuf, who cling to the Book and the Sunna, and the ijmâ' of the Salaf as-sâlihîn will be saved, others will suffer perdition. The 'ulamâ' of fiqh and experts in tasawwuf will exist until the end of the world. But it will not be known for certain who they are. However, those whom Muslims unanimously approve of will be known.

“It is fard 'ayn (commandment for every Muslim) to learn 'ilm al-hâl (books, teachings, of one madhhab). Allâhu ta'âlâ declares, **'Learn by asking those who know!'** So it is necessary for those who do not know to learn from the 'ulamâ' or their books. For this reason, it is declared in a hadîth sharîf, **'It is fard both for men and for women to learn knowledge.'** These commands show that it is necessary to learn the teachings that should be done with the body and with the heart from the books of 'ilm al-hâl and that we should not believe what the ignorant, lâ-madhabî men with religious post [especially religion reformers] say or write.

“As it has been declared by the 'ulamâ' of the right path unanimously, it is fard 'ayn for every Muslim to learn the belief of Ahl as-Sunna briefly and the fard and harâm actions thoroughly in their daily life and 'ibâdât. If they do not learn these from the books of 'ilm al-hâl, they become either heretics or disbelievers. It is fard kifâya (fard for at least one Muslim) to learn more than

these, e.g., the twelve preliminary branches of the Arabic language, tafsîr, hadîth, science, medicine and mathematics. If one person in a town performs the fard kifâya, it is not fard but mustahab for other inhabitants of the town. Keeping fiqh books in a town is like keeping Islamic scholars. It is not fard for anybody in such a town to learn tafsîr, hadîth and the more-than-necessary of fiqh, but it is mustahab. It is never fard for anybody to find out the documents of the rules or to study them, while it is always mustahab for scholars. Learning those branches of knowledge that are mustahab is more blessed than performing supererogatory (nâfila) 'ibâdât. When there exists no caliph, scholars undertake his duties. It is wâjib to obey those scholars who lead a life compatible with their knowledge."^[1]

45– It dates from the time of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm that the enemies of Islam have been deceiving Muslims by disguising themselves as men with religious duties in order to demolish Islam from within. These enemies of Islam, who have worked in the disguise of men with religious posts, have been called “**zindîqs**,” “**religion reformers**” or “**bigots of science**.” They have deceived the ignorant and led them out of Islam in every century, yet they have not been able to harm Islam itself, for there have been many scholars of fiqh and great men of tasawwuf in every century who have been warning Muslims with their lectures and articles to prevent them from being deceived. But now, the scholars of Islam having decreased in number, the enemies of Islam have found an opportunity. Appearing in the disguise of men with religious posts, they have been attacking Islam. To detect these insidious enemies, Muslims should know how a scholar of Islam should be. Hadrat Muhammad Ma'thûm al-Fârûqî as-Sirhindî 'rahmatullâhi 'alaih' described the scholars of Islam as follows:

“Do not make friends with a person who does not obey Islam or who has deviated into a heretical path! Keep away from those men with religious posts who commit bid'a! Hadrat Yahyâ ibn Ma'âdh ar-Râzî (quddisa sirruh) said, 'Hold yourself off from three sorts of people. Keep away from them.' These three sorts of people are the ghâfil (preoccupied with self, so forgetful of Allâhu ta'âlâ), and deviated men with religious posts; those qârîs (reciter of the Qur'ân al-kerîm by heart) who fawn on the rich; and those men of tasawwuf who do not know anything of Islam.

[1] 'Abd al-Ghânî an-Nabulusî, **Al-hadîqat an-nadiyya**, part I, chapter III.

If a person who has come forward with the title of a man of religious authority does not obey Rasûlullah's (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) sunna, that is, if he does not cling to Islam, we should keep away from him and should not buy or read his books. We should keep away even from the place where he is. Even a little credit given to him will ruin your fatih. He is not a man of authority on Islam, but an insidious enemy of Islam. He defiles your faith and îmân. He is more harmful than the Devil. His words may be sweet and persuasive and he may pretend to dislike this world, but you should still run away from him as you would run away from a fierce animal. Al-Junaid al-Baghdâdî (quddisa sirruh), a scholar of Islam, said, 'There is only one way that will lead one to endless bliss: to keep within the footsteps of Rasûlullâh (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam)'; 'Do not follow a man of religious post who does not read the books of tafsîr written by the 'ulamâ' of Ahl as-Sunna or who is not on the path shown in the hadîth ash-sherîf, for a scholar of Islam should be on the path shown in the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the hadîth ash-sherîf'; 'The Salaf as-sâlihîn were on the right path. They were devotees. They attained Allâhu ta'âlâ's love and approval. Their path was the path shown in the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the hadîth ash-sherîf. They held fast to this right path.'^[1]

"The great men of tasawwuf and the 'ulamâ' of fiqh were on the path of the Salaf as-sâlihîn. They all held fast to Islam. They were honoured with being Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) inheritors. Not a hair's breadth did they deviate from Islam in their words, actions and morals.

"I write again and again that you should not think of those who are slack in obeying Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) or who deviate from his lightsome path as authorities on religious matters! Do not believe their false words or ardent writings! Jews,

[1] As it is understood here, Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) path is the path of **Salaf as-Sâlihîn**, who were the group of those Muslims of the first two centuries of Islam which comprised as-Sahâbat al-kirâm and the distinguished ones among the Tâbi'ûn and Taba' at-Tâbi'ûn. The four **a'immat al-madhhâhib** were among these distinguished ones. Then, Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) path is the path explained in the fiqh books of the four madhhabs. Therefore, as declared unanimously by the 'ulamâ' of Ahl as-sunna, a person who turns away from the fiqh books of the four madhhabs will have deviated from Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) path. This unanimity is reported clearly in the annotation of the part "Zabâyah" of **Durr al-mukhtâr** by at-Tahtâwî.

Christians and those Indian disbelievers called Buddhists and Brahmins also have been using sweet and stirring words and sophisms to propagandize that they have been on the right path and that they have been inviting people to goodness and happiness. Abû 'Umar ibn Najîb said, 'Any knowledge which is not lived up to is more harmful than useful to its possessor.' The way leading to all kinds of happiness is Islam. The way to salvation is to keep within the footprints of Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam). Obeying him is the sign that distinguishes right from wrong. Any word, writing or deed which is not compatible with his religion is of no value. Khâriqa (prodigy; an extraordinary thing) happens out of staying hungry or riyâda, and it is not peculiar to Muslims only. 'Abdullah ibn Mubârak (rahmatullâhi 'alaih) said, 'He who is slack in doing the mustahab cannot do the sunna. Slackness in doing the sunna makes it difficult to do the fard. And he who is slack in doing the fard cannot attain to ma'rifa, Allâhu ta'âlâ's love.' It is for this reason that a hadîth sherîf declares, **'Committing sins leads one to disbelief.'** Hadrat Abû Sa'id Abu 'l-khair (d. 440/1049), one of the great Awliyâ', was asked, 'So and so walks on the surface of water. What would you say about that?' 'It is worthless. A duck can float on water, too,' he said. When asked, 'So and so flies in the air?' he said, 'A fly flies, too. He is as valuable as a fly.' When he was asked, 'So and so goes from one city to another instantaneously?' he said, 'The Devil also goes from the east to the west in a flash. Such things are worthless in our religion. A manly person lives among the people and goes shopping and gets married, yet he does not forget Allâhu ta'âlâ even for a moment.' Hadrat Abû 'Alî ar-Rodbârî (d. in Egypt in 321/933), one of the great Awliyâ' and a disciple of al-Junaid al-Baghdâdî, was asked, 'A man with religious duties who listens to musical instruments [or makes friends with na-mahrâm girls and women or allows his wife and daughters to go out without covering themselves as prescribed by Islam] and who says that his heart is pure and that the heart is important, what would you say about him?' 'His destination is Hell,' he said. Abû Sulaimân ad-Dârânî, who settled in a village called Darya of Damascus and died there in 205/820, said, 'First I compare my thoughts and intentions with the Book and the Sunna. I then say and do the ones which are compatible with these two just documents.' The hadîth ash-sherîf declares, **'The men of bid'a will go to Hell'; 'The Devil makes a person worship very much who has made up a bid'a and commits**

it. It makes him weep a lot,’ and ‘Allâhu ta’âlâ does not accept the fast, salât, hajj, ’umra, jihâd and fard or supererogatory worship of a person who commits bid’a. Such a person goes out of Islam easily.’^[1] Shaikh Ibn Abî Bakr Muhammad ibn Muhammad al-Andulusî, who lived in Egypt and died in 734/1334, said in his book **Ma’ârij al-hidâya**, ‘Get to know what is right and be right! Each action, thought, word and manner of a perfect person is in perfect accord with those of Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm), for all kinds of happiness can be attained by following him. To follow him means to hold fast to Islam.’

“How do we follow Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wa sallam)? Here I write its important aspects:

“You should repent (tawba) right after committing a sin. The repentance of a sin which is committed publicly should be done publicly, and the repentance of a sin which is committed secretly should be done secretly. Repentance should not be postponed. The kirâman katibîn angels do not record a sin immediately. It will never be written down if it is repented for. They will record it if one does not repent for it. Ja’far ibn Sinân (quddisa sirruh) said, ‘Not to repent for a sin is worse than committing a sin.’ And he who has not repented on the spot should do it before death. We should not neglect wara’ and taqwâ. **Taqwâ** is not to do what is clearly prohibited (harâm), and **wara’** is not to do doubtful things (**mushtabihât**). It is more useful to avoid the prohibited than doing the commanded (fard). Our superiours have said, ‘The bad as well as the good do favours. But it is only the siddîqs, the good, who avoid sins.’ Hadrat Ma’rûf al-Karkhî^[2] said, ‘Avoid very much looking at all women with the exception of the mahram ones! Do not look even at an ewe!’ A hadîth ash-sherîf declares, **‘It is the men of wara’ and zuhd who will attain to Allâhu ta’âlâ’s Presence on the Day of Resurrection’; ‘The salât of a man of wara’ is acceptable,’ and ‘It is an ’ibâda to be together with a man of wara’. Talking with him is as blessed as giving alms.’** Do not do

[1] These hadîths foretold about those men with religious posts who make reforms or alterations in the religion, for example, who use a radio or loudspeaker in the adhân or salât or who make known the time of salât with lights on minarets.

[2] He was the son of a Christian named Fîrûz. He was emancipated by imâm ’Alî Ridâ and became the master of Sirrî as-Saqatî, who became the master of al-Junaid al-Baghdâdî. He passed away in Baghdâd in 200 / 815.

anything which your heart shivers at! Do not follow your nafs! Consult your heart about the things which you suspect! A hadîth sherîf declares, **‘Any action which calms the nafs and relieves the heart is good. Any action which rouses the nafs and excites the heart is a sin.’** Again a hadîth sherîf declares, **‘Things that are halâl are evident. Harâm has been revealed, too. Avoid doubtful things. Do what you know to be doubtless!’** This hadîth sherîf shows that we should not do something which excites the heart and is doubtful. It is permissible to do something about which there is no doubt. Another hadîth sherîf declares, **‘The things which Allâhu ta’âlâ has made halâl in the Qur’ân al-kerîm are halâl. He will forgive what He has not declared in the Qur’ân al-kerîm.’** When we meet a doubtful affair, we should put our hand on our heart. If the heart does not palpitate, we should do it. If it palpitates, we should not do that thing. A hadîth sherîf declares, **‘Put your hand on your chest! The heart will be calm about something halâl. It will palpitate about something harâm. If you doubt about something, don’t do it! Don’t do it even if men with religious posts issue a fatwâ!’** A person who has îmân will refrain from venial sins in order to escape from committing grave sins.

We should deem all of our ’ibâdât and good deeds as defective. We should think that we have not been able to do Allâhu ta’âlâ’s commands properly. Abû Muhammad ’Abdullah ibn Manâzil^[1] (quddisa sirruh) said, ‘Allâhu ta’âlâ has commanded various kinds of ’ibâdât. He has commanded patience, devotion, salât, fast and istighfâr (begging Allâhu ta’âlâ for the forgiveness of one’s sins), which is done immediately before dawn. He has declared istighfâr last. Thus, it has become necessary for human beings to deem all their ’ibâdât and good deeds as defective and to ask for pardon and forgiveness.’ Ja’far ibn Sinân (quddisa sirruh) said, ‘Worshippers deeming themselves superior to sinners is worse than their sins.’ Once, Hadrat ’Alî Murta’ish (quddisa sirruh) gave up i’tikâf (retreat) and went out of the mosque after the twentieth of Ramadân. When asked why he had gone out, ‘Seeing that the qâris were reciting the Qur’ân al-kerîm melodiously and boasting about it, I could not stay inside any longer,’ he said.

“We should work in order to earn our household’s and our own livelihood in a halâl way. Trade and crafts are necessary for doing

[1] His master was Hamdûn al-Qassâr, who passed in Nishapur in 271/884.

this. The Salaf as-sâlihîn always worked and earned in this manner. There are many hadîths explaining the thawâb in earning in a halâl way. Hadrat Muhammad ibn Sâlim was asked: ‘Shall we work and earn, or shall we only worship and put our trust in Allâhu ta’âlâ?’ He said, ‘Tawakkul (trust in Allâhu ta’âlâ) was a hâl (quality) of Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wa sallam), and earning by working was his sunna. You shall work and put your trust in Allâhu ta’âlâ!’ Abû Muhammad Ibn Manâzil said, ‘It is more useful to work and put one’s trust in Allâhu ta’âlâ than to seclude one’s self for worshipping (’ibâda).’

“We should be temperate in eating. We should not eat so much as to slacken us. Nor should we diet so much as to prevent us from ’ibâdât. Hadrat Shâh an-Naqshaband (quddisa sirruh), one of the greatest Awliyâ’, said, ‘Eat well and work well!’ In short, everything which helps ’ibâdât and the doing of good is good and blessed. And those which diminish them are prohibited. We should check and be careful about our intention on anything good we do. If the intention is not good, we should not do it.

“We should avoid (’uzla) those who do not obey Islam and those who commit bid’as and sins. In other words, we should not be friends with such people. A hadîth sharîf declares, **‘Hikma is made up of ten parts of which nine make up ’uzla. And one is reticence.’** We should meet such people when necessary. We should spend our time in working, making dhikr, thinking and performing ’ibâdât. The time for merry-making is after death. We should be friends with pious, pure Muslims, be useful to them and make use of them. We should not waste our time with useless, unnecessary words. [We should not read harmful books or newspapers, listen to such radio or watch such television programs. Books, newspapers, radios and televisions of the enemies of Islam have been striving insidiously to annihilate Islam. They have been making plans to make the youth irreligious and immoral. We should not fall into their traps.]

“We should treat everybody with a cheerful face, no matter whether he is good or bad. [We should not arouse instigation (fitna). Nor should we make enemies. We should follow Hâfiz Shirâzî’s words, ‘Tell the friends the truth and handle the enemies with a cheerful face and a sweet language.’] We should forgive those who ask for forgiveness. We should show a good temper towards everybody. We should not oppose anybody’s words or dispute with anybody. We should never speak harshly but softly to everybody. Shaikh ’Abdullah Bayal (quddisa sirruh) said,

‘Tasawwuf does not mean salât, fast or ’ibâdât at nights. These are the duties of every person as a human slave. Tasawwuf means not to hurt anybody. He who manages this attains to the goal.’ Hadrat Muhammad ibn Sâlim was asked how to distinguish a Walî from other people. ‘He will be distinguished by his soft words, beautiful manners and plentiful favours, and he never disagrees when speaking with somebody and forgives those who ask forgiveness and pities everybody,’ he said. Abû ’Abdullah Ahmad al-Makkârî said, ‘Futuwwat means to do favours to a person by whom you have been offended, to give presents to a person whom you dislike, and to be cheerful towards a person by whom you are bored.’

“We should talk little, sleep little and laugh little. Laughing too much darkens the heart. We should work, but only from Allâhu ta’âlâ should we expect its recompense. We should take pleasure in doing His commands. If we trust only in Allâhu ta’âlâ, He will bestow on us whatever we wish for. A hadîth sherîf declares, **‘Allâhu ta’âlâ gives every wish of the person who trusts only in Him. He makes other people help him.’** Yahyâ ibn Ma’âdh ar-Râzî (d. in Nishapur in 258/872) said, ‘Others will love you as much as you love Allâhu ta’âlâ. Others will fear you as much as you fear Allâhu ta’âlâ. Others will give you help in proportion to the worship you do for Allâhu ta’âlâ.’ Do not run after your own advantages! Abû Muhammad ’Abdullah ar-Râsîbî (d. in Baghdad in 367/978) said, ‘The largest curtain between Allâhu ta’âlâ and man is man’s thinking of only himself and his trusting in another man who is incapable like himself. We should think of ingratiating ourselves not with men, but with Allâhu ta’âlâ.’

“We should behave with a sweet language and a cheerful face towards our wives and children. We should stay with them as much as to give them their due. We should not attach ourselves to them so much as to turn away from Allâhu ta’âlâ.

“We should not consult the ignorant and deviated men with religious posts about our religious matters. We should not stay together with those who are fond of this world. We should follow the Sunna in everything we do and should abstain from any bid’a. When we are happy we should not overflow the Islamic limits. Nor should we give up hope for Allâhu ta’âlâ’s help when we are in trouble. We should not forget that there is easiness alongside every difficulty. Our attitude should never change in happiness or in trouble, we should be in the same state in abundance and in scarcity. In fact, we should feel easy in scarcity and uneasy in

abundance. Change of events should not make change in us.

“Instead of looking for others’ faults, we should see our own faults. We should not deem ourselves superior to any other Muslim. We should hold every Muslim higher than ourselves. When we meet a Muslim, we should believe that our happiness may depend on the blessing he will invoke on us. We should be like servants with those whom we are obliged to. A hadîth sherîf declares, **‘A Muslim who does the following three deeds has perfect î mân: serving one’s household, sitting together with the poor [not with beggars!] and eating together with one’s servants.’** In the Qur’ân al-kerîm, these three things are declared to be the qualities of Believers. We should learn the manners of the Salaf as-sâlihîn and try to be like them. We should not speak ill of anybody in his absence. We should prevent a backbiter. [It is **ghîba** to talk behind a person’s back in a manner that would hurt him when he hears it and even if what you say is true. If it is a lie, it is **iftirâ** (slander). Both are grave sins.] We should form it a habit to perform al-amru bi ’l-ma’rûf wa ’n-mahyu ’ani ’l-munkar.^[1] Muhammad ibn Alyan’a was asked how to understand if Allâhu ta’âlâ likes you. He said, ‘It is understood when tâ’a comes sweet and committing sins comes bitter to you.’ We should not be stingy with the fear of becoming poor. The Devil deceives man by saying that he may become poor and by tempting him to fornication. A hadîth sherîf declares, **‘A person who has a crowded household but little food and who performs his salât well and who does not backbite Muslims will be with me on the Day of Resurrection.’**”^[2]

A Muslim who possesses the qualities of goodness written above is called a man of religious authority. We should realize that a person who does not own such qualities, and who even dislikes, belittles those who possess them, is not a man of religious authority, but an enemy of Islam, and we should not believe his words or writings.

46– What does **bid’a** mean? In the 54th, 165th, 186th, 255th, 260th and 313th letters of the first volume of the book **Maktûbât**, al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî Ahmad al-Fârûqî ‘rahmatullâhi ’alaih’ elaborated on what bid’a is and on the harms of committing bid’as.

[1] Duty to teach others what Allâhu ta’âlâ’s commands are and to prevent, to disapprove somebody’s committing His prohibitions.

[2] Muhammad Ma’thûm al-Fârûqî as-Sirhindî, **Maktûbât**, vol. II, 110th letter.

We have translated all of the 313 letters in its first volume from Persian into Turkish, and partly into English, and published them in Istanbul in 1387 (1968). Also, there is detailed information on bid'as in the first part of the Arabic book **Hadîqat an-nadiyya** by 'Abd al-Ghanî an-Nabulûsî. And this part also was published by offset in Istanbul in 1399 (1979). In the following, a translation of a part of his writings on bid'a is presented:

Bid'a means belief, deed or word that is incompatible with the Sunna [that is, the religious teachings of Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm)]. Allâhu ta'âlâ created His slaves so that they should worship Him. 'Ibâda (worship) means humiliation and degradation. In other words, it is man's offering his humiliation and incapability to his Rabb (Creator). And this, in its turn, means to disregard the beauty or ugliness dictated by mind, by the nafs and by customs, so as to submit oneself to the Creator's description of what is beautiful and what is ugly, and to believe and obey the Book and the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) sent by the Creator. If a person does some action by his own choice without considering that his Creator has permitted it, he has not offered servility to Him and has not fulfilled the requirements for being Muslim. If that action pertains to belief and is one of the facts which have been unanimously declared to be believed, this belief of his is a **bid'a that causes kufr** (disbelief). If that action pertains not to belief but to words and actions related to the religion, it is *fişq*, a grave sin. It is declared in a hadîth sherîf, **"If a person invents something nonexistent in the religion, it is to be rejected."** This hadîth sherîf shows that if some belief, word, action or behavior that does not exist in Islam is introduced and believed to belong to the religion or to be an 'ibâda, or if some addition or deletion is done in what is communicated by Islam and if it is expected that doing so will cause *thawâb*, such an innovation or change is a **bid'a**, in which case Islam will have been disobeyed and flouted. Those novelties which are done not in Islam but in customs, that is, those for which *thawâb* is not expected, are not *bida'* (pl. of *bid'a*). For example, our religion does not reject the innovations and alterations done in eating, drinking, travelling and transportation or housing. [Therefore, eating at a table or from separate dishes; using spoons or forks; travelling by automobiles and aeroplanes; using any kind of building, house or kitchen utensils; and all sorts of technological knowledge, tools or works are not considered as *bida'* in Islam. It is permitted, even a *fard kifâya*, to make and use them in beneficial fields. For example, it is

permissible to produce radios, loud-speakers or electronic machines and to use them outside 'ibâdât. The use of loud-speakers in worldly affairs is permitted, but the recitation of the adhân, al-Qur'ân al-kerîm or mawlîd through it is an alteration in 'ibâda, and a bid'a. In order for the adhân to be heard from distant places, it should not be called through a loud-speaker, but we should build mosques in every district, and every muezzin should call it separately at each mosque.]

One day, Anas ibn Mâlik (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) was asked why he wept. He said, "Of the 'ibâdât I had learned from Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm), only salât remained unchanged. And now I weep because I see that it has been changed, too." He meant that he wept because most of the people of his time did not carry out the requirements, wâjibs, sunnas, mustahabs of salât and did not avoid its makrûhs, mufsids and bid'as. Those were the people who could not realize the greatness of prophets, of Awliyâ', or of the pious and devoted Muslims. Leaving their path, they changed 'ibâdât according to their personal opinions and nafses. Abandoning the way to felicity, they relapsed into perdition. The reason for his weeping was that they changed salât by putting some additions and deletions in it. Thus they changed the Sunna, [that is, Islam]. And it is bid'a to change the Sunna.

It is declared in a hadîth sherîf, **"If an umma produces a bid'a in the religion after the death of their prophet, they will lose a sunna identical with it."** In other words, if they make up a bid'a that does not cause disbelief, they will lose a sunna of the same category.

It is declared in a hadîth sherîf, **"Unless a holder of bid'a gives up his bid'a, Allâhu ta'âlâ will not give them the chance to repent."** That is, if a person produces a bid'a or commits a bid'a produced by someone else, he cannot repent for it because he considers the bid'a to be good and expects thawâb for it. And, because of the evil of that bid'a, which may even cause disbelief, he will not get the chance to repent for any of his sins.

It is declared in a hadîth sharîf, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ will never accept any [good] deed of a person who commits something which is a bid'a in the religion, unless he ceases from that bid'a for Allâhu ta'âlâ's sake."** In other words, if a person keeps doing something which is a bid'a in belief, deeds, words or morals, He shall not accept any of his 'ibâdât of the same kind even if they are sahîh. In order for his 'ibâdât to be accepted, he has to cease from that bid'a by fearing Allâhu ta'âlâ, expecting thawâb from

Him or for gaining His approval.

It is declared in a hadîth sherîf, **“Allâhu ta’âlâ will not accept the fast, hajj, ‘umra, jihâd, abstention from sinning and justice of a holder of bid’a. He will go out of Islam easily.”** That is, his ‘ibâdât will not be accepted even if they are sahîh; he will not be given thawâb. For, he keeps on committing a bid’a that does not cause disbelief. The worship of a holder of a bid’a causing disbelief are not sahîh in any case. None of his obligatory or supererogatory acts of worship will be accepted. Because bid’a is committed by following the nafs and Satan, its holder goes out of Islam, out of the submission to the commandments of Allâhu ta’âlâ. Îmân is a function of the heart. [The five principles of] Islâm are the function of the heart and language together. Îmân is proper to the heart. But Islâm comprises all: the heart, language and body. Îmân in the heart and Islâm in the heart are identical with each other. What forsakes the holder of bid’a is the Islâm in the language and body. One who goes on committing a bid’a has become a person who obeys the nafs and Satan. One who commits sins becomes disobedient and sinful. He is not called a holder of bid’a. But a man of bid’a is disobedient and sinful and supposes his bid’a to be an ‘ibâda and expects thawâb for it. Sinning outside ‘ibâdât does not prevent the ‘ibâdât from being approval.

It is declared in a hadîth sherîf, **“After me there will be differences among my umma. Those who live in that time must hold fast to my sunna and to the sunna of the Khulafâ’ Ar-râshidîn! They must shun the innovations in the religion! Every innovation in the religion is a bid’a. All bid’as are heresy. The destination of heretics is the fire of Hell.”** This hadîth sherîf pointed out that there would be various differences among this umma; it says that, of them, we must cling to the one which follows the path of Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ‘alaihi wa sallam) and his four caliphs. Sunna means his utterances, all ‘ibâdât, beliefs and morals, and [the things approved by] his keeping quiet when he saw them being done.

It is declared in a hadîth sherîf, **“When corruption is spread among my umma, the one who clings to my sunna will be given the thawâb of a hundred martyrs!”** That is, when people go beyond the limits of Islam by following the nafs, bid’as and their own intellect, a person who follows his sunna is given the thawâb of a hundred martyrs one the Day of Rising. For, during the time of disunion and corruption, following Islam will be as difficult as

fighting against disbelievers.

It is declared in a hadîth sherîf, **“Islam began lonely (gharîb). It will be lonely in its final times, too. Glad tidings be to those lonely people! They will amend my sunnat defiled by people.”** That is, as most people in the beginning of Islam did not know Islam and found it odd, so in the latest time those who know Islam will be few. They will restore his sunna, which will be defiled after him. To this end they will perform al-amru bi 'l-ma'rûf wa 'n-nahyi 'ani 'l-munkar. They will be examples for others in following the Sunna, that is, Islam. They will write the teachings of Islam correctly, and will try to disseminate their books. Few people will listen to them, and they will have a lot of adversaries. During that time, the man with a religious post with many sympathisers will be the person who mixes sweet but false words with the truth. For, a person who tells the naked truth will have many adversaries.

It is declared in a hadîth sherîf, **“Banû Isrâ'îl (Sons of Israel) parted into seventy-two groups. My umma will part into seventy-three groups. Seventy-two of them will burn in the fire, and only one will be safe. They are those who follow me and my Sahâba.”** In other words, The Sons of Israel parted into seventy-two groups in religion matters. And Muslims will part into seventy-three groups. That is, they will part into many groups. None of them will be disbelievers, but they will burn in Hell for a long time. Solely the group that will hold the same belief and perform the same 'ibâdât as he and his Sahâba did will not enter Hell. If those scholars of Islam who do ijtihâd in the teachings of the beliefs of Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) and as-Sahâbat al-kirâm err from a belief which is religiously indispensable and unanimously known, they become disbelievers. They are called **mulhids**.^[1] If they err from a belief which is not communicated by consensus and which is not indispensable, they become not disbelievers but holders of bid'a in belief. They, too, are called **Ahl al-qibla** (Muslims). Also, while employing ijtihâd in the teachings of deeds and 'ibâdât, those who disbelieve those 'ibâdât that are unanimously known to be indispensable become disbelievers or mulhids. But those scholars who err from those 'ibâdât that are neither indispensable nor unanimously communicated earn thawâb if they are mujtahids. They become **lâ-madhhabî** if they are not mujtahids. For, it is not permissible for

[1] It is written in **Bahr** and **Hindiyya** that they are polytheists.

a non-mujtahid to do ijtihād; he has to follow the madhhab of a mujtahid. It is declared in a hadîth sherîf, “**One who says, ‘Lâ ilâha ill-Allâh’, should not be called a kâfir on account of his sinning! He who calls him a kâfir will become a kâfir himself.**” A person who will not enter Hell because of his correct belief may enter Hell because of the sins he commits. If he is sâlih (true, pious, devoted), that is, if he repents for his sins or attains forgiveness or shafâ’a, he will never enter Hell. Because a person who denies a belief or a deed which has been communicated unanimously and is indispensable, that is, known even by the ignorant, will become a disbeliever or a renegade, he is not called a believer in “Lâ ilâha ill-Allah” or a man of the qibla or a holder of bid’a, even if he says “Lâ ilâha ill-Allah,” does all kinds of ’ibâdât and avoids all kinds of sins.

Question: “Our Prophet (sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wa sallam) declared, ‘**All bid’as are heresy.**’ But the scholars of fiqh said that some bid’as were mubâh (permitted), some were mustahab and some were wâjib. How can these two statements be reconciled?”

Answer: The word ‘bid’a’ has two meanings. The first is its lexical meaning, which is general. In this sense, any kind of innovation, whether in customs or in ’ibâdât is called bid’a. Customs are actions for which thawâb is not expected and which are done for worldly advantages. But ’ibâdât are done for gaining thawâb in the hereafter. Lexically, bid’a means all kinds of innovations introduced after **as-sadr al-awwal**, which covers the times of the Salaf as-sâlihîn, that is, the Sahâbat al-kirâm, the Tâbi’în, and the Taba’ at-Tâbi’în. Things introduced in their times are not bid’as. Bid’as are the innovations introduced after the Tâbi’în and the Taba’ at-Tâbi’în.

The second meaning of the word ‘bid’a’ is the innovations in the religion that are introduced after as-sadr al-awwal. These changes are either in belief or in ’ibâdât. To invent a new ’ibâda or to put some addition or deletion in an ’ibâda is a **bid’a in ’ibâdât**. Of such bid’as, those that were introduced without a verbal or practical, overt or denotative permission from the “owner of the religion,” that is, from Muhammad (’alaihi ’s-salâm), are called **bid’at sayyi’a**. None of the bid’as in customs are called bid’at sayyi’a since they are done not for worshipping but for worldly advantages. Innovations done in eatings, drinking, dressing and habitation are bid’as in customs. All bid’as done in belief are **bid’at sayyi’a**. The beliefs of the seventy-two heretical groups are bid’at sayyi’a. The innovations done by the four

madhhabs in 'ibâdât are not bid'ats since they were derived not out of reasoning but from the **adillat ash-Shari'iyya**. They are not additions to the Nass but are the explanations of the Nass. If saying the takbîr iftitâh several times when beginning the salât is intended for extra thawâb, it is a bid'a. If it is done inadvertently because of scruples, it is a sin. If the bid'as made in 'ibâdât were overtly or denotatively permitted by the owner of the religion, they are called **bid'at hasana**, which are mustahab or wâjib. It is mustahab to build minarets for mosques. It is thawâb to build them, and it is not sinful not to build them. A minaret is also called **ma'dhana**. Zaid ibn Thâbit's mother (radiy-Allâhu 'anhâ) said, "The highest house around Masjid an-Nabî in Medina was mine. Formerly, Hadrat Bilâl al-Habashî (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) used to call the adhân by mounting the roof of my house. After Rasûlullah's (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) masjid was built, he called it by mounting the high place built in the masjid." This shows that it is sunna for muadhdhins (muezzin) to call the adhân by mounting the minaret. [It is a dismal fact that the bid'a of calling the adhân through loud-speakers has been annihilating this sunna.] Building religious schools and writing religious books are bid'as that are wâjib. It is thawâb to do and sinful not to do them. So is the case with producing warning proofs against the doubts of the holders of bid'a and mulhids, that is, holders of those bid'as that are disbelief.

All the bid'as stated in the hadîths written above are bida' sayyi'a which were introduced into Islam. They are not useful to 'ibâdât. Bida' hasana, which are helpful in 'ibâdât and which are done with the permission of the owner of the religion are not heresies. The hadîth ash-sherîf, "**Hold fast to my sunna and to the sunna of the Khulafâ' Ar-râshidîn,**" means "Give up the changes which you will make in Islam following your intellect and nafses and hold fast to my path," and shows that bid'as in customs are not heretical. For, Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) path covers religious teachings. He did not say anything pertaining to customs. He came to inform men of their faith. He was not sent to tell them about their worldly affairs. For, men knew their worldly affairs well, while they could not guess what Allâhu ta'âlâ's will and commands were.

Today, the word 'bid'a' comes to mean the bid'as in belief. Holders of such heretical beliefs are called **mubtadi'** and **ahl al-hawâ**. For, they follow not Islam but their nafses. The seventy-two heretical sects are in this group. The beliefs of some of them cause

disbelief. Those who do not believe in the rising after death, deny the Attributes of Allâhu ta'âlâ, or say that classes of beings are eternal are in this group, too. Such beliefs, which cause disbelief, are called **ilhâd**. Those who hold such beliefs are called **mulhids**. A belief does not cause disbelief if the person who holds it derived it by interpreting wrongly one of the âyats and hadîths whose meanings were inexplicit and dubious and, therefore, had to be explained away (ta'wîl) by choosing the most proper meaning among numerous meanings. Those who do not believe in the torment in the grave or who do not believe in the Mi'râj are so. But these bid'as, which do not cause disbelief, are more sinful than the gravest felonies, such as killing a Believer unjustly and committing fornication. They do not become disbelievers because they derive their wrong beliefs by supposition from the Qur'ân al-kerîm and from the hadîth ash-sherîf. Today, many people disbelieve these facts not out of wrong ta'wîl but saying that they are not conformable to reason and science. Such disbelievers who base their beliefs not on Islam but on reason and science become renegades. Mulhids whose beliefs cause disbelief think of themselves as Muslims, perform 'ibâdât and avoid sins, but none of these deeds are valid.

Bida' sayyi'a in 'ibâdât are not so bad as the bid'as in beliefs, but they, too, are unaccepted and heretical. It is necessary to avoid them more than avoiding any kind of wrongdoing. Especially, if a bid'a in an 'ibâda causes neglecting a sunnat muakkada, the bid'a becomes even more sinful.

The belief which is the opposite of the bid'a in belief is called **Ahl as-Sunnat wa 'l-Jamâ'a**. The opposite of the bid'a in 'ibâdât is called **Sunnat al-hudâ**. The former represents the belief of Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam), and the latter are the 'ibâdât which he continuously did but sometimes omitted and which he did not prohibit others from omitting. Those which he prohibited to omit are called **wâjib**. It is not sinful to omit a sunnat hudâ without any excuse. He who omits them continuously will be reproached on the Day of Resurrection. Examples of them are the adhân, the iqâma, performing salât in jamâ'a and the sunnas of the five daily prayers of salât. However, if all the inhabitants of a location omit them, they are to be fought against.

It is not heresy to do bid'as in customs. It is wara' and better not to do them. Building houses higher than necessary, eating until being fully satiated, drinking coffee and tea, and smoking are

bid'as in customs. We cannot say that these are harâm or makrûh. A sultan's commands and prohibitions compatible with Allâhu ta'âlâ's commands and prohibitions are valid. Obeying the orders which he gives following his nafs and intellect are not wâjib, yet it is not permissible to revolt against them. Moreover, it is wâjib to obey a cruel sultan in order to be safe from his injustice and oppression. For, it is not permissible for one to put oneself in jeopardy. **Ulu 'l-amr**, whom the âyat commands Muslims to obey, means the sultan, ruler or judge who is a Muslim. It is wâjib to obey their right and equitable commands. The opposite of the bid'as in customs is the **sunnat az-zâ'ida** which comprises Rasûlullah's (sall-Allâhu alahi wa sallam) habitual actions. Examples of this are the mustahabs such as the styles of his clothes, beginning with his right side when putting on his clothes and dressing up, eating, drinking, giving and taking something with his right hand, cleaning himself with his left hand after relieving himself, and entering the toilet the left foot first. [As it is seen, changes that take place in men's and women's clothing in the process of time, their wearing clothes like those of sinners, are bid'as in customs. Women's dresses large enough to cover the whole body other than their hands and faces are not bid'as in the religion. Nor are they sinful. In using such coverings they must follow the customs in their country. Using coverings and dresses that are not customary will cause repute and fitna, both of which are harâm.]

As it will be understood from what has been told so far, bid'a generally, in its lexical sense, are of two kinds: bid'a in customs and bid'a in the religion. When the word 'bid'a' is used alone, bid'a in the religion is meant. And bid'as in the religion pertain to belief and 'ibâdât. All of those pertaining to belief are sayyi'a. And there are two kinds of bid'a in the 'ibâdât: sayyi'a and hasana. Bida' sayia are those bid'as which are in belief but do not cause disbelief and those which are in 'ibâdât and do not serve Islam. If a bid'a in belief causes disbelief it becomes ilhâd. Bida' hasana are the innovations which serve Islam. They also are of two kinds: mustahab and wâjib. The minaret is a bid'a hasana which is mustahab. For, it is sunna for the muadhdhin to call the adhân by mounting a high place. The minaret serves this sunna. [It is not sunna to call the adhân with a voice louder than a man's natural voice. It is makrûh. Therefore, calling the adhân through an electrical apparatus called a loudspeaker serves not the sunna, but the makrûh. For this reason, using a loudspeaker is a bid'a

sayyi'a and prevents the sunna of calling the adhân by mounting the minaret. It is not commanded to make the call of the adhân reach everywhere. It is commanded to raise the voice as loud as to be heard in the quarter. It is commanded that Muslims should build a mosque at every quarter and that the muadhhdhin in every mosque should mount a high place and call the adhân separately. It is a bid'a sayyi'a, an ugly bid'a, for muadhhdhins to call the adhân through loudspeakers so that the adhân called at one place may be heard in every quarter or to call it at one place and use loudspeakers installed in all the mosques. Allâhu ta'âlâ declared, "The religion has been perfected. It has been explained how 'ibâdât are to be done. Nothing is left incomplete." And the Salaf as-sâlihîn called the adhân and performed salât the same as commanded for a thousand years. It would be an ugly bid'a to dislike, or to find incomplete and unsatisfactory, what they did and to attempt to call the adhân through loudspeakers or to perform salât with loudspeakers. The hadîths above state that none of the 'ibâdât of those who commit ugly bid'as will be accepted, and that they will go to Hell. By ignoring Islam's command to build a mosque at every quarter, to try to defend the bid'a of calling the adhân through loudspeakers under the pretext that otherwise it is not heard everywhere means to try to wash away faeces with urine. Yes, when washed off with urine, the faeces will disappear, and the ignorant will like it. But the case is that faeces spreads everywhere, and urine fouls the places it touches.] The innovations that are bida' hasana are permitted, and even commanded, by the Shâri', the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm).

Question: "Why did the Sahâbat al-kirâm, the Tabi'în and Taba' at-tâbi'în not do the bida' hasana that are mustahab and wâjib?"

Answer: They did not need some of them. For example, they did not build schools, nor did they need to write books. For, there were many scholars and mujtahids. It was easy for everybody to ask and learn. Further, they did not have enough money or property to make huge buildings or minarets. But the most important reason was that they did more important duties, which left them no time to do them. Day and night they fought against disbelievers, against those states and dictators who impeded Islam's promulgation. They spent all their money and property for those jihâds. Conquering countries and cities, they rescued millions of people from the talons of cruel states and, converting

them to Islam, caused them to attain to felicity in this world and the next. They conveyed Islam's order and morals to Allâhu ta'âlâ's slaves. They did not have time to do other things.

Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam) stated, **“If a person makes a sunnat hasana in Islam, he attains its thawâb plus the thawâb of those who will practise it. If a person introduces a sunnat sayyi'a in Islam, he is given its punishment plus the punishment of those who will practise it.”** All the bida' hasana are included in the sunnat hasana stated in this hadîth sherîf. His deserving the rewards or punishments of all the people who will practise a newly introduced sunna till the end of the world depends on his intending for others also to do it. Likewise, if the imâm of the jamâ'a does not intend to be the imâm for the jamâ'a, he only gets the thawâb of performing salât alone — not the twenty-seven times as much as this. For getting the total thawâb of the jamâ'a, he has to intend to be the imâm.

The harm of committing a bid'at sayyi'a is worse than the harm of omitting a sunna and even wâjib. In other words, if it is dubious whether something is sunna or bid'a, it should not be done.

Question: “The religion has been perfected with the Book and the Sunna. 'Ibâdât not permitted by these two are bida'. Now, is it proper to say that the adillat ash-Shar'iyya are four?”

Answer: The scholars of Ahl as-Sunna said that the adillat ash-Shar'iyya are four: the Book, the Sunna, qiyâs al-fuqahâ' and ijma' al-Umma. Yet the last two originate from the first two. Therefore, in actuality, they are two: the Book and the Sunna. A rule which is put by ijma', that is, by consensus, has to be based upon a proof, a document from the Book or the Sunna. Also qiyâs can be a proof for ijma'. An example of this is the ijma' which was applied for electing Abû Bakr as-Siddîq (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) the caliph. A hadîth sherîf reported by one person can be a proof, too. For, the documentation by ijma' does not need its proof to be certain. It is a document because it is the ijma'. If it were a condition for its proof to be certain, the ijma' would be unnecessary; the proof would be the document. For qiyâs also, a proof, a principle from the Book or the Sunna is necessary. For, qiyâs discloses a hidden, concealed rule existing in the Book and the Sunna. It does not add a rule to them. That is, it does not invent but reveals rules. It explains a general rule for furû' (the branch of science not only to be believed but also to be practised). And ijma' can be a support, a source for qiyâs. The Sunna is the

interpretation and explanation of the Book. Then, the only source of Islam is the Book of Allâhu ta'âlâ.

Today some tekke shaikhs and false, mendacious men of tasawwuf, when they are blamed for their behaviour incompatible with Islam, say, "These are harâm in zâhir (exterior, apparent) knowledge. We have bâtin (hidden) knowledge. So they are halâl for us." It is disbelief to say so. A person who says so or who approves such statements becomes a disbeliever. Explaining them away (ta'wîl) or saying them without knowing their meanings is not excusable. These zindîqs say, "You acquire knowledge from books. But we acquire it from its owner, that is, directly from Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm). In case we are not satisfied with it, we ask and learn from Allah. We do not need to read books or to learn from a master. To attain to Allah it is necessary to give up the exterior knowledge and not to learn Islam. If our way had been wrong, would we have attained to such high states and karâmât or have been seeing nûrs (spiritual lights) and prophets' souls? When we do something sinful we are informed of it in our dreams. In our dream, Allâhu ta'âlâ gives us permission to do something which you term harâm, and we know that it is halâl for us." Such words, which aim to sabotage Islam, are ilhâd. That is, they mean to change the overt meanings in the Book and the Sunna. They are dalâla, that is, deviation from the path of Believers. They mean to make fun of Islam. Such depraved words should not be believed. It is disbelief even to doubt that they are wrong. He who says or believes so is called a **zindîq**. You should not call a person a zindîq as soon as you hear from someone else that he says so. You cannot reach this conclusion unless it is understood canonically by the testimony of two just witnesses. Zindîq means dahrî, one who worships matter and nature and does not believe in Allâhu ta'âlâ and in the next world.

Islamic rules cannot be learned by way of ilhâm. The ilhâm (inspiration) given to the Awliyâ' cannot be a proof, a document for others. **Ilhâm** means knowledge coming to the heart from Allâhu ta'âlâ. Yes, the ilhâms of the Awliyâ' are true. Their truth is judged by their compatibility with the teachings of Islam. But being a Walî requires learning and obeying the teachings of Islam. The âyat, "**Allâhu ta'âlâ bestows knowledge upon the people of taqwâ,**" proves this. Ilhâms do not come to the heart of a person who does not adhere to the Sunna or avoid the bid'as. His utterances are heretical things that come from the nafs and Satan. These statements of ours cannot be said to be in contradiction with

the conversation between Mûsâ and Khidir (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm), for the latter was not of the former’s umma. He was not commanded to follow him. Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm), however, is the Prophet of all people and genies all over the world that will come till the end of the world. **Al-‘ilm al-ladunnî** and **ilhâm** are bestowed upon those who adapt themselves to Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm). Those who are endowed with this blessing understand the Book and the Sunna well. Islamic teachings cannot be understood by dreams, either. A dream incompatible with Islam is to be judged as Satanic.

Al-Junaid al-Baghdâdî (d. in Baghdad, 298/910), one of the greatest Awliyâ’, said, “The only way to lead man to Allâhu ta’âlâ’s approval is to follow Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm).” Again, he said, “A person who does not obey the Qur’ân al-kerîm or the hadîth ash-sherîf cannot be a guide.” [Non-mujtahids cannot understand the Qur’ân al-kerîm or the hadîth ash-sherîf. Those scholars who founded the seventy-two heretical groups misunderstood them because they were non-mujtahids. They misled millions of Muslims. To obey the Qur’ân al-kerîm and the hadîth ash-sherîf, following one of the four madhhabs is necessary.] Yes, an illiterate person who has not read or learned anything may become an ‘arif and be able to understand the meaning of the Qur’ân al-kerîm, but he cannot be a guide for others. To be a guide, it is necessary to learn the rules in the Book and the Sunna from a master [or from the books of fiqh in one of the four madhhabs], for the way of the Salaf as-sâlihîn and their successors is the way of the Book and the Sunna.

Sirrî as-Saqatî (d. in Baghdad, 251/865), one of the greatest Awliyâ’, a disciple of Ma’rûf al-Karkhî and the maternal uncle and master of al-Junaid al-Baghdâdî, said, “Tasawwuf comprises three meanings: To be a possessor of wara’; not to utter any words incompatible with the Book and the Sunna; and not to commit harâms while having karâmât.”^[1] **Wara’** means abstention also from doubtful actions. Al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî (d. in Tûs/Meshed, Iran, 505/1111) wrote in his book **Mishkât al-anwâr**, “The heart is a house for angels. Such bad habits as wrath, lust, jealousy and arrogance are like howling dogs. Angels do not enter a place where there are dogs. It is declared in a hadîth sherîf, ‘**Angels do not enter a house where there are dogs or pictures.**’ I do not say

[1] A karâma that causes one to commit a harâm is called “makr” or “istidrâj.”

that the word ‘house’ in this hadīth sherīf means ‘heart’ or that the word ‘dog’ means ‘bad habit.’ I believe in their apparent meanings and also add the meanings above. These words of mine separate Ahl as-Sunnat wa ‘l-Jamā’a from the group of bid’a called Bâtiniyya. Bâtinīs ignore the apparent meanings and invent heretical meanings. If the apparent meaning of an âyat contradicts the apparent meanings of other âyats, then its apparent meaning must be given up, and it must be explained away (ta’wīl), that is, the most appropriate of its meanings must be given to it. Those who insist on giving apparent meanings when ta’wīl is necessary are called **Hishwī**. For this reason, it has been said that the Qur’ân al-kerīm has apparent and hidden meanings. Those who always give apparent meanings become Hishwī. Those who always give unusual meanings become Bâtinī. Those who give both meanings as the case requires become perfect Muslims.” Only an expert in the bâtin (hidden) and zâhir (exterior) branches of knowledge can understand whether or not a statement of a man of tasawwuf is compatible with Islam. Those who do not know the meanings of the words used by the scholars of tasawwuf cannot understand it. Such people [like Ibn Taimiyya and Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhâb], who are far from being perfect, suppose that Bâyezîd al-Bistâmī’s statement, “Subhânî mâ a’zama shânî,” is incompatible with Islam. Muhyidīn ibn al-‘Arabî explained in detail that the meaning of that statement was kamâl-i tanzīh. A person who disobeys Islam may perform wonders. These are called not “karâmât” but “**istidrâj**.” Bâyezîd al-Bistâmī saw a person who was known as a Walî spit toward the qibla and said, “This man has ignored one of the good manners of Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ‘alaihi wa sallam). [So] he cannot be a Walî.”

Bâyezîd al-Bistâmī said, “Even if a person displays karâmât, such as walking on water, going to distant places in a moment and flying in the air, do not consider him to be a Walî unless he obeys Islam!” For obeying Islam, it is necessary to follow one of the four madhhabs. It has been declared by consensus that it is not permissible for non-mujtahids to follow as-Sahâbat al-kirâm. [Because, their madhhabs are not known.] Ijtihâd will be employable till the end of the world. [However, few scholars fulfil the conditions for being able to employ ijtihâd. Further, there is no need for them to employ new ijtihâds. A solution for every matter that will arise till the end of the world exists in one of the four madhhabs.] The ‘ibâda Allâhu ta’âlâ likes best is to do the fard. The valuable ones of the suppererogatory ‘ibâdât are those that

are done alongside the fards, which exist in them and which supplement them.

Muhammad ibn Fadl al-Balkhî (d. 319/931) said, “Four factors cause the nûrs (spiritual lights) of Islam to leave hearts and hearts to darken: not to practise one’s knowledge; to practise without knowing; not to learn what one does not know; to impede others’ learning.” Some people learn in order to be known as men of knowledge and to obtain property and posts. [They use being men with religious posts as a means for living and for politics.] They do not learn for practising. They are men of religion in name. The way they follow is the way of the ignorant. Saying that Allâhu ta’âlâ is compassionate and likes to forgive, they commit grave sins. They act according to their personal reason and wishes. They want others to do so, too. They blame true Muslims for not following them. Moreover, they suppose they are on the right path and will attain to salvation. They do not read the true books compiled from books written by scholars of Ahl as-Sunna, and do not let their children read them, either. Their hearts are evil and their words are deceitful and false. Every day they masquerade in a different appearance. They show a smiling face towards people, but slander them behind their back. They prevent correct books which have not been interpolated with bid’as from being read. [They say, “Do not read these books. They are harmful.”] They intimidate those who publish and read them. With deceitful advertisements they praise the harmful books of the lâ-madhabî. They insult the teachings of Islam. What they write with their short sights are presented to the younger generation under the name of knowledge and science. As it is understood from what has been written so far, all Islamic scholars and men of tasawwuf adhered to Islam, which consequently brought them up to higher grades. It must be realised that those who speak ill of them are ignorant in Islam. We should not believe the false words of such ignorant people. They are thieves of the faith. They are the lâ-madhabî or zindîqs who block the way to felicity.

A person who says that he does not believe in the torment in the grave becomes a disbeliever, for his statement expresses not a report or ta’wîl or Islam but his disrespect for Islam.

Those who belong to the group of Qadariyya, alias Mu’tazila, become disbelievers because they say, “Allah does not create evils or sins. Man creates his own deed.”

Those who belong to the group of Bâtiniyya become disbelievers because they believe in the reincarnation of souls and

say that man comes back to the world after death, that Allah's soul has entered the Twelve Imâms, that it is unnecessary to obey Islam until the Twelve Imâms are reincarnated and that Jabrâ'il ('alaihi 's-salâm) had been commanded to bring the wahî to 'Alî (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), but made a mistake and brought it to Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm).

Those Khârijîs who call all Muslims "disbelievers" without depending on a ta'wîl or who accuse 'Alî, 'Uthmân, Talhâ, Zubair and 'Â'isha (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum) of disbelief become disbelievers.

Adherents of the Yazîdiyya group become disbelievers because they say that a Persian prophet will come and abrogate the religion of Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm).

Those who are in the Najâriyya and Mu'tazila groups become disbelievers because they do not believe in the attributes of Allâhu ta'âlâ.

The Jabriyya become disbelievers because they say that man cannot do anything, that Allah creates everything whether man requests it or not and that for this reason those who commit sins are excusable.

Some among the Mu'tazila group becomes disbelievers because they say that Allah does not see anything and will not be seen in Paradise.

The Qadariyya become disbelievers because they deny the attribute of Knowledge [of Allâhu ta'âlâ] and say that Allah does not know anything.

Of the Murji'a group, those who say that Allah will forgive some disbelievers as He wills and torment eternally some believers as He wills, those who say that their 'ibâdât will certainly be accepted and sins will certainly be pardoned, and those who say that all the fard are supererogatory 'ibâdât, and it is not sinful not to do them become disbelievers.

Khârijîs fall into a group of bid'a because they say that deeds and 'ibâdât are included in îmân, and a person who omits any fard becomes a disbeliever or that a person who commits a grave sin loses his îmân, and his îmân comes back when his sinning is over.

Masah on bare feet instead of masah on mests is not disbelief but a bid'a. The salât performed behind an imâm who has done masah on his bare feet [when performing an ablution] is not sahîh. It is not permissible to make friends with holders of bid'a. It is declared in a hadîth sherîf, **"If a person keeps away from a holder**

of bid'a, Allâhu ta'âlâ fills his heart with amân (security, peace) and îmân. If a person disesteems a holder of bid'a, Allâhu ta'âlâ protects him against the fear of the Resurrection."

The first task for each Muslim is to learn the belief of Ahl as-Sunna correctly and to strive so that his household and all his friends will learn it. He should pray to Allâhu ta'âlâ that they will live in the belief of Ahl as-sunna. He should be very alert not to be deceived by satanic men or genies, by evil company or by misleading writings.

It is declared in a hadîth sherîf, **"The best of people are the Muslims who live in my time. The next best are those who will succeed them. And the next best are those who will come after them. After these, lies will be widespread."** This hadîth sherîf shows that falsities began to take place in words, behaviours and deeds at the end of the third centruy of Islam. People could no longer be trusted, for bid'as among them were on the increase. In belief and in deeds they dissented from the path of the Salaf as-sâlihîn. The great men of tasawwuf and the imâms of fiqh, who were approved unanimously by Muslims, promulgated the path of the Salaf as-sâlihîn.

The fatwâ book **Tâtârhâniyya** says, "One who says that 'Umar, 'Uthmân 'Alî (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum) were not Sahâbîs becomes a holder of bid'a. One who does not believe a narration reported by a single person becomes not a disbeliever but a holder of bid'a. However, one who says that Abû Bakr as-Siddîq (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) was not a Sahâbî becomes a disbeliever since by doing so he denies the âyat al-kerîma." The fatwâ book **Zahîriyya** says, "It is true that one who disbelieves in the caliphate of Abû Bakr as-Siddîq or Hadrat 'Umar al-Farûq (radiy-Allâhu 'anhumâ) becomes a disbeliever, for their selection as khalîfa was reported as an ijmâ'." [According to Ahl as-Sunna, ijmâ' (consensus) is a documentary proof. He who denies this proof becomes a disbeliever. Since ijmâ' is not a proof for the Khârijîs, Shî'ites and Wahhâbîs, they said that he who denies something reported through ijmâ' will not become a disbeliever.]

Ibn 'Âbidîn, in the subject on renegades in the third chapter of **Radd al-muhtâr**, wrote, "Non-Muslim countrymen living in Dâr al-Islâm are called **Zimmîs**. It is not permissible to violate the property, lives or chastity of zimmîs or of those disbelievers who come to the country for trade or as tourists. They possess the same freedom given to Muslims. The case is not so with mulhids. Those mulhids who deceive Muslims are asked to repent. If they refuse,

all of them are killed with the command of the head of the State. If they repent, their repentance is accepted. Those holders of bid'a whose belief does not cause disbelief are given advice. If they refuse and do not repent, they are punished with ta'zîr^[1] by the State. If it is considered necessary, they are forced to repent by imprisonment or flogging. If their leader who endeavours to deceive Muslims, does not repent after imprisonment and flogging, it is permissible for the State to have him killed. Though one who causes Muslims to part from the madhhab of Ahl as-Sunna and to become lâ-madhhabî heretics and thus tries to spread bid'as does not become a disbeliever, it is permissible for the head of the State to have him killed in order to protect the people from losing their peace and unity.

[1] See glossary.

CONCLUSION

As it is understood from the beginning of his book to the end, Rashîd Ridâ does not possess any firm faith or reasonable opinion. He looks for grounds for traducing the Ahl as-Sunna and the four madhhabs and beats about the bush. By using his masonic master's cunning policy and putting in arbitrary examples by translating from books written in Arabic, his mother tongue, he introduces himself as a religious scholar. Lest our young men of religious profession and the pure, credulous Muslims should believe in the lies and slanders of this cunning enemy of the Ahl as-Sunna, we have written this humble refutation.

In summary, the purpose of this book, **Answer to an Enemy of Islam**, is to explain that the four madhhabs of Ahl as-Sunna were deduced from the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the hadîth ash-sherîf. The books of fiqh that exist in the contemporary age do not contain any ijtihâd disagreeing with any hadîth. Of their ijtihâds, which seem to disagree with one another, only one of them is right, yet those who follow the wrong ones, as pointed out in the hadîth ash-sherîf, will also be given thawâb. Therefore, as it will be sahîh (valid) and maqbûl (acceptable in the view of Allâhu ta'âlâ) to do what has been conveyed unanimously in their four madhhabs, so it will be sahîh and maqbûl to do what they disagreed on. Then, every Muslim who is not a mujtahid has to choose and follow one of the four madhhabs in everything he does, without any need to search for the documents of the imâm al-madhhab, for, the new Muslims among the Tâbi'în imitated as-Sahâbat al-kirâm without asking for any documentation. When doing anything in accordance with the madhhab he has liked and chosen, every Muslim should believe that he is obeying the Qur'ân al-kerîm or the hadîth ash-sherîf.

There is no need for a mujtahid today. For, nothing has been left unexplained among Islamic teachings. There is nothing to be added to this religion, which has already become perfect. Rules for everything that will happen until Doomsday were declared by

Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) and explained by the a'immat al-madhâhib. Those scholars who are not mujtahids can manage their application to daily events. Mujaddids who will come in every century will do this job, but, because it is no longer necessary, they will not deduce new rules through ijtihâd. Every harâm, halâl or document has been explained.

Now, anybody who wants to attain to endless happiness should learn the faith of Ahl as-Sunna briefly and believe accordingly, and then, choosing the one which is possible and easy for him to learn of the four madhhabs, he should learn one by one about his daily doings and 'ibâdât in a book of that madhhab and practise them accordingly. In every country, genuine books of 'ilm al-hâl, each writing the teachings of one madhhab, are easily available. This opportunity is Allâhu ta'âlâ's great blessing over the Ummat al-Muhammad (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam). Infinite thanks be to Allâhu ta'âlâ for this great blessing of His! We ought to be on the alert lest we should be deceived by the false words and writings of heretics, of the lâ-madhhabî, of religion reformers and of those ignorant people who speak and write in order to earn money!

As-salâmu 'alâ man ittaba 'Al-hudâ.

GLOSSARY

adhân: the call to **salât**.

af'âl al-mukallafîn: **fard**, **harâm** or **mubâh** acts; **fiqh**.

ahâdîth: pl. of **hadîth**.

ahl: people. **Ahl al-Bait**, immediate relatives of the Prophet. **Ahl ad-dirâya = mujtahidi fi 'l-madhab**. **Ahl as-Sunna(t wa 'l-Jamâ'a)**.

ahwâl: conditions or customs of people when a **hadîth** was said; excellent qualities.

a'imma(t al-madhâhib): pl. of **imâm al-madhab**

'âlim: (pl. **'ulamâ'**) Muslim scholar.

Allâhu ta'âlâ: Allah to whom all kinds of superiority belong.

'allâma: an **'âlim** of high degree.

a'mâl: acts; living up to **'ilm**

âmin: (to **Allâhu ta'âlâ**) 'accept my prayer'.

ammâra: headstrong **nafs** as defined.

arbâb at-tarjîh: = **as'hâb at-tarjîh**.

'ârif: an **'âlim** who knows what is possible to know of **ma'rifa**.

'Asr as-Sa'âda: the 'Era of Prosperity', time of the Prophet and the Four Caliphs.

Awliyâ': (pl. of **Walî**)

âyat (kerîma): a Qur'ânic verse.

bâtin: interior, hidden knowledge pertaining to the heart and soul; **bâtinî**, of **bâtin**. **Bâtinî**, a follower of the **Batiniyya** heresy or **Bâtinism**.

bid'a: (pl. **bida'**)

da'îf: (that considered to be) reported not as genuinely as **sahîh**,

Dâr al-Islâm: Islamic country.

faid: **ma'rifa**.

faqîh: (pl. **fuqahâ'**) **'âlim** of **fiqh**.

fard: (an act) that commanded by **Allâhu ta'âlâ** in the Qur'ân al-kerîm; **fard 'ain**; **fard kifâya**.

fâsid: wrong, invalid, non-**sahîh**.

fatwâ: **ijtihâd** (of a **mujtahid**); conclusion (of a **mufî**) from books of **fiqh** whether something not shown in them is permitted or not.

fiqh: knowledge dealing with

- what Muslims should do and should not do; **a'mâl, 'ibâdât.**
- fitna:** disunion among Muslims.
- fitra:** alms (2 kg of wheat or silver of equal value) given after every Ramadân, the ninth month of Muslim calendar.
- fuqahâ':** pl. of **faqîh.**
- Hadd:** A form of chastisement used in the Islamic penal code. It comprises forms of flogging that vary in vehemence as well as in number, depending on the kind of offence as well as on the social status of delinquent, 128.
- hadîth:** (science or books of) the saying(s) of the Prophet. **-Hadîth ash-sherîf, all the hadîths as a whole.** (See **Endless Bliss, II**, for its kinds.)
- hadrat:** title of respect used before the names of Islamic scholars.
- hajj:** **fard** pilgrimage to Mecca.
- halâl:** (act, thing) permitted in Islam.
- harâm:** (act, thing) forbidden in Islam.
- Haramain:** Mecca and Medina.
- Hijâz:** the region around the **Haramain** on the Arabian Peninsula.
- hikma:** wisdom; right, useful sayings.
- Hujjat al-Islâm:** title of al-Imâm at-Ghazâlî meaning the 'Document of Islam' and depicting that a reasonable person who reads his **Ihyâ'** sees that Islam is a heavenly religion and becomes a Muslim, past and present examples of which are many.
- 'ibâda:** (pl. **-ât**) Islamic rite(s)
- 'Îd al-ad'hâ:** festival of sacrifices and **hajj.**
- ijtihâd:** (meaning or conclusion drawn by a **mujtahid** by) endeavouring to understand the hidden meaning in an **âyat** or a **hadîth.**
- ilhâd:** (of **mulhid**)
- 'illa:** 'reason', question or event upon which a **hadîth** was said.
- 'ilm:** (branch of) knowledge, science; **'ilm al-hâl; 'ilm al-usûl (al-fiqh),** science of methodology (of e.g. **fiqh**).
- imâm:** i) profound **'âlim; imâm al-madhhab; al-Imâm al-a'zam** ii) leader in **jamâ'a;** iii) Caliph.
- îmân:** belief.
- iqâma:** certain words recited just before a **fard salât.**
- islâm:** six fundamentals of Islam.
- i'tiqâd: = îmân.**

jamâ'a: community, body of Muslims in a mosque.

jihâd: war against non-Muslims (or the **nafs**) to convert them (it) to Islam.

-Ka'ba: the big room in the great mosque in Mecca.

kaffâra: specified penalty that should be paid along with **qadâ'**.

kâfir: non-Muslim, disbeliever.

kalâm: (science of) **îmân** in Islam.

khalîfa: (pl. **khulafâ'**) caliph.

Khârijîs, Khârijites, Khawârij: those heretical Muslims hostile to **Ahl al-Bait** and to their posterity.

lâ-madhhâbî: of antagonism to the four **madhhabs**.

madhhab: (pl. **madhâhib**) all of what an **imâm** of (esp.) **fiqh** (usually one of the four: Hanafî, Shâfi'î, Mâlikî and Hanbalî) or **îmân** communicated.

madrasa: Islamic school or university.

mahram: within forbidden (**harâm**) degrees of relationship for marriage.

makrûh: (act, thing) improper, disliked, and abstained by the Prophet.

mansûkh: (a **nass** that had come or said) earlier but cancelled by a later one

(**nâsikh**).

ma'rifa: knowledge about **Allâhu ta'âlâ**, inspired to the hearts of **Awliyâ'**.

masah: rubbing one's wet hands (on his **mests**, which are soft, soleless, waterproof shoes, worn in winter, covering the feet's surface washed) while performing ablution.

mashhûr: 'well-known' among **'âlims**: a kind of **hadîths**.

masjid: mosque.

mawdû': lacking one of the conditions (for a **hadîth** to be **sahîh**) laid down by an **'âlim** of **hadîth**.

mawlid: (anniversary of) the birthday, writings about the excellences, of the Prophet.

Mawqif: place of concentration of all men after the Resurrection.

minbar: high pulpit in a mosque.

-Mi'râj: the Prophet's Ascension from Jerusalem to the skies.

-Mîzân: the Balance in the hereafter.

mu'âmâlât: a division of **fiqh**.

mubâh: (act, thing) neither ordered nor prohibited; permitted.

mufsid: thing that nullifies [**salât**].

muftî: great 'âlim authorized to issue **fatwâ**.

Muhammadi: follower of the path of the Prophet.

muhkam: (of a **nass**) with explicit, clear meaning.

mujaddid: strengthener, renewer, of Islam.

mujâhada: 'striving' to do what the **nafs** does not like; see **riyâda**.

mulfiq: one who practises **talfiq**.

munâfiq: one in the disguise of a Muslim but believing in another religion; so hypocrite.

mushrik: polytheist, idolater.

mustahab: (act) deserving **thawâb** if done but no sin if omitted, nor disbelief if disliked.

mutashâbih: (of an **âyat**) with unintelligible, hidden meanings.

-Mu'tazila: one of 72 heretical groups in Islam.

mutma'inna: (of **nafs**) tranquil, corrected.

nafs: a force in man which wants him to harm himself religiously.

nâ-mahram: not **mahram**.

nâsikh: (a **nass**) that cancelled a **mansûkh**.

nass: (general term for) an **âyat**

or **hadîth**; the **Nass**.

nikâh: Islamic act of engagement for marriage.

nisâb: minimum quantity of specified wealth making one liable to do some certain duties.

qadâ': i) decree of a **qâdî** (Muslim judge); ii) performance of an **'ibâda** after its due time.

qibla: direction towards the **Ka'ba**.

qiyâs (al-fuqahâ'): (conclusion drawn by a **mujtahid** by) likening or comparing an affair not clearly stated in the **Nass** and **ijmâ'** to a similar one stated clearly; **ijtihâd**.

Quraish: Arab community of Quraish, an ancestor of the Prophet.

rak'a: unit of **salât**.

Rasûlullah: Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm), the 'Prophet of **Allâhu ta'âlâ'**.

rijâl: great 'âlim reporters of a **hadîth**.

riyâda: (pl. **-ât**) not doing what the **nafs** likes.

Sahâbî: (pl. **-Sahâbat al-kirâm**) Muslim (Companions) who saw the Prophet at least once.

sahîh: i) valid, lawful; ii) (hadîth) soundly transmitted.

salâm: good wish.

salât: ritual prayer.

shafâ'a: intercession in the hereafter.

shaikh: master, guide; **Shaikh al-Islâm,** Head of the Islamic Affairs Office.

Shâri': the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm).

-Shî'a (Shî'ites): one of the 72 non-Sunnî groups in Islam.

-Sirât: the Bridge in the hereafter.

suhba: companionship.

sunna: act (done and liked esp. by the Prophet as an **'ibâda**) deserving **thawâb** if done but sinful if continually omitted; **sunnat mu'akkada,** that rarely omitted by the Prophet; the **Sunna,** i) all the sunnas as a whole; ii) (with the Book) the **Hadîth;** iii) **fiqh,** Islam.

Sunnî: (one) belonging to **Ahl as-Sunna.**

sûra(t): a Qur'ânic chapter.

tâ'a: those acts liked by Allâhu ta'âlâ but need not be known that He likes.

Tâbi'ûn: Successors of **as-Sahâbat al-kirâm. Taba' at-Tâbi'în,** Successors of the Tâbi'ûn.

tafsîr: (book, science, of) interpretation of the Qur'ân al kerîm.

-Tahiyya: first prayer recited at the sitting posture in **salât.**

takbîr iftitâh: the phrase 'Allâhu akbar'.

tasawwuf: Islamic mysticism or sufism as defined by Islam.

Ta'dhir: a jurisprudential term in the Islamic penal code. It includes degrees of chastisement such as warning, admonition, reprimanding, flogging (which is above **Hadd** in the vehemence of strokes, and below it in their number), imprisonment, and capital punishment.

tekke: (Turkish) place where a **shaikh** trains his disciples.

thawâb: (unit of) reward promised for the next world by **Allâhu ta'âlâ** as a recompense for doing or saying what He likes.

'ulamâ': pl. of **'âlim.**

umma(t): community, body of believers of a prophet.

'umra: **sunna** pilgrimage to Mecca.

usûl: i) methodology or fundamentals of an Islamic science, see **'ilm;** ii) methodologies of basic Islamic sciences; iii) **îmân, kalâm.**

wahî: knowledge revealed to the Prophet from **Allâhu ta'âlâ.**

- wâjib:** (act) almost as compulsory as **fard**, so not to be omitted; that never omitted by the Prophet.
- Walî:** (pl. **Awliyâ'**) one loved and protected by **Allâhu ta'âlâ**.
- zâhir:** exterior, apparent knowledge (pertaining to the body); **zâhirî**, of zâhir.
- Zaidî:** least heretical (so closer to **Ahl as-Sunna**) group of the **Shî'a**.
- zakât:** (**fard** duty of giving annually) 1/40 of a rich Muslim's specified property (to poor Muslims).
- zuhd:** not setting one's heart on worldly things.

HÜSEYN HİLMİ İŞİK,
'Rahmat-Allahi 'alaih'

Hüseyn Hilmi Işık, 'Rahmat-Allahi 'alaih', publisher of the Hakikat Kitabevi Publications, was born in Eyyub Sultan, Istanbul in 1329 (A.D. 1911).

Of the one hundred and forty-four books he published, sixty are Arabic, twenty-five Persian, fourteen Turkish, and the remaining are books in French, German, English, Russian, and other languages.

Hüseyn Hilmi Işık, 'Rahmat-Allahi 'alaih' (guided by Sayyid 'Abdulahakim Arwâsî, 'Rahmat-Allahi 'alaih', a profound Islamic scholar and perfect in virtues of Tasawwuf and capable to guide disciples in a fully mature manner; possessor of glories and wisdom), was a competent, great Islamic scholar able to guide to happiness, passed away during the night between October 25, 2001 (8 Sha'bân 1422) and October 26, 2001 (9 Sha'bân 1422). He was buried at Eyyub Sultan, where he had been born.