



# كشَف الشُّبُهَات

الشيخ محمد بن عبد الوهاب رحمه الله

Kashf Ash-Shubuhaat  
(Removal of the Doubts)

Shaikhul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab

**Commentary by Sh. Haytham Sayfaddin (حفظه الله)**

## Contents

Lesson 1	3
Lesson 2	12
Lesson 3	19
Lesson 4	29
Lesson 5	40
Lesson 6	49
Lesson 7	57
Lesson 8	66
Lesson 9	73
Lesson 10	79
Lesson 11	87
Lesson 12	94
Lesson 13	102
Lesson 14	109
Lesson 15	123
Lesson 16	138
Lesson 17	147
Lesson 18	155
Lesson 19	163

## Lesson 1:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

Insha'Allah, we're going to begin where we left of with the lessons on Aqidah, insha'Allah we're going to start a new text called **"Kashf ash-Shubuhah fit-Tawhid"** or the **"Clarification of the doubts of the misconceptions regarding Tawhid"**. In Arabi, it's about 25 or 30 pages depending on the version you get and translated into English, it's about 65 pages.

So just to start of talking about this book, it was written by **Muhammad ibn Abdul-Wahhab** (رحمه الله) and just a bit of background on who he was and why there's so much written by him on issues of Tawhid and Shirk. He lived in a place called Najd which is in the Arabian Peninsula and it's the area in Saudi Arabia which is towards the middle of the peninsula. The da'wah of these Imams began in Najd, it began in a place called Huraymala which is beside Ar-Riyadh currently, and the Shaykh Muhammad ibn Abdul-Wahhab, his father was a Islamic judge in that area. The reason why this da'wah began was because in that time, Shirk became quite widespread, people would go to graves and make du'a to the people in the graves and they would sacrifice animals for the people in the graves, and they would make oaths to them and they would seek blessings from trees and stones.

Essentially, reverting back to what the religion in the Arabian peninsula was before the sending of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), except that they were doing the same things, saying the same things, believing the same things, except that they claimed to be Muslim, so that was the only difference. So a book was written called **"Kitab at-Tawhid"**, in which the Shaykh put together a number of chapters discussing many issues on Tawhid, so showing the obligation of Tawhid, what Tawhid is, what Shirk is, what actions are only deserving by Allah etc, clarifying this from the Qur'an and the Sunnah and understanding of the Sahabah, trying to call people back to the correct religion and to teach them that which the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sent with.

At that point, there began a backlash against this da'wah, so this calling back to the pure Islam, people didn't like the idea of being told "you can't bury people in the masajid", "you can't build masajid around graves", "you can't light up lamps at your graves seeking blessings", "you can't slaughter for other than Allah". People became so used to this issue, there became a backlash to this. Some people actually began to understand this to be the correct meaning of Islam so obviously they fought back. They would begin to send out letters warning against this da'wah and trying to bring evidences from the Qur'an and the Sunnah to

prove that their actions were correct and to prove that this da'wah to Tawhid is actually incorrect and that it's not supported by the Qur'an and the Sunnah and so on.

So this book "Kashf ash-Shubuhah fit-Tawhid", was written in response to some of these misconceptions that were being spread, particularly as the Shaykh mentions in this book, that one of the scholars in the area of Ahsaa, which is an area in the Arabian Peninsula, he wrote a letter with a number of supposed evidences trying to prove that these actions of Shirk were actually Islamic and they didn't contradict Islam. After him, this da'wah continued from his sons, Hasan and Abdullah ibn Muhammad, and his grandsons, Abdur-Rahman ibn Hasan ibn Muhammad and Sulayman ibn Abdullah ibn Muhammad, may Allah be pleased with them all, as well as other Ulama' from that area. The da'wah became stronger and throughout a matter of years and decades even, alhamdulillah a lot of the Shirk was erased.

The reason why I'm beginning with this is because this book has a number of sections to it. **One of the sections** is just clarifying what is exactly Tawhid, what is Shirk, what was the beliefs of the kuffar at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), why they weren't actually considered Muslim despite as we will see the kuffar at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) believed in Allah, they believed he existed, they believed he was the Creator and the one that sustained everything and so on, but why weren't these people Muslimin, and he clarifies this. Then he goes onto **another section** and begins to discuss some of the evidences that are supposedly used by the people who try to say that these actions are allowed as well as just some of the arguments that they make. Then he has a **conclusion** in which he discusses the importance of acting upon tawhid and to show how just having this belief in your heart isn't sufficient and you have to act upon Tawhid, you have to have these statements as well as have these beliefs in your heart, so all of these things are important in order for the person to be Muslim and he has a section on this as well.

So this was how this book is divided up and in explaining this, there's a number of books that were written by his sons, his grandsons and the scholars after him as an explanation or commentary on this book. One of them was "*Mufid al-Mustafid*", which was by Ibn Abdul-Wahhab (رحمه الله) himself. So some of this explanation will be taken by this as well as the book "*Taysir al-Aziz al-Hamid*", which is an explanation of the book "Kitab at-Tawhid" by Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhab and the explanation was written by his grandson, Sulayman ibn Abdillah (رحمه الله) who didn't actually finish this book because he was killed by the viceroy from England, who at the time gave a command that this person should be killed due to the resistance that this da'wah was being put up to the colonialisation of that area at the time and he was ordered to be executed and killed. So this book actually remained unfinished, also the book "*Al-Intisar*", by Abdullah Aba-Butayn, who was from the scholars as well, and a book by Abdul-Latif ibn Abdur-Rahman (رحمه الله) called "*Minhaj At-Ta'sees*" and lastly a book by Abdur-Rahman Ad-Dawsari. May Allah have mercy on all of them, in which they clarify these issues and they add commentary because very often you'll find that some Shirk will disappear and people will come up with some sort of new Shirk. So, clarifying Tawhid is easy because it's very simple and it remains constant all the time but Shirk will change. People may come up with new types of Shirk depending on the time and the area so often that needs extra commentary and explanation is needed for that so that's why you'll see that throughout history since this book was written, different commentaries were put towards this book. This is just an introduction as to the reason why the book was written and some of the issues about the book.

To start of, the author says:

اعلم رحمك الله - أن التوحيد هو :إفراد الله بالعبادة وهو دين الرسل الذي أرسلهم الله به  
إلى عباده فأولهم نوح  
عليه السلام ، وأرسله إلى قومه لما غلو في الصالحين :ودا وسواعا ، ويغوث ويعوق  
ونسرا

Or “In the name of Allah, the Most Merciful, Every-Merciful to His believing servants. Know - may Allah have mercy upon you - that Tawhid (monotheism) is to single out Allah, free is He from all the imperfections, with all forms of worship (Ibadah) and this is the religion of the Messenger sent by Allah to his servants. The Messenger and their peoples, the first of them was Nuh (عليه السلام), Allah sent him to his people whom they exaggerated the status of their righteous people [such as] Wadd, Suwaa, Yaghuth, Ya’uq and Nasr.”

So here the author begins with **Bismillahi al-Rahmani al-Rahim** and we talked about this before. So the **Basmallah** was used by the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) when he would write his letters, particularly the most famous one was the one he wrote to Kisra to Herackle that’s narrated in Sahih al-Bukhari, in which Hercules received a letter from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and it said Bismillahi al-Rahmani al-Rahim, from Muhammad ibn Abdillah to Hercules, the leader of the Romans. So the scholars have taken from this that it’s Sunnah to begin any sort of interaction, with the Basmallah. The only difference of opinion is with regards to what is best to begin with because Bismillahi al-Rahmani al-Rahim is what the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) would begin his letters with.

Also we know in the Qur’an when Allah mentioned about Sulayman (عليه السلام) when he sent the letter to the Queen of Sabah, that it began with Bismillahi al-Rahmani al-Rahim as well and Allah began the Qur’an with Bismillahi al-Rahmani al-Rahim and we know that every Surah begins with this as well, except Surah Tawbah. So obviously beginning with the Basmallah is something that’s virtuous and some you’ll find that they’ll begin their speeches with Bismillahi al-Rahmani al-Rahim or they’ll begin their letters or books with “**alhamdulillah**” or “**Inna al-hamdulilah**” and so on.

There’s a dispute amongst the scholars as to what is best because if we look to the letters of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), anything written from him always began with the basmallah and whenever he spoke, there’s nothing specifically narrated from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) that when he spoke, he began with the Basmallah. What we have is the hadith of Abdullah ibn Mas’ud (رضي الله عنه) in “Khutbah al-Hajah”, when he would begin with **Inna al-hamdulilah**... to the end of the hadith. We also have a hadith of Jabir (رضي الله عنه) in which a people came to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and he began it with some Ayat from the Quran. So this is the dispute, if we look at all of these evidences, we can say that the Sunnah is to begin speeches with Alhamdulillah or Ayat from the Qur’an particularly **يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوا رَبَّكُمُ** (Ya Ayyuhan nasu-ttaqu rabakum - O mankind, fear your Lord) or anything with these types of verses and when you’re writing something, you being it with the Basmallah. So if you’re writing a book or a letter or a letter to somebody else and so on, this would begin with the **Basmallah** as this is the most precise of what the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did. So if you were to do this, you’re following these ahadith where they apply and you’re following these ahadith where they apply so this is the strongest way of going about things, Allahu a’lam.

This is the first issue that the author mentioned the Basmallah. After mentioning the basmallah, he went on and said:

اعلم رحمك الله

**Or “Know – May Allah have mercy upon you”,**

You’ll often find throughout his letters and some of the other scholars, they’ll continuously say “Know – May Allah have mercy on you”, “Know – May Allah forgive you”, when they’re saying this, when they’re saying “Know”, they’re obviously telling you, have knowledge about this issue. So they’re calling your attention to what’s about to be said because it’s something of importance and they want your attention to be 100% to this so they want you to focus on this. So they’re telling us to have knowledge, meaning don’t be ignorant of this issue that I’m about to speak about.

So if we understand, what is knowledge? Knowledge, in reality is knowing something in the way it actually is. So if someone says “This thing right here is black”, then obviously it is black, if they know that it’s black then it’s knowledge because the reality of this thing is that it’s black, knowing that it’s black is knowledge. If someone came and said, “what is this colour?”, and you said “I don’t know”, obviously that’s not knowledge, it’s considered ignorance.

The scholars divide ignorance into two types, one is called ‘*Al-Jahlul Basit*’ or simple ignorance and the second is ‘*Al-Jahlul Murakkab*’ or compound ignorance. So what is the difference between the two? If I say “What colour is this?”, and you say “I don’t know”, you don’t know it, you’re ignorant of that colour. If I come and say “What colour is this?”, and you say it’s blue, you don’t know the colour and you think it’s something else so you’re ignorant of the colour and you’re ignorant of your ignorance so it’s compound now. So this is the danger of things, if someone is just ignorant of an issue, you can tell them and then they will know, but if they tell that it’s blue and they want to argue with someone, they already have in their mind, “I know the answer to this issue”, and now you have an argument on your hand, and that’s why ignorance in and of itself is dangerous but compound ignorance is even worse because they don’t know and they don’t know that they don’t know. So this is why speaking without knowledge is such a dangerous issue because if you’re not correct, then not only are you not giving the right answer, you’re giving a wrong answer, so you’re spreading something that two things will need to be done to get through to this person. First you have to show to them that they don’t know what they’re talking about and second thing is that you have to teach them the right answer. So this is when it comes to knowledge and ignorance, this is just more of an issue related to Usul al-Fiqh, this is just to comment on what the author said about this issue.

Next, the author says:

رحمك الله

**Or “May Allah have mercy on you...”**

It shows that there’s some sincerity in what the author is saying so he’s telling you that you should know this, may Allah have mercy on you. So it’s not that it’s something that this

person just wants to tell you what they think, and there's not a point behind it. The point of it is that "May you know this issue, so that Allah will have mercy upon you". So there's a goal behind it, it's a sincerity from a Muslim to another, or from a Muslim to a non-Muslim, wanting to bring them to the correct beliefs.

Then he says:

أن التوحيد

Or "that Tawhid...",

So here, he talks about Tawhid, he's talking about a specific type of Tawhid. As many of you may know, Tawhid is divided in a number of categories, so there's **Tawhid ar-Rububiyyah**, or the Tawhid of Lordship. This is the belief that Allah created everything, He has power to manipulate anything that is within His Will or change anything in His Will, to provide sustenance to anything He wants, anything is under His control. So this is Tawhid ar-Rububiyyah, there's **Tawhid al-Uluhiyyah**, and this is the Tawhid as we come to see that the Messengers were sent with. So this is the Tawhid which is the belief that Allah is the Only One who deserves to be worshipped. So not only do we believe in His existence and power and His Might and His Wisdom and His Knowledge, we believe that He's the Only One Who has the right to be worshipped, and we only worship Allah in any aspect that's an act of worship. So, anything that is a right of Allah, then we only do it for Him and we don't do it for anyone else or anything else. So this is Tawhid al-Uluhiyyah and sometimes it's referred to as Tawhid al-Ilahiyyah. Lastly, **Tawhid Asma was-Sifat**, the Tawhid of Allah's Names and His Attributes. Allah mentioned that He has Names, and he mentioned about Himself He has specific Attributes, and the Sahabah affirmed these Attributes from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) for Allah. These are the three types of Tawhid, sometimes you'll see them referred to as "*Tawhid al-Kast wal-Talab wa Irada*", which is referring to what the slave does for Allah, and also the Tawhid of Knowledge and Affirmation.

So these are, in the end whether you take this division or this division, the point is that anything that belongs to Allah, we affirm it. If Allah mentions something about Him, we affirm it, if He negated something off of Himself, if He said He doesn't have a son, He doesn't have a wife, He doesn't sleep, He doesn't become drowsy and so on, anything that Allah negated off of Himself, we negate off of Him. Anything He deserves, we give Him, anything that only He deserves, we don't give to anyone else so on. So this is just a general explanation of all these types of Tawhid.

Specifically here, the author is talking about the second which is Tawhid al-Ilahiyyah, which is what does Allah deserve and what is from the rights of Allah that we can't give to anyone else. So this is where the dispute came between the Messengers who were sent and the people who they were sent to. As we will see in the Qur'an, no group is mentioned as completely disbelieving in the existence of Allah. So we know that the Prophets weren't sent to tell people that Allah exists because everyone in the Qur'an that's mentioned, knows that Allah exists. So why would Allah send someone to teach the people something they've already accepted, this wouldn't be within His Wisdom. So as we will see, the Tawhid that is being discussed here is the Tawhid of Ilahiyyah.



Then he went on to say that:

وهو دين الرسل الذي أرسلهم الله به إلى عباده

Or “and this is the religion of the Messengers sent by Allah to His servants.”

It is, meaning Tawhid, is the Din or the religion of the Messengers. So the next to discuss is that he’s saying it’s the religion of all the Messengers, what does the word “Din” actually mean? So we can see that the word Din has a number of meanings that are mentioned in the Qur’an.

The first is the Mulk or the Sultan, which is the control or the authority. So Allah referred to the story of Yusuf (عليه السلام) when He said,

مَا كَانَ لِأَخَاهُ فِي دِينِ الْمَلِكِ إِلَّا أَنْ يَشَاءَ اللَّهُ ۖ

“He could not have taken his brother within the religion of the king except that Allah willed” [12:76]

So we know that according to the rule of the king, what Yusuf did as a means to get his brother back to him, he wouldn’t have been able to do if he had followed the law or the authority of the King at that point. So here we know that the word “Din” in this sense refers to authority and control.

Also, it can be the “path”, when Allah said,

قُلْ يَٰٓأَيُّهَا الْكَافِرُونَ  
لَا أَعْبُدُ مَا تَعْبُدُونَ  
وَلَا أَنْتُمْ عِبُدُونَ مَا أَعْبُدُ  
وَلَا أَنَا عَابِدٌ مَّا عَبَدْتُمْ  
وَلَا أَنْتُمْ عِبُدُونَ مَا أَعْبُدُ  
لَكُمْ دِينُكُمْ وَلِيَ دِينِ

“Say, “O disbelievers...” [109:1-6]

All the way till the end till Allah says “For you is your religion, and for me is my religion.” So Allah referred to the Muslimin as having one way and the kuffar as having another way and He used the word “Din” for that.

Another meaning of “Din” is what laws are implemented, as Allah said,

وَقَاتِلُوهُمْ حَتَّىٰ لَا تَكُونَ فِتْنَةٌ وَيَكُونَ الدِّينُ كُلُّهُ لِلَّهِ

“And fight them until there is no fitnah and [until] the religion, all of it, is for Allah.” [8:39]



So here what is meant is the rule or the actual governing in the land. So here, this is what is meant by “Din” in this verse because we know that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) commanded his armies when fighting kuffar, to first call them to Islam, if they accepted Islam, then everything was done, if they didn’t accept Islam, then the next choice that they had was to submit to the law of Islam and to pay the jizyah, and if they didn’t then the Muslimin would fight them. So here we see that when Allah ordered Muslimin to fight the kuffar until there’s no more fitnah and the religion is all for Allah, but at the same time, we know that there’s a certain point in which the Muslimin by the command of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) couldn’t fight the people anymore, even though they hadn’t become Muslim. So we obviously know from this verse that what is meant is the actual rule in the land.

Also, another meaning of “Din” is actions or a way a person acts. This is based upon the saying in Arabi that you say,

“As you act towards people, they will act towards you”.

So the word “Din” here just refers to the way a person acts towards another, and also the last meaning that “Din” has is the actual legislation or the law that is followed, not necessarily in the land, but can even be in the sense of a religious law, as Allah said,

شَرَعَ لَكُمْ مِنَ الدِّينِ مَا وَصَّى بِهِ نُوحًا

**“He has ordained for you of religion what He enjoined upon Nuh...” [42:13]**

And then he mentioned other Prophets after that. So these are the meanings of the word “Din”, and also there’s other meanings as well such as the recompense when Allah said,

مَالِكِ يَوْمِ الدِّينِ

**“Sovereign of the Day of Recompense” [1:4]**

The point here is that when we say “Din” in this sense, the meaning is that it was the law in which all of the Prophets came with, as we will see that every Prophet was sent with teaching the people Tawhid, warning them from Shirk and calling them to give Allah His Rights and to not give these things to anyone else.

Then he said (the author):

، فَأُولَٰهٖم نُوْحٌ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ

**Or “The first of them was Nuh (عليه السلام)...”**

And I’m not going to go into too much detail because we discussed this before in the lesson of “*Al-Usul ath-thalatha*”, but there’s a difference of opinion on the Messengers. Who was the first Messenger? So the majority hold the opinion that Nuh (عليه السلام) was the first Messenger and the evidence that they use for this is the hadith [Narrated in Bukhari] in which the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) mentioned what will take place on the Day of Judgement and when the people will want the Judgement to begin due to the harshness and the severity of

that Day, that they will go to Adam (عليه السلام) first and ask him to make intercession with Allah to begin this Judgement so that we can be done with it so he will say, “Go to Nuh, because he’s the first Messenger that was sent to the people of the Earth.”

So this is the evidence which is used by the majority. Some of the scholars such as Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalani and Hadifh bin Hakami, and others say that the first Messenger was actually Adam (عليه السلام) and the evidence that they used for this is the verse when Allah said,

إِنَّ اللَّهَ اصْطَفَىٰ آدَمَ وَنُوحًا وَآلَ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَآلَ عِمْرَانَ عَلَى الْعَالَمِينَ

**“Indeed, Allah chose Adam and Noah and the family of Abraham and the family of 'Imran over the worlds –“ [3:33]**

So they say that, Nuh and Adam, what they were chosen with, or this choice Allah picked them with was that they were given the Risalah, and that they were Messengers, but Allahu A’lam. It’s quite clear in the hadith of the intercession that the first Messenger that was sent to the people of the Earth, was Nuh (عليه السلام), and Adam (عليه السلام) and any Prophets that were before him were Prophets and not Messengers.

So the issue then is what’s the difference between them, and again I’m not going to go into too much detail on this, because we’ve discussed it before but there’s a number of differences of opinion as to what is the difference between a **Prophet** and a **Messenger**. Some say there’s no difference, some say there is a difference and the difference is that a Messenger brings a new Shari’ah and a Prophet merely abrogates certain parts in the general Shari’ah.

So for example, they’ll say that Musa (عليه السلام) was a Messenger and that he came with the Taurah and the laws that was in the Taurah, and the Prophets after him would either rule with that Shari’ah and they wouldn’t bring a new Shari’ah. They’ll use for example a verse when Allah mentioned about the Taurah, that the Prophets would judge with it. So they’ll say that this was actually what the Prophets were, they would judge with it.

Others say that if they came with a Book, then they were a Messenger and if they came without a Book, then they weren’t a Messenger.

Some will say if Allah spoke to them directly, then they were a Messenger, and if he spoke to them through Jibril then they would be a Prophet and so on.

Allahu A’lam, there’s nothing clear on what the difference is between a Prophet and a Messenger, all we know is that for sure there is a difference between them because Allah mentioned them together, obviously for a reason that they were different. He mentioned that there were Prophets and Messengers, so we know that Allah wouldn’t mention two groups of people in the same verse, if they were the same people because there would be no point in doing so.

So this is just a little bit of a discussion, the only thing to make a note on here is that there’s a widespread opinion that Prophets are those who receive revelation from Allah, but aren’t told to go amongst the people and convey it, while Messengers receive revelation and they have to convey it but if we look at the Qur’an and Sunnah that this is an incorrect opinion because

there's a number of evidences in the Qur'an and the Sunnah that indicate that the Prophets are actually sent and they're ordered to convey.

So first of all, from a 'aql or from an intellect point of view, Allah gives revelation for a reason, he doesn't do it for no reason. So why would he give revelation to a person and they don't actually have to convey it, what would be the point in this and what would be the benefit to humankind for them to receive this revelation and not have to tell anyone about it.

But obviously we go to the Qur'an and Sunnah first, so from the Sunnah, the clearest hadith is the hadith [Narrated by Bukhari] when the Prophet (ﷺ) mentioned that he was given five things that none of the Prophets before him were given.

So he mentioned that the *ghanimah* was made permissible for him, so the spoils of war were made permissible for the Prophet (ﷺ), and he mentioned that he was given the all-encompassing short word, meaning he would say a very small number of words and it would contain a lot of meaning and benefit and that the third was that the Prophet (ﷺ) is the last of the Prophets, obviously every other Prophet before him wasn't the last, and the fourth is that all of the earth was made as a masjid and as a means of purification for the Muslimin. So we know that anywhere in the earth we are, we can pray, and anywhere in the earth, we can use the land for *taharah* if we have no water. This is something which wasn't present in the Ummah of the nations before us, and the issue for this hadith or this topic is when the Prophet (ﷺ) said, "And the Prophet used to be sent specifically to his people, and I was sent to all of the people". So we see here that he mentioned that the Prophets before were sent only to their people and I was sent to all of the people. So obviously we know that misconception people have that Prophets were those who received revelation but weren't sent out to the people is false because the Prophet (ﷺ) said, "And the Prophets used to be sent specifically to their people and I was sent to all of the people". So the point to take away from that is that this is misconception and we know that the Prophets, whether they are a Messenger or just a Prophet, they're all commanded to convey what they received from Allah.

Insha'Allah we'll stop there. Wallahu A'lam.

## Lesson 2:

إِن الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ نَحْمَدُهُ وَنُسْتَعِينُهُ وَنَسْتَغْفِرُهُ وَنَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ شُرُورِ أَنْفُسِنَا وَمِنْ  
سَيِّئَاتِ أَعْمَالِنَا مَنْ يَهْدِهِ اللَّهُ فَلَا ضَلَّ لَهُ وَمَنْ يَضِلَّ فَلَا هَادِيَ لَهُ وَأَشْهَدُ أَنْ لَا إِلَهَ  
إِلَّا اللَّهُ لَا شَرِيكَ لَهُ وَأَشْهَدُ أَنَّ مُحَمَّدًا عَبْدُهُ وَرَسُولُهُ

Insha'Allah we'll continue tonight with an explanation of the book “**Kashf ash-Shubuhah**.” Last time we just began with the first paragraph and we didn't finish talking about it. The last thing we talked about was the issue of the **Prophets** and the **Messengers** and we discussed a little bit about is there a difference or not and if there is a difference, what is the difference. That's where we left off, and we also said that there's a misconception about the Prophets, whether Allah sent them with a message or if he just revealed revelation to them. We said that the evidence from the Qur'an and the Sunnah indicates that they were sent as well, so this idea that people have that a Messenger was someone who was sent and a Prophet was someone who wasn't sent or wasn't commanded to go out and call to this message, this is a mistake and the evidence on the Qur'an is when Allah said,

إِنَّا أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْكَ كَمَا أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَى نُوحٍ وَالنَّبِيِّينَ مِنْ بَعْدِهِ ۚ وَرُسُلًا قَدْ قَصَصْنَاهُمْ عَلَيْكَ مِنْ  
قَبْلُ وَرُسُلًا لَمْ نَقْصُصْهُمْ عَلَيْكَ

**“Indeed, We have revealed to you, [O Muhammad], as We revealed to Noah and the prophets after him...And [We sent] messengers about whom We have related [their stories] to you before and messengers about whom We have not related to you.” [4:163-164]**

So, Allah mentioned that they were both sent and when Allah said,

كَانَ النَّاسُ أُمَّةً وَاحِدَةً فَبَعَثَ اللَّهُ النَّبِيِّينَ مُبَشِّرِينَ وَمُنذِرِينَ

**“People were one nation, then Allah sent the Prophets as bringers of glad-tidings and warners.” [2:213]**

So, we see from this verse, as well as the hadith that I mentioned last time about the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) when he mentioned the five things that he was given that no other Prophet was given, that, “The Prophets used to be sent to just his people as for me, I was sent to all of people.” So, we see from this that the Prophets were sent and were commanded to go out and convey the message.

The **next** point that I want to mention about what the author says when he talked about the Prophets other than the Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم), he said (عليه السلام), he would say about them (عليه السلام). So this is what many of the scholars do, they say, if they're talking about the Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم), they'll say (صلى الله عليه وسلم), and if they're talking about another Prophet, Adam or Nuh or Ibrahim or Isa, or any of the other

Prophets, they'll just say (عليه السلام) or (على آله الصلوة والسلام), so this is what some scholars say that when you're talking about another Prophet, you just say this and when you're talking about the Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم), you say the full phrase. This is based upon a number of Ayat in the Qur'an. For example, when Allah said,

وَسَلَامٌ عَلَى الْمُرْسَلِينَ

**“And peace upon the Messengers” [37:181]**

And Allah also said about a number of Prophets, depending on the verse, one includes,

وَتَرَكْنَا عَلَيْهِ فِي الْآخِرِينَ سَلَامٌ عَلَى نُوحٍ فِي الْعَالَمِينَ

**“And left for him [favourable mention] among later generations: “Peace upon Nuh among the worlds”. [37:78-79]**

So they say that, these verses indicate that when it comes to a Prophet, other than the Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم), that you say (عليه السلام).

However, a number of scholars have questioned this and argued against this understanding and they've said that the “Salam”, that's understood from this verse, “وَسَلَامٌ عَلَى الْمُرْسَلِينَ”, and the other Ayat I mentioned, that they say that, it doesn't just mean saying “Salam”. The reason for this is that, amongst ourselves we say “السلام عليكم”, and we send salam upon each other on a daily basis, and this is the Salam of the Muslimin in general. So for us to say that, the Salam that we send upon the Prophets, other than the Prophet Muhammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم), is the same as what we send upon everyone else from the Muslimin, is a concept that's incorrect.

Imam Ibn al-Qayyim (رحمه الله) argued against this or he argued for this opinion in a great length in a number of his books, “*Ighathat al-Lahfan*” and “*Tariq al-Hijratain*”, and a number of other books. So he argued that, and I won't go into too much detail because that's not the topic of this book, but he proved or he made a strong argument to say that, any Prophet we mention, whether it's Adam, we say “على آله الصلوة والسلام” or if we say Nuh, we say “على آله الصلوة والسلام” and so on. So this concept that we don't have to say it for other Prophets or some people have even said to me personally, that you shouldn't say it for other Prophets or if you say Yusuf, you don't say (على آله الصلوة والسلام), you only say (عليه السلام), and you're not allowed and you shouldn't actually say this for the other Prophets. So that's where I'll end with, with that topic, I won't go into anymore detail on that.

Another point, is that the author mentioned about the sending of Nuh (على آله الصلوة والسلام) amongst his people when they went to extremes when it came to the *Salihin*, or when they had *ghulu* with regards to the *Salihin*. So what this means is that, *ghulu* is going beyond the legislated amount of something. So for example, we know that if a Prophet has specific rights to go beyond that, so we say a Prophet is perfect with regards to the *da'wah*, this is something that's legislated, it's proven in the Qur'an and the Sunnah. If we then say “No, it's because their Prophets, they're able to help us, more than other people.” If you make *du'a* to them or something, they can help you, we're going beyond what is actually legislated, with regards to those Prophets.

Likewise, this is what the people of Nuh did, and in the hadith in Sahih al-Bukhari from Ibn Abbas (رضي الله عنه), when he described the story of Nuh (على آله الصلاة والسلام), he described that Nuh or between Adam (عليه السلام) and Nuh, there were ten generations. All of them were upon Tawhid, and in the hadith it says, “When people didn’t have knowledge anymore, they began to worship these Salihin.” And in Ibn Abbas’s statement, it mentions the same thing as what’s mentioned in the Qur’an which the author mentions, about the people of Nuh, that they had a number of Salihin from the earlier generations they began to worship.

وَقَالُوا لَا تَذَرُنَّ آلِهَتَكُمْ وَلَا تَذَرُنَّ وَدًّا وَلَا سُوَاعًا وَلَا يَغُوثَ وَيَعُوقَ وَنَسْرًا

**“And said, ‘Never leave your gods, and never leave Wadd, or Suwa’ or Yaghuth and Ya’uq and Nasr’”. [71:23]**

So these people, who were the Salihin, they began to worship them and then Allah sent Nuh to bring them back to **Tawhid**. So, in this verse and in this story, there’s a refutation against this idea that people say, regardless of what the people do, they can always be excused by their ignorance. So even if people are ignorant of an issue, and it’s been made clear to them, or if it’s an issue that is very easy and the Qur’an is very clear on it, or if it’s an issue that is in front of them and they can seek the knowledge on this issue, but they choose not to or they choose to close their eyes on an issue, that this idea that they didn’t know, **isn’t an excuse anymore**. Because here we see that the people of Nuh were upon Tawhid, and then when the knowledge was forgotten amongst their people, they began to do these things, but they obviously weren’t upon Islam anymore.

So this idea that regardless of how much people turn away from learning their religion, that they’ll always have an excuse and that people can be as negligent as they want in the religion and as long as they don’t know it’s an excuse, then we know from this verse and from the story of Nuh (على آله الصلاة والسلام) that this is a mistaken concept, and we’ll get into much more detail in this further in the book but this is just a comment to mention on the story. So that’s the end of where we stopped last time.

The author continues, and he says about Nuh or about the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), he says:

، وآخر الرسل محمد (صلى الله عليه وسلم) ، وهو الذي كسر صور هوءء الصالحين  
أرسله إلى قوم يتعبدون ويحجون ويتصدقون ، ويذكرون الله كثيرا ، ولكنهم يجعلون  
بعض المخلوقات وسائط بينهم وبين الله يقولون : نريد منهم التقرب إلى الله ، ونريد  
شفاعتهم عنده ، مثل المنكة ، وعيسى بن مريم ، وأناس غيرهم من الصالحين

**Or “And the last of the Messengers was Muhammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and he smashed the statues of these righteous people. Allah sent him to a people who were given to devotion and worship, would make the pilgrimage, give charity and remember Allah often. However, they made some of the creatures into intermediaries between themselves and Allah, and they would say “we seek nearness (taqarrub) to Allah from them” and “we seek their intercession from them with Allah”. Such (creatures) included the Angels, Isa, Maryam and others from among the righteous people.”**

He says, he sent him amongst a people who used to worship Allah (perform Hajj, give Sadaqah, mention Allah) very often, but they would make some of the creation to be intermediaries between them and Allah. They would say, “we want from them to become closer to Allah” and “we want their intercession with Allah”. Then he gives examples, so the Angels, Isa bin Maryam and other people from the Salihin, from the righteous people.

Then he says:

فبعث الله محمداً (صلى الله عليه وسلم) (يجدد لهم دين أبيهم إبراهيم ، ويخبرهم أن هذا ، التقرب واعتقاد محض حق ، يصلح منه شيء لغير الله ، لملك مقرب ، و لا لنبي مرسل فضلاً عن غيرهما

**Or “So Allah sent him Muhammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to renew the religion for them which was the religion of their father Ibrahim. And he would inform them that this type of worship and these beliefs are specifically from the rights of Allah and they’re not befitting to give anyone other than Allah, whether it’s a Prophet, who was sent or it was an Angel who was brought near to Allah, let Alone other than them.”**

So, he’s saying that, if the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sent to people who, amongst them were people who used to worship angels and worship Prophets, but because of this worship, all of the things they did for Allah didn’t benefit them. So then, what would we say about someone, they’re not worshipping a Prophet, they’re not worshipping an Angel, they’re worshipping someone who’s lower than them, from amongst the good Muslims, or maybe not even the good Muslims, from amongst the **fussaq** or the Muslimin who are very sinful, or maybe they aren’t even Muslimin. So, if the fact that they were doing this to Prophets and Angels was enough to remove them from their religion, then what would we say about someone who’s doing this to someone who’s lower in status.

Then he continues and says:

و إلا فهو لا ءالمشركون يشهدون أن الله هو الخلق و حده لا شريك له ، و أنه لا يرزق إلا هو ولا يحيي إلا هو و لا يميت إلا هو ، و لا يدبر إلا هو ، وأن جميع السموات و من فيهن و الأرض وما فيها ، كلهم عبيده ، و تحت تصرفه وقهره . وإذا أردت الدليل على أن هو لا ءالذين قاتلهم رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) (يشهدون بهذا ، فاقراً قوله تعالى : قل من يرزقكم من السماء و الأرض ، أمن يملك السمع و الأبصار و من يخرج الحي من الميت و يخرج الميت من الحي ، و من يدبر الأمر ؟ ، فسيقولون الله فقل أفلا تتقون

**Or “So they were Mushrikin, who bore witness that Allah was the Creator or al-Khaliq Alone, and He has no partners in this, and He was the one who would give them their sustenance and no one would do it except for Him, and that He was the one who would give life and death, and no one would do it except for Him, and that He would control the universe and no one would do this aside from Him and that all of the heavens and the Earth and everything that is in them are His slaves and they are beneath His Will and if you want the evidence for this, that those ones who the Messenger of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم) fought against bore witness to this, then read Allah’s statement,**



“Say: Who provides for you, from the sky and the earth? Or who owns the hearing and the sight? Who brings the living out of the dead and Who brings the dead out of the living? And Who disposes the affairs? They will say Allah. Say: Then will you not then be afraid”. [10:31]

Then he says, and His statement:

وقوله قل لمن الأرض ومن فيها إن كنتم تعلمون \*سيقولون لله قل أفلا تذكرون\* قل من رب السماوات السبع ورب العرش العظيم \*سيقولون الله قل أفلا تتقون \* قل من بيده ملكوت كل شيء وهو يجير ولا يجار عليه إن كنتم تعلمون \*سيقولون لله قل فأنى تسحرون . يات وغير ذلك من ا

“Say: “Whose is the earth and whosoever is therein? If you know!” They will say: “It is Allâh's!” Say: “Will you not then remember?” Say: “Who is (the) Lord of the seven heavens, and (the) Lord of the Great Throne?” They will say: “Allâh.” Say: “Will you not then fear Allâh (believe in His Oneness, obey Him, believe in the Resurrection and Recompense for each and every good or bad deed).” Say “In Whose Hand is the sovereignty of everything (i.e. treasures of each and everything)? And He protects (all), while against Whom there is no protector, (i.e. if Allâh saves anyone none can punish or harm him, and if Allâh punishes or harms anyone none can save him), if you know.” They will say: “(All that belongs) to Allâh.” Say: “How then are you deceived and turn away from the truth?” [23:84-89].

And other such verses.”

So here the author begins to discuss the issue of just worshipping Allah in a manner, whether it's with the *Salat*, *Zakat*, or *Hajj*, or *Fasting*, or mentioning Allah, or having some fear in your heart, or believing that He exists, or believing that He's the Creator, in and of itself, these things aren't sufficient for a person to be a Muslim. Even if they claim to be Muslim, just having these things, if they have Shirk along with this, that claim is insufficient and in reality it's a false claim, so it's saying that "we're Muslim or that this will benefit us on the Day of Judgement." If they have these actions, it's actually an incorrect statement and belief and the evidence for this is these verses. So these people knew that Allah created them, and all of these other concepts, they completely accepted them but what was the reason it wouldn't benefit them? It was that they performed Shirk with Allah as we will go onto mention right away.

So, we can *summarise* this statement of the author by saying that these people amongst Quraysh who the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sent to, they accepted the **Tawhid of Rububiyyah**, so what we talked about last week, which is the *Tawhid of Lordship – that Allah created everything and controls everything, and provides sustenance for everything*. So, the kuffar of the Arab at the time accepted these concepts, they didn't reject them, and like we talked about last week, sometimes it's called "*Tawhid ar-Rububiyyah*", other times it's called "*Tawhid al-Ma'arifa wa'l Ifbat*", so depending on what book you're reading, it might be phrased differently, so just keep that in mind.

We also see from what the author mentioned that they had specific actions of worship. So, they didn't just believe these things, they worshipped Allah as well, and he mentioned a

number of them. So, he mentioned the Hajj, and we know that they did perform hajj at the time, we know that Allah says,

ثُمَّ أَفِضُوا مِنْ حَيْثُ أَفَاضَ النَّاسُ

**“Then depart from the place from where [all] the people depart...” [2:199]**

So, Allah was discussing the Hajj and we know that He was referring them in how to perform Hajj to do what they used to do. So, this was a correct action amongst the Hajj, was to leave from area to area. So, Allah was referring them back to what they used to do in that issue. So, we know that they would perform Hajj and we know that ‘Ali (رضي الله عنه) was sent to call out in the haram that no one should perform the tawaf while they were uncovered because this is something they used to do. So, we know that, if they weren’t performing it, then what was Ali referring to when we went and called the people to this. And we know that in the hadith from Abdullah ibn ‘Abbas (رضي الله عنه), that he said, “That the Mushrikun used to say *“Labayk Allahumma Labayk”* or *“We are at your command and One who has no partner.”* So the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) when he would hear them say this, he would say ‘Enough, Enough’.” So, meaning “Stop, what you just said, don’t say anything further.” Then they would say *“Except for a partner that You have who You control and that which he has.”* Meaning that, they would then go on and say something further which was actually a statement of Shirk, so the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was essentially saying, what you’re saying in the beginning is correct, don’t go any further because you’re going to wreck what you’re saying. You’re doing something that’s a worship of Allah, don’t add any Shirk to this. So, they would say this while performing Tawaf and this hadith was narrated by Imam Muslim.

So, obviously they were performing *Hajj* and they would perform *Tawaf*, and they would mention Allah and they would fast as well. We know that they had types of fasts, some say it was Ashura and some say it was just a general fast. Also, the author mentioned that from Abdullah ibn ‘Umar, that ‘Umar bin Khattab said to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), “In *Jahiliyah*, I made an oath that I would perform *I’tikaf* in Masjid al-Haram for one night”, so the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said “Fulfil your oath.” So, we know that they used to have oaths or vows that they used to make to Allah and they also had *I’tikaf*. So, these are all acts of worship, that they used to perform for Allah. Also the hadith of A’ishah (رضي الله تعالى عنها) in which she described the Muskrikin, that they used to perform fasting during the time of Ashura.

So, all of these things, the point of this, and there’s other actions of worship that they used to do. What we see from this is that they had some acceptance of Allah, and they had acts of worship that they would actually perform for Allah, but despite this, it was their Shirk which removed them from the religion that they were upon. So, this is actually what took them out of the religion of Ibrahim, which they were originally upon.

So insha’Allah we’ll stop there for now. Just to recap, we have that the Mushrikin believed in Allah’s existence, they believed in many of His Actions, that He Created and that He would give Rizq to people and to all creation and so on. They performed specific actions for Allah as acts of worship, and there’s even acts of worship that continued in Islam obviously without the Shirk in specific guidelines, but they did have many acts of worship that we still perform. They had a version of that, but despite this, it didn’t help them. And we know that the

Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), **if they were upon Islam**, he wouldn't be calling them to anything, and **if they were upon Islam**, they wouldn't have fought him and **if they were upon Islam**, he wouldn't have fought them.

So, this idea that, you'll hear very often about the *Jews* and the *Christians*, and about the *Rafidah*, and about the *Druze* and even about atheists somehow, sometimes you'll hear people say, "But they believe in a Creator". I don't know how that works when they refer to the atheists, but you'll even hear people say this, or communists, or people who are among democracy or whatever other religion it is that they following, they'll say "Oh but they believe that Allah created everything." Or "He's a good person." So they think that this is sufficient for the person to become Muslim. Really, how is that possible when these people who the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sent to, called to Islam, and he actually fought them to bring Islam to them. They were much closer to Islam than a lot of what goes on nowadays, but somehow they weren't Muslims, but these people nowadays are considered Muslims.

Obviously, anyone who has a small amount of intellect would look at that and say, even if I don't understand all the details, I know that this is wrong, it can't make sense, it can't be that Allah sent the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to call these people to Islam, but there's people who are further from Islam now, who are Muslims. How does that work? Someone with knowledge would be able to look at that and explain it and someone without knowledge should be able to look at that and say I don't understand all the details but I know it's a false claim because it doesn't comply with the Qur'an, and it doesn't comply with the Sunnah.

So insha'Allah we'll stop there and next week, we'll get a little bit further into this topic, and go onto some of the misconceptions of this issue. Wallahu a'lam.

### Lesson 3:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

Insha'Allah, we're continuing now with the commentary or explanation of the book "**Kashf ash-Shubuhah**" by Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhab. The last part we talked about last week was the discussion on the issue of the kuffar of the Quraysh and the fact that they believed in the existence of Allah, and that they believed that Allah was the Creator of the universe, and they believed Allah was the Sustainer of the universe, and they believed Allah had many of these characteristics and Attributes, so, they believed many of these things about Allah (سبحانه و تعالى).

They also used to worship Allah with a number of types of worship. We mentioned that, they would perform *Hajj*, and within the *Hajj*, *Tawaf* and they would fast in general, and specifically we mentioned that, they used to fast the fast of *Ashura*, and they would mention or remember Allah and perform *Thikr of Allah*, and they would make *du'a* to Allah, and they would give *Sadaqah*, and they would do many of these acts of worship, and they claimed that they were upon the religion of Ibrahim, but despite this, this wasn't sufficient for them to be considered Muslimin.

So, we see from this, that the idea that the person believes in the existence of Allah, or they believe in some of the Attributes of Allah, or they worship Allah with false or even if it's a correct type of worship, that all of these things, in an of themselves, and even all of these things combined together **isn't sufficient** for the person to be considered Muslim. There's more to Islam than that and even if a person claimed to follow the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and they worshipped Allah, and they believed in the existence of Allah, but then they associated or performed an act of Shirk with Allah, that this would be sufficient for them not to be Muslim.

So, in the end, it isn't sufficient to worship Allah, it has to be worship sincerely for Allah, and it can't be with any sort of intermediary or any sort of partner with Allah, whether we're saying it's the same as Allah, or whether we're saying that it's an intermediary between us and Allah, that worshipping this person or this thing, so that they will intercede for us with Allah, that this isn't an argument or this isn't an excuse for these acts and it doesn't make this forgivable or it doesn't make them to be valid excuses.

So, we'll move on and mention the next point that the author mentions, so after mentioning all these points, he says:

فإذا تحققت أنهم مقرون بهذا

Or, “If this becomes known to you, that they accepted all this”.

So, meaning, they accepted Allah exists, and that He’s the Creator and the Sustainer.

Then he says:

ولم يدخلهم في التوحيد الذي دعاهم إليه رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم). ( وعرفت أن التوحيد الذي مجدوه ، هو توحيد العبادة الذي يسميه المشركون في زماننا لا اعتقاد : كما كانوا يدعون الله سبحانه ليلا ونهارا ، ثم منهم من يدعو الملائكة لأجل صلاحهم ، وقربهم من الله ليشفعوا له أو يدعوا رجلا صالحا مثل اللات ، أو نبيا مثل : عيسى ، وعرفت : أن رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) قاتلهم على هذا الشرك ودعاهم إلى إخلاص العبادة لله وحده كما قال الله تعالى : فلا تدعو الله أحدا وقال تعالى : له دعوة الحق والذين يدعون من دونه لا يستجيبون لهم بشيء . وتحققت أن رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) قاتلهم ليكون الدعاء كله لله ، والنذر كله لله والإستغاثه كلها بالله ، وجميع أنواع العبادات كلها لله وعرفت : أن اقرارهم بتوحيد الربوبية لم يدخلهم في الإسلام و أن قصد هم الملائكة ، و الأنبياء و الأولياء ، يريدون شفاعتهم ، والتقرب إلى الله بذلك ، هو الذي أحل دماءهم . وأموالهم عرفت حينئذ التوحيد الذي دعت إليه الرسل ، وأبى عن الإقرار به المشركون وهذا التوحيد

Or, “But this did not include them or enter them into Tawhid, or the Tawhid which the Messenger of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم) called them to, and you know that the Tawhid which they rejected was the Tawhid of ‘Ibadah, that which the Mushrikin of our time have called belief (I’tiqaad). So, they used to call upon Allah in the day and in the night but then some of them would call upon, or perform du’a to the Angels, due to their Salah, or their righteousness and their nearness to Allah, and that they would do so that they would intercede for them. Or they would make du’a to a righteous person or righteous man such as “Al-Lat”, or a Prophet like ‘Isa, and you come to know that the Messenger of Allah fought them due to their Shirk and called them to make their worship sincere for Allah Alone, as He (ta’ala) said,

وَأَنَّ الْمَسَاجِدَ لِلَّهِ فَلَا تَدْعُوا مَعَ اللَّهِ أَحَدًا

Or that, “And the masajid belong to Allah, so do not perform du’a to anyone with Allah.” [72:18]

And Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) said,

لَهُ دَعْوَةُ الْحَقِّ ۖ وَالَّذِينَ يَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِهِ لَا يَسْتَجِيبُونَ لَهُمْ بِشَيْءٍ إِلَّا كَبَاسِطٌ كَفَّيْهِ إِلَى الْمَاءِ لِيَبْلُغَ فَاهُ وَمَا هُوَ بِبَالِغِهِ ۚ وَمَا دُعَاءُ الْكَافِرِينَ إِلَّا فِي ضَلَالٍ

Which translates as, **“For Him is the Word of truth, so whom they invoke or perform du’a to or worship besides Allah, will not answer the, except the way that one who stretches out his hand in order for water to reach his mouth but it reaches him not and the invocations of the disbelievers is nothing but an error” [13:14]**

And then he [the author] continues:

**“And when you have established that the Messenger of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم) fought them so that all of invocation (du’a) would be for Allah [alone], likewise making oaths for Allah alone, [ritual] sacrificing (dhabh) for Allah alone, seeking aid [in times of hardship] from Allah alone, and all the various forms of worship for Allah alone. And when you have come to know that their [mere] affirmation of Tawhid ar-Rububiyyah did not enter them into Islam, and that their seeking the Angels, or the Prophets, or the Righteous, seeking their intercession and seeking nearness to Allah through all of that was the reason that made their blood and wealth lawful. When you have come to know all of these affairs], then you will have come to know [the true nature] of the Tawhid which the Messengers invited to and which the Mushrikin refused to affirm and accept [which is the Tawhid of ‘Ibadah].”**

So, this is the section we’ll begin talking about today, so the author here is following up on what we talked about last week. So, he is explaining that accepting the existence of Allah and worshipping Him with acts of worship and attributing to Allah some of the things that are correctly attributed to Him, that He is the Creator and Sustainer and so on, that this isn’t sufficient to enter the person into Islam, just like it isn’t sufficient for someone who was in Islam to only accept these things, and to mix in acts of Shirk with this.

So, what he argues here, is he says that, when Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) said,

وَأَنَّ الْمَسَاجِدَ لِلَّهِ فَلَا تَدْعُوا مَعَ اللَّهِ أَحَدًا

**“And the masajid belong to Allah, so do not perform du’a to anyone with Allah.” [72:18]**

This is, Allah giving us the forbiddance of worshipping anything with Allah and the reason for this. So, the *masajid* here in this verse, the scholars differ upon the opinion. So, the masajid, the main understanding of what the *masajid* are, are the place where you go to pray. The other understanding of masajid is the limbs in which you perform Sujud.

So, in any case, whether it’s either of the explanations of what masajid in this verse means, in any case Allah is giving us the reason why we shouldn’t make Shirk. So, if the masajid which are the houses of Allah, belong to Allah, then why would we go to this House of Allah, then worship someone other than Him. And if it’s the limbs which we perform Sujud with, so meaning our hands, our knees, our feet and our head, if these belong to Allah, then why would we use them in worshipping someone other than Allah.

So, this is the point here. Allah is giving us a forbiddance and He's telling us the reason why which is only logical. If someone did this in the dunya, if someone gave you something and you thanked someone, it would be illogical for you to do so. Or if someone gave you something as a present and you did something wrong to them with that present, you insulted them with that present, this would be illogical even in the dunya. So how about, when it's not a person giving you something, it's Allah creating you and giving you these virtues and these bounties, then you use them to worship other than Him. So, this is the meaning of this verse.

Then what Allah said in the other verse,

وَمَا دُعَاءُ الْكَافِرِينَ إِلَّا فِي ضَلَالٍ

**“And the du'a, or the acts of worships of the kafirin are nothing but an error.” [13:14]**

So, Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) is saying here that, the Mushrikin who claim to believe in Allah, or they might actually believe in Allah, the acts of worships that they do when they're in this state, in the end they won't benefit them. So, the fact that they claim something and do something based upon that claim because it's not being fulfilled in the correct way, meaning that because these acts of worship are either being done with Shirk in them, or they may be doing something sincerely but then performing Shirk elsewhere, it invalidates all of these things, and it makes them worthless in the end, and we'll talk about that in a bit more detail.

So, now just to talk specifically about some of the things that the author said. I'll talk about some of the words, or some of the sentences that he used. So, it's been confirmed from these Ayat and these hadith that we talked about, that the kuffar accepted a number of things which we also accept. So, the Rububiyyah or the Lordship of Allah. We also know that they used to worship Allah and we know that the Tawhid that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) called them too, wasn't to accepting the existence of Allah, but it was to the worshipping of Allah Alone, and to leave any types of Shirk, and we talked about this last week, when we said that the Mushrikin used to say “*Labayk Allahumma Labayk*”, but then they would add something to it, which was an act of Shirk. So, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) didn't say, “It's good that you're doing this, we have this in common,” no, he said “Stop where you are, stop”, he said in the hadith that we talked about. So, he didn't say that we have these things in common, or this is good that you're doing this, it was like stop no, the whole thing is needed. It's not sufficient that you do just part of it, you need to have the whole thing, because it's not something where part of it is sufficient. If you do something good, but then you put something within that goodness that invalidates the whole thing, then really in the end, the whole thing was worthless. It isn't something where you could say, part of it is sufficient, or part of it will fulfil what needs to be fulfilled. **It's an all or none when it comes to Tawhid and Shirk.**

So, the author mentioned a number of things that the Mushrikin would worship besides Allah. So, we see that Allah mentioned that the kuffar at the time or the Mushrikin at the time would worship Angels, or Prophets, or righteous people with Allah.

The **important** thing to look here is that, if we look at what the Mushrikin used to do, when they were questioned about, why are you worshipping these things, they wouldn't say “Because we believe they're creating us”, or “because we believe that they have power.” It was because their good, because the Angels are righteous, because Allah has bought the



Angels near to Him, and He has given them specific virtues, because of their righteousness, instead of worshipping Allah directly, we worship these things to intercede for us with Allah. But despite this, this was sufficient for them to be considered Mushrikin. So, the fact that they claimed that, they weren't saying "We're not worshipping Allah", if you look at it, they're saying, "we accept Allah should be worshipped, but these creations have a better chance with Allah than us, so we're going to do an act of worship for them, and this will bring us nearer to Allah."

So, for a Muslim, we look at this as quite ridiculous and it doesn't make any sense, as Allah (سبحانه و تعالی) told us to worship Him, why are you worshipping something then hoping that's going to intercede for you with Allah. But it is quite common nowadays, they might go to a grave and make du'a to that person to make du'a to Allah for them. Or they'll make a sacrifice of an animal, and do it for so and so, whether it's for their father, or someone in a grave a saint, in some of the countries, this is widespread, that they'll go to certain places and they'll slaughter at that area and they'll say this is for the person in the grave, so they'll intercede with Allah on our behalf. It's common also, you know they call them saints or they call them or a Sayyid, amongst many groups of the Sufis, throughout the world, and it's become quite widespread Allahul Musta'an in our city now, or the groups of the Rafidah who make du'a to al-Hasan or al-Husayn or Fatimah, or 'Ali, or the Imams.

These types of things become very widespread now, where to us when we look at it, it seems ridiculous, but it's being done by people who claim to be Muslimin, even in our time. So, this is the importance of knowing this, because if someone was ignorant, and they went to some of these people, and they said what are you doing, and they said "I'm going to this grave, because if I worship this person here, then he'll intercede on my behalf with Allah." Someone who doesn't know about Tawhid, doesn't know about Islam, their fitrah will be "I want to please Allah, if this is going to please Allah then I'm going to do it."

So, people who aren't aware of these things, can fall into this trap, just out of ignorance of the Qur'an and the Sunnah, so they might think they're doing something good, but really in the end, this is the exact opposite of what Allah told us to do. So, this as we see becomes a trap of the Shaytan, that someone will think they're doing something good, when in reality not only is it not what Allah ordered us, it's the completely opposite with what He ordered us, and it's the thing that the Messengers came with to actually fight and eradicate.

As we see here, when the author mentioned they might worship an Angel, or they might worship a righteous person like "*Al-Lat*", or they might worship a Prophet like 'Isa, this isn't intended to be like all inclusive. So just because the author didn't mention something else, it doesn't mean there's not people out there who worship other things. We talked about people who will go to a grave, or they'll go to a site, or they'll go to a house or whatever it is, and they make du'a to this Sayyid, or their Imam, this would be included in all of this, even though the author didn't mention it. So this is something that, insha'Allah it's clear, the evidence is quite clear for it, but despite this, there are people who, nowadays, what they try to do, is that they say, "no, what you're saying in that the Mushrikin accepted Allah as their Lord, but they just worshipped other than Allah, this is incorrect." And they'll try to mention Ayat from the Qur'an to try to prove this statement.

So the point of them doing this, there's something behind, there's an ideology behind it, and what that is, is that, if we establish from the Qur'an and the Sunnah that someone who claims Islam, might not actually be Muslim, if they worship other than Allah, and we use these

evidences, this will have implications on people doing things they shouldn't do. If someone follows a certain methodology in which they perform acts of worship for their Shaykhs, or they perform acts of worship for their Sayyid's or whatever they call them, and they claim to be Muslim and they claim this is from Islam. When this evidence is presented to them, that the Mushrikin used to do things very similar to what you're doing, that they accepted Allah as their Creator, but they worshipped other than Allah, or they associated other than Allah in their acts of worship that were for Allah, so they had a partner with them.

This has implications on what they're doing because then this proves now, we can't continue doing what we're doing, we can't claim to be Muslim, and claim that we're worshipping Allah, but then also associate these people, or these shrines or these Angels, we can't associate them with Allah, **so what is the argument they try to put forth in order to reject this?**

They say no, the whole concept that you're coming up with is wrong to begin with. This isn't what the Mushrikin used to do, the Mushrikin actually didn't accept Allah, so this is why the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sent to them, it wasn't to make them worship Allah Alone, it was to make them accept Allah to begin with. And they try to use a number of Ayat to prove this.

So, the first Ayah they try to use is in Surah al-Furqan, when Allah said,

وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُمْ اسْجُدُوا لِلرَّحْمَنِ قَالُوا وَمَا الرَّحْمَنُ أَنَسْجُدُ لِمَا تَأْمُرُنَا وَزَادَهُمْ نُفُورًا

Or which translates as, **“And when it was said to them, “Prostrate to Ar-Rahman”, they would say “And what is Ar-Rahman, shall we perform prostration to that which you command us”. And it increases them only in aversion.” [25:60]**

Meaning they would turn away from it even more so. So the ones who try to argue against this idea that we're showing in the Qur'an and the Sunnah that they can't worship anyone with Allah, and this was what the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was actually sent with to the Mushrikin to clarify, they say, no, they didn't even believe in Allah to begin with, they didn't accept Allah.

What is your evidence? They say when Allah mentioned in this verse, that they said, “What is Ar-Rahman?”. So, their argument is they say that when the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) commanded them to worship Allah, they were saying “Who is Allah?”, or “What is Allah?”. We know that Allah has many Names, and from His Names was “Ar-Rahman”, so they say they didn't even accept Allah to begin with.

Also, they use another verse which is similar to this, when Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) said,

كَذَلِكَ أَرْسَلْنَاكَ فِي أُمَّةٍ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِنْ قَبْلِهَا أُمَمٌ لَتَتْلُوَ عَلَيْهِمُ الَّذِي أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْكَ وَهُمْ يَكْفُرُونَ  
بِالرَّحْمَنِ ۚ قُلْ هُوَ رَبِّي لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ عَلَيْهِ تَوَكَّلْتُ وَإِلَيْهِ مَتَابِ

Or that, **“Thus have We sent you to a community before which [other] communities have passed on so you might recite to them that which We revealed to you, while they**

**disbelieve in the Most Merciful. Say, "He is my Lord; there is no deity except Him. Upon Him I rely, and to Him is my return." [13:30]**

So, they say this is another verse that shows they disbelieved in Allah to begin with. They didn't even accept the existence or the Lordship of Allah, it had nothing to do with worshipping someone other than Allah, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sent to inform them about Allah to begin with.

So, they mention these two verses, but if we look at these verses and the context in which it was revealed. If we look at some of the incidences that took place during the lifetime of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), we see that what is meant in these Ayat, isn't what these people claim that these Ayat mean.

So, first of all when they said, "What is Ar-Rahman?", if we look to the treaty of *Hudaybiyyah* in which the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) wrote a contract with the kuffar, we see that in this hadith, that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) commanded 'Ali (رضي الله عنه) to write down, "**Bismillahi al-Rahmani al-Rahim**", on the contract. At this point, Suhail, who was from the kuffar of Quraysh said, "What is Ar-Rahman?, we do not know what Ar-Rahman is, but instead write the name of Allah".

So, we see here that this Ayah isn't referring to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) coming to teach them Allah exists, it's referring to the kuffar rejecting one of the Names of Allah. So, this argument is a completely invalid argument, and even more so, if we look at the evidences that were mentioned last week, when they used to say "*Labayk Allahumma Labayk*", they're clearly believing in the existence of Allah, and they're even worshipping Him, but then they would add acts of Shirk to it.

Another evidence that they try to use is the verse in which Allah said,

وَيُسَبِّحُ الرَّعْدُ بِحَمْدِهِ وَالْمَلَائِكَةُ مِنْ خِيفَتِهِ وَيُرْسِلُ الصَّوَاعِقَ فَيُصِيبُ بِهَا مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَهُمْ يُجَادِلُونَ فِي اللَّهِ وَهُوَ شَدِيدُ الْمِحَالِ

Which translates as, "**And the thunder exalts [Allah] with praise of Him - and the angels [as well] from fear of Him - and He sends thunderbolts and strikes therewith whom He wills while they dispute about Allah ; and He is severe in assault.**" [13:13]

So, they say here that, Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) mentioned here that, they actually dispute the existence of Allah to begin with, so they argue that, "you claim that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) fought Quraysh and called them to Islam", it wasn't because they were performing Shirk, it wasn't because they were worshipping a Prophet, or it wasn't because they were worshipping their elders or their ancestors, and it wasn't because they were worshipping At-Lat and Uzza, it was because they didn't accept Allah to begin with.

So, they say the evidence is, "**They are disputing about Allah.**" So, they say this is evidence enough to prove this point.

There's a number of ways to reply to this. **First** of all, we know that the name of Allah comes from "Ilah", which is The One that is Worshipped, so their disputing the worship of Allah, they're not disputing the existence of Allah. **Secondly**, the beginning of the verse is talking

about worship, **“the thunder praises and glorifies Allah”**, this is an act of worship, **“as do the Angels due to awe”**. So, Allah here is mentioning that these creations, so the thunder which is from Allah’s creation and the Angels, which are from Allah’s creation, they’re worshipping Allah, due to their knowledge of the power and the awesomeness, and the awe of Allah, but the kuffar are disputing this.

So, it’s not that they are disputing the existence of Allah, they’re disputing the worshipping Allah Alone. Plus, if we look at the fact that they used to accept Allah, and they used to worship Him, and they used to perform these actions, then really in the end, this argument is a baseless argument, and it’s quite ridiculous in the end if we look at it in the context of all the other evidences.

They also try to use the verse when Allah said,

وَلَا يَأْمُرُكُمْ أَنْ تَتَّخِذُوا الْمَلَائِكَةَ وَالنَّبِيِّينَ أَرْبَابًا

Or that, **“Nor would he order you to take the Angels and Prophets as Lords.” [3:80]**

So, meaning that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) wouldn’t come to the people and order them to take the Angels and the Prophets as Lords. Allah is saying here that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) didn’t come to teach the people to take these things as Lords, on the contrary, he was coming to teach the people to take Allah as their Lord. So, if we look at this again, what’s mean by **“Ar-bab”** here or **“Lords”** is, Gods. Allah sent the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to take the people worshipping other things, to worshipping Allah, not that he came to teach the people to accept the existence of Allah, or to take Him as their Lord.

Likewise, if we look at it the context in which this verse in the Qur’an was revealed, there’s actually a story behind it. So, the story for this is that there was a group of the kuffar, specifically they’re Christians from Najran, and they came to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) called them to Islam, so their response was, “Do you want us to worship you?”, so they’re asking is it you that you’re wanting us to worship, so Allah revealed this verse. So, we see from this verse, that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was being asked, should we worship you, so Allah revealed this verse explaining that it would be impossible, or that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) would come with Islam then call people to worship himself.

So, if we look at this, we can see that, of all the creation, we know that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is the best of creation, he’s the best of the humans, he’s better than any of the creation of Allah, so if there was going to be a creation which would be the most logical, even though it’s not logical, but if it’s not accepted to worship the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), than how about a Prophet that isn’t at his status, and how about on top of that, someone who isn’t a Prophet, he’s only a righteous person, and if he’s not a righteous person, he’s a fasiq, and how about if he’s not a fasiq only, he’s not even a Muslim.

So, if it’s unacceptable to worship the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and to perform du’a to him, and to perform oaths based upon him or oaths to him, and to slaughter things on his behalf,

all these things are unacceptable for him, then doing it for your Shaykh, or your Sayyid or your Imam, or doing it for a Prophet or anything else would be even more unacceptable.

So, this verse that, they try to use to say that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) didn't dispute with the Mushrikin about Tawhid of worship, it was about the existence of Allah that this would be completely unacceptable. And they use a number of other Ayat, which are again very weak in their argument. For example, they mention that Allah said,

وَمَا يُؤْمِنُ أَكْثَرُهُمْ بِاللَّهِ إِلَّا وَهُمْ مُشْرِكُونَ

Or that, **“Most of them don't believe in Allah, except that they are Mushrikun”. [12:106]**

So, they say that here that most of them didn't believe in Allah. But if we look at this in the context, Allah is saying, most of them didn't believe in Allah, except that they added to this, acts of Shirk. So, again this is something that is exactly what we're saying, if someone worships Allah, or believes in Allah, then they perform an act of Shirk with it, it makes their claim invalid. And I'll stop there in regards to mentioning the Ayat that they use, but I just want to add a bit more as to the reason for this.

**So, what is the big deal if someone claims that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) came to teach Quraysh that Allah exists, or that he came to teach the Quraysh that Allah is the Creator. What's the problem if we say this?**

We would say that the problem with this is, first of all it's not reality, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) didn't come to Quraysh to tell them Allah exists, this was something that was well established amongst them, they knew Allah exists and we proved this last week, the author talked about it. So, what is the fall out of accepting this?

The results of following this misconception is that people who accept that Allah exists, and they accept that Allah is the Creator and they worship Allah, regardless of what they do, regardless of whether they worship someone other than Allah, these people would be considered Muslims, and they would be afforded the rights of Muslimin, and we would treat them as Muslimin, and we would make du'a for them for goodness and we would give them all the rights of the Muslimin, and we would say that eventually they would enter Jannah.

This is why it's a problem, because if we're saying that the only reason the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) came was to tell people that Allah exists, the next steps of this is saying that, all we really need to do to be Muslim is accept that Allah exists, and that He creates everything, and that we do some acts of worship for Him, regardless of whether we worship Allah in the masjid, then we go out and go to graveyard and prostrate to a grave, or we bring someone to the masjid, and we pray our Salat, and after we put someone in front of the masjid and everyone makes Sujud for him. If we accept this argument that the prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) came to teach Quraysh that Allah exists and that was the only thing he came for, that's the result of that, that's what that argument would lead to, because then we're saying what Quraysh did was correct because once they believed in Allah, they were upon the correct religion.

So, someone might look at it and say what's the big deal if we say that Quraysh didn't believe in Allah, this is the fall out of it, and this is why it's so important to be aware of the

misconceptions that people try to bring and this is why we're spending so much time talking about these things because it's becoming more and more widespread in general and it's becoming more and more widespread in our city, and the da'wah to these types of things, and bringing up these misconceptions about Islam, and misconceptions about Tawhid are becoming more and more widespread so insha'Allah, people should be aware what's out there from the misconceptions, and they should know how to argue against, and how to answer against these misconceptions so that they themselves don't fall into it, and they can warn others about it.

Insha'Allah we'll stop there for today and we'll continue next week where the author left of. Wallahu A'lam.

## Lesson 4:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

Insha'Allah we'll continue discussing some points or some explanatory notes on the book "**Kashf ash-Shubuhah**." The last thing that we talked about was the idea that some people try to propagate or try to spread that the Mushrikin at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) didn't actually believe in Allah, or the existence of Allah, or that they didn't even believe Allah existed or created anything or any of these types of Tawhid, which we call **Tawhid ar-Rububiyyah**. More importantly, we talked about the dangers of saying this, so someone might say what's the problem if we say that Quraysh who were kuffar, that they didn't believe in the existence of Allah, and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) came to teach them this.

What's the problem of saying this, and we talked about the dangers of that idea and that the real danger in this idea is that, we know that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sent by Allah to teach the people what they needed to learn, so and what he came with was the Tawhid that was needed by the people, or that the people didn't have at the time. So, we know also based upon that, that if Allah judged on the people at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), that they were disbelievers or kuffar, or that they were polytheists or mushrikin, that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) came to bring the people away from that.

So, this is where we see the danger in saying that at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), the people didn't believe in Allah at all, because then what this would lead us to say is that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) didn't come to teach people to stop making Shirk and to worship Allah Alone, but what he actually came to do, was to teach people about the existence of Allah. If we accept this idea, then the next logical step is that we would say that, as long as someone believes in the existence of Allah, and that Allah created everything, and He is the Sustainer and the Provider, and these types of Tawhid, that we called *Tawhid ar-Rububiyyah*, that Allah is the Lord, then after that, whether the person worships Allah or not, or whether her worships Allah Alone or something with Him, that this wouldn't affect their Islam, and it wouldn't affect their status in the Hereafter.

So, this is the danger in the claim that Quraysh didn't believe in Allah at all, what we're saying is that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sent for a completely different reason and that the situation at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was a situation that was completely different than reality. Alhamdulillah, we discussed some of the evidences that they use to try to prove this, we mentioned four or five Ayat from the Qur'an and how they try to use these things as evidence to say that they disbelieved in Allah or they used to dispute the existence of Allah, or they disbelieved in Ar-Rahman, or that most of them wouldn't believe in Allah to begin in and so on, and we discussed how they used them and the refutation or response to these arguments.

So, the **next thing** we're going to discuss, is that the author he said:



هو معنى قولك لا إله إلا الله ، فإن لا إله عندهم هو الذي يقصد لأجل هذه الأمور

Or, “And this Tawhid, it is the meaning of your statement, La ilaha ila Allah because the ‘Ilah’ or the God is the One who is Sought out for these matters”.

So, meaning the types of Tawhid we talked about.

And:

أو نبيا ، أو وليا ، أو شجرة ، أو قبرا ، أو جنيا لم يريدوا أن الإله هو الخالق ، الرزق المدبر ، فإنهم يعلمون أن ذلك لله وحده ، كما قدمت لك وإنما يعنون بالإله ، مايعني المشركون في زماننا بلفظ السيد

Or, “Whether this person is an Angel or a Prophet, or a Wali, or a saint, or a Salih person, or a tree, or a grave or jinn or something else. They didn’t intend by the word Ilah that He was the One Who Created and the One Who Provided and the One Who Sustained, because they knew that was for Allah Alone. As was mentioned before [meaning the evidence that were presented before] and at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), what they meant when they would say the word Ilah was the same thing that was meant by people nowadays [time of the author] when they would say the word “Sayyid” [or Master].”

So, people often would, in his time, and we see it nowadays with groups of Sufis, that they’ll label people who they go to the graves and worship them, they’ll label them as “Sayyid”.

Then he says:

فأتاهم النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) يدعوهم إلى كلمة التوحيد ، وهي : لا إله إلا الله

Or, “So, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) came to them, calling them to the word of Tawhid, and it is “La ilaha ila Allah.”

So this is what the author said on this topic, so what we need to take from this or what we can call this section is that the Mushrikin, they knew the meaning of *La ilaha ila Allah*, they knew the actual true meaning of *La ilaha ila Allah* and this is why as we’ll see soon and we’ll talk about in the future as well, why when they were called to say *La ilaha ila Allah*, they refused because they knew what it entailed. They knew that by saying this, they were accepting something that was larger than just a statement, it actually had a general meaning and it had an effect on their daily lives, and what they would be able to do, and what they wouldn’t be able to do.

So, this is what we’ll talk about today, is this statement of the author. So, what we can say first is that, the “Ilah” or the God according to Ahlu Sunnah wa’l Jama’ah, it means anything that is worshipped, or it means anything that is intended with any act of worship, whether it’s Salat or Zakat, or Hajj, or Fasting, or giving Sadaqah or making an oath, or slaughtering, or any type of act of worship. So, this is the meaning of the word “Ilah”, according to Ahlu Sunnah wa’l Jama’ah.

But if we look to the word of “*Ilah*” or the word of God according to the other groups, within Islam, or some that have actually left Islam, whether it’s the *Ash’ariyyah* or the *Jahmiyyah*, or the *Mu’tazillah*, or the *Rafidah* and others. What they say is that the meaning of the word “**Ilah**” is the same as the word “**Rabb**” or same as the word “God”. So, what that means is they say that, according to that, this comes back to what we talked about a few weeks ago, that anyone who believes Allah exists, then that’s sufficient for them to be Muslim, then they would be sufficient for them to enter Jannah and to keep them away from the Fire. So, this is the meaning of “*Ilah*” according to Ahlu Sunnah wa’ Jama’ah.

The next thing is, when we say “**La ilaha ila Allah**”, what does this mean?

Well if we understand the word “**Ilah**”, and we understand what an actual “*Ilah*” or God is, then we come to understand what the meaning of “*La ilaha ila Allah*” is, meaning that **“There’s nothing that’s truly worthy of worship or worthy of worship at all except Allah.”**

So, this is the definition of “*La ilaha ila Allah*”, according to Ahlu Sunnah wa’l Jama’ah, but if we look to the meaning of “*Ilah*” or “*La ilaha ila Allah*”, according to the *Ash’ariyyah*, or the *Jahmiyyah*, or the *Sufis* and the *Rafidah* and the people who worship graves and the like, then we see that, what they mean by the word “*La ilaha ila Allah*”, or that statement, that there’s no one who’s able to create except Allah. So, this again it comes back to the idea that they’ve restricted the word “*Ilah*”, to have a different meaning than what it actually means according to Ahlu Sunnah wa’l Jama’ah.

Another definition, that’s also becoming more widespread, and it’s a sad state of affairs when it’s becoming widespread is according to philosophers or people they call “Ahl-Qalam” or these types of people who try to take on a philosophical understanding of Islam and they go away from the Qur’an and the Sunnah, what they say “*La ilaha ila Allah*”, means is that “There’s no God in existence, except Allah”. Obviously, this would be the height of disbelief, to say that there’s actually no God in existence except Allah. So, it could be that they’re saying that everything is Allah and we know that this is a type of belief that’s out there, even according to some people who attribute themselves Islam, they say, everything around us and everything in existence is Allah, we seek refuge from Allah in this type of belief. So, this is the first part of what the author mentions, so he’s talking about the meaning of “*La ilaha ila Allah*”, and obviously we need to understand what the word “*Ilah*” means, in order to understand that as well.

The next thing that the author says:

والمراد من هذه الكلمة معناها لا مجرد لفظها

**Or, “And what is meant by that statement isn’t just the mere saying that statement”,**

So, meaning what is meant by “*La ilaha ila Allah*”, isn’t just saying “*La ilaha ila Allah*.” Just saying it, in and of itself isn’t what is meant, or isn’t what Allah sent the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to teach the people. We know this as well, because when the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) came to Quraysh, and he called them to “*La ilaha ila Allah*”, they didn’t say it. Even though it was leading to people leaving the religion, and they were losing their power, and eventually it led to war and the taking of their wealth and so on, and all these things were happening, and

all they had to say was just say it on their tongues, and say “La ilaha ila Allah”, but they knew that this wasn’t what was meant by it. They knew that this wasn’t the point of saying “La ilaha ila Allah”, it was a statement yes, but every statement has a meaning, and every meaning, there’s a point behind the meaning, it isn’t just a sound that comes out of your mouth, there’s something that follows it, there’s a belief behind it, there’s actions that are behind it.

So, when you say a statement, to say that “well I said the statement so every benefit from it I get”, this is something that’s completely incorrect. Even the kuffar of Quraysh at the time understood this.

So, then the author continues, and he says:

والكفار الجاهل يعلمون : أن مراد النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) بهذه الكلمة هو : إفراد الله تعالى بالتعلق والكفر بما يعبد من دون الله والبراءة منه

Or, “Even the ignorant people of the Kuffar at the time, knew that the (صلى الله عليه وسلم)’s intention of this was to only worship Allah Alone, and to disbelieve or to disavow oneself from everything besides Allah.”

Meaning, they knew this was the meaning of the statement “La ilaha ila Allah.”

Then, the author mentions the verse in Surah Sa’d, when Allah said,

فإنه لما قال لهم قولوا : لا إله إلا الله ، قالوا : أجعل الآلهة إلها واحدا ، إن هذا لشيء عجاب

Or that the kuffar of Quraysh said about the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم),

Or, “For when he said to them, “Say La ilaha ila Allah”, they replied, “Has he made the Aliha (all the things that we worship) into One God? This is something very strange.” [38:5]

And then he continues, the author he says:

فإذا عرفت أن جهال الكفر يعرفون ذلك ، فالعجب ممن يدعي الإسلام وهو لا يعرف من تفسير هذه الكلمة ما عرفه جهال الكفار بل يظن أن ذلك هو التلفظ بحروفها ، من غير اعتقاد القلب لشيء من المعاني . والحاذق منهم يظن أن معناها : لا يخلق ، و لا يرزق ، إلا الله و لا يدبر الأمر إلا الله

Or, “So, if you know that the ignorant people from the disbelievers of Quraysh, knew this meaning, then it is something extremely strange about someone who claims to be upon Islam and he doesn’t know the meaning of this word, the same level that the ignorant people of the kuffar knew the understanding of this word. Rather, he thinks that just saying the word on his tongue, and not having any belief behind it, this would

**be sufficient for being accepted. And the smart one from amongst them [meaning these people who claim to be on Islam now and, but they don't actually understand what Islam really is], would say that, it means that "no-one Creates or Sustains, or does any of these types of things except Allah."**

So, he's saying, the majority of people think it just means saying it with your tongue, as long as you say it with your tongue, that's sufficient to be Muslim. But the smart one amongst them, and we'll see how it's actually not smart, thinks that it means as long as you believe that only Allah creates and sustains, that's sufficient.

So, then he says:

**فلا خير في رجل جهال الكفار أعلم منه بمعنى لا إله إلا الله**

**Or, "So, there is no good in a person who the disbelievers of Quraysh were more knowledgeable about the meaning of "La ilaha ila Allah" than him."**

So, we see from this, how there are some people who would claim Islam, and claim to be calling to Islam and following Islam, but if we look at what their understanding of "La ilaha ila Allah" is, and "La ilaha ila Allah", it's not something that is a deep context in the religion that would take after amounts of study, this is when you would come to learn about "La ilaha ila Allah". It's the first thing that you say when you enter into Islam, we say it daily, we say it in every Salat, it's the most basic aspect of Islam.

So, he's saying that there are people who claim Islam, but they know less about the meaning of "**La ilaha ila Allah**", then the disbelievers in the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) actually knew about the meaning. So, this is what the author says, so the author mentioned a number of people, he mentioned those who think that this statement is just something that's said upon the tongue and they don't know anything about the meaning of it. Then, he mentioned another type of people, that they believe it has to do with whether Allah created or not, or whether Allah exists or not.

So, the ones who say that it's only on the tongue, so they'll take certain ahadith, and they'll say that, "*The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, whoever says La ilaha ila Allah will enter Jannah*", or "*Whoever's last word in the dunya is La ilaha ila Allah, will enter Jannah*", or that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, "*I used to go to the markets and say, 'say La ilaha ila Allah, and you'll be successful.'*"

They'll use these types of statements and say, anyone who says La ilaha ila Allah regardless of what they believe, regardless of what they say on their tongue, regardless of what they do with their actions, this is sufficient for the person to be Muslim and enter Jannah.

All we need to refute this idea is that we say, what was the state of the hypocrites at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)? Allah said about them,

**إِنَّ الْمُنَافِقِينَ فِي الدَّرَكِ الْأَسْفَلِ مِنَ النَّارِ وَلَنْ تَجِدَ لَهُمْ نَصِيرًا**

Or that, "**Indeed the polytheists are in the lowest depths of the Fire, and you'll never find any helper for them.**" [4:145]

So, we see from this, we know that the Munafiqun, they used to say La ilaha ila Allah on their tongue, they used to perform the Salat, some of them would give Sadaqah, they would go out and some of them would actually perform Jihad, but not only are they in the Fire, they're in the lowest part of the Fire and what is the reason for this? Because the Iman wasn't in their heart.

So, anyone who tries to use these ahadith talking about the virtues of La ilaha ila Allah or the ruling of someone who says La ilaha ila Allah, just by the statement, then all we need to say in how they're wrong in their understanding if they say that, all that is this statement, is the condition of the Mushrikin at the time of the Prophet (ﷺ) or the Munafiqin at the time of the Prophet (ﷺ). Because if we say that, we only stick to the outward phrasing of these hadith and say that, whoever says it, that's all that's needed, doesn't matter what they do, doesn't matter what they believe, then according to that, the Munafiqin would be in Jannah, and they would be at the same level of Iman as all of the rest of the people, because they've said what you need to do, or they've said what you need to say, in order to be Muslim and fulfil all of those conditions. So, this is the **first group**, or the way to refute the first group or argue against that first understanding.

The **second group** is those who think that as long as you understand "La ilaha ila Allah", in your heart or in your mind, then this is sufficient to be Muslim. If this was the case, then what other group was around at the time of the Prophet (ﷺ) that would have been Muslim by having this understanding?

We just talked about them, Quraysh, because they knew, they knew the meaning of La ilaha ila Allah, that's why they wouldn't say it. So, we know obviously that if all that was meant was just understanding it, then what was the point of saying it then, they refused to say it and the Prophet (ﷺ) led to fighting them to say it, so obviously we know that just knowing the meaning isn't sufficient, and just saying it with your tongue isn't sufficient as well.

And the **third type** that he mentions, is those who say that believing in Allah and saying that only Allah created the heavens and the earth, and is the One who sustains, this is sufficient for the person to be Muslim. In order to refute this idea, then we would say that, there's a difference between saying that "Allah is the Rabb", and "Allah is the Ilah", or that we accept Allah as our Lord and we accept Allah as our God. There's a difference between these two, and one of the evidences for this is when Allah said,

قُلْ أَعُوذُ بِرَبِّ النَّاسِ  
مَلِكِ النَّاسِ  
إِلَهِ النَّاسِ

**"Say: I seek refuge in the Lord of the people, the King of the people and the Ilah of the people." [114:1-3]**

So, Allah differentiated between these, not that it's a different entity, Allah is all three of these, He's the King over the people, He's the God of the people and He's the Lord of the people, but these are different characteristics. So, someone may accept Allah as their Rabb, but they won't accept Him as their Ilah, so just saying "I accept Allah created everything, so

that means that I accept Him as my God or as my Ilah”, it’s a completely false statement, because there’s a difference between the two. You can’t have one and not the other.

So, this is just a few comments on this that the author mentioned.

The next thing that the author says, is he says that:

إذا عرفت ما ذكرت لك معرفة قلب ، وعرفت الشرك بالله الذي قال الله فيه : إن الله لا يغفر أن يشرك به ويغفر ما دون ذلك لمن يشاء

Or, “If you know what I mentioned to you [all the things that have been discussed; Shirk and Tawhid] and you know it with your heart, and you know that Shirk, or making Shirk, or associating someone with Allah, which Allah said about, “Verily, Allah forgives not that partners should be set up with Him in worship, but He forgives everything less than that to whom He pleases and whoever sets up partners in worship, indeed he has invented a tremendous sin” [4:48].

So, he [the author] says:

وعرفت دين الله الذي أرسل به الرسل ، من أولهم إلى آخرهم ، الذي لا يقبل الله من أحد دينا سواه ، وعرفت ما أصبح غالب الناس فيه من الجهل بهذا ، أفادك فائدتين

Or, “If you come to know all these things that we’ve talked about, and you know that Shirk is the thing that Allah said this about, that He won’t forgive Shirk, but he’ll forgive everything that is less than that, and you know that the religion of Allah which He sent the Prophets with, from the first one until the last of them, and it’s the religion that Allah won’t accept anything or a religion other than it from anyone and you know that the majority of the people are ignorant about these issues, then this leaves you two points of benefit...”

So, what he’s saying is that, if we see that not having Shirk with Allah and not performing Shirk, or performing Shirk, is the thing that Allah said he won’t forgive and that staying away from Shirk is the religion of Allah and the religion that He sent all of the Prophets with, and that this is the only religion that Allah will accept from anyone, and he won’t accept any religion other than this from the people, then if we know this, there’s **two** things we can take away from this, or two benefits we should see in this.

The first he says is:

الأولى :الفرح بفضل الله ورحمته ، كما قال الله تعالى : قل بفضل الله وبرحمته ، فبذلك فليفرحوا ، هو خير مما يجمعون . الثانية :الخوف العظيم

Or, “Being happy or being elated about the virtue and the mercy of Allah, and Allah said: “Say: in the bounty of Allah and His Mercy, therein let them rejoice, that is better than what they amass.” [10:58]. And it also should give you extreme fear.”

So, what the author's saying here is that, if we see the benefits of knowing the meaning of "La ilaha ila Allah", and how the vast majority of the people, first of all don't even claim to be Muslims and then the people who do claim to be Muslim, the vast majority of them won't actually know the real meaning of "La ilaha ila Allah." If we learn the real meaning of "La ilaha ila Allah" and we see how important it is, and we're able to understand what that actually entails, we should have two things on our mind.

**First of all**, we should be extremely happy with the Mercy that Allah and the virtue that He gave to us, because He let us come to this understanding, and come to learn this about our religion, and learn this about what He sent His Prophets with. The **second** thing would be that we should have a lot of fear about this issue.

So, the first one is clear, he mentioned a verse from the Qur'an to explain this or to prove this that the virtues and the mercy of Allah is something that we should be very happy and thankful for, and the second thing is having a lot of fear.

So, what does this mean when we say that we should have a lot of fear that the majority of people haven't even learned this, so obviously it's something that's easy to fall into, so we can have a lot of fear, knowing that could have been us, that could still be us, something could come along and lead you astray from the correct meaning of "La ilaha ila Allah". Someone could come and start bringing you misconceptions, and if you're weak, you might be fooled by then, or you might start following them out of just a weakness of Iman, or whatever the case may be. So this should also keep us very diligent in staying away from acts of Shirk and types of Shirk. So, this is what he meant when he said that we should be grateful as well as afraid.

*Another issue* to mention here is that Allah mentioned in this verse that He doesn't forgive any type of **Shirk**, and everything less than that, He would forgive. So, there's **two** points here:

**First** of all, if someone does a major act of Shirk, and this is what we talked about in the last series, and the series before that, someone worships other than Allah with a clear act of worship, they pray to other than Allah, they fast for other than Allah, they slaughter for other than Allah, they rule with the laws other than the laws of Allah. They do something that is a major act of Shirk, this is something that there's a consensus that it would never be forgiven. So, if someone dies upon this, then they would die as a non-Muslim and they would remain in Jahannam forever. The issue, or where there's a dispute is, when it comes to minor Shirk, and we haven't gone into minor Shirk very much, we'll talk about it in some other lessons, but if someone performs an act of minor Shirk, and they die before they repent from that, is this something that Allah would forgive, or would it require some punishment in the Hereafter, whether in the grave or Jahannam, in order for it to fall off a person or to be forgiven or to be expiated off a person, so, this is a matter of dispute. So insha'Allah, we'll talk just a bit about this now.

So, **the vast majority of scholars** say that the only types of Shirk that won't be forgiven is major shirk, so if someone does an act of minor shirk, or they make a statement of minor shirk, or they have something in their heart that's minor shirk, that this is something that Allah may forgive, He may punish them for it, but it doesn't necessarily require for them to be punished in the Hereafter, before it would be cancelled out of them. This is the vast majority, that they take this opinion, but there's also another opinion, a **minority opinion** that



states that it isn't forgiven, and it would require punishment in the Hereafter in order for it to be cancelled out of a person. So, they say is that when Allah said,

إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَغْفِرُ أَنْ يُشْرَكَ بِهِ

Or that, **“Allah doesn't forgive that any Shirk be performed with Him.” [4:116]**

What is meant here by the Shirk, is major Shirk, it doesn't mean minor Shirk, and they said that the context of the verse, it's being mentioned in the context of talking about disbelievers and the disbelievers in the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), and just disbelievers in general, so it's talking obviously about things that took someone out of the realm of Islam or prevented them from entering into Islam to begin with. So, this would be the meaning of the verse, that Allah wouldn't forgive this type of Shirk, or would only hold the person on major shirk, and minor shirk is something that could be forgiven.

They also used the hadith of 'Ubadah ibn Samit (رضي الله عنه) that he said, it's a long hadith, but he said, *“We swore allegiance, or we pledged allegiance to the Messenger of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم) that we wouldn't perform zina, or we wouldn't perform fornication, or we wouldn't perform any acts of Shirk with Allah, but then whoever did anything from that, and then the Hadd [punishment of the dunya] was implemented upon him, then it would be a kaffarah, or an expiation for him, and if Allah covered that and shielded him, and didn't let people know about that in the dunya, then if Allah wills, will punish him and if He wills, he will forgive him.”*

That hadith is narrated by Imam Muslim in his Sahih, and Imam Ahmad in his Musnad, so obviously it's an authentic hadith, so what they said is that, here the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) obviously isn't talking about major shirk because major shirk, it doesn't matter what happens to you in the dunya, you would die as a non-Muslim, so there's no expiation or *kaffarah* for major Shirk in the dunya, so obviously the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) isn't talking about this type of Shirk. The type of Shirk he would be talking about is the minor Shirk, so they say, the ones who argue this, they say this is evidence that performing an act of minor Shirk should be left up to Allah whether He will forgive you or not, and that it would be similar to performing zina, or stealing, or drinking alcohol, or the other types of major sins. So, this is the way they argue this, and they use some other evidences as well and it's the more widespread opinion.

So, if someone wanted to look into this on their own, the majority of the discussion they would find would be on this, so I won't go into that into too much just because arguments are much easier material to find.

The **second opinion** is that they said if you perform major Shirk, with minor Shirk, it wouldn't be forgiven with Allah, and the person would be required to be punished in the Hereafter before that sin would be taken off of them, and the argument that they use, is they use the same verse, so Allah said,

إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَغْفِرُ أَنْ يُشْرَكَ بِهِ

Or that, **“Allah doesn't forgive that any Shirk be performed with Him.” [4:116]**

If someone performs major shirk, have they performed shirk? Yes, they have. If someone performs minor Shirk, have they performed Shirk, yes, they have. So, Allah didn't differentiate between the two, He didn't say whoever performs major shirk or whoever worships other than me, he said indeed Allah won't forgive that shirk be performed with him and he didn't specify a specific kind, so this is the first evidence. So, you can see how they both used the same verse, but it's a different interpretation of the verse. They also use the hadith that was narrated by Imam al-Tirmidhi, that the Prophet (ﷺ) said, mentioning that what Allah said, so it's a hadith Qudsi, or it's a hadith in which the Prophet (ﷺ) is narrating a statement of Allah, so it says,

*"Abu Dard (رضي الله عنه) said or he reported the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) mentioned that, Allah said about himself, that if you were to come to me with the amount of the whole earth in sins, and then you came to me with not associating anyone with me or anything with me, then I would come to you with its amount (meaning amount of the Earth) with forgiveness."*

This hadith was also narrated by Imam Muslim as well. So, they argue that here the Prophet (ﷺ) when he was mentioning about Allah, again in this hadith it was a general statement, it didn't say major shirk, it didn't say minor shirk, it didn't say "if you came to me as a Muslim", because if it said that then we would know that obviously it's only referring to major shirk. But "if you came to Me, not associating anything with Me at all", the word 'anything', if someone associates anything with Allah in a minor way, have they associated something with Allah? They have, so just like with something major.

So, technically, it would fall under the meaning of this hadith as well. Then they mention a number of other statements of the Prophet (ﷺ) arguing this point, that what is meant by this Shirk that won't be forgiven is any type of Shirk, whether it's major or minor, and like we said, this is a minority opinion, it was the opinion of Ibn Taymiyyah (رحمه الله), and also the opinion of Ibn Qayyim (رحمه الله) and it was the opinion of a number of the Imams of the Najdiyyah da'wah, so Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhab (رحمه الله) and some of the statements that he said and Abdur-Rahman ibn Qasim (رحمه الله) and some of the others.

So, even though it is a minority opinion, it's definitely an opinion amongst *Ahlu-Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah*, so it isn't an opinion someone might say this is an extremist opinion, or it's going too far, or that it's the opinion of the *khawarij*, or the opinion of people who are too strict on Muslimin, but in reality, many scholars of Ahlu Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah have taken this opinion, they have clear evidence from the Qur'an, and clear evidence from the Sunnah. So, even if someone doesn't agree with the opinion, this is a type of opinion where even if someone was to say I don't agree with it, it's within the realm of Ahlu Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah and it's within the realm of an acceptable opinion, and it's not something that we would that this is going too far, or this is unacceptable within the religion of Islam and myself, I'm convinced by which is the stronger opinion, but it's important to know the second opinion.

Even if you don't agree with it, it shows how extreme or what a dangerous thing minor Shirk is, because if someone actually said or interpreted the evidence to be that it's actually never forgiven, and you will be punished regardless if you die upon that. Then this shows how it is definitely worse than major sins, to the point where if someone interpreted the evidence like I said that it wouldn't be forgiven. So, regardless of what opinion you're convinced by, the takeaway point for that is that it's definitely a dangerous thing.

Insha'Allah we'll stop there, next week we'll continue from where we left off today.  
Wallahul A'lam.

## Lesson 5:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

The next part of the book that we're going to talk about is that the author he says, and again we're going over "Kashf ash-Shubuhah" by Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhab, he says:

فإنك إذا عرفت : أن الإنسان يكفر بكلمة واحدة يخرجها من لسانه ، وقد يقولها وهو جاهل فلا يعذر بالجهل ، وقد يقولها وهو يظن أنها تقربه إلى الله تعالى ، كما ظن المشركون خصوصاً إن ألهمك الله ما قص عن موسى – مع صلاحهم وعلمهم أنهم أتوه قائلين : اجعل لنا إلهاً كما لهم آلهة

Or, "So, if you know this, or if you know that the person can disbelieve can leave Islam, with a word that comes off of his tongue, and he might say it, and he's ignorant about it, but he would not be given the excuse of ignorance, or he would not be excused due to his ignorance on this topic, or he may say something or he believes it's actually bringing him closer to Allah, just as the Mushrikin, or the polytheists, or the people of Shirk do, then you should know, or that you'll have a good understanding of what Allah mentioned about the people of Musa (عليه الصلاة والسلام), despite their righteousness, and despite their knowledge, they came to him and they said [in the Qur'an], "**We bought the Children of Israel across the sea and they came upon a people devoted to some of their idols, they said "O Musa, make for us an Ilah (God), as they have Aliha (Gods)." He said, "Verily, you are a people who are ignorant."** [7:138]

So, then the author continues, he says:

فحينئذ يعظم خوفك وحرصك على ما يخلصك من هذا وأمثاله

Or, "– then after all of this your eagerness for and your great fear of what will deliver you from all of this and what is similar to it will greatly increase."

If you understand this, meaning if you understand the fact that someone can disbelieve or leave Islam just by a statement they say on their tongue without knowing the greatness or severity of what they're saying, then at that point your fear and your zeal for Islam or for knowledge would increase and your zeal to have knowledge about that, which would keep you safe from this matter and the likes of it would increase and would be great.

So, this section here, there's a number of points that we can talk about, the first one, and it's the one I'll probably focus on a bit more is when the author said that the person can disbelieve by a statement that he says. So, there's **two** points here that I'll talk about in this topic. The **first** is, the fact that someone can disbelieve with a statement and the **second** one is that he can disbelieve with a statement, while not knowing exactly what it means or not

actually being completely aware of the severity of what he's saying. So, there's two points to this section.

So, the **first** point is that someone can disbelieve with a statement that they say. So, this is matter of consensus amongst *Ahlus Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah*. Imam as-Shafi'i (رحمه الله) mentioned that it was a consensus that **Iman is, statements, and actions and it's in the heart or beliefs**, and that none of them would benefit a person without the other. So, meaning that if someone has belief in their heart, yet it's not on their tongue, meaning they haven't professed to "*La ilaha ila Allah*", even if they believe in their heart, this wouldn't benefit them. Likewise, if someone says "*La ilaha ila Allah*" in their tongue, but they don't act upon it, or they don't believe it in their heart, then this would also not benefit them. Also, like we talked about many times before and I gave many examples, if someone does many good deeds, many acts of worship, if they don't believe it in their heart, in Islam and they don't profess to "*La ilaha ila Allah*", so that they entered Islam to begin with, then this would also not benefit them.

So, based upon this, what Imam ash-Shafi'i narrated the consensus on this topic, and Imam al-Bukhari mentioned that he met 1000 scholars in the different towns that he went to, and all of them agreed that Iman is statements and actions. Then **likewise, there's a consensus among Ahlus Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah, that disbelief or kufr is also statements and actions, meaning that it can be on your tongue, it can be in your heart and it can be on your body**. Meaning, someone may leave Islam due to something that they believe, someone may leave Islam due to something that they say, and someone may leave Islam due to something they do, so it's possible to actually leave Islam in all these ways as well. So, just like it's required for a person to be a Muslim that they have belief in their heart, that they say statements on their tongue meaning the *Shahadah*, and that they perform actions of Islam, likewise the opposite, so it's possible that someone could leave Islam in the same way. So, this is what the author is mentioning, when he says it's possible for someone to disbelieve or to leave Islam with a statement that they say on their tongue, and the evidence for this from the Qur'an is many.

So, first of all, any evidence in the Qur'an that would indicate that statements are required for a person to be a Muslim, they would prove the opposite as well; that someone can disbelieve because it's not possible for us to say a statement can be something good, but it can't be something bad, and likewise it's not possible for us to say that a statement can be required for a person to be Muslim, but it actually couldn't take him out of Islam. So, if he said the complete opposite of what makes you a Muslim, if he said the complete opposite then it wouldn't take you out of Islam, and this is a matter of consensus as well amongst Ahlus Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah, and the classical books of 'Aqidah discuss this at length, "*Ash-Shari'ah*" by Al-Ajurri and "*Sharh Usul al-I'tiqad Ahlus Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah*", by Al-Lalaka'i, and many other books as well.

And Allah mentioned examples of this in the Qur'an, particularly in Surah Tawbah, when Allah said,

قَدْ كَفَرْتُمْ بَعْدَ إِيمَانِكُمْ

Or, **"You have disbelieved after your Iman."** [9:66]

When Allah said,

وَلَيْنَ سَأَلْتَهُمْ لِيَقُولَنَّ إِنَّمَا كُنَّا نَخُوضُ وَنَلْعَبُ ۚ فَلَنِ أَبَٱللَّهِ وَآيَاتِهِ وَرَسُولِهِ كُنْتُمْ تَسْتَهْزِئُونَ  
لَا تَعْتَذِرُوا قَدْ كَفَرْتُمْ بَعْدَ إِيمَانِكُمْ

Or, **“Is it that you mock Allah and His Ayat and His Messenger? Don’t give any excuses, you have disbelieved after your Iman.” [9:65-66]**

So, here clearly Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) is mentioning that the thing, what the people did was that they *mocked*. Mocking is clearly something on the tongue, and despite then, when Allah mentioned this about them, at the end He said, “Don’t give any excuses, you have disbelieved after your Iman.” So, Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) mentioned that the reason that they disbelieved was this statement and He described the results of this statements as being the reason that these people had left Islam and if we look at the Tafsir of this verse, and there’s many narrations on it, some are weak, some are Hasan. In general, what we know about the reason these verses were revealed is that some of the Companions at the time were travelling and as a means to break to monotony of the travel, and keep themselves busy, they began to joke and tell stories. So, they made a statement about the Companions of the Messenger of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and the *Qur’a* specifically of them, so meaning the scholars and those who were the reciters and the memorisers of the *Qur’a*, and they said that “we don’t see anyone to be more cowardice or have more cowardice when it comes to fighting, nor to have larger bellies.” Meaning they were saying they were lazy or they would eat, and all they cared out was these things. So, Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) revealed this verse.

So, making fun of the Sahabah in the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), particularly making fun of the *Qur’a*, they were making fun and they were insulting the ones who were carrying the knowledge on behalf of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) or carrying the knowledge from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). So, we see from this that people nowadays may say something much greater than this, but think that it has no effect. But if we look to this verse, Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) says “Don’t even give any excuses, you’ve disbelieved after your Iman.” So, there was no excuse for this even, and if we look to what the excuses that they did give the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), they said, we were only saying it out of joking, so they didn’t actually believe it, so this is what Allah revealed.

So, the **benefit** we can take from this, is that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) didn’t tell them, “no, you actually believed this”, he accepted what they said, he accepted that they didn’t actually believe this, they didn’t believe in this mocking and these insults they were saying to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), but they did leave Islam obviously because Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) clearly judged and He said, “You’ve disbelieved after your Iman.” So, this proves that the statement was the cause of their disbelief, they didn’t actually believe it in their heart, and they were saying it as a joke, but despite this it wasn’t an excuse that didn’t benefit them.

So, what would we say about someone who says a statement that insults Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) or the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) or Islam as a whole, or the *Qur’an* and they actually believe it. If just saying the statement would take you out of Islam, what about someone who actually believes it, and what about someone who makes du’a to other than Allah, and they actually have the belief behind this statement as well. So, we know that any statement that contradicts or that goes against the basis of Islam, that goes against the very meaning of “La ilaha ila Allah”, just to not worship anyone except Allah, any statement that would contradict

this meaning making du'a to other than Allah, anything like this, then this would be something that would take the person out of Islam.

So, just a point to mention here then, is kind of the widespread idea about this topic nowadays is that, someone will say something, and maybe a Muslim will rebuke them to they'll censor them, or they'll make inkaar (disbelief out of denial) on them for what they've said. Or, the person will do something and the Muslim will come and say this as well, and you'll hear people, instead of rushing to the side of the Muslim, or rushing to the side of the brother who has *ghayrah* for his Din, they'll rush to the other side and say, "You don't know what was in his heart", and how often do we hear this all the time; "you don't know what was in his heart", "Brother, Iman is in the heart, we don't know what he's thinking, maybe he didn't know...".

So, first of all, there's the obvious problem here that why is this always the excuse and rushing to defend is always going to the side of the people who are doing something wrong. So, that's a problem in and of itself that needs its own discussion, but what we need to understand is that the whole statement of "Brother, Iman is in the heart", yes it's in the heart, but it's also on the tongue, and it's also on the body. Just like, disbelief can take place in the heart, and disbelief can take place on the tongue, and disbelief can take place on the body.

So, this idea and this misconception is kind of the widespread accepted idea and if you go to the Muslim countries, this is kind of the widespread idea spread amongst the general people, and even amongst those people who attribute themselves to knowledge. You often hear this statement as well, that **"you don't know what was in his heart"**, and "how do you know what he believed", and "Maybe he didn't believe it", or "Maybe he didn't make it halal...", and it always comes back to this idea of the heart being the soul place that Iman can place, and the soul place where disbelief can also take place, and everything else is either completely disregarded, or it's taken into account but it doesn't have much weight as whatever takes place in the heart.

The reason for this is, if we look to where does this idea come from, this idea of Iman being only in the heart and not being on the tongue and not being on the body, and the opposite as well, disbelief being in the heart, and not in the body, and not on the tongue, this goes back to the concept of *'Irja*. Or the concept that, it's the group of the *Murji'ah*, and there different groups but the point is that they take away actions from being part of Iman, or part of kufr, and they take away statements from being part of Iman and apart of kufr as well.

The funny thing is that this book we're reading now, the *Murji'ah* today, this is one of the main books that they talk about all the time and they say, "we're going to study Kashf ash-Shubhat, and we're going to go through it, and we're going to learn all the benefits from it, and we're going to figure it out etc." Throughout the book, the whole book is essentially a refutation of all of their ideology. The whole thing is talking about making du'a to other than Allah, insulting Allah (سبحانه و تعالی), insulting the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), calling on the Salihin, calling on the different dead people, and going to the graves and all these types of things, and how someone can leave Islam through this. Actually, if we look to the final approximately last page, between 1 and 3 pages of the book depending on which one you have, the whole thing is a refutation of the *Murji'ah* and the *'Irja* of the people that make these claims, specifically if we look towards the end of the book which we don't need to get ahead of ourselves, but when the author mentions, when Allah (سبحانه و تعالی) said, about the disbelievers, when they perform there disbelief and refuse to enter into Islam, Allah said,



## ذَلِكَ بِأَنَّهُمْ اسْتَحَبُّوا الْحَيَاةَ الدُّنْيَا عَلَى الْآخِرَةِ

**“That is because they chose the life of the dunya over the Akhirah.” [16:107]**

So, if we look at this verse, we see that, the point is that Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) is saying, the reason they didn't enter Islam wasn't because they didn't believe in it, wasn't because they hated it, wasn't because they found something better, it was because they chose the life of the dunya over the Akhirah. So, what bigger evidence do we need from the Qur'an, and what clear evidence do we need from the Qur'an, that is idea that disbelief can't take place except in the heart, or that in order for someone to disbelieve, it's a condition, that they disbelieve in their heart. This is a complete refutation of this, so this is just kind of a discussion on the first part of what the author mentioned.

The **second** part, is that he said, that the person could say something while he's ignorant of the issue, so this comes back to a topic that the scholars refer to as *“al- 'Udhr bil-Jahl”*, or the *excuse of ignorance* or the excuse of misconceptions or *ta'wil* when it comes to performing acts of disbelief or statements of disbelief, so what does this mean?

This means that if you see a person go to a grave, whether they're a Sufi, or they're from the Rafidah, or Shi'a or whatever group they are, they go to grave or they go to shrine and they make du'a to either the person in the grave or whatever the case may be. Do we then say this person could possibly have an excuse for what they're doing? Do we say we have to check, did they actually know that this was wrong?

So, this is what it comes down to, if we look to the words of the Imams of the Najdi da'wah, the vast majority of them don't give any excuse for these types of things, and likewise Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Qayyim, if we look at some of their words, they indicate that they wouldn't give an excuse to this type of thing. Some of their words would indicate otherwise, but in the end, what it comes down to, and the thing that everyone is agreed upon *from Ahlus Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah* is that ignorance isn't always an excuse. Some never give it, some only give it for certain issues, but the general or the consensus that everyone is agreed upon is this idea that regardless of what the person does, and regardless of what the person says, you can never judge on them that they've left Islam, you can never say that what they're doing is kufr, until you establish the proof against them for this issue. And what does this come back to?

This comes back to, how can someone say *“La ilaha ila Allah”*, which is what we talked about for the last three weeks, of what the meaning of *“La ilaha ila Allah”* is, and the ease of understanding it in its most basic form, maybe some won't understand every point of it, and everything that it entails, but just the basic understanding that if you're saying “nothing is worthy of worship except Allah”, and then you go and worship something other than Allah, have you actually understood this? Either you haven't understood it, so is your Islam valid to begin with, or you have understood the meaning and then that's proof that you did know what you're doing and you did know what was wrong, because you entered Islam, you professed to *“La ilaha ila Allah”*, you professed that “nothing deserves to be worshipped except Allah”, then you go and worship something other than Allah, there's a gap here, which is the gap? Is it that you knew what you meant and just decided to do it anyway and if that's the case, then you have no excuse, or you didn't know what it meant and did you really enter Islam to begin with?

Obviously, both of these are clear, you wouldn't be Muslim in either case. The only time when it would be an excuse is if the person actually doesn't know that the act they're performing is an act of worship. So, this is the time when it would come to be something that is an excuse, so, they understand "La ilaha ila Allah", they say "La ilaha ila Allah", they don't even know they're worshipping other than Allah. This would when it would be an excuse, because if you say to them, can somebody be worshipped other than Allah, they'll say "no, of course not, I'm a Muslim, I don't accept this for anyone to do and I would never let anyone call to this", or anything like this, then if you tell them this is an act of worship and they don't even know that it is.

So, this is when the *excuse of ignorance* would come into play that's agreed upon. So, this idea that regardless of where the person lives, regardless of what knowledge we know they have, that we always give this excuse and we say the person didn't know, this is absolutely a false concept and it comes down to, that sometimes there would be an excuse, and sometimes it wouldn't be an excuse.

This comes back to again what we talked about two or three weeks ago, the story or the tafsir of Abdullah ibn 'Abbas (رضي الله عنه) in *Sahih al-Bukhari*, when he mentioned about the people of Nuh, and he said that, he described when Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) mentions in the Qur'an about *Wadd*, and *Suwa'*, and *Yaghuth* and *Ya'uq* and *Nasr*, Ibn 'Abbas (رضي الله عنه) is saying, how did this come about, how did these people begin to be worshipped and where these idols come from, because Ibn 'Abbas mentions that there were ten generations between Adam and Nuh, all of them were upon Tawhid.

So, obviously we know Allah created Adam and he was upon Tawhid, and he taught his family and his children Tawhid, and there were ten generations upon Tawhid, then Allah had to send Nuh, for what reason? When his people went too far and they went into extremism with regards to the Salihin and the righteous people amongst them. So, these people *Wadd* and *Suwa'*, and these people I mentioned, they were Salihin from the people of Nuh or they were righteous people amongst them, when they died, the Shaytan came to them and said, why don't you make idols that would commemorate them and would remind you about their Salah and their righteousness, so they did this. Then, when Ibn 'Abbas says, "Then when the knowledge was forgotten, they worshipped them", and then Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) had to send Nuh to teach these people.

So, we see here that if we were to say they didn't know, Ibn 'Abbas himself is saying when the knowledge was gone, they started to do this. So, we would by necessity have to say that every person from the people of Nuh had an excuse, and it wasn't upon Nuh to even call them disbelievers and even when Nuh was sent to his people, he was sent to a Muslim people, this is what this would necessitate us to say.

Likewise, what we talked about before, we know that the Quraysh, claimed to be upon the religion of Ibrahim, so they were claiming to be upon the religion of a Prophet that was actually a Prophet and was actually sent amongst them, amongst that area, and they worshipped Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) with some acts of worship, and they had some correct beliefs about Allah, that He was the Creator, and the Sustainer and so on. But they also performed Shirk, so if we were going to say that this idea that any ignorance or any excuse, or any ignorance can be used as an excuse, then it's possible for someone to come and say, the Quraysh had an excuse and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) wasn't sent to a disbelieving people, because they said "we're following Ibrahim (عليه الصلاة والسلام), and we're worshipping

Allah, and we're believing in Him, and they had some misconceptions, but someone could argue that it was based upon ignorance.

So, you see here the danger of this claim that disbelief is only in the heart. Obviously, it's not and the evidences for this are *mutawatir*. You know there's no dispute about this amongst Ahlus Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah and likewise, the idea of giving an absolute or unrestricted idea or concept that ignorance is always an excuse regardless of what the person does.

The **last** point that I want to mention comes back to what the people say about when it comes to statement that **"Iman is in the heart"**, or "you don't know what in his heart" and that type of thing. Again like we said, yes Iman is in the heart, there's no dispute about that, the only people who dispute this is the *Qaramiyyah*, who are attributed to the *Murji'ah*, and they say in the dunya, we knew that he didn't believe in his heart, if he said "La ilaha ila Allah", with his tongue, we would still treat him as a Muslim, and again even if they say, in the hereafter, he would be a disbeliever. So, there's no dispute amongst anyone that belief in the heart is a condition for a person to be a Muslim.

The only people who dispute is the Murji'ah, and some of them say that, "saying La ilaha ila Allah is a condition to be a Muslim." Meaning, if someone believed in their heart, but didn't say La ilaha ila Allah, they wouldn't have entered Islam. Others go even further and they say, all you have to have is in your heart, but saying La ilaha ila Allah is evidence that you've entered Islam. So, you could actually be a Muslim, and never say La ilaha ila Allah on your tongue, but you just couldn't be treated as one in the dunya, because we have no way of knowing that you're Muslim if someone doesn't say La ilaha ila Allah.

So, you see the ridiculousness of these claims, things that any child would be able to look at this and say that someone doesn't say "La ilaha ila Allah", in order to be a Muslim you need to say "La ilaha ila Allah", but this person is still a Muslim. It's a ridiculous claim, and no one who has some intellect or some intelligence would accept this kind of statement, and likewise when it comes to actions. Someone to say that you can only disbelieve in your heart, like we said, this is a consensus against this idea amongst Ahlus Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah.

So, what do we say when someone says, well we don't know what's in someone's heart, of course we don't know what's in his heart, who knows what's in the hearts? Nobody, only Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) knows what's in the hearts. So, does this mean that everything that Islam came with, with regards to judging on someone that they've left Islam, or someone entering into Islam and all of these concepts are thrown out the window because human beings don't know what's in the heart. Of course not, because then we're accusing the Shari'ah of having defects and we're accusing the Shari'ah of being incomplete or imperfect because we're saying, Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) mentioned all these *Ahkam* in the Qur'an, and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) mentioned all these *Ahkam* in the Sunnah, but they're pointless, because we need to know what's in the hearts. Or do we say, Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) in the Qur'an and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in the Sunnah, gave us ways in dealing with people that don't require knowing what's in the heart, so we're accepting all of these *Ahkam*, and all of these things that came in the Shari'ah, and we're accepting the other ones as well, and we're reconciling between them.

So, of course we don't know what's in the hearts, but what do we get in place of knowing what's in the heart? The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, *"Indeed, there's a piece of flesh in*

*the body, that if it is righteous or it's good, then the whole body would be good, and if it's bad, then the whole body would be bad, indeed that is the heart."* [Narrated in al-Bukhari]

So, here the Prophet (ﷺ) is telling us, there's part of your body, that if it's good, everything would be good, and if it's bad, everything would be bad. So, the Prophet (ﷺ) is giving us the means of not knowing what is in the heart, but having evidence of what's in the heart based upon what? Based upon the outside. So, if someone swears on Allah, do we know it's in his heart? No, do we need to know? Of course not, because first of all, the Prophet (ﷺ) is telling us, if the outside is bad, it's most likely, the inside is bad, the inside is bad. If the outside is good, the inside is good. **What are the exceptions to this?**

We talked about last week, the *hypocrites*, the outside is "La ilaha ila Allah", and praying and fasting and performing Jihad, and making Hajj, and so on, there insides are completely rotten. They disbelieve in their heart, and they're in the lowest part of the Fire. This is one exception, the other exception is when Allah (ﻋﺎﻟﻰ ﺳﺒﺤﺎﻧﻪ ﻭ ﺗﻌﺎﻟﻰ) said about the people who are forced into doing something bad, that they're compelled or that they're coerced into doing something that they didn't want to do, which is the issue of *Ikrah* or the issue of coercion. So, if someone is coerced at gunpoint or at knifepoint or their children are threatened, or whatever else the issue is, and they do something wrong, then we say this is an exception to the rule, we don't say that he's inside was bad because his outside was bad. What's the reason? Is it just because we feel like saying that, no it's because, he's saying "Yes I swore at Allah, the reason was that this person threatened my children."

There's the excuse, there's the thing that makes the exception to this general rule. But this other idea that regardless of what happens, we always say that, if the person swears at Allah, and throws the Qur'an in the garbage and never prayed in his life, and kills Muslimin and so on, we come in the end and say we don't know what's in his heart. First of all, at this point, yes we do because the Prophet (ﷺ) told us, that this amount of evidence, would prove that there's something wrong inside. Do we know if he believed that it was good or not? No, we don't need to, we know that the inside is rotten or there's something wrong with it. And likewise, even if we don't know that, we don't need to know that, we judge on the outside.

Just lastly, I'll mention the misconception on this topic, in which one of the Companions came to the Prophet (ﷺ) and he mentioned that he was in battle, and he went to kill the Mushrikin, so when he raised his sword, the Mushrik said "La ilaha ila Allah", so the Sahabi killed him. So, he came to the Prophet (ﷺ) and told him what happened, and the Prophet (ﷺ) said, "Did you kill him when he said La ilaha ila Allah?", so the Sahabi replied and said, he only said this out of fear of being killed, so the Prophet (ﷺ), did you break open his chest to know whether it's settled or not, meaning did you break open his chest to know whether his heart actually believed in "La ilaha ila Allah", or not. So, this hadith is widespread, or used in a widespread manner for people to say you don't know what it's in the heart so you can't judge.

If we look at this hadith in a correct way, what did the Prophet (ﷺ) rebuke him for? Did he rebuke, or make inkaar, or get angry at the Sahabi because he didn't judge what was on the inside? Or did he do the opposite? The Sahabi, what did he do? He made a claim for what was in his heart, he said he only did it for this reason, the Prophet (ﷺ) said, did you open it up to know what it said, so you had something on the outside, that was

indicating one thing, and you made your own excuse as to what was on the inside, and you went on that or you made your own claim about what was on the inside, and you went on that. That was the thing the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was clearly making inkaar on or clearly was rebuking him for.

So, why does it then come to the opposite somehow, people would use this, so if the outside is bad, then the inside we can't judge on, and they use this hadith, and the opposite as well, they say that if the outside is good, then they'll use this hadith to say that you don't know what it's in the heart either. It doesn't work that way, it's either this way or that way, it's either that you judge on the outside or you judge on the inside, it isn't that we always judge whatever's the opposite of the bad, because it's going to give people more excuses to do, whatever they want and to do whatever they please, and to always use this excuse that "you don't know what's in my heart".

So, this understanding, somehow nowadays, the groups of 'Irja, and the groups of the Murji'ah use this hadith as a basis for their whole ideology. Yet, Ahlus Sunnah, if you look to their books, particularly that relates to Iman, or what they call "*al-Asma'i al-Ahkam*", or the issues of labels or rulings, or if you look to the books of Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn Qayyim and the Imams of the Najdi da'wah and so on, they actually use this hadith in the complete opposite manner, they use it in the correct manner. That the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was rebuking or criticising the Sahabi for not judging what was apparent to him, so this is what we should take from it, we shouldn't always think that we only go by what's in the heart.

So insha'Allah we'll stop there, we didn't get too far in the book but I wanted to mention this concept because it is a very important concept and the misunderstandings with regards to it are widespread all over the world and people who use these misconceptions, have the outward appearance of being very pious, and being very "*Mul'tazim*", very following of Islam and that. So, it's easier for people to fall into this, so I wanted to mention this and kind of refute or discuss some of the misconceptions or some of the ways this is a completely false idea, but really this whole topic would come in a topic of "*Mu'samal Iman*" or the reality of Iman, which if Allah wills we can have a series on that. But we'll stop there and next week we'll continue with this same section, but we'll get furthermore into what the author has said. Wallahul A'lam.

---

Note: Sh. Haytham Sayfaddīn (حفظه الله) fell into an error and Irjā' when he said the one who is ignorant of something being an act of worship can be excused by ignorance.

Even though his position is better than the Murji'ah who stipulate "understanding the hujjah" in all matters of major Kufr, irregardless of the place and time (unlike Haytham & 'Alwān who say Hujjah is established if he's able to seek knowledge, such as one living among muslims).

However, it's important to clarify that this is the same position as Shaykh Sulaymān al-'Alwān (فك الله أسرته), and he fell into Irjā' and falsehood on this issue.

There's absolutely no excuse of ignorance in worshipping other than Allāh, and those that exaggerate in separating between general and specific are at times excusing kuffār the Jahmiyyah and Murji'ah of the past wouldn't even excuse, wallāhul-musta'ān.

## Lesson 6:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

The last thing that we talked about last week or two weeks ago, was the issue of the excuse of ignorance when it comes to matters of Shirk, or what they call in Arabi, “*al- ‘Udhr bil-Jahl*”, so we talked a little about that. When the author said, that the person can say something and not know it’s Shirk or not know the severity of what he’s saying, and that he would leave Islam, based upon that statement and he wouldn’t be given the excuse of ignorance. So, that was the last thing we talked about.

We mentioned the hadith from Ibn ‘Abbas in Sahih al-Bukhari, in which he mentioned this when he was talking about the people of Nuh, and when they worshipped the idols that they set up when Allah mentioned about in the Qur’an, *Wadd* and *Suwa’*, and *Yaghuth* and *Ya’uq* and *Nasr*, when Allah mentioned these people, Ibn ‘Abbas (رضي الله عنه) explained that they were from the people of Nuh (على آله الصلاة والسلام), they were righteous people from amongst them, and when they passed away, the Shaytan came to them and told them they should set up idols or set up statues to remind them of the worship that these people would perform to try to keep them as an example, and the Ibn ‘Abbas (رضي الله عنه) said in the end, “And then when the knowledge was forgotten, they worshipped them.”

So, he mentioned or he clearly states here, when the knowledge was gone, that’s when they performed this action of Shirk. So, obviously when Allah sent Nuh (على آله الصلاة والسلام) to these people, obviously He was sending him to a people who had disbelieved, and who had left Islam, and weren’t upon the religion of Adam (على آله الصلاة والسلام) anymore. So, the fact that he says that when the knowledge was gone, that’s when they performed the Shirk. This indicates that this idea that no matter what anyone does, there’s always this excuse that, “I didn’t know”, or “they didn’t know”, or “what if they didn’t know”, it’s not absolute how people try to make it, so we talked a bit about that.

The second thing we talked about last time was the issue of judging upon the outward, or judging upon what we see from people, and we’re not required to look into the hearts of people because we can’t do that, because Allah said,

لَا يُكَلِّفُ اللَّهُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا

**“Allah does not place responsibility upon a soul except in what it can bear” [2:286]**

So, obviously we know that when Allah gives us rulings or Islamic rulings to follow, obviously it’s possible to follow them. So, if we know it’s possible for us to follow them, and we know that it’s not possible for us to know what’s in the hearts, then we know that’s not what Allah has charged us with, or made us responsible with doing, and we talked about the hadith of ‘Usama ibn Zayd (رضي الله عنه) in which he killed a person, and before he killed

him, the person said “La ilaha ila Allah”, and then he came to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and told him about this story and what had happened, and he said “did you kill him after he said La ilaha ila Allah?”, so ‘Usama (رضي الله عنه) said “he only said so out of fear of being killed.”. So he said, “did you open up his heart to know whether its settled or not?”, so whether his heart declared this truthfully, and we talked about how according to Ahlus Sunnah wa’l Jama’ah, the correct way of looking at this hadith is that we judge upon the outside, and we don’t have to know what’s on the inside, in order to judge and in order to deal with someone who’s a Muslim or non-Muslim.

We don’t have to look into their hearts, we don’t need to know what’s in their hearts, as opposed to what the groups such as the *Murji’ah* and other groups of bid’ah, what they say is that, you have to know what’s in the heart before you can deal with anyone in a certain way. We know that, that’s impossible, we know here that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), he admonished, or he criticised ‘Usama (رضي الله عنه) for not going upon what was apparent to him. So ‘Usama made an assumption for what was in his heart, when what he saw was the opposite of that, so the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) rejected this from him, and it isn’t the opposite. So, this is where we left off last time.

So, the next thing that we’ll talk about is that the author he says:

وأعلم أن الله سبحانه - من حكمته - لم يبعث نبيا بهذا التوحيد إلا جعل له أعداء كما قال تعالى: وكذلك جعلنا لكل نبي عدوا و شياطين إلا ناس والجن يوحى بعضهم لى بعض زخرف القول غرورا

“And know that, Allah from his Wisdom, did not send a Prophet with Tawhid, except that He placed enemies for him as He (سبحانه و تعالى) stated, “And so We have appointed for every Prophet enemies, Shayatin among the mankind and Jinn, inspiring one another with adorned speech as a delusion (or way of delusion).” [6:112]

Then, the author says:

وقد يكون لأعداء التوحيد علوم كثيرة ، وكتب الحج كما قال الله تعالى : فلما جاءتهم رسلهم بالبينات فرحوا بما عندهم من العلم

Or, “And it’s possible that, the enemies of Tawhid may have many sciences or much knowledge, and books and arguments that they may use as He (سبحانه و تعالى) stated, “Then when their Messengers came to them with clear proofs, they exulted (in pride) with that which they had of the knowledge.” [40:83]

So, this is what the author says here, so there’s a number of points we can take from this section that the author says. The **first** is that, the *Shayatin* can be as Allah said, mankind and jinns, so the idea that the shayatin are only from the Jinn, we know that this is a mistake. The Shaytan can be from mankind and from the Jinn. So, if they’re a disbeliever, and they call to disbelief, and they try to get people to leave Islam, and to stay away from Islam, and they try to spread *fasad*, or mischief or corruption in the Earth, then this can also be labelled as a Shaytan. Whether it’s from the humans or the Jinn, and this is clear in this verse. Allah refers to the shayatin to mankind and to the Jinn. In Surah Nas, Allah said,



Or, **“from the Jinn, and from the people.” [114:6]**, when referring to the Shayatin.

So, we know that, this is something that is possible, and we don't restrict the Shayatin being from the Jinn. This is the first point to mention from this, the **second** is that he said that, *“Allah did not send a Prophet, except that He placed, or made for them enemies, or from the Shayatin of mankind and the Jinn.”*

So, this is the other point here is that, like we talked about many times before, the difference between a Prophet and a Messenger, we know that there's a difference, but the idea that a Prophet is someone who receives revelation but isn't commanded, or doesn't have to go tell the people about, that this is a mistaken concept, and that the difference between a Prophet and a Messenger, isn't that one is sent and one isn't sent, and we talked about this before. So, both a Prophet and a Messenger is sent and commanded to go out and teach what they came with, but the difference is some come with new *Shara'a*, or new legislation, and others judge with the legislation that came before them with the messengers. So, this is the stronger opinion on what the difference is between a Messenger and a Prophet is.

The next point in what the author mentions is when he says, that it's from Allah's wisdom that He doesn't place, or He doesn't send a Prophet, except that He makes or places enemies for them. So, this is a point about the Qadr, and we talked a bit about this when we had the *Sharh* or explanation of *“al-Usul ath-Thalatha”*, when we talked a bit about the Qadr, or the pre-destination. So, here Allah, we can say that there's **two** types of, when Allah makes or places these things, and in Arabi, it's the *“Ja'al”*, when He makes. So, we can say there's two types, the first is *“Al-Ja'al al-Qadri”*, and the second is *“Al-Ja'al al-Shar'i”*. When Allah places or makes things, there's two types. **One is related to the legislation or to the Shari'ah**, and **the second is related to the Qadr, or Allah's creating of the universe and how things are laid out. and how Allah pre-destined things to take place.**

So, the first thing we'll talk about is the Shar'i, or *“al-Ja'al al-Shar'i”*, and this is something that Allah loves, or He accepts it or He is pleased with it. An example of this is when Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) said,

Or that Allah said,

جَعَلَ اللَّهُ الْكَعْبَةَ الْبَيْتَ الْحَرَامَ قِيَامًا لِلنَّاسِ وَالشَّهْرَ الْحَرَامَ وَالْهَدْيَ وَالْقَلَادَ ۚ ذَٰلِكَ لِتَعْلَمُوا أَنَّ اللَّهَ يَعْلَمُ مَا فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَأَنَّ اللَّهَ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عَلِيمٌ

**“Allah has made the Ka'aba, the sacred House, an asylum of security and Hajj or Umrah for mankind, and also the sacred month [meaning Allah has made the sacred month] and the animals of offerings and the gardens that are garlanded, that you may know that Allah has knowledge of all that is in the Heavens and all that is in the Earth, and Allah is All-Knower is each and everything.” [5:97]**

And Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) also said, when He is speaking about the da'wah and trials of Ibrahim (عليه الصلاة والسلام), that he said,

وَجَعَلَهَا كَلِمَةً بَاقِيَةً فِي عَقِبِهِ لَعَلَّهُمْ يَرْجِعُونَ

**“And He made it a word lasting amongst his offspring that they may turn back.”  
[43:28]**

So, this is a type of *Ja'al*, or a type of *taqdir*, or type of Qadr or type of decision-making that Allah makes with regards to the Shari'ah. So, these are things that Allah chooses, and people may follow follow it, and they may not follow it. So, just like Allah legislates and He is pleased with, or wishes, decides that people should enter Islam, that they should pray, they should fast, and they should stay away from Shirk and so on.

These are things that Allah has commanded, but people may follow it, and they may not follow it, as opposed to the other type of command, or the other type of *ja'al*, or the other type of 'irada or will that Allah has, that is the Qadri or that relates to the universe, and the creating of the universe. This is another evidence for this, or an evidence for this is when Allah said,

Or that Allah said,

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنَّا خَلَقْنَاكُمْ مِنْ ذَكَرٍ وَأُنْثَىٰ وَجَعَلْنَاكُمْ شُعُوبًا وَقَبَائِلَ لِتَعَارَفُوا ۚ إِنَّ أَكْرَمَكُمْ  
عِنْدَ اللَّهِ أَتْقَاكُمْ

**“O mankind, We have created you from a male and a female and made you into nations and tribes, that you may know one another. Indeed, the most honourable of you with Allah is the most God-fearing of you.” [49:13]**

So, here Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) mentioned that He made something a certain way, but it's not a command. It's not something Allah expects for us to do, this is something of the way He created us, and it's the way He pre-destined things to be. So, this is similar to when Allah has his 'Irada, or His Will, that there's two types. So, this is something that people have no escape from, people can't decide to be this way or not be this way. This is how Allah created things. So, similar to when we say that if Allah wishes for someone to die, this isn't a choice someone has, it's something that's predestined upon them, and they don't escape it, and they don't have a choice whether they want to follow it or not, even though this is a decision from Allah. Likewise, if Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) decides to legislate something to be obligatory or haram, people, in this situation they have a choice to follow this thing or not.

The point of knowing this is that, there is many groups of Muslims that went astray when it comes to this issue, and it's because some will say that Allah has forced people to do everything that they do, so people have no choice. So, if the person performs zina, they'll say that “Allah willed this to happen, so if Allah willed for this to happen, or wished for this to happen, then obviously I'm doing what Allah wants me to do.” And the opposite is that people will go the other extreme and say that Allah has no involvement whatsoever in what we do and what we say.

So, they'll go to the other extreme and say that, “Allah doesn't even know what happened, until after it takes place.” And there's a number of steps to how they get to this idea, but the basis of this dispute, or the basis of this misguidance is that people don't differentiate

between when Allah wills something or wishes something, or expects something, or legislates something, or commands something. There can be two types, one is related to the Shari'ah, that we have a choice to follow or not, and the second is related to the creation and related to the how the universe itself works, so this is just a point that I wanted to touch upon and we went into it in a little bit more detail before and another evidence for this as well is when Allah said,

Or that Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) said, which means,

وَهُوَ الَّذِي جَعَلَ لَكُمُ اللَّيْلَ لِبَاسًا وَالنَّوْمَ سُبَاتًا وَجَعَلَ النَّهَارَ نُشُورًا

**“And it is He Who makes the covering for you and the sleep a repose, and makes the day as a thing to go out and spread amongst the earth.” [25:47]**

So, here we see that there's another evidence, that Allah, there's certain things that He has pre-ordained, or pre-destined that we have no choice with. So, we have no choice about the heavens and the Earth, and how they work and that type of thing, and yet this is also from Allah's Decisions.

And then, the author said, *“And he'll have enemies.”*

We'll go back to what the author said, he's speaking about when Allah would send a Messenger, and He would place enemies for him. What an enemy is, is someone that whatever pleases you, makes him upset and whatever makes you upset, pleases him. This is the basis of enmity, that they have a complete opposite of what you want, and their goals are different from your goals, and not only are they different, but they oppose your goals. So, this is what defines the basis of what an enemy is. So, if you're trying to do something, their whole goal is to stop it, or if you're trying to stop something, their whole goal is to make it happen.

So, by understanding this, we understand when Allah said, *“We place enemies from all the messengers.”* If we look through the Sirah of the messengers, then we see that Allah mentioned either all of them or most of them at least, there's stories with their enemies. To explain this, Allah said,

Or that Allah's describing the enemies of the Muslimin, He says,

إِنْ تَمْسَسْكُمْ حَسَنَةٌ تَسُؤْهُمْ وَإِنْ تُصِيبْكُمْ سَيِّئَةٌ يَفْرَحُوا بِهَا ۚ وَإِنْ تَصْبِرُوا وَتَتَّقُوا لَا يَضُرُّكُمْ كَيْدُهُمْ شَيْئًا ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ بِمَا يَعْمَلُونَ مُحِيطٌ

**“If a good befalls you, it grieves them, but if an evil overtakes you, they rejoice at that, but if you remain patient, and become pious, not the least harm will their .... Do to you. Indeed, Allah surrounds all that they will do.” [3:120]**

So, this is the explanation of what an enemy actually is, that when you're happy, they're sad and when you're sad, they're happy so they have the complete opposite goals that you have. Then the author he said, or he mentioned the verse, he mentioned that the enemies of the Prophet and the enemies of Tawhid, they may have many arguments, and they may have

many books that they have in order to try to counter Tawhid and call to Shirk and say “this is what Allah wants”, or “this is what Allah is pleased with and He wants us to make du’a to other than Him and He wants us to place intermediaries between us and Him, and He wants us to go to graves and He wants us to rule other than His Laws and to pick our own laws”, and so on. So, they may have arguments that they may bring to try to argue this, and to try to say that this is actually what Islam wants, and they’ll come and try to take the falsehood and place it in the clothing of Islam.

So, if we look at this, then we see that the author mentioned a number of things. He said that they’ll have many sciences, and books and many arguments, and all of these things are really the same, so these are all inter-linked in some way so we don’t need to go into what each of these means. If we look to current days, we see that there’s many ways that these go about. So, there’s many conferences or many gatherings, or many times where they’ll gather and they’ll have conferences, whether it’s international, or conferences that are national, and they’ll have ways of countering the da’wah of Islam, or countering what the Muslimin are doing in certain places, and they’ll use these things, and they’ll call them or they’ll state, this is what is civilisation, and this is what will push humanity forward, and bring progress to humanity, and if you follow Islam, and if you follow these things, then look what happened before in this place, and this is something that will keep people back in the dark ages and so on.

They’ll make these arguments, and they’ll go on televisions, and radio and newspapers and so on and many people will believe them because of these arguments, that they make. This is why Allah warned us about this, he didn’t warn us for something that isn’t real. When Allah (سبحانه و تعالی) warns us about something, obviously not only is it a reality but it’s something that can actually have an effect and needs to be countered in a way because why would Allah warn us about something that isn’t real. So, the fact that Allah (سبحانه و تعالی) says that, when the Messengers came to their people, these people, they became happy or they became very impressed with, what they had from knowledge, and how they were able to try to counter it.

So, this is something to keep in mind, when you see people trying to counter Islam, and they try to make arguments and say that, anything that keeps you back, or anything that Islam calls to that will take you back to the old days, or it’s ancient and so on. That this is complete falsehood, and it’s something that is expected from the enemies of Islam, and it’s expected from the kuffar because they don’t want Islam to progress and they don’t want Islam to prevail, otherwise they would become Muslimin. So, if we look at all of these things, and we look at the warnings that Allah has given us, and the guidance he has given us, we should take it as a real advice from Allah, that it’s not just empty words like people might give advice to each other, this is coming from Allah. So, this is the second point that the author mentioned, or that we’re talking about today.

The next thing that the author said, he says:

إذا عرفت ذلك ، وعرفت أن الطريق إلى الله ، لا بد له من أعداء قاعدين عليه ، أهل فصاحة وعلم وحجج فالواجب عليك : أن تتعلم من دين الله ما يصير سرحا لك تقاثل به هؤلاء الشياطين

**Or, “And if you know that [all the things we mentioned before], and you know that the path to Allah must have upon it, or must have on the sides of it, those who sit at it, and they have clear speech, or they have knowledge, and they have arguments. Then it is obligatory upon you to learn from that religion of Allah, that which will give you a weapon to fight against those Shayatin.”**

Meaning that, so he’s saying that if we know all of these things that Allah warned us about, and we know that the Shayatin, or the enemies of Islam will have arguments or they’ll have “*Shubuhah*”, or misconceptions, that they’ll take from the Qur’an, or they’ll take from the Sunnah and try to distort Islam from the inside. Then, it’s obligatory upon us to learn enough of our religion so we can counter these things.

So, this is the whole point of this book, is to look at the arguments that people use to try to spread their da’wah, or spread the things that they call to, and to know how to reply to these things, because if someone comes to you and they’re Muslim, at least on the outward as far as you know, and they start claiming that something’s from Islam, or this is how you practice Islam, and they bring Ayat from the Qur’an, and they bring ahadith from the Sunnah.

They might be calling to something completely other than Islam, they might be calling to worshipping other than Allah, they might be calling to going to graves, or going to what they call ‘Awliya and saints and so on. Someone who doesn’t know any better may say “this makes sense, he’s proving it to me from the Qur’an and the Sunnah, it must be right.” So, if we know that this is the case, it’s only natural, or it’s only logical that we would learn as much as we can to counter these things so when someone comes to you, you know what they’re coming to you with, and you’re able to teach people and otherwise call people back to Islam, or back to the Sunnah. So, this is what the author is saying, and then he says, evidence for this that the Shayatin will always be calling people away from Islam, he says:

**الذين قال إمامهم ومقدمهم لربك عز وجل لا قعدن لهم صراطك المستقيم ثم لا تينهم من بين أيديهم ومن خلفهم وعن أيمنهم وعن شمائلهم ولا تجد أكثرهم شاكرين**

**“Their Imam and their leader [Iblis] said to your Lord Azzawajal, “Then I will come to them from before them, and from behind them, from their right and from their left and You will not find most of them as thankful ones.” [7:17]**

He mentions here, that Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) tells us clearly that the Imam of the Shayatin, who is *Iblis* [may Allah curse him], from the beginning said to Allah that this is his goal, this is what he wants to do, he is going to call people away from the path of Islam. So, if we know this, then it only makes sense to know that the Shayatin who follow him, whether they’re from the Jinn or mankind, their goal is going to be the same as well. So, we know that this is going to take place, Allah told us that Iblis said this to Him, himself. So, would we then just say, “Okay, we believe it but we’re not going to do anything about it, or we don’t really care about it”, or we just expect that we’re going to be safe from it, or are we going to arm

ourselves with the knowledge that's necessary to counter these things, so this is what the author is saying.

Then he says:

ولكن إذا أقبلت على الله وأصغيت إلى حجته وبيناته فلا تخف و لا تحزن، إن كيد الشيطان كان ضعيفا

**“But if you turn to Allah and accept His arguments and His clarifications, then do not be afraid and do not grieve. Allah said, “Those who believe fight in the cause of Allah, and those who disbelieve fight in the cause of the Taghut. So fight you against the friends of the Shaytan. Ever feeble indeed is the plot of the Shaytan.” [4:76]**

So here, the point of which the author is mentioning this verse for is to say that Allah has already told us, this is what the Muslims will be doing and this is what the kuffar will be doing and in the end, He said, **“Indeed, the plot of the Shaytan is weak.”**

So, we know for sure that it is weak, it's not strong in and of itself, so we know that it is possible to beat, it is possible to argue against, and it is possible to overcome with argument and evidence from the Qur'an and the Sunnah. So, just knowing that in and of itself, then we know that nothing special needs to happen in order to beat these arguments. If we take what Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) has given us, it's sufficient, we don't need to have anything else. If we just look to what Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) has given us, and how He has taught us to preserve His religion, this is sufficient for us to be able to beat the plan of the Shaytan.

So, if it's related to arguments that they bring from the Qur'an and the Sunnah, we know that the Qur'an and the Sunnah will clarify these better than their understanding of it, and if they come to us with logical arguments, or they try to bring arguments that are outside of the Qur'an and the Sunnah, we know that whatever Allah gives us, that's the most logical thing. So, if someone brings you something opposite than it, than then Qur'an and the Sunnah will have something that's more logical and will beat that logic. So, we know that this is the case as well.

So, this is what the author says about this, insha'Allah we'll stop there for tonight, and we'll leave it open for questions. Wallahul A'lam.

## Lesson 7:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

Last week, we finished talking about or we began talking about the issue of having a sufficient amount of knowledge to be able to, first of all know your Tawhid, and to know your religion in a sufficient manner, so that one doesn't fall into matters of Shirk or kufr. Likewise, to have sufficient amount of knowledge, or that there's a level of knowledge above this that is needed, in order to be able to refute or to keep away any doubts or any sort of misconceptions that people try to bring and try to have matters of shirk and kufr come into Islam.

We spoke about that these matters are often propagated by different groups, some that are Muslimin but are upon misguidance, and some that are out of the fold of Islam. Certain groups like the Rafidah, and certain groups like the Sufis or what people call *Quburiyyun*, the people who worship graves and modernists and things like this, that will try to bring things from the Qur'an and things from the Sunnah and try to say that a matter of Shirk and a matter of kufr is actually apart of Islam.

So, there's **two** levels of knowledge that's needed. So first of all, in order to not fall into this ourselves, we need to have a certain amount of knowledge, but likewise we need to have enough knowledge to repel these misguidances and these doubts because someone might know that something's wrong when they're told it, or when someone brings it up but they don't have a sufficient amount of knowledge to disapprove this idea, or to prove to others that it's a wrong idea and to get rid of this doubt. So, there's two levels of knowledge that we talked about, so that's where ended off last week.

The next thing that the author says is that:

والعامي من الموحدين ، يغلب الألف من علماء هو لا ء المشركين ، كما قال تعالى : وإن جندنا لهم الغالبون

Or, "The general person or the lay person from the Muwahhidin."

So, meaning from the Muslimin, the people of Tawhid.

"...has the ability to beat 1000 of the scholars of the Mushrikin. As Allah said, "And our soldiers, they will be the ones who are victorious." [37:173]

And then he continues, and he says:



فجند الله هم الغالبون ، بالحجة واللسان ، كما أنهم الغالبون بالسيف والسنان

**Or, “So the army of Allah, or the soldiers of Allah [in this context, he’s referring to the Muslimin], they are those who are victorious when it comes to there proofs on their tongue, just as they are the ones who are victorious with their swords and their spears.”**

So, meaning, just as they’re victorious on the battlefield when they fight, they’re also the ones who are victorious when it comes to arguing for Tawhid and arguing against Shirk.

Then he said:

وإنما الخوف الموحّد الذي يسلك الطريق وليس معه سلاح

**Or, “The only thing that is feared is for the Muwahhid or the person of Tawhid [so in this context, he’s referring to the Muslimin] is to go about this path [calling to Tawhid] but they don’t have the sufficient amount of weapons.”**

So, what he’s referring to here is someone who gets involved in this matter, calling to Tawhid and arguing against Shirk, but they don’t really know, they don’t have a sufficient amount of knowledge to refute these types of things. So this is what’s feared, someone may get involved in this issue, and they’re on the truth, and they know what’s wrong, but then they get themselves involved in arguments, and they get themselves involved in discussions. That even though they’re correct, they don’t know how to refute these ideas and because of this, people listening or people who are sitting around while this is going on, it looks to them that this person doesn’t know what he’s talking about and therefore they might follow the thing that is wrong.

So, this is what the author says, this is why he says it. Here he refers to the general lay person being able to beat 1000 of the scholars of the Mushrikin. So, what he means here is that, or the reason for this is because something that’s wrong can’t be right, it’ll never be right, Shirk, so something that’s an insult to Allah, regardless of how many people follow it or how many people call to it, it’s never something that will be correct.

So, as long as the person is on Tawhid, then he is able to beat the scholars of Shirk on this matter. This doesn’t mean he’ll always win an argument clearly because he might not know how refute what’s being said or he might not know what to say to these people, but the fact he’s still upon Tawhid and that he knows Shirk is wrong, then this is something that’s sufficient for him to be considered that he was victorious, or he was the one who won in this situation.

When we say people who are lay people or people who are ‘ammi’, so that’s what the author refers to here, literally it translates to someone who is illiterate or unlettered. There’s a number of different types that we can talk about for this, so one is called “Amm-il harfi wa’l qira’a”, or someone who is illiterate when it comes to reading or writing and this is also what could be called “al-Ummi”, so when Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) referred to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), He referred to him as “al-Ummi”, and this has nothing to do with the amount of knowledge, all it means is that the person can’t read or write.

The second type is what we say is that he's an "*Ammi*", it can be when it relates to his belief. So, he's a lay person, he has no knowledge when it comes to his beliefs, and this, we would call someone who's not upon Islam because obviously someone who's upon Islam opposed to someone who isn't upon Islam, the person who's Muslim would be considered one of knowledge, and the person who's on Shirk, would be considered someone of ignorance.

The last one, and this is what the author's referring to here is the "*Ammi*" from the Muwahhidin, or the general lay person from the Muwahhidin, or from the Muslims. In this context, we call him an "*Ammi*" or someone who's a lay person, merely because he doesn't know the arguments, or he doesn't know the evidence from the Qur'an and the Sunnah to prove his beliefs. He's on the correct beliefs but he doesn't have the evidence to prove them. So, he might be correct in and of himself and be safe in and of himself because he's upon Tawhid, but his benefit doesn't go further than that and he can't benefit people beyond himself in that sense.

The next point to talk about is when Allah said that the victory will be for the Muslimin or His '*jund*'. There's a number of different types of '*ghalabah*' or victory, or being victorious that we can talk about.

The **first** is the victory that is related to being upon the correct 'Aqidah. So just being upon the correct 'Aqidah is already a type of victory because if we know that the vast majority of the people aren't upon Islam, and the people who are in Islam, according to the hadith of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) when he said: "*This Ummah will be divided into 73 sects, all of them are in the Fire except for one.*" We know that the vast majority of people who attribute themselves to Islam aren't upon the correct Islamic belief. They're still Muslimin, but they still have these misguidances. So, the fact that the person's upon the correct beliefs, this in and of itself is a victory.

The **second** type of '*ghalabah*' or the second type of victory is when Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) gives you victory in the sense that you're able to stay steadfast upon what your beliefs are, so whether it relates to people bringing you misguidances or misconceptions and you're able to refute them, and you're able to stay away from following them. Or if it becomes to someone is being put through trials in the dunya that's related to the religion and someone is able to stay steadfast upon the religion, then this is also a type of victory. This is what Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) referred to when He said,

الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَلَمْ يَلْبِسُوا إِيمَانَهُمْ بِظُلْمٍ أُولَٰئِكَ لَهُمُ الْأَمْنُ وَهُمْ مُهْتَدُونَ

Or which translates as, **"It is those who believe, and confuse not their belief with dhulm [meaning Shirk], for them there is security and they are the ones who are guided."** [6:82]

So, here Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) referred to those who are upon Islam and don't then perform any Shirk that they are the ones who are safe and have security, and they're the ones who are guided. And Allah said,

يُثَبِّتُ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا بِالْقَوْلِ الثَّابِتِ فِي الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا وَفِي الْآخِرَةِ ۖ وَيُضِلُّ اللَّهُ  
الظَّالِمِينَ ۖ وَيَفْعَلُ اللَّهُ مَا يَشَاءُ

Which translates as, **“Allah will keep firm those who believe with the word that stands firm in this world and the Hereafter, and Allah will cause to go astray those who are dhalimin and Allah does whatever He wills.” [14:27]**

Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) also said,

وَالَّذِينَ جَاهَدُوا فِينَا لَنَهْدِيَنَّهُمْ سُبُلَنَا ۚ وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ لَمَعَ الْمُحْسِنِينَ

Which translates as, **“As for those who strive hard in Our Path, we will surely guide them to Our Paths, and verily Allah is with the Muhsinin.” [29:69]**

And lastly, Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) said,

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِن تَنصُرُوا اللَّهَ يَنصُرْكُمْ وَيُثَبِّتْ أَقْدَامَكُمْ

Or which translates as, **“O you who believe, if you support Allah, He will support you and make your foothold firm.” [47:7]**

So, here Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) mentioned a number of situations which if the person stays steadfast upon the religion, and that’s whether it is related to misconceptions that are brought to them, or whether it’s related to trials that are brought to them in the dunya with regards to their wealth, or with regards to their self or their family, that if the person stays steadfast upon this, then Allah will give him the means to stays steadfast as long as the person is sincere. So, this is the second type of victory.

The **third** is that if the person dies upon something good, so meaning they at the very least die upon Islam and in a better situation. They die in a good state, so maybe while they’re praying, or they die while making da’wah or they die while fighting for Islam or something like this. So, this is the last type of victory, and that’s similar to when Allah mentioned in Surat al-Buruj about ‘*Ashab al-Ukhdu*’, that these people were killed and all of them were killed but despite that, Allah said that they were victorious.

ذَلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْكَبِيرُ

**“That is the great victory” [85:11]**

So, Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) said this about them and the only reason that was said about them because they died upon Tawhid, and they died upon what Allah was pleased with. So, this is a bit about the issue of *ghalabah*.

There’s also a second way of looking at victory, the first way we looked at victory relates to the actual victory itself so what is considered victory. The second type we look at is how will the victory come.

So, the author mentioned **two types**, the **first** was the victory or the *ghalabah* as it relates to proofs and arguments, so meaning that if someone is upon Islam, and they're calling to Tawhid, then they will be victorious with regards to the proof that they use and the arguments that they have and the reason for that is...we know that Tawhid is correct and Shirk is something that's false so it can never be proven that Shirk is something that's correct. So, maybe the person in and of himself can't argue for it and can't prove it with his words, but in and of itself, what he's arguing for is something that's correct, and this is what the author referred to.

The **second** is the type that relates to fighting itself when it comes to weapons and this is the type that sometimes the Muslimin will be victorious with it and sometimes they won't be. We know in the time of the Sahabah, there were certain battles that they lost and in the time of the Tabi'in and so on and all the way down, we know that there's sometimes Allah will give the Muslimin victory, like physical victory and sometimes He won't, but when it comes to arguing on behalf of Tawhid, then we know that it will always be something that is victorious.

The next part that the author mentioned as I quoted before is that what's feared is the one who goes about this path and doesn't have the sufficient amount of weapons. So, meaning that he doesn't have a sufficient amount of knowledge and a sufficient amount of proof for what he's arguing for.

So, what we fear for him is two things, one is that he might actually be taken astray, so maybe if he doesn't have sufficient knowledge and he doesn't have enough knowledge and enough studying that he's done with regards to the issues of Shirk, he might actually be convinced and taken astray by people who bring misconceptions about Islam. The second type is that even if he doesn't have enough knowledge or he doesn't go astray when it comes to matters of Shirk, he might at the same time not be able to prove to other people how these things are false.

So, he might not be convinced by these Shubuhah or these misconceptions that people bring to him with regards to Shirk, but at the same time we fear for him. We fear for the person who doesn't have enough knowledge, he might not be able to convince others so he'll get himself in a situation where he might look like he doesn't know what he's talking about or he might look like what he's calling to is incorrect because he doesn't really know how to speak on behalf of Islam the way he should. So, these are two ways that we would fear for someone who doesn't have enough knowledge.

The next point that the author says is he says:

وقد من الله علينا بكتابه الذي جعله تبياناً لكل شيء وهدى ورحمة ، وبشرى للمسلمين فلا يأتي صاحب باطل بحجة ، إلا وفي القرآن ما ينقضها ، ويبين بطلانها كما قال تعالى : ولا يأتونك بمثل إلا جئناك بالحق وأحسن تفسيراً

Or, "And Allah has given us a virtue in His Book as He's made it a clarification for everything, and a guidance and a Mercy and a clear call or giving of glad-tidings for Muslimin, and that no person of falsehood will come with a proof, except that in the Qur'an we find something that would negate it and show that it's something false as

Allah said, “And no example or similitude that they bring but we reveal to you the truth and a better explanation thereof.” [25:33]”

And then he said:

قال بعض المفسرين: هذه الآية عامة في كل حجة يأتي بها أهل الباطل إلى يوم القيامة

Or, “And some of the scholars of Tafsir have said this verse is general with regards to every argument or proof that someone of falsehood comes with until the Day of Resurrection.”

So, here the author is saying that the Qur'an contains evidence to refute everything that a person of falsehood comes with. So, if we know that in general, Tawhid is correct, regardless of any argument someone brings, whether they try to bring it from the Qur'an or from the Sunnah or from the statement of the Sahabah and their actions, or anything after, if they try to bring something to show that a matter of Shirk is correct. We know for a fact that in the Qur'an we'll find something that will refute this and show it's incorrect. Likewise, whether it's with regards to Shirk or whether it's with regards to kufr, or whether it's with regards to something against the Sunnah, anything that's wrong, in the Qur'an will find something that will be an argument against this and a proof to show that it's actually wrong.

So, this is what the author said next, after this he goes into the second part of the book. So, as we talked about when we first started this book, it's divided into a number of categories or a number of sections. The first was a general introduction to the book and to why it's being discussed and some of the points that need to be known before he goes into the actual crux of the book. The second part is mentioning the misconceptions and the doubts that people bring about Islam, particularly by the people of Shirk, to mention what they say as argument and then to refute them, so this is the second part of the book which we're starting now.

This we can say is also two parts, so the first is a general refutation, so the author will give us some arguments and some evidence from the Qur'an and the Sunnah that gives us a proof and gives us strength to be able to look at any argument that's brought, that is calling to Shirk and anything else that's false, it gives us enough proof to refute this in general.

So, we might not be able to use it to look at every evidence that they bring and say, “This evidence is wrong because of this and this.” He will give us some general rules for us to say if we hear something that's against Islam, we can use this general rule to refute it. The second part of this section, he brings specific evidence that they use from the Qur'an and shows how each one of these evidences is something that's wrong. So, we won't get through all this section today, we'll start with part of it.

So, the first is the general refutation or the general 'Radd against some of these misconceptions. So, the author says:

وأنا أذكر لك أشياء مما ذكر الله في كتابه جوابا لكلام احتج به المشركون في زماننا علينا فنقول :جواب أهل الباطل من طريقين مجمل ، ومفصل أما المجمل :فهو الأمر العظيم ، والفائدة الكبيرة لمن عقلها وذلك قوله تعالى : هو الذي أنزل عليك الكتاب منه آيات ، محكمات هن أم الكتاب وأخر متشابهات

Or, “And I’ll mention some of these things to you that Allah mentioned in His Book as a refutation or an answer to the words which are used as evidence by the people of Shirk or the Mushrikun in our time. So, we say that answering the people of falsehood, there’s two ways to do so. First is general and the second is specific. As for the general rule or the general answer we give them, then this is the great matter and the important benefit to those who can understand it. And that is His statement: **“It is He Who sent down to you the Book, in it are Verses that are entirely clear, they are the foundations of the Book, and others not entirely clear...”**”

And then He (سبحانه و تعالى) continues,

فأما الذين في قلوبهم زيغ فيتبعون ما تشابه منه ابتغاء الفتنة وابتغاء تأويله

**“So as for those in whose hearts there is a deviation, they follow that which is not entirely clear, seeking fitnah, and seeking its hidden meanings.” [3:7]**

Then he continues and says:

الذين يتبعون ما تشابه منه قد صح عن رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) أنه قال :إذا رأيتم ، فأولئك الذين سمى الله فأحذروهم مثال ذلك إذا قال بعض المشركين :ألا أولياء الله لا خوف عليهم و لا هم يحزنون

Or, “That it’s authentic from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) that he said, “If you see those who follow that which isn’t clear from it [meaning from the Qur’an], then those are the ones who Allah has mentioned or has labelled so beware of them.” An example of this is, some of the Mushrikin say, **“No doubt, indeed the awliya or the allies of Allah, no fear shall come to them, nor shall they grieve.” [10:62]**”

So, he says that if we look at this Verse from Surah Ali-‘Imran, then we understand that Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) revealed two types of Ayat in the Qur’an.

So, the first, is that which is clear and there’s no way of anyone misinterpreting it, and there’s no doubt about what it means, and the second types which aren’t entirely clear, and that someone can try to use this Verse as an argument for something that’s false. Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) told us that there’ll be people who follow these unclear Verses, or Verses that might have some ways of misinterpreting them and they follow these ones, or they follow these Verses as a means to make fitnah and they try to use these Verses to say, this is from Islam, this is what the Qur’an says, this is something correct and they’ll bring a Verse that really doesn’t prove what they’re saying but someone could interpret it that way, or someone might look at it and say “I could see how it could mean that.”



Then he mentioned that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said that if you see the people who do this, then these are who Allah warned us about so beware of them, so meaning stay away from them. Then he gave an example of this, the Verse when Allah said, which means that the allies of Allah, there's no fear upon them and they'll never grieve.

So, this is where we are at this point so then they say:

وَأَن الشَّفَاعَةَ حَقٌّ وَأَنَّ الْأَنْبِيَاءَ لَهُمْ جَاهٌ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ أَوْ ذَكَرَ كَلَامَ النَّبِيِّ (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) يَسْتَدِلُّ بِهِ عَلَى شَيْءٍ مِنْ بَاطِلِهِ ، وَأَنْتَ لَا تَفْهَمُ مَعْنَى الْكَلَامِ الَّذِي ذَكَرَهُ ، فَجَاوِبُهُ بِقَوْلِكَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ ذَكَرَ فِي كِتَابِهِ أَنَّ الَّذِينَ فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ زَيْغٌ يَتْرَكُونَ الْمُحْكَمَ وَيَتَّبِعُونَ الْمُتَشَابِهَ وَمَا ذَكَرْتَهُ مِنْ أَنَّ اللَّهَ ذَكَرَ : أَنَّ الْمُشْرِكِينَ يَقْرُونَ بِالرُّبُوبِيَّةِ ، وَأَنَّ كُفْرَهُمْ بِتَعَلُّقِهِمْ عَلَى الْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالْأَنْبِيَاءِ ، مَعَ قَوْلِهِمْ

Meaning the Mushrikin will say that the *Shafa'a* or the intercession, meaning when someone intercedes on our behalf to Allah, this is something that's correct, and it's done by the Anbiya, and its done by the Shuhada, and it's done by the Salihin and so on.

So, if we know this and we know that there's no fear for them, then according to them, they say it only makes sense for us to then make du'a to these people and ask them for *Shafa'a* for us, because why would we ask Allah ourselves when we're very low, and we don't have knowledge, and we're not very pious. But these people were and the Anbiya received Wahi from Allah, or revelation and they were protected from major sins, and they were protected from making mistakes in regards to da'wah, and for example, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), we know that all of his sins were forgiven, and we know that all the rewards that Allah has promised him, so why would we ask Allah for something. Let's ask the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to then ask Allah for us, because if Allah loves the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) more than us, he'll more likely have his du'a answered than us, and they'll say Allah said this, isn't this correct.

So, they'll bring things like this that each of them in and of themselves are correct, but if we put it together, it's a completely false concept. So, the author says that this is an example of this, that they'll bring this verse. He mentions that what we first need to know is that this is something that the people of falsehood will do, they'll bring things that aren't clear, and they'll try to prove something that is completely against Islam, and he said that even someone who doesn't know the specific answer to this, or how to answer this verse, if they know a general rule, and they know a general concept in Islam, this will be sufficient for them to refute this.

Then he gave the example when Allah (سبحانه و تعالى) said,

وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ هَؤُلَاءِ شَفَعَاؤُنَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ قُلْ أَتُتَبَّنُونَ بِاللَّهِ بِمَا لَا يَعْلَمُ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ ۖ سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى عَمَّا يُشْرِكُونَ

Or which translates as, **“and they worship besides Allah, things that hurt them not nor profit them, and they say, “These are interceders with Allah.” Say: “Do you inform**



**Allah of that which He knows not in the Heavens and in the Earth.” Glorified is He above all that which they associate partners with Him.” [10:18]**

So, the author continues and says:

هذا أمر محكم بين , لا يقدر أحد أن يغير معناه وما ذكرت لي أيها المشرك من القرآن، أو كلام النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) (لا يخالف كلام الله وهذا جواب سديد ولكن لا يفهمه إلا من وفقه الله فلا تستهن به ، فإنه كما قال الله تعالى : وما يلقاها إلا الذين صبروا ، وما يلقاها إلا ذو حظ عظيم

“This is something that’s very clear, and no one can change its meaning, and that which you mention to me O you Mushrik [he’s giving us how to argue with someone who calls to shirk], that which you mention to me from the Qur’an or the statement of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), I don’t know what it means, but I know that the words of Allah do not contradict each other, and that the words of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) do no contradict the words of Allah. This is a very good answer, but most people will not understand it, except those who Allah has given tawfiq to, or success too, so do not take it as something light, as He ta’ala has said, **“But none is granted it, except those who are patient, and none is granted it except the owner of a great portion.” [41:35]**

So, here he’s saying that if we understand this general argument which is that, if we look at what the Mushrikin did at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), the claim that those who they were worshipping were at a higher status than them, so they would make du’a to them, to make du’a to Allah.

So, now when a mushrik comes to you, whether he claims Islam or not, whether he’s from a sect within Islam, or whether he’s from a sect outside of Islam, he tries to claim that this is something correct, and they’ll say that, this person will make *Shafa’a* or that we’re making du’a to this person, that if we know that Allah at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) called these people Mushrikin and he judged them as being disbelievers because they did this same act, then we know that whatever proof you bring to us to try to validate this, to make it to be something that’s correct, we know that it’s wrong.

Doesn’t matter what evidence you bring us, even if I don’t know how to answer this specific evidence, I know that it was wrong in the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) so it’s wrong now. Even if I don’t understand, maybe you bring me a hadith that’s weak, if I don’t know that it’s weak, it doesn’t matter because I know that it’s incorrect because it was incorrect at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

So, this is where the author stops with regards to the general answer, so insha’Allah we’ll stop there, next week I’ll comment a bit about the general answer, and next week we’ll get into the specific doubts or misconceptions some of the mushrikin use to try to justify their Shirk from the Qur’an, and then we’ll talk about how to refute those insha’Allah. Wallahul A’lam.

## Lesson 8:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

Last week, the last thing we talked about was we began going into essentially the main part of the book which is “*Kashf ash-Shubuhah*”, and the main part of the book is a refutation of the evidences that some people use to try to justify Shirk and they try to say that, these are evidences from the Qur’an or evidences from the Sunnah that justify making du’a or seeking things from other than Allah. So, what we talked about last week was that the author, he mentioned that there’s two ways of refuting or arguing against these types of misconceptions or these “*Shubuhah*” that people bring. He said that the first is a general way of refuting, or a “*Muj’mal*” way of refuting, and the second is a specific way of refuting the evidences that they bring.

So, last week we went over or we began speaking about the **general way that we refute** these evidences, that they try to bring from the Qur’an and we call it general for a number of reasons, so the first reason is that it’s general, it doesn’t go into the specific evidence that’s mentioned by the people who are trying to call to this Shirk.

So, it’s general in the sense that if someone brings a specific evidence from the Qur’an, and says “this can be used to say that we can make du’a to other than Allah”, that this evidence or this argument that’s general won’t specifically discuss that Ayah, it’ll be a general argument that’s used to refute that.

What we said last week was that the general rules that we know in the Qur’an and we know in the Sunnah, that Allah has forbid Shirk and that Allah has forbid making du’a to anyone other than Him. So, regardless of what evidence the person brings, even if the general person or the laymen or a person who doesn’t have a lot of knowledge on the issue, even if he doesn’t know how to refute this evidence specifically, he can always go back to this general rule, which is that Allah has forbid Shirk, and he can say, “I don’t understand or I can’t refute or discuss this specific evidence that you’ve brought, but I know that in general these things are forbidden in Islam, so whatever you’re trying to argue, must be wrong.” So, if we have a general rule, we can use this to refute these ideas in a general manner.

Secondly, we call it general because it doesn’t just relate to the issue of Shirk and kufr, it relates to the issues of *bid’ah* and it relates to the issues that come into the *Asma wa’l Sifat* or the Names and the Attributes of Allah, and it comes in many different areas in the religion, that if we have a general rule and we understand what’s the basis or what’s the most basic issue or ruling on this topic, then we can use this rule to always go back to, and it will always be a way that can help us.

With regards to these types of rules, firstly as I said, it’s a type of rule that can go and it can affect all matters of the religion. Secondly, it can be used by someone who’s a scholar, but it can also be used by someone who’s a student of knowledge, and it can also be used by

someone who's from the lay people, from the 'awwam and that he doesn't really have knowledge on specific issues, so it isn't restricted to one level of knowledge. Another point on these general rules is that it doesn't benefit others.

So, what I mean by this, if someone comes and says that this is matter of Shirk, or this you can make du'a to other than Allah, and they bring an evidence, if a person uses just a general rule to refute this, all this does is benefit them themselves. It doesn't really teach other people why it's wrong, and it doesn't really teach other people how to stay away from this matter. So, like we mentioned last week, the evidence that some of the people who worship graves, and the Sufis and the like, what they mention from the Book of Allah is they say that, Didn't Allah say,

أَلَا إِنَّ أَوْلِيَاءَ اللَّهِ لَا خَوْفَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ

**“Indeed, the ‘Awliya or the allies of Allah do not have any fear or they not grieve.”  
[10:62]**

So, because of this, because they're at the highest level, it makes more sense to make du'a to them and they'll make du'a to Allah for us. So, as we said last week, the general refutation of this is to say that we know that Shirk isn't allowed in general so obviously making du'a to other than Allah isn't allowed in general, so this can't be allowed. Specifically, how to refute this verse, the person may not know how, but this would be a general rule that would be enough to at least keep himself safe, it wouldn't benefit other people, because someone else might say, “you didn't really show me how this is wrong.” But the very least, if you have general rule, this can show or this can keep the person safe in and of themselves. So, this is some points when we talk about the difference between a general refutation, and a specific refutation.

So, this is what the author mentioned, or this is the misconception that the author mentioned. We can also use this general rule, or this general way of refuting things as a way, or we can use it in other areas of the religion. For example, if someone tries to argue and say that the issue of hijab or the issue of the veil is something in jahiliyyah, and all it was, was a custom, it wasn't part of the religion.

The person might not know how to specifically refute these things and say that this argument isn't correct, but in general they would be able to say that, we know that there's evidence in the Qur'an and evidence in the Sunnah that this is from Islam, so because of this I know whatever you're saying is wrong, I may not know how to specifically refute what you're saying, but I know that this concept in general is incorrect.

Likewise, people nowadays for example will look at what's going on a number of countries, or the Muslimin are being fought, and they'll say look what these people are doing, this must show that the idea of Jihad or the idea of defending yourself in general must be something wrong, and it must not be from the religion, and what's their evidence, they'll say “they did this and they did this,” and they'll bring this general misconception to try to argue against what the Muslimin are doing.

So a person might not be able to say “I know that this is wrong because of this...”, so they might not be able to refute each individual thing, but what they could say in general is “I

know that this is something that Islam came with, and I know that the people who perform these actions are considered from the highest people in the religion of Islam, so everything that you accuse thereafter, I know there must be something wrong, and there must be some misconception that you have, and it must not be completely the way that you're doing it."

This is something that people can use as a general rule, and likewise this general rule can also be used for other things with halal and haram. So, they'll have a store and they're selling something that's haram, it'll be pork, or it'll be cigarettes or whatever the matter is, and they'll say, "no, it's mixed with halal and haram", or "it's my business, I'll lose my business and so on", and they'll bring these things that they consider to be rules, or that they're trying to use as an argument to try to prove these things, but the person might not be able to say I know this argument is wrong because of this, they might not be able to go through each one and argue it, but they can say it in general, "I know Allah forbid these things, and I know that Allah wouldn't forbid something and permit it at the same time, so because of this, I know whatever things you're bringing, they must be wrong."

So, these are just some issues to show that there's **general refutations** and there's **specific refutations**.

After that, the author finished this sub-section and he said that:

ولكن لا يفهمه إلا من وفقه الله فلا تستهن به ، فإنه كما

**Or, "And this answer is very good, direct and strong, however none understand it except those whom to Allah the Most High has granted success. So do not belittle this answer."**

This is a very good answer, but most people will not understand it, except those who Allah has given *tawfiq* to, or success too, so do not take it as something light. Don't look at the general refutation as being something that we should take lightly, we should look at it being it's a great matter in the religion and it's something that if it benefits people and protects them in their religion, then it's something that shouldn't be taken lightly. So, the fact that someone knows how to do this and knows how to protect themselves, don't take it lightly.

And then he concluded it with the verse when he said:

قال الله تعالى : وما يلقاها إلا الذين صبروا ، وما يلقاها إلا ذو حظ عظيم

**"And none will understand it except those who are patient, and none will understand it except those who have a great portion." [41:35]**

Meaning that, even though to some people being able to refute things with general statements, might look like not a big deal to some people, in reality it really is a big deal, so someone being able to look at an issue and say "I can't refute every aspect of this, but I know it's wrong in general", this is a great matter, it's a very important thing, because it stops the person from falling into Shirk, or maybe falling into matters of innovation or bid'ah, or maybe falling into issues of major sins. So, this is where the author left off, so where the author finished talking about the general refutations of these misconceptions.

So, then the author goes into the **specific way of refuting** these misconceptions. So, he says:

وأما الجواب المفصل فإن أعداء الله لهم اعتراضات كثيرة على دين الرسل ، يصدون بها الناس عنه :منها :قولهم :نحن لا نشرك بالله ، بل نشهد أنه لا يخلق و لا يرزق ، و لا ينفع و لا يضر ، إ لا الله وحده لا شريك له ، وأن محمدا (صلى الله عليه وسلم) لا يملك لنفسه نفعا و لا ضرا فضلا عن عبد القادر أو غيره ، ولكن أنا مذنب ، والصالحون لهم جاه عند الله ، وأطلب من الله بهم

**Or, “And as for the detailed reply, then verily the enemies of Allah have many objections against the religion of the Messengers, by which they hinder the people from it. Amongst these objections is their saying: “We do not associate any partners with Allah, rather we testify that none creates, nor provides, nor benefits, nor harms except Allah alone, who has no partners. And that Muhammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم) cannot bring about any benefit for himself and nor bring about any harm, let alone the likes of AbdulQadir and those like him. But I am a sinner and the Righteous have position and status with Allah, hence I ask Allah though them.”**

As for the specific answer, then the enemies of Allah have many arguments that they use against the religion of the Messengers, which they use to try to stop the people from coming to it. For example, when they say “We are not performing Shirk with Allah, rather we testify to La ilaha ila Allah...” To the end of what he said there.

So, here if we look at this, we’re going into the specific arguments people use to try to defend themselves. So, as we talked about before there’s many people, and it’s even spreading in this city Allahul Musta’an, and they call on other than Allah, they call on the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), or they’ll call on their Shaykhs or whatever they call, and some of them even will take trips around the world to go to certain places in Morocco or in Spain, and different places, and they’ll call this their Hajj, and they’ll say that they’re going to go make du’a to a person there.

But then when you go and confront them on this, they’ll say, “how can you say that we’re not Muslims?” or, “how can you say that what we’re doing takes us out of Islam, we testify La ilaha ila Allah, we say La ilaha ila Allah and we believe that no one could be worshipped other than Allah, so doesn’t this show this show that what we’re doing is fine.”

So, as we said before, if we saw someone doing this, the first thing if you didn’t really know what to say, if you bring a verse, I don’t know how to refute, but I can say in general, I know that Allah forbid making du’a to other than Him, and he forbid seeking things other than Him, you’re doing that so I know it’s wrong. I might not know every detail of the argument, but I know in my heart that what you’re doing is definitely something wrong. So, that’s the benefit of having the general answer.

The specific answer is what we’ll go into now. So, in this section, the author mentions three misconceptions that are used. The first is that they say that, “we testify to La ilaha ila Allah”. We talked about this alhamdulillah in lots of detail, about merely saying “La ilaha ila Allah” or merely saying that only Allah Creates or only Allah can benefit and can harm, this isn’t sufficient for someone to be Muslims and we covered that in great detail.

This is just one of the most basic things that every Muslim should have and what's the evidence that this isn't sufficient to be Muslim? We talked about this lots before alhamdulillah, that the kuffar of Quraysh used to believe these things. We know that Quraysh used to worship Allah, and they used to do many acts of worship as we talked about before, and they used to believe that Allah creates, and He is the One Who Protects, and He is the One Who can harm, and He is the One Who gives sustenance and so on, but despite this, the Prophet (ﷺ) didn't accept them as Muslimin, and despite this, the Prophet (ﷺ) called them to Islam, and when they wouldn't accept, and they fought against him and he fought against them and so on. So, at no point were they considered to be Muslims because they believed that no one Creates except Allah, because and what was the reason, they performed acts of Shirk, when they were supposed to be only worshipping Allah. So, this is the first misconception that people will bring.

The second one, is that "we're not performing Shirk because we're not worshipping other than Allah, all we're doing is asking this person to then ask Allah for us." So, the kuffar of Quraysh, they'll say they were asking these people or these idols in and of themselves, and when the Christians worship 'Isa, they're asking 'Isa in and of himself and they're worshipping him. [They say] "What we're doing isn't that, what we're doing is that we're asking this person whether he's a Prophet or from the Salihin or whatever the person is, we're asking him to ask Allah and it's going back to Allah, we're not worshipping these things in and of themselves." So, this is the second misconception that they bring, and insha'Allah we'll begin discussing each one of these.

So, after we talked about the general way of refuting this or answering it, because a person might not know all the evidences from the Qur'an and the Sunnah to show that this is wrong, alhamdulillah we have that already. So, now specifically the first thing we would say is that the mere asking of someone for something that they themselves can't provide and it belongs only to Allah, this is an act of Shirk. It doesn't matter whether you're putting them between you and Allah or whether you're going to them directly. Sure, one might be worse than the other, but at the same time, it's still an act of Shirk, and the evidence for that is if we look at what the kuffar of Quraysh were doing, they themselves, Allah said about them He said,

أَلَا لِلَّهِ الدِّينُ الْخَالِصُ ۚ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَىٰ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَحْكُمُ بَيْنَهُمْ فِي مَا هُمْ فِيهِ يَخْتَلِفُونَ ۗ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَهْدِي مَنْ هُوَ كَاذِبٌ كَفَّارٌ

Or that, **"Surely, the religion is only for Allah, and those who take Awliya besides Him, they say 'We worship them, only that they may bring us near Allah', verily Allah will judge between them concerning that which they differ. Indeed, Allah guides not him who is a liar and the disbeliever."** [39:3]

So, here Allah is mentioning about the kuffar of Quraysh, and He's saying that what they used to do is that they would worship these things, not for what these things were in and of themselves, the point of it in the end was to bring us closer to Allah, but despite this, Allah said that they would say, "we don't worship them except that they bring us closer to Allah." So, He confirmed that they were worshipping them, and that they were doing it to bring themselves closer to Allah, but despite this, this didn't save them, this doesn't make it okay, it just makes it a different type of Shirk, that's all it really does.

And Allah also said, and we talked about this last week,



وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِن دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ هَؤُلَاءِ شَفَعَاؤُنَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ  
 قُلْ أَتُنَبِّئُونَ اللَّهَ بِمَا لَا يَعْلَمُ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ ۚ سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى عَمَّا  
 يُشْرِكُونَ

**“And they worship besides Allah things that hurt them not, nor profit them, and they say “These are our intercessors with Allah”, Say: “Do you inform Allah of that which He knows not in the Heavens and on the Earth?” Glorified and Exalted be He above all which they associate partners with Him.” [10:18]**

So, here Allah mentioned about the kuffar of Quraysh as well, that they were taking these people and they were taking these graves, and they were taking these statues and whatever else they were doing, they were taking these as interceders or intercessors between them and Allah. So, they were using these things as a means to get closer to Allah, but despite this, it didn't help them, and it didn't make what they were doing right.

So, someone comes to you now and says, “when I go to this graveyard, and I make du'a to the dead person in the grave”, whether they're Muslim or non-Muslim, or if the person makes du'a to the Prophet (ﷺ) or to Abu Bakr or 'Umar, or to al-Hasan, or Husayn, or Fatimah, or whoever it is, then they say “no, we're not worshipping them as the end of our worship, we're only worshipping them, or asking them, or doing something for them so they bring us closer to Allah, so in the end our goal is Allah, so you can't say what we're doing is wrong.”

Then we say, yes we can and the reason for that is, what you're doing is exactly what Quraysh was doing. Quraysh, the people who fought against the Prophet (ﷺ) to stop the religion of Islam from being spread, this is the exact same thing that they were doing so you can't then say it's different or what we're doing is okay, because if what you're doing is okay, then what Quraysh was doing was okay, then it would mean what the Prophet (ﷺ) did to them wasn't okay.

So, the way the Prophet (ﷺ) dealt with them was wrong because they were actually Muslimin and so on. So, by trying to defend themselves, by saying what we're doing is okay, in and of itself is a big deal, but it also leads to other things, because then we have to say that Quraysh was right, and if Quraysh was right then the Prophet (ﷺ) was wrong and if the Prophet (ﷺ) was wrong, then who sent him? It was Allah, so you fall into these bigger things, so instead of someone just saying it was wrong, I'm going to stop doing this, this defending of themselves leads to things which are even greater acts of kufr, and greater statements of kufr against Allah.

So, this is just a very short discussion on the first issue or the first misconception that the people when they try to justify what they're doing from the acts of Shirk. So, what they say is that they try to say things like “this is something that isn't dua, because we're asking them to ask Allah, so really in the end it's going back to Allah.”

If we look at what Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah what they consider is that it's the request or act itself to someone who doesn't deserve it, that's the matter of Shirk. It doesn't matter whether you're going back to Allah in the end. This *shubuhah*, it's not something that's new, it was brought up in the time of Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhab, and it was done by a man



named Muhammad ibn ‘Afalaq, who died in the year 1164 Hijri, and he wrote a letter in the time. So, we know that in the beginning of talking about this book, the circumstances of the time were one in which people were far away from Islam, and many of them had actually left Islam because they were worshipping Awliya or what they call Awliya, and they were making Hajj to other than the Ka’bah, they were making Tawaf around people’s graves and so on, and they were performing such acts of Shirk that it was unrecognisable as Islam.

So, this da’wah began to spread the Qur’an and the Sunnah, and to try to fight off this Shirk, so at the same time just like anytime people are told to stop doing something they don’t want to stop doing, people try to justify it, so this person was one of the people who tried to justify his actions, and he actually wrote two letters or two small books trying to justify and trying to that because we’re not worshipping these people as an end, they’re a means to Allah. He wrote a book called “*Tahakkum al-Mukhalidi li-Muda’i Tajli ad-Din*”, and he wrote another Risalah or another book called, “*Risalatul Radda alayhim bi Mu’amal*”, and he tried to spread these misconceptions and tried to defend the people who were performing these acts of Shirk in the time of Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab.

Alhamdulillah, if we look at what we talked about many times before these are more than enough to refute this first misconception, and insha’Allah we’ll stop there for tonight and then if there’s any questions, we can take the questions. Next week we’ll get into the second, and third and we’ll go on from there, and there’s approximately 9 main misconceptions that are addressed in this book. The first 3 are the strongest ones, and after that they get weaker and weaker but insha’Allah we’ll go through all of them and just add some commentary where it’s needed. Wallahul A’lam.

## Lesson 9:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

Last week we began speaking about some of the specific misconceptions, or the specific *Shubuhah* that the Mushrikin try to use to prove their Shirk or to prove that what they're doing is something acceptable in Islam. When we say Mushrikin here, or the Mushrikun, or the people of Shirk, or the polytheists or whatever we call them here, we're referring to people who claim Islam, but are actually not upon Islam.

So, they've either left Islam, or they've never been Muslim to begin with. The reason for this is obviously if they're trying to prove what they're doing is correct, by using Ayat from the Qur'an, or hadith from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), then obviously these are people who are claiming Islam, because a Jew or a Christian, they wouldn't bring or try to bring Ayat from the Qur'an or hadith from Rasul (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to try to say that "what we're doing is correct", because they don't accept the Qur'an to begin with, let alone the Sunnah, and they don't claim to be Muslimin.

So why would they try to prove that what they're doing is Islamic, when they don't even claim to be Muslim to begin with. So, this is something people need to keep in mind that when we're talking about these misconceptions, it has to do with people who say that they're Muslimin, but then introduce acts or beliefs, or statements in what they're doing, trying to pass it off as being Islamic.

Last week we talked about *three* evidences that they try to use to say that what they're doing from this Shirk is something acceptable. So, we mentioned three things, one of them was that they say that, we do these acts of shirk when we call upon someone in a grave, or call upon someone who's alive but not in front of us, or we make sujud to our Shaykh, or whatever else they claim to do, that these are acts of Shirk. But what they will claim, is that they'll say that this is something that's Shirk or kufr, and it doesn't take you out of Islam, and the reason for this is because, we aren't that these people whether they're alive or dead, we're not saying that they control everything, we're not saying the rizq comes from them, and we're not saying that these people have the ability to take people's lives or bring them back to life, and they don't control the universe and these types of things.

So, they try to say that they're on an acceptable path because we don't attribute things of *Rububiyyah* or things of Lordship to these people. So, we talked about this at length alhamdulillah, and the most basic way to refute this is to say that, likewise the kuffar of Quraysh didn't believe these things either. So, the kuffar of Quraysh that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sent to and that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) fought against, and they fought against the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), they didn't believe that the idols that they worshipped had any control over these things. So, they didn't take any attributes of *Rububiyyah* and attribute it to these things either.

They were merely saying that things that we use to intercede between us and Allah, and that they're wasiyat, they're intermediaries between us and Allah. This whole argument, by trying to say that it's fine because we're not saying that they control everything is completely false, the mere fact that they're being taken as partners with Allah, or intermediaries between the person and Allah is sufficient for it to be something unacceptable.

The second argument that they use, is that they'll say that what we're doing now, we're not going to the Shaykh of ours, whether they're from the Sufiyyah, or we're not going to the graves of any of the Sahabah, or what they claim to be the Sahabah if they're from the Rafidah, or we're not going to our Ayatullah, or whatever they call from their Imams, and we're not seeking something directly from them. What we're doing is asking them to ask Allah if they're dead, and we're doing something of 'Ibadah for these people so that they will then intercede with Allah on our behalf. So, we're not worshipping them for the mere fact to worship them, what we're doing is we're worshipping them, we're doing this act so then they will seek something from Allah for us. They say that, this isn't shirk because we're not intending them as our end, they're not the goal of what we're doing, they're just the intermediary. So, this is where we left off last week.

So, this is what we'll talk about today. So, the first way to refute this, after we talked about already the general way of refuting. So, like we said before, Shaykh al-Islam here, Muhammed ibn 'Abdul-Wahhab, he talks about two ways of talking about these misconceptions, the first is that it's general. So, we say we know Allah, and then through the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), he forbid shirk, we know this already, this isn't something that's really disputed, and we know that what you're doing is asking something from other than Allah, so even if I don't know how to explain this specific or refute, or argue against this specific argument, I know it's wrong in and of itself because it doesn't comply with the general rules of the Shari'ah, so this is the first way.

Specifically, if we want to talk about the specific way to refute or to answer this *Shubuha* or this misconception, then there's a number of ways.

The *first* way would be that we start with the *Ijma'* or we start with the consensus, because we know that the consensus of the Muslimin, or the consensus of the scholars of Islam is considered an evidence, because there's evidence in the Qur'an, or evidence in the Sunnah, that this is the case, as Allah said

وَمَنْ يُشَاقِقِ الرَّسُولَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُ الْهُدَىٰ وَيَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ سَبِيلِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

Or that, **“And whoever opposes the Messenger after the clarification has come to him and he follows other than the way of believers...” [4:115]**

So, if the believers take a specific path, or they agree on something, this is considered to be an evidence, it's considered to be the truth. So, we know that this is the case when it comes to shirk, so this is one evidence. Allah said,

فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ

**“And if you dispute on something, then take it back to Allah, and the Messenger if you believe in Allah and the Last Day.” [4:59]**

So, here Allah referred us back to the Qur'an and the Sunnah on things that we dispute. So, the scholars of Fiqh, or specifically *Usul al-Fiqh* have said that this is evidence that if there is an agreement, that if all the Muslimin agree on something, then it's already truth, it doesn't need to be referred back to the Qur'an and the Sunnah because they've already agreed upon it. We know that in the Sahihayn, that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said in a number of ahadith with different phrasings, that he said, "There will never cease to be a group of my Ummah openly on the truth or clearly on the truth."

So, this is another evidence that the scholars of Usul have used to say that Ijma' is an evidence, because we know that in every single generation, there will always be at least one person or one group upon the truth. So, if the whole generation agrees on something, then we know that it's the truth because that one group or that one person is included in that. So, how it be that if there's always at least one group upon the truth, but everyone agrees upon it, and then someone says "No, it's not necessarily the truth," how can it be? It can't be. So, this is just some of the evidence with regards to that.

So, knowing that Ijma' is an evidence, or that consensus is a evidence, then we say that the first person who mentioned or narrated the Ijma' that this action of putting someone between you and Allah not as the goal, but as a means for them to then intercede on your behalf. The *first person* who mentioned that this is the matter of disbelief or matter of kufr according to 'Ijma was Shaykh al-Islam ibn Taymiyyah. So, he said that this is matter of consensus when he was talking about the people who worship statues. Then the evidence he mentioned for this specifically himself was the Verse that we talked about before when Allah said,

أَلَا لِلَّهِ الدِّينُ الْخَالِصُ ۚ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَىٰ

**"Surely, the religion is only for Allah, and those who take 'Awliya besides Him, they say: "We worship them only that they may bring us closer to Allah." [39:3]**

So, the people in the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), the mushrikin and even before that, when they would worship the idols, or they would worship something besides Allah, they would openly say, "we're not doing it for this person in an of himself, we're doing it that they will bring us closer to Allah."

So, they weren't wanting to be closer to al-Lat or they weren't wanting to be closer to al-Uzza, and they weren't wanting to be closer to any of the idols that they would worship, they were wanting to get closer to Allah, but despite this we don't say that because they wanted to get closer to Allah by worshipping al-Lat, they're Muslimin. We wouldn't say that, even though they're wanting to please Allah, but despite that they weren't following the correct way of doing so, so it all became something that was rejected. So, this is the first person who mentioned the 'Ijma.

The *second person* was Abdul-Latif ibn Abdur-Rahman, who was from the Imams of the da'wah Najdiyyah, and we talked a bit about in the beginning of this series, some of the main scholars of this da'wah, so he was one of them. He mentioned this in his book, "*Da'awah al-Manawi'in*" or this book which he refutes some of the claims that are against the da'wah of Najd. So, he takes many of the claims that people say this is wrong, and he refutes them, so

he was the second person to do so and you can also find him narrating the 'Ijma in a book called "*Mamju Risa'al wa'l Masa'il*", also in a letter by Abdul-Latif ibn Abdur-Rahman.

The *third 'Ijma*, or the third discussion on this took place in the year 1343 Hijri, and it was the scholars of Makkah came together in this year, so just under about 90 years ago now, and they wrote a letter called "*Al-Bayan al-Mufeed fi-matafaqa alayhi Ulama'i Najd min Aqa'id Tawhid*" or they wrote a letter talking about all the things that the scholars of Najd had agreed upon to be from the correct issues of 'Aqidah and Tawhid. They used the evidence when Allah said,

وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِن دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ هَؤُلَاءِ شَفَعَاؤُنَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ  
فَلْ أَتَيْنُونَ اللَّهَ بِمَا لَا يَعْلَمُ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ ۚ سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى عَمَّا  
يُشْرِكُونَ

**“And they worship besides Allah things that hurt them not nor benefit them, and they say “these are our intercessors with Allah.” Say: “Do you inform Allah about something which He does not know in the Heavens and the Earth.” Glory and Exalted be He above all that they associate partners with Him.” [10:18]**

So, Allah is also saying or He is clarifying that these people who Islam was sent to, they were worshipping these things, not to go against Allah in their claim, but they were doing it as a means to get closer to Allah, but despite this Allah called it shirk, and He rebuked the for it and He sent the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to them to bring them to Islam. And likewise, another person who mentioned the consensus on this issue is Hamad ibn Nasr ibn Mu'amr in his book, "*Al-Hadiyah Sunniyyah*", so he mentioned also that there's a consensus on this issue as well. So, if someone says "Ya Rasullullah", or if he says, "O wali of Allah", or "O friend of Allah or ally of Allah", if he goes to a grave and says that or if he goes to a Shaykh and says something like this, then this would be a matter of Shirk and that's again a matter of consensus.

So, this is some of the evidences that they use to prove that what they're doing is actually a matter of Shirk. Also, the scholar Sulayman ibn 'Abdillah who was from the grandsons of Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhab, he wrote the book "*Taysir al-Aziz al-Hamid*", and he mentioned many evidences in this book to clarify that this act is actually an act of Shirk. So, first of all, he mentioned the verse,

قُلْ لِلَّهِ الشَّفَاعَةُ جَمِيعًا

Or that, **“To Allah belongs all the intercession.” [39:44]**

So, how is this used as evidence? If someone says "I'm seeking intercession from this person, so what's the problem is we know that Allah will give the intercession to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and the other Anbiya, and we know that He gives it to the Shuhadah, and we know that the Salihin have it, and we know that the Mala'ika have it on the Day of Judgement, if we know that the Shafa's is something correct, then what is the problem if we seek intercession from someone to then intercede with Allah on our behalf?"

The first problem is that, this intercession is it belongs to Allah, so even if this does have this intercession, they're only able to do so after Allah gives permission for it. So, Allah says,

قُلْ لِلَّهِ الشَّفَاعَةُ جَمِيعًا

Or, **“All of the intercession belongs to Allah.” [39:44]**

So, how can we take something that belongs to Allah and then go and ask for it from somebody else, just like we wouldn't ask for Rizq from someone unless it was done in a Shar'i way, for example someone had food with them and you ask them “Can I have some food?”, that would be something that would be acceptable. But for example, if someone was to say “I'm starving, so I'm going to ask so and so who's not even around me, doesn't have the ability to give me Rizq, I'm going to ask him for Rizq, and the evidence that this is okay is that sometimes people give other people food.” We would say that this is something completely rejected, so the fact that it belongs to Allah, it's only asked for from Allah. So, this is the first evidence.

Also, if we look at generally, the evidences that forbid Shirk, which is asking for something other than Allah. So, Allah said,

وَلَا تَدْعُ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَنْفَعُكَ وَلَا يَضُرُّكَ ۚ فَإِنْ فَعَلْتَ فَإِنَّكَ إِذَا مِنَ الظَّالِمِينَ

Which means, **“And invoke not besides Allah any that will neither profit nor hurt you, but if you did do so than you shall certainly be from the Dhalimin.” [10:106]**

And Allah also said,

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

Which means, **“And who is more astray than the one who calls besides Allah. Such as he will not answer them until the Day of Resurrection and who are unaware of the calls, and when mankind are gathered, they will be enemies for them and they will deny their worshipping.” [46:5-6]**

So, here Allah rebuked and essentially cut down anybody who makes du'a to other than Allah saying that first of all, they can't hear them so if they're a statue they don't have hearing to begin with, if it's a human that's dead, they can't hear you anymore, and if it's someone who's on the other side of the world that you're making du'a to, then obviously they can't hear you as well, so they won't hear you and they won't answer you all the way until the Day of Judgement. So, no matter how long you wait, it's not going to happen essentially, and then on the Day of Judgement, they'll reject what you were even doing, they'll say “we didn't accept this, we didn't want them to do it and we weren't even aware of it,” so because they didn't even know it was happening, so how can you then make du'a to someone who first of all can't answer you, second can't hear you and third doesn't even know it's taking place. So, on the Day of Judgement when they hear of it, and they're aware that you're worshipping them, they won't even know that it took place, so how you can then expect to come from them.

So, this is another evidence that they use, and they use the verse when Allah said,

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ عِبَادٌ أَمْثَلُكُمْ ۖ فَادْعُوهُمْ فَلْيَسْتَجِيبُوا لَكُمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ

Or which translates as, **“Indeed, those who you call upon besides Allah are slaves just like you, so call upon them, and let them answer you if you are indeed truthful.” [7:194]**

So, Allah here again is showing the ridiculousness of the claims that people say that “We’re going to make du’a to other than Allah, even if it’s as a intermediary.” So, even saying that, we’re not worshipping this person so they’ll enter us into Jannah, we’re worshipping them, so they’ll ask Allah to enter us into Jannah. These people can’t hear you, they can’t do anything for you, they’re either dead, or they’re statues that were never alive, or they’re on the other side of the earth, or even if they’re sitting in front of you and you’re making Sujud to them, they can’t do anything that you’re asking from them, they can’t do anything.

So, all of these things, Allah is essentially cutting them down and showing how dumb these things are that they claim, that they’re doing. Insha’Allah we’ll stop there. Next week, we’ll go onto the next Shubuha’. Wallahul A’lam.



## Lesson 10:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

Insha'Allah we'll continue where we left off two or three weeks ago since the last lesson from this series. The last thing that we were talking about was the misconception some people try to use when it comes to matters of Shirk and they try to use the argument that there's a difference or that when we go to somebody and ask them to ask Allah..so particularly if we go to a graveyard and ask someone who's in that grave to ask Allah to ask something for us, that this is a matter of shirk that it's actually allowed to do. Some will go a little bit further and say that it's not allowed, it's something that's an innovation, but it wouldn't remove someone from Islam.

So, we talked about this last week, and how this is a misconception, and how it actually is in contradiction to the consensus, and we mentioned a number of people who mentioned consensus on this matter, from the Imams of the Najdi da'wah and those before them. Likewise, we talked about the evidences for this from the Qur'an, and the logical arguments against this idea. So, we're almost done the first misconception.

The next part we'll talk about for this, is some questions to ask people who say these types of things. Someone might look at this topic and say why are we talking about these matters, nobody does this and this is something that was done a long time ago. The reality of the matter is, is that it isn't just something that was done a long time ago, it still goes on today. It still goes on in this country, it still goes on this city, it goes on, on some of the masajid in this city here, it goes on the U of A, it goes on a number of people call to this filth.

So, the idea that it doesn't need to be talked about is completely wrong because it is being spread, and Allahul musta'an, it's being spread more and more and people aren't really aware of it, so this is the reason we talk about it still, so don't think that it's a matter that's pointless to talk about. So, first we'll talk about some questions we'll ask to these people in order to show them what they're calling to is something that's false.

The first thing that we would ask them is, if you say that asking someone for something that they ask Allah for you. So you don't ask them for something, you don't say "O so and so from the grave...", if he's a Sayyid or Wali or whatever they happen to call that person, that this would be shirk but if you say to them, "...O walidi or O Sayyidi, ask Allah for us." If you say that this is not shirk, then we'll say, what you would say about someone who goes to a grave and slaughters for the person in that grave with the intention that they would then ask Allah for them.

So, we're no longer asking the person to ask, we're doing something for them, so that they will ask Allah on our behalf. This is a matter that it's very very rare that anyone has ever said that this wouldn't be shirk. So, even those who say that it's permissible to go to a grave and

ask that person to ask Allah on your behalf, even them, the vast majority of them would say that this remains a matter of shirk.

So, then we would say to them, then what is the difference between this type of worship, so that the person or the dead person asks Allah on your behalf, and making du'a to them so that they ask Allah on your behalf? Both of them are acts of worship, both of them are being done for the person in the grave, and both of them are being done with the intention that they will then intercede on your behalf with Allah. So, really in the end, there's no difference between the two.

The second question that we would ask is, when the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sent to the kuffar of Quraysh, what was the thing that they were doing? We know by the clear text of the Qur'an, that they didn't believe that anyone other than Allah creates or provides or anything like this. We know for a fact that what their opinion or their beliefs were that, when they would worship something other than Allah, that that point was, they would intercede on behalf of the person making du'a.

So, if this was the case with the kuffar of Quraysh, then what is the difference between what you're doing and what used to do. There's no difference really, so if that was disbelief and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sent to remove them from it, then what you're doing is disbelief, and Islam is the thing that would be removing you from it, and the Qur'an and the Sunnah would be the matter that would remove you from this state that you're in. So, again this is the second thing that we say.

So, then if they say, "the difference is that the kuffar of Quraysh used to worship statues, and they used to make du'a to statues and idols, but we're doing this to people in graves, so there's a difference." Then we say that, yes they used to do this but going to someone's grave and asking them for something, makes that grave an idol itself, and this is evident when the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), it's narrated in a hadith, and it's narrated by Imam Ahmad and others that he said, *"Do not make my grave or do not make it so my grave becomes an idol that is worshipped."*

So, we know that things can become idols, they don't necessarily have to be built with the intent of an idol, if someone treats it as an idol, it becomes an idol with regards to that person. So, this is the case with regards to the people in the grave as well. Yes, the grave originally was set up so this person would be in the ground, but the fact that people go to it, and start performing acts of worship around the grave, it now becomes an idol with regards to those people. So, this argument that we're doing different to what they were doing, by your action itself, it becomes what the Quraysh used to do, to the statues and idols they use to worship.

The next question is that we say that, what is some of the shirk of the Christians or the Nasara. We know that even up until today, especially the Catholics, they'll go and they'll go to statues of Maryam (رضي الله عنها), or to 'Isa (عليه الصلاة والسلام) and others, or to their saints, and they'll ask for intercession on behalf of themselves to Allah, and this is well-known especially amongst the Catholics, that they have a saint for travel, and a saint for people who are sailors, and a saint for tradesmen and a saint for this etc., and that person who's travelling, he asks that saint to intercede on behalf of him with Allah.

So, what is the difference between that shirk and what you're doing. We know that is shirk, and we know that, that would remove someone from Islam, and they would be deserving of

Jahannam, and that they wouldn't leave it, so likewise with these actions that you're performing as well.

So, these are some of the questions we would ask to these people who say these things, they'll say things like "What we're doing is different with what they're doing", and there's many other questions that can be asked to them to prove that really in the end, when you sit down and talk to them, and look at their arguments, they don't hold up at all, and they can kind of fall apart in the first little bit of discussion that you have with them.

So, insha'Allah with that we'll end the first misconception that they use and we'll go onto the second misconception that the author mentioned in the book.

So, the author (رحمه الله), he said:

هو لا ء الآيات نزلت فيمن يعبد الأ صنم ، كيف تجعلون الصالحين من الأ صنم ؟ أم كيف  
تجعلون الأ نبياء أصناما

Which translates as, "Then if someone says all of those Ayat that you're mentioning, they came down with regards to people who worship idols and how can you make the Muslimin that we're going to their graves and asking them, how can you make them at the same level of the statues and the idols that Quraysh used to worship, or how can you make the Anbiya, how can take the Anbiya that we're making du'a to and making shafa'a from, how can you say that they're at the same level as the statues or the idols that Quraysh used to worship."

So the author continues and says:

فجاوبه بما تقدم فإنه إذا أقر أن الكفار يشهدون بالربوبية كلها ، وأنهم ما أرادوا منها إلا  
الشفاعة

"The answer to this is everything that we have mentioned before. So the answer to this is that the Kuffar of Quraysh used to bear witness that Allah is the complete controller of Rububiyyah, He is the One Who is the Lord, He is the One Who Creates, and all of these things are his rights and from his traits, and that when they would worship them, and when they would do actions and make statements for these statues and these idols, they were only doing, so that these would be an intercession with them, with Allah."

أراد أن يفرق بين فعله وفعلهم بما ذكر - فاذكر له : أن الكفار منهم من يدع الأ صنم  
ومنهم من يدعو الأ ولياء ، الذين قال الله فيهم : أولئك الذين يدعون يبتغون إلى ربهم  
الوسيلة أيهم أقرب

"Likewise, we say to them from the kuffar of Quraysh and those in the same time, and those before them, some of them yes, they would worship idols, but also some of them would worship Salihin. And he says the evidence for that is Allah said about them:

"Those whom they call upon desire a means of access to their Lord, as to which of them would be nearest." [17:57]"

So, he's saying that Allah said, the people or the ones who are being worshipped, or du'a is being made to, instead of Allah, they themselves also seek from Allah, and they will compete with each other to be closer to Allah. So, meaning that these people you are making du'a to, they're just like you in the sense that they also seek things from Allah and want to be close to Him. So, this shows that they didn't only worship idols, they also worshipped people as well. And then he says:

ويدعون عيسى بن مريم وأمه ، وقد قال الله تعالى : ما المسيح ابن مريم إلا رسول قد خلت من قبله الرسل وأمه صديقة كانا يأكلان الطعام انظر كيف نبين لهم الآيات ثم انظر أنى يؤفكون قل أتعبدون من دون الله ما لا يملك لكم ضرا ولا نفعا والله هو السميع العليم واذكر له قوله تعالى : ويوم يحشرهم جميعا ثم يقول للملائكة أهو ء إياكم كانوا يعبدون \* قالوا سبحانك أنت ولينا من دونهم بل كانوا يعبدون الجن أكثرهم بهم مؤمنون

“And they make du'a to 'Isa Ibn Maryam and his mother, and Allah said: “The Messiah (the son of Maryam) was no more than a Messenger. Many were they Messengers who passed before him, and his mother was a Siddiqah, and they both used to eat food. Look how we make the Ayat clear to the, yet look how they are deluded away. Say: “How do you worship besides Allah, something which has no power, either to harm you or benefit you, but it is Allah Who is the All-Hearer, the All-Knower.” [5:75-76] And mention to them the statement of Allah: “And the Day when He will gather them altogether and He will say to the Angels, “Was it you that these people used to worship?”, so they will say, “Glory be to you, you are our Wali instead of them, nay! They used to worship the Jinn and most of them were believers in them.” [34:40-41]

And then he mentions Allah's statement:

وقوله تعالى : وإذ قال الله يا عيسى ابن مريم أنت قلت للناس اتخذوني وأمي إلهين من دون الله قال سبحانك ما يكون لي أن أقول ما ليس لي بحق إن كنت قلته فقد علمته تعلم ما في نفسي ولا أعلم ما في نفسك إنك أنت علام الغيوب

“And when Allah will say to Isa, the son of Maryam, “did you go onto the people and say “worship myself and my mother as two gods beside Allah?”, he will say, “Glory be to You, it was not for me to say what I had no right, if I had said such a thing then You know it, You know what is in my inner self and I do not know what is in Yourself, truly only You are the All-Knower of all that is the Unseen.” [5:116]

Then the author ends with saying:

ف قيل له : أعرفت أن الكفر من قصد الأصنام وكفر – أيضا - من قصد الصالحين

“Then say to him, “you know Allah has declared that these people are disbelievers and that they were only seeking things from the Salihin.”

So they weren't seeking anything from the idols or statues that they built themselves, they were seeking things from human beings that were righteous and even Anbiya.

Then he says that:

وقاتلهم رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم)

**“So, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) fought them for this.”**

So, he ends with this. So, this section, what it’s essentially talking about is the idea that if we look at something that the kuffar do, and Allah rebukes them and makes *Inkar* on them for it. Then if we see someone who claims Islam, that they’re argument is that “we can’t then say these verses came down for kuffar, and you’re applying it to Muslimin or you’re mistaken.”

So, this is the argument of what they say at this point, and the link that there is between this *Shubuha*’ or this misconception and the first one is that in the first one, the author mentioned all of the evidences to say to them to disprove their argument.

So, the next thing that they is that, ‘yes, these are correct, but it doesn’t apply to us because we claim to be Muslimin and we say that we’re Muslims, as for the people that these came down for, they were the kuffar of Quraysh, so how can you say that we’re equal? You can’t apply evidence that came down to them and apply it to us.”

So, this is essentially, the argument, and this argument was first bought up by someone named Sulayman ibn ‘Abdul-Wahhab, and he was the brother of Muhammad ibn ‘Abdul-Wahhab. So, he wrote a book essentially trying to refute his brother, Muhammad ibn ‘Abdul-Wahhab, so it shows that, even in his time, everyone wasn’t on the same side, and there were people fighting against his da’wah, and people fighting against Tawhid, to the point where even his own brother was writing books and *Rasa’il* or essays in order to refute his own brother.

So, this is one of the first people who bought this up, and this was his book called “*Al-Sawa’ik al-ilahiya*”, and sometimes it’s called *Faslu-Kitab*. So, this book that his brother wrote. So, in this book he said “how can you apply the Ayat that Allah revealed for the Mushrikin, how can you apply them to the people who say La ilaha ila Allah”. And also this *Shubuha*’ or this misconception was then carried on afterwards by someone named Alawi Haddad, and he wrote two books or two Risalahs about this issue as well.

Then also someone named Alawi Ad-Mahuri, when he tried to scare people away from this argument, he said “just as the khawarij took Ayat that Allah revealed for the kuffar or just as they then started applying to the Muslimin, just as people do now when they say ‘you can’t worship other than Allah, you can’t make du’a to other than Allah, you can’t slaughter for other than Allah’, the khawarij used to take Ayat that came down for the kuffar and say that this applies to the Muslimin, you’re doing the same thing. So when you say that Allah judged that someone who made du’a to a wali, that he would be deserving of Jahannam forever, when you say this is also the case for someone who claims Islam, you’re doing what the Khawarij also did.”

This is something that comes up often, when people no longer have a way to argue with the Qur’an and Sunnah against an idea, they say you’re applying things that don’t apply to these people so instead of being able to sit down and argue it in a manner that goes through each

point, they say we don't have to listen at all because this doesn't apply to us because we're Muslims, or this doesn't apply to those people because they're Muslimin.

People even tried to bring this up or not necessarily in the sense that it was being done as a means to defend people, but even in the time of the Tabi'in, they would have some misconceptions about certain Ayat that came down, and they would say this came down for the kuffar. We see that the Sahabah (رضي الله عنهم), their response to this would be that it came down for them but if someone does the same thing that's done by the person who the Ayah came down for, the ruling is the same, and this is narrated by Imam al-Hakim and Abdur-Razzaq in 'Al-Musannaf' and others that some people came to Hudayfah al-Yaman (رضي الله عنه) and they asked him about the verse,

وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ

**“And whoever doesn't rule by what Allah has revealed then those are the disbelievers.” [5:44]**

They said this applies to Bani Isra'el, so Hudayfah (رضي الله عنه) said: *“What good brothers they are for you, everything that's good applies to you, and everything that's bad applies to them.”*

Then he said: *“No, by Allah! You will follow them in their path, even down to the width of a shoelace.”*

So, meaning you're going to do the same thing, it applies to you, so he's saying that why is it that bad things that came down for them doesn't apply to you, but good things that came down, it only applies to them. And this is an authentic narration from Hudayfah. So, it shows that even the Sahabah understood that, if something came down for the kuffar, yes it came down for them, but anyone who does that action, then they deserve the same ruling. It shows that if something comes down to rebuke people who make du'a to other than Allah, if it came down to Quraysh, we wouldn't then say 'it's fine for us to do, because Allah was only making *Inkar* of Quraysh so it doesn't apply to us anymore.'

So, this shows that one of the evidences that the Sahabah understood that things that came down to kuffar could be applied to Muslimin, if they do the same action. So, it doesn't mean that we treat Muslimin like kuffar just for the sake of it, no, if someone does something that the kuffar did also, then they get the same ruling as the kuffar did in that action. So, that's what's meant by it, and also Allah said to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and it would apply to us after,

وَأَنْ أَقِمَّ وَجْهَكَ لِلدِّينِ حَنِيفًا وَلَا تَكُونَنَّ مِنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ

Or that, **“And direct your face entirely towards the religion as a Hanif [and a Hanif is someone who stays completely away from Shirk], and never be from the Mushrikin.” [10:105]**

So, Allah is telling us to not be from them. So, if it was something to ever enter into Shirk again, or that nothing that came down to them, applied to us and nothing that they ever do we could ever do, Allah wouldn't be telling us to not be from them, because obviously it's a

possibility that we could be from them, unless Allah protects us from falling into that. And Allah also said,

وَدُّوا لَوْ تَكْفُرُونَ كَمَا كَفَرُوا فَتَكُونُونَ سَوَاءً

Or that, **“They wish that you will reject faith or disbelieve as they have disbelieved, and then you would be equal.” [4:89]**

So, Allah is saying that, if someone was to disbelieve, they would be exactly the same as the ones who were disbelievers before. So, this idea that there’s some difference that if someone claims Islam, starts doing Kufr and leaves Islam, somehow, they’re still at a higher level than someone who’s always a non-believer or non-Muslim. So, this shows that there’s evidence also from the Qur’an to show that, this isn’t something that’s correct. Also, Allah said,

وَمَنْ يَتَوَلَّهُمْ مِنْكُمْ فَإِنَّهُ مِنْهُمْ

Or that, **“Whoever takes them as allies, then he is from them.” [5:51]**

So, we know that this is something again that Allah is saying that even the people who aren’t from them, if they take them as allies, they’ll be from them, or that they’ll be the same as them. So, it shows this idea that something came down for the kuffar, and we can’t do the exact thing or that we’re safe or that there’s no rebuke or there’s no Inkar on us, this is something completely rejected.

And the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said,

Or that, *“Whoever imitates a people then he is from them.”*

And the hadith is narrated by At-Tirmidhi and others, and the strongest opinion about the hadith is that it’s a Hasan hadith, there’s some weaknesses in most of the chains, but it’s come from Hudayfah, and it’s come from Abdullah ibn ‘Umar and Abu Hurayrah and A’ishah as well and others so altogether it’s definitely an acceptable hadith.

Also the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said in a hadith from Abu Sa’id al-Kudri,

Or that, *“You will follow the path or the actions of those before you, handspan by handspan, and armspan by armspan, to the point if they entered into the hole of a lizard, you would follow them,”* So they said, *“Are you talking about the Jews and the Christians?”*, so he said, *“Who else?”* And this hadith is narrated by al-Bukhari.

So, we know here that if it was possible for people who claim Islam to do what the kuffar do, and it was fine, then all we would have to do to respond is to say “no, these Ayat came for the kuffar”, if that was the case then why is the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) telling us that you’re going to do this and he’s making Inkar on us for that. So, if it’s fine for us, then why tell us about it, all we would have to do is say that “As soon as I claim Islam, everything is fine for me to do, because these Ayat don’t apply to me because I’m Muslim.”

This is a completely rejected way of thinking and it doesn’t even comply with the whole point of why the Qur’an was sent with the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and why the Prophet



(صلى الله عليه وسلم) warned us, and taught us good, if nothing applied to us anymore that came down to everyone else, then everything would be pointless, because all we have to do is say we're Muslim and we have a blank slate.

So, this is the beginning of the evidences to show that things that come down to the Kuffar can apply to Muslimin and do apply to Muslimin, if something's obligatory and the kuffar reject it, we can't say this only came down to the kuffar, it's fine for us to reject it, and likewise the opposite. Insha'Allah we'll stop there for today, next week we'll finish this second misconception and go onto the third and possibly the fourth. Wallahul A'lam.

## Lesson 11:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

Last week we finished talking about the second misconception that the kuffar use to justify what they do, or what types of shirk that they do, and that second misconception was that they state that when we make *Inkar* or we rebuke, or we say that what they're doing is wrong, and these types of acts of shirk or statements of shirk are wrong. They say, the evidence that you're using from what Qur'an to prove what we're doing is wrong, these are actually verses which were revealed by Allah regarding kuffar, regarding people who never entered into Islam, who never claimed to be Muslim, and had never said said La ilaha ila Allah or anything like this. So, how can you take these Ayat and then apply them to people who say they're Muslimin and say the Shahadah, and some of them will have prayed and so on.

So, they say this is a false use or a false usage of evidence that this doesn't apply to this, and alhamdulillah we mentioned or talked a lot about what the author had used to refute this and alhamdulillah we came to see that, evidence in the Qur'an; it doesn't matter who it was revealed for, what it comes down to is what was it revealed for, what is the action or statement that Allah is judging upon. So, if Allah judges that a certain statement is wrong, then it doesn't matter who it comes from, and if it came from someone who claims Islam, or someone who claims Juda'ism, or anything like this, it doesn't really make a difference, the statement still has the same ruling.

Likewise, if Allah judged that people left Islam for a statement that they said, or an action that they said, or that they were deserving to be in Jahannam forever because of a certain statement, or an action that they said or did, then it doesn't matter the person who said it, whether they're Muslim or not, because we're saying that Allah judged on a action or statement. He didn't judge, or he didn't restrict it to the person who it was revealed for, so this is essentially what the author mentioned for refutation or the answer towards this misconception. So, this was the second one that the author mentioned in his book.

The next misconception he says, it's the third one, and like we talked about before, this book revolves or it's mostly around these first three misconceptions, and the author says, as we'll come to see, that these are the three strongest misconceptions that the kuffar have and if someone is able to understand them and refute them, then the other ones come a lot easier.

So, the third misconception is that these kuffar will say that:

فإن قال الكفار يريدون منهم ، وأنا أشهد أن الله النافع الضار المدبر ، لا أريد إلا منه :  
والصالحون ليس لهم من الأمر شيء ، ولكن أقصدهم أرجوا منهم شفاعتهم فالجواب  
أن هذا قول

“When we make du’a to these people or make du’a to these sites, whether it’s a grave or whether it’s at a holy place that they call a holy place, due to a tree or due to their land that they’re in, that they perform these acts of worship in these areas, they’re not seeking from these people themselves, they’re seeking from Allah and they’re saying that “we accept that Allah is the only One who Creates, and the Only One who benefits, and the Only One who can bring about harm, and the Only One who Sustains and so on, so we’re not intending them in and of themselves, we’re intending Allah and these are intermediaries in between us and Allah.”

And as you’ll see, this misconception is very, very similar to the first misconception of the three. So, the first misconception was that, because they don’t believe about these statues, or these idols or these people who they worship other than Allah, because they don’t believe that these things have any of the attributes of Rububiyyah or Lordship which is that Allah is the Only One Who Creates and Sustains and so on, because we don’t believe these about idols, than what we’re doing is fine, so what we’re doing it fine. So, that’s what the first misconception is.

This third one, what it is, is that it’s not coming down to beliefs now, what they’re saying is that, because we’re not seeking something from them directly, we’re seeking it from Allah, so we’re placing the between us, that’s what makes it fine. So, there’s a fine line in the difference between the two, but there is a difference, and this difference, it complies with the **beliefs of Ahlus-Sunnah wa’l Jama’ah, in that Iman is on the tongue, on the body and in the heart, and likewise kufr can on the tongue, in the heart, and in the body**, so as we see from these two Shubuha’ or these two misconceptions, one of them relates to belief, they say because we don’t believe this in our heart, the action doesn’t have this effect. The second one is where they’re differentiating between two different actions.

So, if someone sees these misconceptions and says I don’t really get the difference, that’s not completely unheard of, just because they are so similar in their nature, so that’s the actual difference between the two.

So then he says, that the answer to his misconception, and again many of the Ayat that we talk about here also apply to the first Shubuha’. So, he says:

الكفار سواء بسواء ، وأقرأ عليه قوله تعالى والذين اتخذوا من دونه أولياء ما  
نعبدهم إلا ليقربونا إلى الله زلفى . وقوله تعالى ويقولون هو لا ء شفعاؤنا عند الله

The answer to this is that Allah says, or that in Surah Zumar: **Allah said about the kuffar of Quraysh that their statement is that “Those who we take as allies instead of Allah, we don’t worship them except that they would bring us closer to Allah.” [39:3]** And also His, the Most High’s saying, **“And they worship besides Allah things that hurt them not, nor profit them, and they say: “These are our intercessors with Allah.” [10:18].**

So, they're admitting they're only doing this to get closer to Allah, the end goal isn't these idols or isn't these 'Awliya or these Sayyid or whatever they call them, their end goal, what they're trying to reach is Allah, but in this verse Allah is saying that, He's judging on them as being kuffar, so the fact that they made this claim didn't make a difference. And also they would say, or when they would worship these idols, they would say **"These are our interceders with Allah."**

So, Allah judged upon them as being kuffar and He sent His Prophet to them, to call them to Islam and to fight the ones who didn't accept and who were stubborn and fought back against the Muslimin. So, all of this took place with people who doing the exact same thing that they were claiming. So, this claim that "we're not intending them or intending Allah through them", this was the same action as the actions of the kuffar of Quraysh.

So, again pretty much everything that we talked about before applies to this Shubuha' as well. So, I won't go over it again just because to save time, whoever wants can go back to their notes or to the recording of those lessons. So, that's the end of the third Shubuha' or the third misconception.

**So, to recap them [misconceptions]** because the author says these are the strongest ones that they have:

- 1) The **first** like I said, is that they say that, "We don't believe about these things what we believe about Allah."
- 2) The **second** one is they say that "The Ayat that you're using don't apply to Muslimin or don't apply to someone who claims Islam because they were revealed for people who didn't claim Islam."
- 3) And the **third** one is that "These actions aren't matters of Shirk because we're not intending them, our goal isn't them, our goal is Allah."

**So, these are the first three and strongest misconceptions that people try to use.**

For those of us who have only spent their time in the masjid, or spent their time with Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah whether in our homes or with our friends, we might find it strange why anybody would need to talk about these things because it'd seem like why would anyone make du'a to other than Allah, or how can anyone have these misconceptions because they seem so ridiculous because why would you put something between you and Allah.

But, as I talked about before these misconceptions have remained for 100s of years, and wallahul musta'an, they're spreading in our cities, some of the masjid openly endorse these things, and other ones endorse them in secret and in a number of the post-secondary places, Grammiquian and U of A, these things are spreading and no-one really talking about them, they just let it go like it's not going on or maybe they don't know it's wrong or they know it's wrong but don't know how to kind of answer back to these things, so this is the reason why we're putting so much emphasis on it, because it is actually going on and taking place amongst us. So, this is the third Shubuha'.

The **fourth** is that the author says that:

فإن قال :أنا لا أعبد إلا الله ، وهذا إلا لتجاء إلى الصالحين .ودعاهم ليس بعبادة

**“It’s possible that one of these Mushrikin or kuffar will say to you, “I don’t worship anyone except Allah, and these things that we seek from or we look for help from these righteous people and when we make du’a to them, this isn’t actually ‘Ibadah.”**

So, this is the next thing that they say, they say that what we’re doing isn’t even ‘Ibadah. So, as we see, the arguments start from having a strong misconception, and each one gets less and less to the point where you can see that, each one is more ridiculous than the one that came before it, but here they say that, du’a isn’t even worship.

So, when I make du’a to this Sayyid or this Wali, or at this grave, it doesn’t really matter because this isn’t actually worship so anything that you bring to show that worshipping other than Allah isn’t allowed really doesn’t apply to me because I’m actually not doing that. So, that’s the next thing that they say.

So, they say that this is the crux of their argument, and they say that or we would say to them, this is what the author is saying:

فقل له أنت تقرر أن الله افترض عليك إخلاص العبادة ، وهو حقه عليك

**“If you accept that Allah has obligated Ikhlas upon you when you worship Him, and that it is His Right upon you.”**

Obviously, this person would say yes, because no one who even claims Islam, regardless of how bad they are would say that no, Allah does not expect me to worship Him sincerely that I can worship someone else.

، فإذا قال نعم .فقل له :بين لي هذا الذي فرض عليك ، وهو إخلاص العبادة [الله و حده]  
وهو حقه عليك

**“If he says, “Yes”, then we would say to this person after he says yes, tell us or explain to us what this Ikhlas is when Allah expects from you in His worship.**

فإنه لا يعرف العبادة ، و لا أنواعها فبينها له بقولك قال الله تعالى :ادعوا ربكم تضرعا وخفية

**For verily, he does not know what is the reality of worship and nor its various types. So explain it to him by His saying, “Invoke your Lord with humility and in secret.” [7:55]**

So, then what we would say to him if he doesn’t know how to answer this, he says, “I don’t really know the evidence for this or I don’t know the Ayat in the Qur’an that would prove this, but I know that it is something that is obligatory upon Him and upon us.” Then we would say to him that Allah said, in Surah al-A’raf, Allah said: **“Seek or supplicate to your Lord with sincerity and humbleness.” [7:55]**

So, Allah here is ordering us to do a specific action, specifically for Him with specific conditions, so that it should be done with humility and should be done with fear for Him.

So, then we would say to him:

فإذا أعلمته بهذا ، فقل له : هل علمت ؟ [هذه عبادة الله ] فلا بد أن يقول : نعم والدعاء  
مخ العبادة

**“So, do you not accept that this is a type of worship to Allah”, then it’s impossible for him to say no.”**

And the author says the reason for this is because, he mentions the part of a hadith that says: *“Du’a is the essence of worship.”*

And we talked about this when we had our lessons on Al-Usul ath-thalatha, that this hadith, it’s narrated by Tirmidhi and others, that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: *“Du’a is the essence of worship.”* **It’s actually a weak hadith.**

**The authentic hadith is “Du’a is worship”,** not that it’s a type of worship, it is in and of itself a worship, it encompasses what worship is. So this is what he says that we would say to him.

The author then continues and says:

فقل له إذا أقررت أنها عبادة ، ودعوت الله ليلاً ونهاراً ، خوفاً وطمعا ، ثم دعوت هل  
هذه عبادة فلا بد أن يقول : نعم

**“That we would say to him, “If you accept that this is an act of ‘Ibadah, and you worshipped Allah or you supplicated to Him, night and day out of fear and hope for him, then after that you sought or you supplicated to a Prophet or someone other than Him, then would this mean that you have now performed an act of Shirk, or that you have worshipped other than Allah. So, it’s a must that he would say yes.”**

There’s no other way for him to then say no, because if he’s accepted that du’a is a type of worship and it should only be done for Allah, and then if you say to him, if you do this every day, you do this specifically for Allah and you have no intention other than Allah, and then right after that you do it for a Prophet, have you now made this Prophet equal in what you were doing for Allah.

There’s no way except for him to say yes, because he’s already accepted that this is a right of Allah, and then now he’s done it for someone else. So, now the point of this type of argument is that you don’t let the person try to get around the argument and try to say “No, I didn’t say that”, or “I don’t mean that”, or “I didn’t accept that”, or those types of things, so you at each step, you say “do you accept this or not?”, and you put it in a phrase where it’s impossible for this person to reject it, because if Allah is telling us to perform du’a to Him, and to do it with humbleness and fear and the hadith says that du’a is ‘Ibadah, at this point there’s no possible way for them to say “No it’s not like that”, so then you’ve kind of, you’ve stuck them to that first point.

فقل له :إذا نحرت لمخلوق - نبي ، أو جني ، أو غيرهما - هل أشركت في هذه العبادة .  
غير الله فلا بد أن يقر ويقول :نعم

“Then you say, “So you do it only for Allah and then you do it for someone else, now when you do it for someone else, isn’t that the same as when you did it for Allah?”

He can’t then say no, because what’s the difference then if you did the exact same action for two different causes or two different reasons, in the end it’s the same thing, so now you’ve trapped a person in that sense at that point.

So then after that we would say to him:

و قل له أيضا :المشركون الذين نزل فيهم القرآن ، هل كانوا يعبدون الملائكة  
والصالحين و اللات ، ، وغير ذلك ؟ فلا بد أن يقول :نعم . فقل له :و هل كانت  
عبادتهم إياهم إلا في الدعاء والذبح و إلا لتجاء ، ونحو ذلك ، وإلا فهم يقرون أنهم عبيده  
وتحت قهره ، وأن الله هو الذي يدبر الأمر ، ولكن دعوهم والتجأوا إليهم للجاء ،  
والشفاعة ، وهذا ظاهر جدا

“And also say to him, “The Mushriks about whom the Qur’an was revealed, did they used to worship the Angels, the Righteous, al-Laat and others?” He will have not option but to say “Yes”. Then say to him, “And was their worship of them with anything except supplication (du’a) and sacrifice (dhabh) and making recourse to them (iltijaa’) and other such things? And if not, then they (the Mushriks) affirmed that they (the Angels, Prophets, Idols, Jinn, the Righteous) were all slaves and subservient to Allah, under His control, and that Allah in reality is the one who controls all affairs. But they (the Mushriks) actually called upon them and made recourse to them merely on account of their status and position with Allah and for seeking their intercession (Shafaa’ah). And this is very clear indeed.””

Also, when Allah revealed these verses regarding these types of things, these came down for people who would do the same action as you.

So, they would supplicate for people or statues or whether they were alive or dead, they would do this for people and so on, and this is exactly what you’re doing as well. So, this is essentially what this misconception revolves around. The attempt for these Mushrikin or these people who perform Shirk to runaway from the idea that du’a is actually worship. So, if you tell them, no the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) not only is it, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) didn’t say “Du’a is part of ‘Ibadah or type of ‘Ibadah”, He said “It is ‘Ibadah”, and Allah said:

وَقَالَ رَبُّكُمْ ادْعُونِي أَسْتَجِبْ لَكُمْ ۚ إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَسْتَكْبِرُونَ عَنْ عِبَادَتِي سَيَدْخُلُونَ جَهَنَّمَ  
دَاخِرِينَ

“And your Lord said supplicate to Me and I will answer you, indeed those who are stubborn concerning My worship will enter into Jahannam...” [40:60]



So, Allah commanded us to supplicate to Him and then said “Those who refuse to worship Me, will enter Jahannam”. So, clearly made the or put du’a and ‘Ibadah as almost interchangeable in that sense there.

So, this is the fourth Shubuha’ and insha’Allah we’ll stop there for tonight and we’ll continue next week, we’ll finish this and we’ll go onto the fifth and probably the sixth, because as we go through, each one of these Shubuhah, or each one of these misconceptions gets quite short so we can probably do two or three a night. Wallahul A’lam.

## Lesson 12:

إِن الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ نَحْمَدُهُ وَنُسْتَعِينُهُ وَنَسْتَغْفِرُهُ وَنَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ شُرُورِ أَنْفُسِنَا وَمِنْ  
سَيِّئَاتِ أَعْمَالِنَا مَنْ يَهْدِهِ اللَّهُ فَلَا مُضِلَّ لَهُ وَمَنْ يَضِلَّ فَلَا هَادِيَ لَهُ وَأَشْهَدُ أَنْ لَا إِلَهَ  
إِلَّا اللَّهُ لَا شَرِيكَ لَهُ وَأَشْهَدُ أَنَّ مُحَمَّدًا عَبْدُهُ وَرَسُولُهُ

Last week we began talking about the fourth misconception people use to justify the matters of Shirk that they perform, and like we said the first three are the main things that the author talks about. The last one that we talked about was the claim that people will say that when we make du'a to other than Allah, that this isn't actually an act of 'Ibadah, or it's not an act of worship. So, we said that what they try to claim is that they say that "yes, we're making du'a to other than Allah or we're seeking something from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), or we're seeking something from our Sayyid, or our Wali, but there's no problem with this, because this isn't actually an act of worship.

So, they'll say that every evidence you bring from the Qur'an or from the Sunnah to say that you're not allowed to worship other than Allah, this doesn't even apply to us because when we make du'a to other than Allah, this isn't worship, so you're using evidence in a place that it doesn't belong. And like we said, this is rejected in the Qur'an and the Sunnah. In the Qur'an, Allah tells us to perform du'a or make du'a to Him or to supplicate to Him, when He says:

وَقَالَ رَبُّكُمْ ادْعُونِي أَسْتَجِبْ لَكُمْ ۚ إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَسْتَكْبِرُونَ عَنْ عِبَادَتِي سَيَدْخُلُونَ جَهَنَّمَ  
دَاخِرِينَ

**“And your Lord said supplicate to Me and I will answer you, indeed those who are stubborn concerning My worship will enter into Jahannam...” [40:60]**

So, here we see that Allah told us to supplicate to Him, and then He said “*those who refuse to worship Him.*” So, he used them essentially in an interchangeable manner. And also the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said in an authentic hadith, “**Du'a is worship**”, or it is the worship. It's the act of worship itself, it encompasses everything that worship indicates, everything that worship would imply. So, really for someone to say that du'a isn't worship, this is a false claim, it's declared false by the Qur'an and it's proven false by the Sunnah, and really it's not something that's even possible, that these people really believe, in the end it's not something that's real, strong misconception that people can say “I really didn't understand this matter.”

So, to go further into this, we'll follow what the author said when he takes us through the manner in which to debate with someone who says this claim or who makes this claim. So, as we know, as we talked about many times before, this small book is essentially a manual to refute the mushrikin or those people who claim Islam, but are really upon Shirk. So, the author takes you through step-by-step what to do with, if someone say this, this is what you say and if they answer with this, then you say this, and so on. So, really he takes you through in a manner that doesn't really leave any room for misconceptions by the end.

So, first of all, after the introduction we had last week to this topic, if we look at what the author says or what this section would include, then we can see that, the first thing that we

would say to these people is to define what worship is for us. So, if they say we're not worshipping these people, we're not worshipping our Shaykhs, or our Sayyids or our Wali's or anything like this, then tell us what is worship.

So, either he's going to have an answer or he's not going to have an answer. If he says "I don't know", or "I don't know what worship actually is", then we would say to him, how can you tell us something is wrong or that it doesn't include this, or it does include this when you don't actually know the answer. So, then right at that point, the whole discussion is done. You've proven that this person doesn't know what he's speaking about, and really you have them where you want, and you can explain to them whatever you need to explain to them from the matters of Tawhid.

The other possibility that they will say is that they'll give you a wrong definition, and there's a number of wrong definitions that are more widespread by the people who stick to these misconceptions. So, the first definition that they would possibly give is that they said that, "Worship is to perform Sujud or to prostrate to idols," and this was mentioned by a person named al-Qabani. So, this is what they say, all that worship is, is if you make Sujud to a statue, so this doesn't fall under that, so, this is obviously something that's false. So, that's the first thing that they'll say.

Another misconception or another false definition that they give for worship, is they say that it's "for someone to lower themselves to make themselves lowly in front of a person or in front that they believe and bring about benefit and bring about harm." So, again they brought it back to the matters of heart.

So, as we talked about before in a number of lessons, this complete or this constant tie of things on the outside to things on the inside isn't from the 'Aqidah of Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah. Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah, yes we believe that there's a tie between the outside and inside, we believe there's a tie between the things that somebody says and does, as well as what's in their heart, but we don't say that everything that a person does or says, is only contingent upon what the person has in their heart.

So, we don't say that if someone makes du'a to other than Allah, that this is only Shirk, if they believe the person can benefit them. Or that, we don't say that the person only leaves Islam if they worship other than Allah, only if they believe that the thing that they're worshipping is better than Allah. We don't make any claims like this, these are the claims that are made by the group called *Murji'ah*, who tie everything to the inside and say that everything is based upon inside, whatever you do on the outside doesn't have any effect unless you believe it in your heart or unless you reject Allah with your heart, otherwise you're fine as long as you don't reject Allah with your heart. So, again this second definition of 'Ibadah has taken this route, it's taken the route of tying everything outside to the inside and they bring it back to, "you can only leave Islam if you do something for someone other than Allah that's a worship if you believe they're at the level of Rabb."

A third definition was mentioned by a person named Abdullah Az-Zubayri, in a book called "*Al-Sawa'ik wa-Ra'ud*", or this is a person who tried to bring about or try to prove the *Shubuhah*, or the misconceptions against the Muslimin and try to say that these type of Shirk are permissible and try to bring arguments for these things. So, what he said was that when we seek these things from other than Allah, that really there's no problem with these types of things because we're not making them at the level of Allah. So, when we seek something

from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), we make du'a for him or anything like this, it's fine because it's not worship, the reason it's not worship is because we're not raising them to the status of Allah.

A similar thing was mentioned by a person named Isma'il al-Tamimi in a book he has called "*Al-Mineh al-Ilahiyah*", and he tried to propagate the same misconception. So, again if we go back to where we were, that either the person will say that they don't know what worship is, so why are they making claims about that they're not worshipping. How can you say you're doing something and not doing something and you don't even know what that thing is.

So, for example if someone said to you, or he was drinking something, and you said to him "you know it's forbidden for you to drink alcohol," and he said "this isn't alcohol", and you said to him "what's the definition of alcohol?", and he said "I don't know." Then you can tell him, "how can you say this isn't alcohol, and you don't even know what alcohol is?". So, at that point he's already expressed his ignorance on the topic, and really there's nowhere for him to go at that point. Or he'll say, "Alcohol is only something that comes from grapes." At this point, we would say, "Yes, alcohol can come from grapes but your specifying something...you're taking one type of alcohol and restricting it to that, when there's no evidence for that, if we look at what makes something alcohol, it's the thing that plays with your mind." Or *khamr* literally in Arabi is that it covers your mind, it changes the way your thought pattern is, and it makes you unclear in the way you think.

So, this is similar to if they say, "No, the only type of worship is if you make Sujud." We say, it's a type of worship but who said that, that's the only type. If you want to say it's the only type then we say, what makes something worship? It's that Allah loves for us to do it for Him, and forbid us to do it for anyone else. This is what things of worship are. So, if you take anything that Allah has specified can only be done for Him, and you do it for someone else, then you've taken Allah right and given it to someone else, so you've worshipped them, in place of what Allah commanded you to worship Him with. So, this is what 'Ibadah actually is.

So, this would be the next step, we would explain to them that their definition is wrong, this is how it's wrong and that the correct definition is if we look at your actions within this, it falls directly underneath what 'Ibadah is. So, this would be the next step that we would take with regards to showing how their misconception is actually completely false and it has no weight.

So, if they accept and say, "I accept that worshipping other than Allah or making du'a to other than Allah is something that would be Shirk", then we have them in the next step or the next closer to where we want them to be. So, then at this point we would say, if someone did anything other than du'a for example something that Allah loves, He loves for us to sacrifice for Him, whether it's at Eid al-Adha or whether it's for 'Aqiqah or whether it's just for our daily food or anything like this. They would accept this as being yes, because already they've tried to say that du'a is something that's different from every other act of worship, in the sense that, it isn't worship. But now we get them to the point where they accept that it's worship.

So, the next thing to say that is, what would the ruling on someone that does these other things? Does something else for other than Allah. Obviously they're going to accept it because that's where we actually started with in the topic. So, at this point we would bring

them back and say “you’ve accepted that doing something specifically for other than Allah, that he’s asked or he’s told us to only do for Him, is an act of worship, so you either can continue doing it for other than Allah and be clearly in Shirk, or you can do it only for Allah and repent from that. So, at this point these are the steps that we would argue with the person on this point. So, that’s the end of the fourth misconception that the author talks about.

To go into the fifth, the author, now he is talking about what this argument evolves into. So, he says:

**فإن قال أنتكر شفاعه رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) وتبرأ منها ؟**

**“If this person says, “do you reject the Shafa’a or the intercession of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and do you reject it, or free yourself from it?”**

Because the whole point of this, is that they’ll say, “we’re worshipping or we’re making du’a to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) because Allah has given him special rights. He’s given him that on the Day of Judgement, he will be able to intercede for us, so we’re asking the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) or we’re making du’a to him for these things. So, the first thing that they’ll say is that, do you reject that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) can intercede for us? They’ll try to hold us to a point and say if you don’t accept us doing it, this can only be that you don’t accept that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) will intercede for us. So, this is what they start with.

So, what we would say to them:

**فقل له لا أنكرها و لا تبرأ منها ، بل هو (صلى الله عليه وسلم) (الشافع المشفع وأرجو شفاعته**

**“Then say: I do not reject it, and nor am I free of having any need of it. Rather he is the one who will intercede and the one whose intercession will be granted. I hope in his intercession.”**

Obviously as Muslimin no we don’t reject it, we accept it, and we hope for it, and we know that Allah has blessed the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) with the right of Shafa’a on the Day of Resurrection, and we hope that we will be deserving of it, and we ask Allah to let us be deserving of it on the Day of Judgement.

So, this whole claim or trying to push us into a corner by saying that you reject the *Shafa’a* of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), no that’s not what it is, it’s nothing to do with that, and that type of argument or that type of arguing shows where a person’s mentality is; that it’s either this or this, if you don’t worship the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), you must reject everything that he has. No it has nothing to do with that, we take exactly what has come in the Qur’an and the Sunnah with regards to his rights. But we would say to him, yes, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has this, but:

**ولكن الشفاعه كلها الله كما قال تعالى : قل الله الشفاعه جميعا**

**“Allah has stated that all of the Shafa’a belongs to Him, when He said, “Say: To Allaah belongs all intercession.”” [Surah Zumar:44]**

So, Allah has told us that even though He has given the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) the right of *Shafa'a*, all of the *Shafa'a*, whether it is to begin the Judgement on the Day of Judgement, or to stop people from going into Jahannam, or to remove them from Jahannam, or to raise them at a higher status into Jannah, and all of these types of *Shafa'a* or any other type of *Shafa'a*, and whether it belongs to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) or if it's from his rights, or from the Angels, or from the *Shuhada'*, from the Salihin or anything else, every single type of *Shafa'a* belongs to Allah, and that's from His property or from His complete right to do with as He pleases. Also, we know that any *Shafa'a* that does take place, will only be after Allah gives permission for it. So, even the people or creations that Allah has given the right of *Shafa'a* to, they'll only be able to do so after Allah gives permission. Then the author mentions for this:

**ولا قال عز وجل :تكون إلا من بعد إذن الله ، كم من ذا الذي يشفع عنده إلا بإذنه**

**“Who is it that would give intercession in front of Him or on his behalf, except after He gives permission to do so.” [2:255]**

Then the author continues and says:

**ولا يشفع في أحد إلا من بعد أن يأذن الله فيه**

**“And no-one would give Shafa'a even after His permission except with regards to people who Allah has given permission that they can receive intercession.”**

So, it has to be after His permission, and it can't just be for anybody, it can only be for those who Allah has given permission that they can be interceded for.

And then he says that the evidence for that is that Allah said,

**كما قال عز وجل :ولا يشفعون إلا لمن ارتضى**

**Or that, “They will not intercede except for those who He is pleased with.” [21:28]**

So, here already we see that the author is telling us, **first** we reject the concept that we don't accept the *Shafa'a*. **Secondly**, we begin to show them what are the conditions for the *Shafa'a*? Can the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) perform *Shafa'a* without the permission of Allah? No he can't. Can he intercede on behalf of someone who Allah isn't pleased with? No, he can't. So, already we see that it doesn't belong to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), it's something that's given to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) by Allah as a virtue or as a blessing to him, but it still carries conditions that Allah has placed.

The author continues and says:

**وهو لا يرضى إلا التوحيد**

**“He would not be pleased with anyone to receive intercession except for the people of Tawhid.”**

Then he mentions the verse where Allah said,

**كما قال عز وجل :ومن يبتغ غير الإسلام ديناً فلن يقبل منه**

**Or that, “And whoever seeks a religion or a way of life other than Islam, it won’t be accepted from him.” [3:85]**

So, we know that this point that anyone who isn’t Muslim, doesn’t claim Islam, or anyone who claims Islam but isn’t actually Muslim, won’t be able to receive the *Shafa’a* of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) or anyone else.

So, then the author continues and he says:

**فإذا كانت الشفاعة كلها لله ، ولا تكون إلا من بعد إذنه ، ولا يشفع النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم)، ولا غيره - في أحد حتى يأذن الله فيه ، ولا يأذن إلا لأهل التوحيد ، تبين لك إن الشفاعة كلها لله فاطلبها منه**

**“So, if the Shafa’a is all for Allah or belongs all to Allah, and it be not be except after His Permission, and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and anyone else would not intercede except for people who Allah has given permission for, and that he would not give permission except for the people of Tawhid, then we see at this point, that all of the Shafa’a, every single aspect of the Shafa’a or intercession, belongs to Allah, so I should seek it from him.”**

So, if the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) doesn’t control the *Shafa’a* and even the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) has all of these conditions to be met before he would intercede. Why would I then seek it from him, instead of seeking it from the One who first of all it belongs to, second needs to give permission, third needs to give permission for the person who’s going to receive it. So, all these things belong to Allah, so it only makes sense that we would seek it from Allah and not from anybody else.

And then he says:

**فأقول : اللهم لا تحرمني شفاعته ، اللهم شفعه في وأمثال هذا فإن**

**“So, I would seek it from Him, and I would say, “O Allah, do not forbid his Shafa’a, so meaning the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)’s Shafa’a, and O Allah make him an interceder on my behalf and the likes.”**

Then he says...so now he is again going back to this way of debating or this argument:

**قال النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) أعطي الشفاعة ، وأنا أطلبه مما عطاها الله**

**“If the person says, “the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was given the Shafa’a, so I will seek from him whatever Allah has given him.”**

So, like if someone gave you some money and then someone wanted some money from you, they would ask you, not the person who gave it to you because it’s your money now. Or, if you needed some food and found that somebody gave your neighbour food, you wouldn’t ask



the person who gave your neighbour, you would ask your neighbour because now it belongs to this person, because it wouldn't make sense to go to the person who gave it away. So, this is their argument.

So, then the author says:

**فالجواب : أن الله أعطاه الشفاعة ، ونهاك عن هذا ، فقال : فلا تدعو مع الله أحدا**

**“The answer to this, is as follows: Indeed, Allah did give him the Shafa’a but he also forbid you from asking him for it when He said, “Do not supplicate to anyone other than Allah.” [72:18]**

So, we know that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is given *Shafa’a* by Allah, so these people will say, we're only following what Allah told us so how can you make *Inkar* on us, or how can you rebuke us, if Allah told us that He gave the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) *Shafa’a*, or the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) told us that Allah gave him *Shafa’a*, then who are you to tell us that we're wrong. So, we're saying no, we'll stick to this line of thinking that we're going to follow what Allah told us and what the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) told us.

So, yes He did give him that but He is also the One Who told you, don't seek anything except from Allah, so why are you accepting the verses of Allah and His Rulings on one issue, but then rejecting them on another issue. So, that's what we would say. We would say, if you're going to follow this, you have to follow the other one too, you can't pick and choose, once you start picking and choosing, you're on a path other than Islam, once you start trying to find, this is a way where I can do what I want, and this is a way where I can get around what Allah has actually told us to do.

And Allah said,

**فلا تدعو مع الله أحدا**

**“Do not supplicate to anyone other than Allah.” [72:18]**

So, Allah is the same One who told us both of these things, so we need to reconcile between His statements when He says different things. Also, these people only make *du'a* to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and the *Anbiya*, it's rare if not completely that it doesn't exist that they make *du'a* to the *Mala'ika*, this is something really amongst people who even claim Islam, even amongst the *Mushrikin*, you don't really see them making *du'a* to *Jibril*, or *Mika'il* or *Isra'fil* or any of the other *Mala'ika* that we know the names or don't the names, we don't see them making *du'a* to them. So, we would say to them:

وأيضاً :فإن الشفاعة أعطيتها غير النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم )، فصح أن الملائكة يشفعون ، و الأفراط يشفعون أتقول :أن الله عطاهم الشفاعة فأطلبها منهم ؟ .فإن قلت هذا ، رجعت إلى عبادة الصالحين التي ذكر الله في كتابه وإن قلت :لا بطل قولك :أعطاه الله الشفاعة وأنا أطلبه مما أعطاه الله

“Also, intercession has been given to other than the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). It is authentic that the Angels will intercede, likewise the Pious Friends of Allah, and also others (who died before the age of puberty). Will you then say (and argue) that Allah has given them the right to intercede, and hence I ask for this intercession from them? If you were to say this, then you have reverted back to the worship of the righteous which Allah has mentioned in His Book. And if you were to say “No”, then your claim that “Allah has given him (i.e. the Prophet) the right to intercede, and I merely ask him from that which he has been given” is actually falsified.”

We know that other than the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) from the human beings, and even from the other creation such as the *Mala'ika*, they have *Shafa'a* as well, so why don't you seek it from them as well, why are you only specifying the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), and not the Angels as well. If they say that, these are people who Allah has given the *Shafa'a* to and I seek it from them, then we're going back in a circle now, so we're bringing them back to the beginning.

So, this is what the author said or essentially what he said. So, this is what they're saying, they have to either accept worshipping both or reject both of it, and if they accept that they're different, then we also proven that that's false as well because both Allah has given *Shafa'a* to, and He's placed the same conditions on those types of *Shafa'a*.

So, insha'Allah next week we'll go a little more into this *Shubuha'* which is the *Shubuha'* of intercession, and it's a little bit longer. There's about **six steps** that we can derive from the author's statements, so he essentially put it into three, but if we follow it, and want to go a little bit deeper, we can get it into six different points which really tears down any type of argument that they may have, and it also will lead into some of the other *Shubuha'*. So insha'Allah to not go too long, we'll finish that next week. Wallahul A'lam.

## Lesson 13:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

So, we'll continue, last week we left off, we were speaking about the seeking of the *Shafa'a* from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) which is something that some of the Mushrikin do when they ask the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) directly for *Shafa'a*. Either when they go to his grave or even when they're away from his grave, they'll ask the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to give them *Shafa'a* and sometimes they ask for it, for things in the dunya, for help from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

More specifically when it comes to this point, they ask for the *Shafa'a* in the Akhirah, but they ask for it now. So, we talked about the author's word last week and I said we're going to go into it in a little more detail, and to go step-by-step as how the author tells us to go through this *Shubuha'*, or go through this misconception insha'Allah so we'll do that.

So, the author mentions, if we break his words down, we can find that there's about **7 steps** that he mentions when we're talking about dealing with this *Shubuha'* and people who call to this *Shirk*. So, the first thing that the author tells us to do is to clearly accept the *Shafa'a* of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). So, we would say, because the author tells us how the conversation would go with someone who holds this belief or performs these actions.

So, he says what they will try to do is say, "if you don't accept this, if you don't accept asking the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) for his *Shafa'a*, this can only mean you reject his *Shafa'a* to begin with." Meaning that, you don't accept that he will intercede for Muslimin on the Day of Resurrection.

So, **the first step** that the author says if we tell this person, "No, we accept the *Shafa'a* of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and we hope that Allah will make us from those who are worthy of receiving his *Shafa'a* either by not going into Jahannam if they were deserving of being so or by being raised higher in Jannah, or any of the types of *Shafa'a* that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) will be given on the Day of Resurrection."

So, this is the first thing because then it takes all the ammunition away from the person who is arguing this point, because if their whole thing is try to push you into a corner and say, "This means you don't accept the *Shafa'a*", take that away from them right away, then essentially their whole argument will crumble at that point because the point that they try to use is no longer present, it's been taken away from them.

The next [**second**] thing that we would say is that, even the *Shafa'a* that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was given, when does it take place? When did Allah tell us that people will ask for it from him, and they will be given to them? Was it in this dunya that they ask things for this dunya, or was it in this dunya that they ask things for the Akhirah, asking for things in the Akhirah?

So obviously the answer is if we look to the ahadith that talk about this topic, we know that it's relating to the Akhirah. So, we know that one of the Shafa'a that the Prophet (ﷺ) will be given is the beginning of the questioning on the Day of Resurrection. So, we know that the Prophet (ﷺ) will be the one, when the people go to Adam, and then they go to Nuh and Ibrahim and so on, until they get to the Prophet (ﷺ), this is when the Shafa'a will be sought from him, and when it will be granted. So, to ask from it in the dunya, we're not even following the timing of when it should be done with the actual legislated typed of Shafa'a. So, this is the second point.

So first of all we accept it, but we do it in the manner that the Prophet (ﷺ) instructed or told us it will take place, which is on the Day of Resurrection. We don't ask for it now because it's pointless to ask for it now, because we know for a fact that it won't begin until the Prophet (ﷺ) intercedes or mankind to begin the questioning, and despite all the people who are asking for the Prophet (ﷺ)'s Shafa'a now, we know that it's still going to take him to do so on the Day of Resurrection, so, the whole point of doing it now is pointless, it doesn't hold any weight and it doesn't do anything.

The next step, or **step number three** is that we clarify that this isn't the Prophet (ﷺ)'s property, it's not in his Mulk, it doesn't belong to him specifically. It's something that Allah gave to the Prophet (ﷺ) to use on the Day of Resurrection with specific conditions.

So, now this is the next thing and we talked about this alhamdulillah in detail last week, that the Shafa'a belongs to Allah, and doesn't belong to the Prophet (ﷺ), even the Shafa'a that the Prophet (ﷺ) will intercede with, doesn't belong to him, it's been given to him by Allah. And we know that Allah said:

قُلْ لِلَّهِ الشَّفَاعَةُ جَمِيعًا

**Or that, “And to Allah belongs all of the Shafa'a.” [39:44]**

So, that means every type of Shafa'a and every part of every type. So, seeking it or anything like this all of it belongs to Allah.

So, after we have this point which is the third step, then the **fourth one** is to explain to them, or to clarify to them that if something belongs to somebody, then you ask for it from that person. If something doesn't belong to somebody, you don't ask it from that person. It makes no sense in the dunya, and it makes no sense in matters of the Din even more so when it comes to Allah's rights.

And we know that again, we talked about this last week, what we said last week was that, one of the arguments that the Mushrikin will try to use at this point is that they'll say, “The Prophet (ﷺ) was given it so we're going to ask it from the Prophet (ﷺ) because Allah told us that it was given to the Prophet (ﷺ).”

So, they try to bring evidence from Qur'an, or evidence from the Sunnah to say that, we're following the Qur'an and the Sunnah so what's the problem?

So, then again like we said, the **fifth [step]** said in this argument which is what we talked about last week, we would say, “just as you’re following Shari’ah in believing that the Prophet (ﷺ) has Shafa’a, following the Shari’ah, when Allah says, or tells us to not make du’a to anyone other than to Him, so just as you’re following it here, also follow it here and then you’ll be in a good state.” So, don’t pick and choose parts of the Shari’ah that you feel comfortable with, or that you were taught by your parents and so on, stick with the Shari’ah the whole way and then you’ll be fine. But you can’t say we’re going to follow it here and then reject it in other spots.

So, just as Allah forbid making du’a to other than him. As we talked about before, du’a is asking for something from Allah or asking, more specifically, the definition of du’a is asking for something from someone who is higher than you.

When it comes to Allah, then any request from Allah can be du’a and when it comes to things from the creation, when it’s something that the creations is able to do, and they’re present and they can hear you, then this would be fine, but when it comes to things that the creation isn’t able to do, for example when it comes to forgiving sins, or performing things in the Hereafter or removing sicknesses or things like this, this would be a form of Shirk but asking things that are legislated that’s fine.

The **sixth step** in this, is that we say, that the Shafa’a isn’t specifically for the Prophet (ﷺ). We know that he does have Shafa’a, and we know that he does have numerous types of Shafa’a, but we know also that the Shuhada have Shafa’a, and we know that they have 70 people from their family. We know that the Mala’ika will have Shafa’a. We know that when Allah tells or in the Hadith al-Qudsi, when the Prophet (ﷺ) tells us what Allah said,

*“The Anbiya will perform the shafa’a, the Angels will perform the shafa’a and then the Most Merciful of the Merciful remains.”*

So, we know that the Anbiya or that the Mala’ika also have shafa’a, and we know that the Salihin also have shafa’a as well from others evidences.

So, the next step **[seventh step]** would be say to them, why don’t you make it to the other creation? If they say, “yes we do”, then we would tell them no you don’t, we know for a fact by watching your actions, you never do this, so we would say that they’re essentially lying, trying to get out of the argument by saying it’s equal for everybody. So, this is one possible answer that they would give, they say we do it for everyone and then we would say to them “that’s not the case, why are you making it up?”

The next step or the next possible answer that they would give, is that they say, “We don’t ask them because their shafa’a would come on the Day of Judgement.” So, then we would say to them, the Prophet (ﷺ)’s shafa’a is on the Day of Judgement as well, so why are you differentiating between the two. So, then they will say “the Prophet (ﷺ) was given the shafa’a”, and we would say “the same as the other ones too, so why are you differentiating between the two.” And if they say, “asking someone other than the Prophet (ﷺ) is shirk”, then we would say, “asking the Prophet (ﷺ) is also shirk”.

So, the author walks us through the steps on how to argue these points with the people who try to prove that these are from the Shari'ah. Because this wasn't based upon...it wasn't strictly theoretical, the author lived this, and went through these arguments in his life-time.

So, he had arguments and he saw the arguments and the proofs that people tried to bring to prove these things, then he was able to see this doesn't make sense because this and this. So, it's not as though the person who's writing this book said this is what might happen. He's had these arguments with people and seen this is how it goes, and if it goes this way, this is the answer you take and if it goes the other way, you give this answer, so, these are matters that have been tested before.

So, this is the end of the sixth Shubuha' or misconception, and alhamdulillah we've gone through it thoroughly, so we don't need to go through it anymore.

The next Shubuha' that the author mentions, is he says...so again he's saying:

فإن قال أنا لا أشرك بالله شيئاً ، حاشا وكلا ، ولكن الإلتجاء إلى الصالحين ليس بشرك ؟

**“If this person [so this Mushrik], if he says to you, “I do not perform Shirk with Allah, but this seeking of asylum or this seeking of protection from the Salihin isn't Shirk.”**

So, again he's arguing or giving us the argument that the Mushrik would try to tell us.

Then he says,

فقل له :إذا كنت تقرر أن الله حرم الشرك أعظم من تحريم الزنا ، وتقرر :أن الله لا يغفره فما هذا الأمر الذي حرمه الله وذكر أنه لا يغفره ، فإنه لا يدري .فقل له :كيف تبرئ نفسك من الشرك وأنت لا تعرفه

**“Then say to him: “If you accept that Allah has forbidden Shirk with a forbiddance that's greater than the way he forbid Zina, and you accept that Allah won't forgive this, then tell us what is the Shirk exactly then?” Then if he says: “I don't know”, then you can say to him: “How can you say that this isn't Shirk when you don't even know the thing is that you're defining.”**

So, we talked about this before, if you said to someone, “you can't drink alcohol”, and he said “this isn't alcohol, it's wine”, and you said to him “define what alcohol is”, and he said “I don't know what alcohol is”, then you can say to him, “how are you saying that, that's not alcohol when you don't even know what it is to begin with?”.

Same thing with shirk, if someone says, “this isn't Shirk”, then you say, “What is shirk then, if you're saying this isn't, you must know what it is then.” If he says, “I don't know”, then again you can say, “how are you arguing for something when you don't even really know the definition of the thing that you're supposed to stay away from.” So again, he brings this to begin with.

So, again it comes a number of times in the book, that the person can either give the answer that he doesn't know, or he can give the wrong answer, or he can give the correct answer. So, if he doesn't know, then alhamdulillah we've talked about that and all you've got to do is explain to him what shirk is, how this falls into shirk and it should be hopefully something he gives.

The next possibility that we've talked about this before is that he says that shirk is "worshipping idols and we don't worship idols."

So, for example he'll say that, if someone went to a statue and made sujud to it, that's shirk, or if someone went to a tree and made a sacrifice before it then that would be worship, but what we're doing asking things from Salihin isn't worship or it isn't shirk so that's fine. So, at that point we would say: "What does it mean to worship a statue? Define that for us."

So, again we take them to really explain everything that they believe, so we can break it down and show how it's actually false. So, if he says that: "Worshipping these statues or these idols, what it means is that, you believe that they take some sort of characteristic of Allah, that these things create, or that they give the rizq, or they control matters of the universe and so on."

This is one answer that they'll give, so then at the point we would say and again this is a repeat from before,

"Allah declared the kuffar of Quraysh to be mushrikin, and He sent the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to remove all of the shirk that they have. What did they used to do? They used to believe that statues created, they used to believe that statues would create or that they would give rizq or anything like this. We know for a fact in the Qur'an that Allah tells us that they didn't believe these things. So, He called them mushrikin, He called their action shirk, but they weren't doing what you're saying is Shirk. So, either you're right and Allah is wrong, and then you have a whole other problem of why you've left Islam, or you're wrong and Allah is right so follow what Allah is telling us that shirk is."

So, this is one possibility. So if he gives us the right answer which would be that, shirk is taking something that belongs to Allah and doing it specifically for something else, whether it's a piece of wood, whether it's a statue, a tree, anything else like this, then we would say, this is correct, but is this the only type of shirk, that if someone does these same actions for a human being who's alive or dead, does this fall under shirk or not. If he says yes, then we've explained exactly what we need to explain to them. If he says no, then we can say that,

**فهذا يرد ما ذكره الله في كتابه من كفر من تعلق على الملائكة أو عيسى ، أو الصالحين ؟**

**"Then this actually goes against what Allah has mentioned in His Book about the disbelief of the one who is attached to the Angels, or 'Isa (عليه السلام), or the Righteous."**

We know that Allah called the Christians mushrikin and they were worshipping 'Isa and we know that Allah mentioned about the other types of kuffar that they would worship Mala'ika and others would worship Salihin and so on. So, despite all of this, Allah called them all mushrikin. So, again we would say that you're right and Allah is wrong and we know that's



not the case, or Allah is right and you're wrong and that is the case definitely, and what you're doing is shirk.

So, again this is a very condensed reading of what the author said because you can find this translated in English, and the original's in Arabi so I don't need to read his words word for word, but to comment a bit on what the author says in this Shubuha' or when he discusses this misconception is that this whole misunderstanding as what they define shirk as, which is that it's related specifically to Rububiyyah, that it's related to Allah creating things, or Allah giving rizq or controlling matters of the universe, or bringing life and death and so on, this is all based upon their understanding of Tawhid to begin with.

So, Allah sent the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to teach Tawhid, and **what is Tawhid according to Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah? That nothing is worshipped except Allah.** We know that Quraysh accepted aspects of Tawhid that were correct, they accepted that Allah created and He's the Only One Who Creates, that He controls the matters and He's the Only One Who does so and so on. So, when the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sent, it wasn't to teach these things and to wipe out shirk with regards to Rububiyyah, it was specifically, or it was more related to matters of Ilahiyah or Uluhiyyah.

So, again, just to add a bit more to this, this Shubuha' or this misconception is nothing new now, and it was argued during the lifetime of the author, Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhab. The person who propagated this Shubuha' or misconception the most, was a person named Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Majeed al-Fasi and he died in the year 1227 Hijri, and he wrote a book called, "*Ar-Radd A'la-Ba'd al-Mubtadi'a mina Ta'ifah al-Wahhabiyyah*". So, even back then, this label of people who argue against shirk or call to Tawhid or these types of things, at that time even people would try to call it Wahhabiyyah, which is a made-up false thing, it's not even a thing to really discuss, but he was one of the first people who argued this, and this was the book he argued it in.

And one of the things he said in this book is that, the people in Jahiliyah, the only reason he disbelieved or fell into Kufr was because they worshipped idols, so this was what he said. So, the point of this is that they would say that everything else they did, them doing it for the Mala'ika, them doing it for the Anbiya, or the Salihin, all these types of things, this didn't affect their Iman, it was only the fact that idols were involved. So, if you worshipped a human, that's fine, if you made an idol of that human and worshipped them, that's not fine anymore. Even though they both are worship of other than Allah, and they are both worship of creation, this is what they try to argue.

Also, another person during the lifetime or just after the lifetime of the author, he was the mufti of the Shafi'iyyah at the time, he used to argue similar things as well and his book was called, "*At-Tu'huf as-Sunni'yyah fi-Radd al-Wahhabiyyah*", and again he would say very similar things. He would say that shirk, what is shirk, we say it's giving worship to other than Allah, they say it's believing that something other than Allah has control of matters, or the thing other than Allah can bring about life and death and so on.

So, again we see that one of the main components of all of the misconceptions that they have is because they misunderstand what Tawhid is to begin with, and they misunderstand what shirk is to begin with.

And the steps with regards to arguing against this misconception, they're very similar to when it came to the fourth misconception which was when they said that, "Making du'a to other than Allah isn't worship" – when we make du'a it's not an act of worship, so if you tell us, du'a to other than Allah is shirk, we would say it can't be because it's not even worship. So, if you back to that Shubuha' and the way we spoke about that, it's essentially the same arguments in how you would argue those points.

The next misconception that the author talks about is that the people disbelieve because they said that Allah has a son, or that the Angels are the daughters of Allah, so this is the next misconception that he goes into, but since that might take a while , insha'Allah we'll stop there for tonight and if there's any questions...Wallahul A'lam.

## Lesson 14:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

Last week, we finished speaking about the sixth misconception that the author talks about. So, who knows what it was?...So, the last thing that we talked about was that when people say that the things that they are doing aren't shirk, and they give specific reasons for that, and they bring false arguments and they'll say that, for example, "Du'a can't be worship", then they give some reason why, and they tie all of these things to the heart, and they say that something can only be worshipped if it's in the heart and so on.

So, alhamdulillah, we discussed this and we clarified that these claims are false, so we'll move onto the seventh misconception that the author mentions. So, the next one he says is,

فإن قال

**"So, if this person says..."**

So, now he's talking about someone who is calling to shirk or calling to something that they think is from Islam, or they think is permissible in Islam, but is actually something that's shirk, so going to the graves or going certain places and calling upon their Shaykhs and calling upon the people who they call their 'Awliya and their Sayyid and things like this. So, if someone makes these claims, one of the misconceptions that they'll bring is that they'll say that,

إنهم لا يكفرون بدعاء الملائكة و الأنبياء ، وإنما يكفرون لما قالوا : الملائكة بنات الله

**"Yes, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) declared the people at the time to be disbelievers, but the reason for this wasn't because they were calling upon the Salihin or calling upon 'Awliya and so on. The reason for this was because they stated that the Mala'ika or the Angels are the daughters of Allah."**

So, they'll that when the Quraysh and the other kuffar at the time, when they would call upon the Anbiya, or call upon the Mala'ika, or call upon the Salihin or call upon their 'aliha, which were all of those things, or they could've been things like their statues and so on and their idols. This wasn't what prevented them from being Muslims, and this wasn't what would necessitate them from entering Jahannam. The reason for them being declared as such and treated as such was because they were claiming that Allah has daughters, and that these daughters were the Mala'ika.

So, this is one of the claims that they make. So, the author says,

فإننا لم نقل : عبد القادر ابن الله

**“The person might say this but then they’ll say, “We aren’t saying that ‘Abdul-Qadir is the son of Allah.”**

And, he’s referring to ‘Abdul-Qadir al-Jaylani, who was one of the Salihin and one of the Imams of the earlier generations of the Muslims, who for whatever reason the people after him began to take him as an *‘Ilah*, would call upon him and go to his grave and would make Hajj to his grave and so on. So, he’s saying these people who do this, they’ll say that, “We’re not making this claim about this person, likewise any of their people who they worship or perform shirk with, we’re not saying this is the son of Allah, or that this is the daughter of Allah, so we don’t fall into what the Quraysh and the kuffar at the time fell into. We’re completely on a different path.”

So, he says,

فالجواب : أن نسبة الولد إلى الله كفر مستقل

**“The answer to this misconception is that we would say: “Claiming that Allah has a son is an act or statement of disbelief or a statement of kufr in and of itself, it’s not tied to anything else, it’s kufr or it’s shirk, or it’s kufr on its own, it doesn’t matter whether you believe it or not, or it doesn’t matter whether you worship someone other than Allah or anything like that.”**

If someone only worshipped Allah, and claimed that Allah had a son, this would be sufficient for them to leave Islam and to be declared a kafir. So, he says, that this is a matter of kufr in and of itself, it doesn’t matter whether they worship other than Allah, it’s still kufr in and of itself.

And he says, Allah said,

قال الله تعالى : قل هو الله أحد \*الله الصمد

Or that when Allah said in Suratul Ikhlas, **“Say: He is the Allah, One” and “Allah is the Samad.”**

And there’s different translations, and different tafsir of what “*As-Samad*” is.

Then he says,

والأحد: الذي لا يظهر له  
والصمد: المقصود في الحوائج

**“The Ahad is the One Who has no-one like him, and As-Samad is the One Who is intended or the One Who is Sought out when there’s a need.”**

So, this is the meaning that the author describes makes tafsir of the “*Samad*” as, and there’s other ones which we can get into a different time. But, just to add what the author says, this statement of “the One Who is intended”, or sought out in need. This is attributed to ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Abbas, and this was his tafsir of “*As-Samad*”.

Also, others say “*Or the One Who the creation go to in their need.*” And also there’s other Tafsir of it, “*Or the One Who has no open space inside of Him*”, and there’s other definitions which are given, but the point here is that when Allah said, “*Say: He is One*”. He’s telling us, that there’s no-one like him, so if you attribute to Allah, a son or a daughter, this is kufr even if you didn’t worship them, even if you only worshipped Allah your whole life, but you also said, “Allah had a son”, you’re not Muslim.

So, likewise the opposite, if someone worshipped other than Allah but he never said, He had a son, he’s also not Muslim. It doesn’t mean that only one takes you out of Islam, or prevents you from being Muslim, there’s no reason that both can’t be statements or beliefs or acts of kufr.

Then, the author continues, he says,

فمن جحد هذا فقد كفر ولو لم يجحد السورة

**“So, whoever rejects this, he has disbelieved. Even if, he does not reject the Surah.”**

So, meaning, even if someone said, “Yes I accept that Allah said “*Say: He is One*”, and this is from the words of Allah that he spoke, but I also say that he has a son. This would also be sufficient for them to not be Muslim.

And then he says,

وقال الله تعالى: ما اتخذ الله من ولد وما كان معه من إله

**And Allah said, “Allah did not ever have a son or take a son and He never had another god with Him.” [17:111]**

So, meaning, another god was worthy of being worshipped.

Then the author continues, he says,

ففرق بين النوعين, وجعل كلا منهما كفرا مستقلا. وقال تعالى: وجعلوا لله شركاء الجن وخلقهم

**“So, He differentiated between the two types, and He made each one of them disbelief on their own. Allah said, “Or they made partners with Him from the Jinn, and He is the One Who Created them...” [6:100]**

So, meaning obviously this doesn't make sense, how could there be partners with Allah, and He is the One Who made them. So, even if you look at the creation, there's certain times where you would say, this person is better than this person, or this person is not even near the same level as this other person, and these are all creation.

So, if that's acceptable for the creation, then how about when Allah created the Jinn and you're making them partners with Allah. So, they're not even both creation for us to say that there's some similarity. It's Allah Who Created, and the Jinn who were created, so they're not even at the same level.

So, then he says,

وخرقوا له بنين وبنات بغير علم ففرق بين الكافرين

**“And they make false claims that He has sons and daughters without any knowledge”**

So, meaning they do this without any knowledge. So, he says here again that Allah differentiated between the two things. The first thing he said was that they made partners with Him from the jinn, and He's the One Who Created them, so this is one thing that Allah told us. And they made false claims or lies that Allah has daughters and sons. So, there's two separate things here. Allah didn't say they're all one, they're all the same thing, He differentiated between the two.

So, then the author continues,

والدليل على هذا أيضا: أن الذين كفروا بدعاء اللات مع كونه رجلا صالحا

**“The evidence for this is that those who disbelieved because they made du'a to Al-Laat, despite the fact that he was a righteous man...”**

So, originally, *Al-Laat* or the person who the statue of Al-Laat was made, he originally was a righteous person.

So, then he says,

**“...they didn’t claim that he was the son of Allah.”**

So, we know that the kuffar of Quraysh, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) called them to Islam, he dealt with them as non-Muslims, he told them to leave their shirk and so on. One of things that they were doing was making du’a to Al-Laat. They never claimed that Al-Laat was the son of Allah. So, this claim that people will say, “well no as long as we don’t claim that it’s Allah’s son”, or “that it’s equal to Allah or similar to Allah, we can continue doing whatever we do”, that this is something that is a completely rejected claim.

Then he says,

والذين كفروا بعبادة الجن لم يجعلوهم كذلك وكذلك – أيضا :- العلماء في جميع المذاهب الأربعة يذكرون في باب حكم المرتد

**“And those who disbelieved by worshipping the jinn, they never claimed that the jinn were the sons and daughters of Allah...likewise the scholars of all the four madhahib state in the chapters of the murtad...”**

So, in the books of the fiqh when they talk about the rulings related to someone who leaves Islam, who’s a murtad or an apostate, all the four madhahib, and we look to other madhahib as well, they explain this, one of things that they mention in these chapters is that they say,

أن المسلم إذا زعم أن لله ولد فهو مرتد ، ويفرق بين النوعين ، وهذا في غاية الوضوح

**“If the Muslim claims that Allah has a son then he is a murtad. And they differentiate between the two things and this is from the most clear of matters.”**

So, here’s where the author ends this *Shubuha’* or this misconception, and he brings Ayat from the Qur’an and he brings logical arguments to show that these aren’t the same thing and that someone doesn’t need to have more than one belief, or act or statement of kufr in order to disbelieve, and that there’s different types. So, someone can have one, and someone can have two and someone can have ten. We don’t say that one isn’t sufficient, or we don’t say that they’re all there or that none of them are there.

**From the ‘Aqidah of Ahlus-Sunnah wa’l-Jama’ah, is that we say that Iman is at different levels and there’s different parts.** Salat is from Iman, Sawm is from Iman, giving Zakat is from Iman, having fear of Allah is from Iman, they’re all different things. Someone might pray five times a day and that’s it, and they don’t pray any other Salat. Someone might pray the five Salawat and pray the Sunnah salat with them, 12 or more or less. All of these are Iman in and of itself. We don’t say that it’s possible for someone or that it’s impossible for someone to be Muslim unless they do everything.



Likewise, we say that it's possible that kufr is at different levels too. Someone can hate Allah or someone can hate the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), or someone reject an Ayah from the Qur'an, and someone can reject the whole Qur'an, and someone can leave the Salat, or someone can swear at Allah, all of these are different things. We don't say that they all need to be present for someone not to be Muslim. What if someone says that Allah has a son or 'Isa is the son of Allah, this is kufr in and of itself. We don't say that he has to worship 'Isa too and likewise if someone worshipped a man and didn't say he's Allah's son, or doesn't say that he's Allah's so, we don't say that he has to do both.

So, this is the point of the author when he talks about these two things. So, then just to clarify this just a bit more, like we've been doing for most of the misconceptions. We've been going through them and then talking about what are the steps at we would follow if we're going to debate or if we're going to have an argument or try to clarify these matters to somebody.

So, the first step that we would follow is that we would that, saying that the angels are the daughters of Allah's kufr on its own. Regardless if you make du'a to them or not, regardless of whether you perform a sacrifice for them or not. Regardless if you make a *nadhr* or oath by them or for them, regardless of whether you do any of these things. Just the claim or the statement even that Allah has daughters is kufr in and of itself.

And likewise, if we were to say the opposite about sons. If we say sons or daughters, in any case it's disbelief on its own. And the evidence for that is what the author mentioned, so Allah said,

قل هو الله أحد \*الله الصمد

**“Say, “He is Allah, [who is] One, Allah, the Eternal Refuge.” [112:1-2]**

So, this is the first thing that we would say. That there's no reason for us to link the two together and say they're all the same or that there's no difference. The second thing we would say that is that we know this is kufr, and we also know that du'a to other than Allah is kufr in and of itself as well, just like Quraysh were disbelievers because they would make du'a to other than Allah. Then also we would say, on top of this, this is matter of consensus, so there's no dispute on this matter.

If we look at the books of fiqh, all of the scholars from the time of Sahabah, up until today clearly state that making du'a to other than Allah is kufr, making any worship to other than Allah is kufr, and likewise, making the claim that He has daughters or sons or partners or if someone said parents or brothers, or anything that even gives this idea that Allah has some sort of equal or something that's similar to Him, all of these are kufr in and of themselves.

So, this is the seventh misconception that the author talked about. Next, is the eighth misconception, and the author says...and as well see that each of these misconceptions is weaker and weaker and it's like a person drowning, they want to stick to whatever they're on, but you keep clarifying to them that this is wrong and then they come with something that's weaker and you clarify to them, that's wrong and they come with something weaker. So, by now you would hope that if you were clarifying these matters to people, they would have

already alhamdulillah came back to Islam, but if they don't then the author walks us through it again. So, he says,

**وإن قال ألا إن أولياء الله لا خوف عليهم ولا هم يحزنون**

**“If after this, if this person was to say that Allah said, “Indeed, the ‘Awliya or the allies of Allah have no fear or that they should never fear or never grieve.” [10:62]**

So, meaning that Allah has placed them at such a high level that they'll never fear or they'll never grieve. So, they'll never have anything in the grave and on the day of judgement, or they shouldn't have any fear because they were from the 'Awliya of Allah, and they shouldn't grieve because they'll enter Jannah, and they'll never enter Jahannam or if they do enter Jahannam, it'll be for a short time relatively obviously and then they'll leave Jahannam and enter Jannah, so isn't this true, this is the argument that they'll say.

So, we'll say to this person,

**. فقل : هذا هو الحق ، ولكن لا يعبدون**

**“Yes, this is true, we completely accept that the ‘Awliya, they shouldn't fear and they shouldn't grieve. But this isn't evidence that they should be worshipped, why would you then make du'a to them.”**

Who's the One Who's making them not have fear? Who's the One Who's making them not grieve? It's Allah because the way they dealt with Allah...

So, for us to then say, well because these people were good, and they followed Allah's commands and He rewarded them for that, we're going to go now and worship them. So, you're not even following their example in what they did to get to that level. So, the author says,

**ونحن لم نذكر إلا عبادتهم مع الله وشركهم معه ، و إلا فالواجب عليك حبهم واتباعهم**

**“And we are not claiming anything, except that they shouldn't be worshipped with Allah, and that we're rejecting making them partners with Allah, otherwise it's obligatory upon us to love them these people...”**

So, if we know of 'Awliya of Allah from the *Sahabah, Tabi'in, Atba at-Tabi'in, the Shuhadah, the Mujahidin*, the Muslims who are upon the correct path, if we know of these people, it's obligatory upon us to love them, and it's obligatory upon us to follow what they were upon. And if they have kara'mat, or if they have miracles that Allah performs through them, then it's obligatory upon us to accept this. We know that this is a reality, that Allah will sometimes perform kara'mat through the 'Awliya.

They'll do something that doesn't go with the nature of the world, it's something out of the norm. If this is the case, we accept this, and we accept it because Allah has raised them to this level, that as a means of showing that they're on the truth, He will perform these things through them.

But then the author says,

و الإقرار بكرامتهم و لا يجحد كرامات الأ ولياء

**“And no-one rejected the kara'mat of the 'Awliya...”**

So, no-one rejected the concept of a kara'ma which is a miracle on something other than or through someone other than the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

إلا أهل البدع و الضلال

**“...except the people of innovation and misguidance...”**

So, the people of bi'dah, through the *Mu'tazilah* and others. No-one ever rejected this, so Ahlus-Sunnah never rejected the concept that the 'Awliya can have kara'mat performed through them. Then he says,

ودين الله وسط بين طرفين ، وهدى بين ضلالتين ، وحق بين باطلين

**“And the religion of Allah is in the middle between two sides, and its guidance between two matters of misguidance, and it's the truth between two matters of falsehood...”**

So, meaning that, just like we accept the kara'mat of the 'Awliya, so we're in the middle. Who are we in the middle between? People who worship them because of the kara'mat, and people who reject the kara'mat, so we're in between. We don't reject it, but we don't say that it makes the worthy of worship or anything like this. And likewise, when he says in between two misguidances and so on.

Then, he says,

فإذا عرفت : أن هذا الذي يسميه المشركون في زماننا [كبير الا عتقا

**“So, if you know this, this what the people or the Mushrikin of our time call al-'Itiqaad...”**

So, when they would perform these actions, they would call all of this shirk, this is *al-'Itiqaad*.

So, he says,

هو الشرك الذي نزل فيه القرآن

“...this is the shirk that Allah sent the Qur'an down for...”

So, people are doing things now, claiming that it's good, and it's actually the thing that Allah sent the Qur'an and sent the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) with the Qur'an to actually eradicate. And now not only are people doing it, but they're claiming that it's something that's good.

And then he said,

و قاتل الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) الناس عليه فاعلم أن شرك الأولين أخف من شرك أهل زماننا بأمرين

“And the Messenger of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم) fought the people due to this. If you know all of this, the know that the shirk of the earlier people, was less than the shirk of the people of our time.”

So, it wasn't as extreme.

And then he says,

حدهما : أن الأولين لا يشركون ولا يدعون الملائكة والأولياء والأوثان مع الله إلا في الرخاء وأما في الشدة فيخلصون لله الدعاء

“This is for two reasons: The first is that the earlier people, they would only perform shirk in times of ease...but the mushirkin of our time, would perform it in ease and when there's a tribulation.”

And then he mentions when Allah said,

وَإِذَا مَسَّكُمُ الضُّرُّ فِي الْبَحْرِ ضَلَّ مَنْ تَدْعُونَ إِلَّا إِلَاهَ ۖ فَلَمَّا نَجَّكُمْ إِلَى الْبَرِّ أَعْرَضْتُمْ وَكَانَ الْإِنْسَانُ كَفُورًا

“And when harm touches you upon the sea, those that you call upon besides Him vanish from you except Him (Allah Alone). But when He brings you safely to land, you turn away (from Him). And man is ever ungrateful.” [17:67]

So, Allah is saying is that at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) or before, they would perform shirk in times of ease. So they would go to wherever they would go, and they would worship Allah, but things got down to where they really needed help, when they were in

trouble at area, when there was a storm, when the waves were crashing down on them and so on, they knew in their heart that Allah is the Only One Who really could save them.

So, they would make du'a to him, knowing He's the Only One Who could do it. They would forget about all their other *Shuraka* or all their other partners that they would worship than Allah. But, then when Allah brought them safely back to land, they would go back into what they were doing before.

So, then he quotes the statement of Allah,

قُلْ أَرَأَيْتُمْ إِنْ أَتَاكُمْ عَذَابُ اللَّهِ أَوْ أَتَتْكُمُ السَّاعَةُ أَغَيْرَ اللَّهِ تَدْعُونَ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ بَلْ إِيَّاهُ تَدْعُونَ فَيَكْشِفُ مَا تَدْعُونَ إِلَيْهِ إِنْ شَاءَ وَتَنْسَوْنَ مَا تُشْرِكُونَ

**“Say (O Muhammad): “Tell me if Allah's Torment comes upon you, or the Hour comes upon you, would you then call upon anyone other than Allah? (Reply) if you are truthful!” Nay! To Him Alone you call, and, if He will, He would remove that (distress) for which you call upon Him, and you forget at that time whatever partners you joined with Him (in worship)!” [6:40-41].**

So, Allah again here is reminding, when something really comes down that's effecting you, or you're really scared or so on, you'll forget everything other than Allah, but when things go back to ease, you go back into kufr, and your shirk and the filth that you call upon, and call too.

Then, the author mentions the statement of Allah,

وَإِذَا مَسَّ الْإِنْسَانَ ضُرٌّ دَعَا رَبَّهُ مُنِيبًا إِلَيْهِ ثُمَّ إِذَا خَوَّلَهُ نِعْمَةً مِّنْهُ نَسِيَ مَا كَانَ يَدْعُو إِلَيْهِ مِن قَبْلُ وَجَعَلَ لِلَّهِ أَنْدَادًا لِّيُضِلَّ عَنْ سَبِيلِهِ ۚ قُلْ تَمَتَّعْ بِكُفْرِكَ قَلِيلًا ۚ إِنَّكَ مِنْ أَصْحَابِ النَّارِ

**“And when some hurt touches man, he cries to his Lord (Allah Alone), turning to Him in repentance, but when He bestows a favour upon him from Himself, he forgets that for which he cried for before, and he sets up rivals to Allah, in order to mislead others from His Path. Say: “Take pleasure in your disbelief for a while: surely, you are (one) of the dwellers of the Fire!”.” [39:8]**

And the statement of Allah,

وَإِذَا غَشِيَهُمْ مَّوْجٌ كَالظُّلَلِ دَعَوُا اللَّهَ مُخْلِصِينَ لَهُ الدِّينَ فَلَمَّا نَجَّاهُمْ إِلَى الْبَرِّ فَمِنْهُمْ مُّقْتَصِدٌ ۚ وَمَا يَجْحَدُ بِآيَاتِنَا إِلَّا كُلُّ خَتَّارٍ كَفُورٍ

**“And when a wave covers them like shades (i.e. like clouds or the mountains of seawater), they invoke Allah, making their invocations for Him only. But when He**

brings them safe to land, there are among them those that stop in the middle, between (Belief and disbelief). But none denies Our Signs except every perfidious ungrateful.” [31:32]

Then he says,

فمن فهم هذه المسألة التي وضحها الله في كتابه ، هي : أن المشركين الذين قاتلهم رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) يدعون الله ويدعون غيره في الرخاء ، وأما في الضراء والشدة فلا يدعون إلا الله وحده لا شريك له ، وينسون سادتهم – تبين له الفرق بين شرك أهل زماننا وشرك الأولين ولكن أين من يفهم قلبه هذه المسألة فهما راسخا ، والله المستعان

“So whoever understands this point, which Allah clarified in His Book, and it is that Mushrikin or the polytheists that the Messenger of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم) fought, and that they would call upon Allah, and that would make du’a to Allah, and they would make du’a to other than Allah in times of ease, as for times of hardship or harshness or times of need, they would not call upon anyone except Allah Alone with no partners, and they would forget about their masters, or what they call the Sayyid. Then if you understand this, then you would see the difference between the shirk of the people of our time, and the shirk of the people who were earlier. But where is someone who would understand the likes of this matter with a good understanding, and Allah is the One Who we complain too.”

So, the first thing he mentions is that the earlier kuffar would only worship other than Allah in times of ease, but not in times of need. Then he says, the second point, so now he’s talking about why is shirk worse now, and this is back in the time of the author which was over 200 years ago, and things are worse now even, so he says,

أما الأمر الثاني : أن الأولين يدعون مع الله أناسا مقر بين عند الله إما أنبياء ، وإما أولياء وإما ملائكة

“The second reason for this is that the earlier people would only worship or call upon someone who is close to Allah, they would worship the Angels, worship the Prophets, some of them would worship or call upon the Salihin...”

So, he’s saying the earlier ones would only do this with people or creation that were close to Allah. So, he gives those examples.

أو يدعون أشجارا أو أحجارا ، مطيعة لله وليست عاصية

**“...Or they would call upon things that are inanimate. For example, trees or rocks which in reality, they’re not disobedient to Allah and in essence, they also do have an act of worship...”**

Which we know that Allah mentioned in the Qur’an, that everything from the creation has some form of *tasbih* that it performs for Allah, so even a tree, even a rock, even the Earth, everything, we know that it worships Allah in its own way, but it’s also inanimate, it doesn’t perform anything bad, it just is. It’s just from the creation of Allah.

But then he says,

وأهل زماننا يدعون مع الله أناسا من أفسق الناس ، والذين يدعونهم هم الذين يحكون عنهم الفجور من الزنا والسرقه ، وترك الصلاة ، وغير ذلك

**“And the people of our time, call upon Allah, they make du’a to other than Allah with Him, [so they make shirk with Him], from the worst of the most evil of people and these are the people who are called, for example, they fall into zina, they steal, they leave the Salat and so on. “**

So, he’s saying, the shirk of the earlier people, at least it’s still shirk, and it still takes someone out of the fold of Islam, and it still would necessitate that they’re in Jahannam forever. At least of the very least, they were picking people, who in and of themselves, were good. Someone could say, “even though it’s not a misconception that’s acceptable, at least they were looking for someone who’s good and then they performed this.”

But then you have people who worship other than Allah, but then you look at them, they don’t pray, they don’t fast, they don’t give zakat, they don’t make Hajj, they steal, they make zina, they sing, they smoke, so on and so on of every type of kufr and every type of act of disobedience, then they go and they pick those people too worship and claim that they’re Allah, or that they’re a *Sharik* or partner with Allah and so on.

Then the author, he says,

والذي يعتقد في الصالح - أو الذي لا يعصي - مثل الخشب والحجر - أهون ممن يعتقد فيمن يشاهد فسقه وفساده ، ويشهد به

**“The person who has these beliefs regarding someone who’s a Salih or a righteous person or something, an inanimate object that doesn’t disobey Allah, is at a much easier level, or a much lower level in their shirk, then someone who does the same acts for the worst of the people on the earth.”**



So, this is what the author said, and so we'll go through this. We're almost done this one, and then he says, so we can look at this and say that, there's the levels or steps in which you would argue against this misconception.

So the first, like we talked about before, we would say that, "This claim that you're making that the 'Awliya are at a higher level, we don't reject this."

So, as we talked about before, with the *Shafa'a* of the Prophet (ﷺ). One of the things that people try to do is that they'll say, "If you don't make *du'a* to the Prophet (ﷺ), that mean you don't accept his *Shafa'a* on the Day of Judgement." And we said, before, this is a complete lie, of course we accept that the Prophet (ﷺ) will have a *Shafa'a* on the Day of Judgement, and we accept that there's more than one kind even, and we accept that the *Shuhada'*, and the *Salihin*, and the *Siddiqin*, and the *Mala'ika* and whoever the texts of the Qur'an and the Sunnah have come with, that they have a *Shafa'a*, and they have an intercession, we accept it.

So, don't try to back us into a corner saying that, "You either worship the (ﷺ) or you reject everything from him." It's a complete lie, why does it have to be all or nothing, there's different levels of actions different levels of beliefs.

So, the first thing that we would say that is, "No, we accept all of these things, but we don't claim that they can be worshipped." So, this is what would say, so, that the first thing. Then, after that we would say, or we would clarify that, you can perform shirk at different levels, and people aren't all at the same level.

So, just because someone doesn't do shirk all the time, doesn't mean that they haven't fallen into shirk. Or just like if someone said, "if you perform zina one time, it's the same as performing zina three times a day." No rational person would accept this, one's doing it once, and ones doing it more than one time every day, how are they at the same level? If someone steals, someone who steals \$1 from a person as opposed to someone who steals a million dollars from ten people, how are they the same? Of course they're not the same, someone who killed one person, and someone who killed 50 people, of course they're not the same.

Does that mean because the person only killed one person that another guy killed 50 people, that the first guy's okay? Of course not, this is the type of arguments that kids come up with when they don't want to get in trouble. They'll say, "someone else did worse than me." Who cares if someone did worse than you, it's still wrong, it still takes you out of Islam.

So, this is what we would clarify to them, that even the mushrikin in the time of the Prophet (ﷺ), at times they had Tawhid, at times they only worshipped Allah, but because of the other times they worshipped other than Allah, this was sufficient to remove them or to prevent them from Islam. So, this is something to think about when we say that kufr can be different levels, and different numbers, and likewise good deeds can be the same.

So, we don't take this all or nothing idea, and one thing to end with, is that if we see that nowadays, and it obviously started before, if you look at some of the people who go and they give pledges of allegiance to their Shaykhs and certain areas, and we had in this city an incident with that before. If you look at the people that they go to and that they claim that, this is a Wali of Allah, and you look at them, and you say that, this person isn't even Muslim.

When we all saw that video of that guy, in the thing he'll swear, then he'll say, "Allah permitted it for me, and I just got this information now from this Angel beside me." He'll say one of those things, and each one of those things is kufr to say. First of all, you're not seeing an Angel that no-one else is seeing.

Second, we know that Allah didn't permit it for you. And people go to this person and they make Sujud for him, and they give him bay'ah, and they say that he'll forgive your sins, and so on and so on, at least if they did this with the Prophet (ﷺ), we would say it's still kufr, you still can't worship the Prophet (ﷺ), but at least, the Prophet (ﷺ) was Muslim, he was the leader of the Muslimin, and he was the leader or the Imam of Sayyid Bani Adam like in the hadith. He's the best of creation, at least with him you can see people have love, they went too far into where it's haram. But then you have, someone and this person, he's claiming that they reached this level of Yaqin, that he's not responsible to worship Allah anymore, and he can do this and he can do this, and they say that this is the best person.

So, we see that this is the idea that someone should keep in mind. How did the Prophet (ﷺ) treat Quraysh, and how did he deal with them, and what did they go through? And what's waiting for them in the grave and the Day of Judgement that we know from the Prophet (ﷺ), if this is what's coming for them, and how they were treated, what about people who do the things as Quraysh did, but worse. This is something to keep in mind, that just because someone claims something is from Islam, it doesn't mean it's from Islam. It can actually be something that takes you out of Islam.

So, this is what the author is going through with this misconception, and insha'Allah it's quite clear, it doesn't need too much of an explanation or commentary on. So insha'Allah we'll stop there and next week we'll get into the ninth misconception. Wallahul A'lam.

---

Note: English translations aren't translated accurately from the Arabic text as they were mostly summarised or elaborated upon by the commentator of this series.

## Lesson 15:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

So, today we'll be discussing the *ninth misconception*, and it's the final misconception that the author talks about, in the book. So, we finished all the misconceptions or this will be the ninth.

As we talked about in the beginning, *the book is divided into three sections*. The first is a lengthy introduction that talks about the topics, the second is nine misconceptions that the mushrikin use to try to justify their shirk by the Qur'an and the Sunnah, and the third which we'll get into insha'Allah next week or the week after.

So, we'll talk about what the author says right now, then we'll explain it. He says,

فإذا تحققت أن الذين قاتلهم رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) أصح عقولاً ، وأخف شركاً من هؤلاء فاعلم أن هؤلاء شبهة يوردونها على ما ذكرنا

**“When it has been established that those who the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) fought were of sounder intellect and less severe in their shirk than these people nowadays, then you should know that the contemporaries have a doubt which they present and reply to what we have mentioned.”**

So, now he's talking about the mushrikin and all of the misconceptions that they bring. So, we know that the Muslimin bring evidences from the Qur'an and the Sunnah to disprove these misconceptions or to refute these misconceptions that the author mentions from them. So, they try to reply to these answers.

So, he proved or he discussed as we talked about last week, that the mushrikin at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) weren't as bad as the mushrikin that came later on, and that was for a number of reasons. One of them was that they would only perform in times when they weren't in need or they weren't in severe situations, while the mushrikin later on performed shirk all the time.

Also, the mushrikin in the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) performed shirk with people who weren't bad at all compared to the mushrikin that came later on. So, we know that the Christians, their shirk is through 'Isa (عليه السلام) and Maryam (رضي الله عنها) and we know that even the kuffar of Quraysh, much of their shirk was through the Salihin, or some of them was through the *Mala'ika*, as opposed to later on, the mushrikin they would perform shirk with things that were inanimate, that weren't obeying of Allah and they weren't disobeying. They had no 'aql. Or they would perform shirk with people who were fussaqa or evil people who were kuffar, and people who were leaders of shirk.

So, he's saying now that the people who say this, they have arguments that they try to use to prove what they say. So, he says,

وهي من أعظم شبههم ، فأصغ سمعك لجوابها وهي [ :أنهم يقولون [ :إن الذين نز  
ل فيهم القرآن لا يشهدون أن لا إله إلا الله ويكذبون الرسول (صلى الله عليه وسلم)  
وينكرون البعث ، ويكذبون القرآن ، ويجعلونه سحرا ، ونحن نشهد أن لا إله إلا الله وأن  
محمدا رسول الله ، ونصدق القرآن ، ونؤمن بالبعث ونصلي ونصوم ، فكيف تجعلوننا مثل  
أولئك ؟

“So, this is of their greatest of doubts, so pay careful attention to the answer, so this doubt is that they say: “Verily, those whom the Qur’an was revealed upon, or those who it was revealed for, did not testify that none has the right to be worshipped in truth except Allah, and they rejected the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم), and they rejected the Resurrection, and they rejected the Qur’an and they declared it to be from the magic or from the Sihr. Whereas we testify, that none has the right to be worshipped except Allah, and Muhammad is His Messenger and we believe in the Qur’an, and we have faith in the Resurrection, and we pray and we fast so how can you make us to be like those kuffar.”

So, he's bringing now this Shubuha' that they have, or this misconception. So, he says that,

فالجواب :أنه لا خلاف بين العلماء كلهم أن الرجل إذا صدق رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم)  
وسلم في شيء ، وكذبه في شيء

“The answer to this is: that there's no difference amongst the scholars that if a man believes in the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and he disbelieves in something from him...”

So, he believes in part of what he came with and disbelieves a part of it, there's no dispute among scholars,

أنه كافر لم يدخل في الإسلام

“...that this person would be a kafir. He would have left Islam or he wouldn't have entered Islam to begin with.”

So, if right from the beginning, he didn't accept something from the Qur'an and the Sunnah, he wouldn't have entered Islam to begin with, if he believed in it and he rejected it later on, he would have left Islam. So, then he says,

وكذلك إذا آمن ببعض القرآن وجدد بعضه ، كما أقر بالتوحيد وجدد وجوب الصلاة ، أو أقر بالتوحيد والصلاة وجدد وجوب الزكاة

“And likewise, when he believed in part of the Qur’an and rejected part of it, such as the one who affirmed Tawhid, and he rejected the obligation of the prayer, or affirmed Tawhid and the prayers, then rejected the obligation of the Zakat.”

So, if someone accepts the Shahadah, and accepts the Qur’an, and accepts the fasting but rejects the Zakat, obviously they wouldn’t be Muslim. And then he continues and says,

أو أقر بهذا كله ، وجدد الصوم ، أو أقر بهذا كله وجدد الحج .ولما لم ينقد أناس في زمن النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) للحج ، أنزل في حقهم

“Or if they affirmed all of these things, but rejected the obligation of fasting, or affirmed all of this but rejected the obligation of Hajj, when the people of the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did not comply with the obligation of Hajj, and Allah revealed concerning them...”

So, now he’s saying, even when people in the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) accepted most things, but some of them wouldn’t follow the command of Hajj, Allah revealed,

وَلِلَّهِ عَلَى النَّاسِ حِجُّ الْبَيْتِ مَنِ اسْتَطَاعَ إِلَيْهِ سَبِيلًا ۚ وَمَنْ كَفَرَ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ غَنِيٌّ عَنِ الْعَالَمِينَ

Or that, Allah revealed, “And the hajj to the house is a duty upon mankind to Allah, those who can afford the expenses, and whoever disbelieves then indeed Allah is not in need of the ‘Alamin [so of His creation].” [3:97]

Then he says,

ومن أقر بهذا كله وجدد البعث ، كفر بالإجماع ، وحل دمه و ماله ، كما قال تعالى : إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَكْفُرُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَرُسُلِهِ وَيُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يُفَرِّقُوا بَيْنَ اللَّهِ وَرُسُلِهِ وَيَقُولُونَ نُؤْمِنُ بِبَعْضٍ وَنَكْفُرُ بِبَعْضٍ وَيُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يَتَّخِذُوا بَيْنَ ذَلِكَ سَبِيلًا أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ حَقًّا ۖ وَأَعْتَدْنَا لِلْكَافِرِينَ عَذَابًا مُّهِينًا

“The one who affirmed a of this [so he accepts all of the five Arkan or the pillar of Islam] but then rejected the Resurrection, then he is a kafir by consensus and his blood and his wealth would be halal or lawful, just as He Azzawajal said or that Allah said, the meaning of which is, “Indeed, those who disbelieve in Allah and His Messengers, and wish to make a distinction between Allah and His Messengers, by saying “We believe in some of it and we reject others”, and wish to adopt a way in between, they are

**in truth disbelievers, and We have prepared for the disbelievers, a humiliating torment.” [4:150-151]**

So, Allah here rejected the Islam of anyone who accepted some of the Messengers and rejected some of them. So, it's not sufficient to accept one or two or some of them, rejecting one is rejecting all of them. Just like rejecting one part of the religion, is a rejection of the whole thing. You can't pick and choose. So, if one part is rejected, it's the same as, or almost the same as the whole religion was rejected.

Then he says,

فإذا كان الله قد صرح في كتابه : أن من آمن ببعض وكفر ببعض ، فهو الكافر حقا ، زالت هذه الشبهة ، وهذه هي التي ذكرها بعض أهل الأحساء في كتابه الذي أرسله إلينا

**“So, Allah has made it explicitly clear in His Book, that whoever believes in a part of it, and disbelieves in a part of it, then he is a kafir in truth, then this doubt comes to an end, and this doubt is the one the people of al-Ahsa mentioned in his book, that he sent to us.”**

So, the author here is talking about, in his time, when he was calling to Tawhid, some of the people around him rejected this, and they would write books, and they would write Risalah's and things like this to try and refute this da'wah, and one of the people who did this was someone who was from the town of al-Ahsa, or the city of al-Ahsa, and he brought up this misconceptions.

Then he says,

، ويقال أيضا : إذا كنت تقر أن من صدق الرسول (صلى الله عليه وسلم) في كل شيء وجد وجوب الصلاة ، فهو كافر حلال الدم و المال بالإجماع ، وكذلك إذا أقر بكل شيء إلا البعث . وكذلك لو جدد وجوب صوم رمضان وصدق بذلك كله

**“It can also be said, that if you affirm that the one who believes in the Messenger, that he believes in everything then rejected the obligation of the prayer, he is a kafir, whose blood and wealth become lawful by consensus, and likewise if he affirms everything except the Resurrection and likewise, if he rejects the obligation of fasting and believes in everything else...”**

So, he's going through again, the different types of things that a person might accept or reject, but it still wouldn't benefit him.

And he said,

لا تختلف المذاهب فيه ، وقد نطق به القرآن ، كما قدمنا فمعلوم : أن التوحيد هو أعظم فريضة جاء بها النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) وهو أعظم من الصلاة والزكاة والصوم والحج

**“The various schools of thought do not differ on this, since the Qur’an itself has spoken of this, thus it is known that Tawhid is the greatest obligation that the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) came with and it is greater than the prayer, the Zakat, the fasting and the Hajj.”**

So, here he’s saying or he’s explaining that, if someone rejected even the hajj, the fifth of the pillars, we know that the person would leave Islam. So, why would we then think that if someone did the four pillars then nullifies his Tawhid that somehow that would be...he still would be Muslim. By not doing the fifth of the five would remove someone from Islam, then why would we think that the first of the five of the pillars, it’d be fine to not have that fulfilled but you’d still be Muslim. So, that’s what the author is saying here.

Then he says,

فكيف إذا جحد الإنسان شيئاً من هذه الأمور كفر ، ولو عمل بكل ما جاء به الرسول (صلى الله عليه وسلم) ، وإذا جحد التوحيد الذي هو دين الرسال كلهم لا يكفر ؟ سبحان الله ، ما أعجب هذا الجهل

**“So, how can it be when a man rejects any of these matters, he disbelieves, even if he acts upon everything that the Messenger of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم) came with, and yet if he rejects Tawhid, that is the Deen of all the Messengers, he does not disbelieve. Subhan’Allah how amazing is this ignorance.”**

So, we know that the Anbiya’ would come with different Shari’ahs, but the basis of Shari’ah from every Prophet, was the Tawhid, so how could it be that, if someone performed the five salawat, and they gave the zakat, and they performed the fasting and the hajj, but they didn’t accept them from Islam, so they even did them, but not following or accepting some of these Shara’a, or some of these legislations would remove someone from Islam, even though these legislations would differ from Prophet to Prophet, but rejecting or nullifying the basis of the da’wah of this Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and every Messenger before him, somehow that would be acceptable.

Then he says,



و يقال - أيضا - هؤلاء أصحاب رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) قاتلوا بني حنيفة وقد أسلموا مع النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) وهم يشهدون أن لا إله إلا الله وأن محمد رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم)، ويؤذنون ويصلون

“It could also be said that those Companions of the Messenger of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم), that they fought Banu’ hanifah, and yet they had accepted Islam with the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), and they testified to La ilaha ila Allah, and that Muhammad was the Messenger of Allah and they prayed, and they would pronounce the adhan.”

So, here he is referring to Musaylamah al Kadhab and his people. They were from Banu Hanifah or the tribe of Banu’ Hanfifah. So, these people, some of them were in the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had actually accepted Islam during his time, yet despite this, when they followed Musaylamah, even though they still accepted the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) as a Prophet, when they followed another Prophet after him or claimed that someone else was a Prophet, the Sahabah fought them and declared them to be kuffar. So, that’s what he’s referring to here.

And he says,

فإن قال أنهم يقولون : أن مسيلمة نبي فقل : هذا هو المطلوب ، إذا كان من رفع رجلا إلى رتبة النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) كفر وحل ماله ودمه ، ولم تنفعه الشهادتان ، ولا الصلاة

“If the person tries to reply to this and says: “But they said that Musaylamah was a Prophet, then we say: “this is what we’re trying to get at” [so this reply is exactly what we want], for if a person raises a man to the level of a Prophet, disbelieves and his wealth and his blood becomes halal, and for whom the Shahadahtayn are of no benefit, nor the prayer...”

So, he’s saying now, if someone who took just a man and made him like a Prophet, that all of the things from Islam that he performed, wouldn’t benefit him, then what would we say about someone, who didn’t put someone at the level of Prophet but he puts someone at the level of an Ilah. Obviously, that would be much worse. So, he says,

فكيف بمن رفع شمسان - أو يوسف ، أو صحابياً أو نبياً - إلى مرتبة جبار السموات والأرض؟ سبحان الله ما أعظم شأنه

“So, how is it for the One who raises Shamsan and Yusuf or a Companion, or a Prophet to the level of the Jabbar of the Heavens and the Earth, subhan’Allah, how great is His affair.”

So, here he’s referring to someone named Shamsan, and someone named Yusuf, it’s not important to know exactly who they were, the important thing is that in the time of the author, they were people who the mushrikin took as Ilah or ‘Aliha. So, they would go to their

graves and they would make du'a to them, and they would make Thab'h around their graves and so on.

The point that he's trying to make is, if taking someone and saying he's a Prophet, would make every part of their Din useless, then how about someone who takes someone who's either a Prophet or less than a Prophet like a companion, or someone who isn't even a companion, and might even be a kafir, what if they take them, and put them at the level of Allah by worshipping them.

And then he says,

كَذَلِكَ يَطْبَعُ اللَّهُ عَلَى قُلُوبِ الَّذِينَ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ

**“Thus, does Allah seal the hearts of those who do not know.” [30:59]**

And then he says,

ويقال — أيضا — :الذين حرقهم علي بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنه بالنار كلهم يدعون الإسلام ، وهم من أصحاب علي ، وتعلموا العلم من الصحابة ، ولكن اعتقدوا في علي مثل الا اعتقاد في يوسف وشمسان

**“It is also said that those whom ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib (رضي الله عنه) burned with the fire, all of them claimed Islam, and they were the associates, or they were the Companions of ‘Ali (رضي الله عنه) and they acquired knowledge from the Companions. However, they believed concerning ‘Ali, a belief similar to what the people believe about Yusuf and Shamsan.”**

So, again, what he's saying is that during the time of ‘Ali, and this hadith is in Sahih al-Bukhari from Abdullah ibn ‘Abbas. During his time, people came to him and said, “you're Allah”, and this is the beginning or some of the ancestors of the *Rafidah* and more particularly the *Nusayriyyah*, so certain types of the Shi'a, they came to ‘Ali and said “you're Allah”.

So, ‘Ali dug a giant pit, or had a giant pit dug, and fires were lit in them and he threw them all in this fire as a punishment as what they were saying about him, as it was an insult to Allah.

All of these people claimed to be Muslim, they prayed, they would give the Zakat, they fast, they would make Hajj, they were from the companions of ‘Ali (رضي الله عنه) and they would take their knowledge from the Sahabah (رضي الله عنهم), yet despite this, they didn't say “well it's fine because you're claiming Islam” or “it's fine because you're praying”, none of this benefited them whatsoever.

So, then he says,

وأمثالهم ، فكيف أجمع الصحابة على قتلهم أظنون أن الصحابة يكفرون المسلمين ، أم  
تظنون أن الاعتقاد في تاج وأمثاله لا يضر ، و الا اعتقاد في علي بن أبي طالب يكفر

**“How then did the Companions agree upon their disbelief and in executing them. Do you think that the companions declared Muslims to be disbelievers or kuffar? Do you think that holding disbelief concerning Taj [and this is another person that some of the mushrikin would treat in a similar manner, that disbelief doesn’t harm them and yet holding disbelief about ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib is disbelief.”**

So, his point here is he’s saying, who’s better ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib, or someone who came after him who wasn’t from the Sahabah? Obviously, we would say ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib. We know that he’s the Sahabah, he was from the *Khulafa ash-Rashidin*, the fourth of them, we know that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) married his daughter Fatimah to him, we know that he promised him or gave him tidings that he’s in Jannah and so on and so on.

And we know that the virtues of ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib, they can be spoken about for hours and hours. So, if saying something like this was deserving of death according to the Sahabah, then what would we say about someone who said this about someone who came after them and go to their grave and say “he is Allah”, or “Allah entered his body”, or “he’s the embodiment of Allah on the earth”, or we can go to his grave and make du’a to him or thab’h for him, or he’ll help us if we need help and so on and so on.

Obviously, this one would be much worse who says this about ‘Ali, and even the one who said it about ‘Ali, he’s at some of the worst of creation. Then the author says,

**ويقال — أيضا — :- بنو عبيد القداح الذين ملكوا المغرب ومصر في زمان بني العباس**

**“It is also said that Bani Ubayd al-Qad’a... who are those who took over Morroco and Egypt during the time of Banu Abbas...”**

And we’ll talk about them right away...

So, he’s talking about a group of, and we’ll talk about them in a bit, a group of the kuffar who took over northern Africa, from who we call the Fathimiyyah.

**كلهم يشهدون أن لا إله إلا الله وأن محمدا رسول الله ، ويدعون الإسلام ، ، ويصلون  
الجمعة والجماعة فلما أظهروا مخالفة الشريعة في أشياء دون ما نحن فيه ، أجمع العلماء  
على كفرهم وقتالهم ، وأن بلادهم بلاد حرب ، وغزاهم المسلمون حتى استنفذوا ما  
بأيديهم من بلدان المسلمين**

**“...a group of them, all of them testified that there is none to be worshipped except Allah, and that Muhammad was the Messenger of Allah, and they claimed Islam, and they prayed Jumu’ah and Jama’ah however, when they manifested some opposition to the Shari’ah, so when they began to openly show opposition to the Shari’ah, different to**

**that which they are upon, the scholars reunited concerning their disbelief and fighting against them, and that their land had become a land of war or dar al-harb, and so the Muslims made expeditions against them until they delivered the lands of the Muslims from their hands.”**

So, he's saying here that Banu Ubayd al-Qad'a, who were this group who took over much of northern Africa, all of the scholars of the Muslimin at the time, they had performed consensus that these people weren't Muslim. Despite the fact that they said they were Muslim, they would establish and pray the Jumu'ah and the Jama'ah salat, so obviously all the five salawat, and they would do whatever they would do that would comply with the Shari'ah outwardly.

But despite this, the Muslimin...and we could go into lots of details about this situation, but the Muslimin said that they were kuffar, and that you had to fight them, and that if you weren't in the land, you couldn't go to that land, unless you were going there to fight them, and if you were in the land, you had to leave, the only time you didn't have to leave was if you were trying to stop them or if you couldn't leave for whatever reason.

So...and the whole area according to the scholars at the time was declared dar al-harb, so meaning that it was a land of kuffar at the time. So, obviously, the people who were living there weren't all kuffar, but the land itself, because it was being controlled by people who left Islam, the Muslimin, and the scholars at the time, declared it to be a land of war, meaning that it needed to be returned back to the Muslimin, even though all these people claimed to be upon Islam.

So, then the author continues and he says,

ويقال — أيضا — : إذا كان الأ ولون لم يكفروا ، إلا لأ نهم جمعوا بين الشرك وتكذيب  
تالرسول و القرآن ، وإنكار البعث ، وغير ذلك ، فما معنى الباب الذي ذكره العلماء في  
كل مذهب : باب حكم المرتد ، وهو المسلم الذي يكفر بعد إسلامه

**“And it could also be said that, when the very first ones did not disbelieve except due to their combining between shirk and disbelieving the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and the Qur'an, and the Resurrection and other matters, then what exactly is the meaning of the chapter of the scholars of every school of thought have mentioned, the chapter of the ruling upon an apostate. And this one [the apostate] is the one who disbelieves after his Islam.”**

So, his point here is he's saying that these people who say, anyone who says he's Muslim is a Muslim, regardless of what he does, regardless of what he says, regardless of what he believes, that it's impossible for him to ever leave Islam, and we can't say that anyone who says he's Muslim isn't Muslim, it could never ever be said at any point.

What's the point of the chapter that you'll find in almost every book of fiqh that talks about the rulings of an apostate, or the ruling of a murtad or someone who leaves Islam. If you can't leave Islam, why do scholars have books on how to deal with them, what's the ruling on them, what happens to their wealth, what happens to their marriage, how do they define what their kids are, if they have kids when they're in that state, all of these things. If it's not

possible for someone to leave Islam ever, why are scholars having chapters and chapters, and books talking about this matter.

Then he says,

ثم ذكروا أنوا عا كثيرة

**“Then they mentioned many types of disbelief.”**

So, they would go into this book and say “this is a type of disbelief” and show that if someone does, says or believes these things, that they’ve left Islam.

Then he says,

كل نوع منهما يكفر و يحل دم الر جل وماله ، حتى إنهم ذكروا أشياء يسيرة عند من فعلها  
مثل كلمة يذكرها بلسانه دون قلبه ، أو كلمة يذكرها على وجه المزح واللعب ،

**“Everyone of which necessitates disbelief, and makes lawful a person’s blood and his wealth, until they even mentioned some matters that would be considered very light to the one who committed them. Such as statements he makes with his tongue as opposed to his heart, or a word that he says out of jest and playing around.”**

So, his point here is that if you look at the books of fiqh, depending on which madhab, they would mention certain things that would remove a person from Islam, but if someone said or did them, many people would think what’s the big deal with that, what’s the harm in that. So, for example, putting on a necklace that has a cross on it, someone would say all you did was put something on your neck.

There’s a consensus that, that would remove you from Islam. Imitating leaders of kuffar, so for example, if a person dressed like a priest. Someone would say, “Oh I was just doing it out of a joke”, this is another thing that the scholars have talked about that would remove someone from Islam. So, even things like this that wouldn’t come across someone’s mind. Scholars have talked about what to do with a person who does these types of things.

Then the author says,

ويقال — أيضا — : الذين قال الله فيهم : حَلَفُونَ بِاللَّهِ مَا قَالُوا وَلَقَدْ قَالُوا كَلِمَةَ الْكُفْرِ  
وَكَفَرُوا بَعْدَ إِسْلَامِهِمْ

**“It is also said that those about whom Allah said, “They swear by Allah that they said nothing [meaning that they didn’t do anything wrong], but really they said the word of disbelief and they disbelieved after their acceptance of Allah.” [9:74]**

So, he's saying here that these people were saying, we didn't even say anything wrong but Allah is saying, yes they did and this statement or the statements that they made, so these people at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) had actually left Islam with this statement that they didn't even see to be something that was wrong.

Then he says,

أما سمعت الله كفرهم بكلمة ، مع كونهم في زمن رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم)  
ويجاهدون معه ويصلون ويذكرون ويحجون ويوحدون

**“Have you not heard that Allah declared them to be disbelievers by a mere word that they uttered, alongside their being from the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and their having fought alongside with him, and prayed with him, and given Zakat, and made Hajj, and they had Tawhid.”**

So, he's saying that, these people who Allah said this about, they claimed Islam, they prayed with the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), they gave the Zakat, they fasted, they made Hajj, they fought with the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) against the kuffar, but when they said something, or they said a word, that they didn't even see was a big deal, Allah declared that they weren't Muslim anymore.”

And he says,

وكذلك الذين قال الله فيهم : قُلْ أَبِاللهِ وَآيَاتِهِ وَرَسُولِهِ كُنْتُمْ تَسْتَهْزِئُونَ لَا تَعْتَذِرُوا قَدْ كَفَرْتُمْ  
بَعْدَ إِيمَانِكُمْ

**“And likewise, those whom about Allah said, “Was it at Allah and his Ayat, and His Messenger that you were mocking, make no excuse, you have disbelieved after you have believed.” [9:65-66]**

So, here Allah is telling us, these people, they were only mocking, they weren't saying anything that they really believed in. They weren't saying that, “we believe that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) is such and such”, or “the Sahabah are such and such”, or “the Qur'an is such and such.”

They were saying things to just pass the time, and they were making jokes, but Allah judged upon them is that they have disbelieved, and their excuse that, “we were only joking”, doesn't benefit them, and Allah didn't accept it from them, but He didn't say “you weren't joking”. So, this is an important thing.

So, people might say “maybe they weren't joking, maybe they really believed it.” But when they said, these people were mocking the Sahabah and the Qur'a of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), they were joking, they didn't actually believe bad things about the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), because when they said we were only joking, Allah didn't say “No, you weren't

joking”, He said “don’t give any excuses, you have disbelieved after your Iman.” So, this excuse that you’re giving isn’t going to benefit you, so this is the point of this verse.

Then the author continues, he says,

فهو لا ء الذين صرح الله فيهم أنهم كفروا بعد إيمانهم وهم مع رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) في غزوة تبوك

“So, those who were with the Messenger of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in the expedition of Tabuk...”

And this is referring to when this verse came down, this was mentioned by Ibn Jarir and Ibn Hatim, that this verse came down at the time of Tabuk.

And he says,

قالوا كلمةً ذكروا أنهم قالوها على وجه المزح فتأمل هذه الشبهة وهي قولهم :تكفرون من المسلمين ناسا يشهدون أن لا إله إلا الله ويصلون ويصومون ؟ .ثم تأمل جوابها ، فإنه من أنفع ما في هذه الأوراق

“...about whom Allah made it clear that they have disbelieved after having faith, they uttered a word and then they mentioned it was only out of jest or only out of joking, so reflect upon this doubt which is their saying, you declare it to be disbelievers, those from the Muslims who’d say La ilaha ila Allah, and who pray and fast, and reflect upon its answer for it is amongst the most beneficial in what is in these papers.”

Then he says,

ومن الدليل على ذلك – أيضا - ما حكى الله عن بني إسرائيل – مع إسلامهم وعملهم وصلاحهم

“And the proofs for what we have mentioned is contained in the description of Allah or what He gave about Bani Isra’il, even though they were Muslims...”

So, he’s talking about the story of Musa (على آله الصلاة والسلام) and his companions, who were obviously Muslims, they were following their Prophet, and they had knowledge and piety.

أنهم قالوا لموسى اجعل لنا إلهًا كما لهم إلهة

“So, they asked Musa or they said to Musa, **“Or make a god for us as they have a god.”** [7:138]



So, if we look to the story of Bani Isra'il, their story in the Qur'an, that Allah mentions that when they were with Musa (عليه السلام), they passed by a people who were staying around or they were making I'tikaf, or they were staying around some idols that they had, they said to Musa, "make a god for us like they have a god." Then we know that Musa made 'Inkar and he rebuked them, so he's saying that this is another similar thing. We know that they were with their Prophet, we know that they were Muslim, but they we know that they weren't in a good situation after they said this.

Then he says,

وقول أناس من الصحابة : إجعل لنا ذات أنواط فحلف النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) أن هذا نظير قول بني إسرائيل اجعل لنا إلها ولكن للمشركين شبهة [أخرى] يدلون بها عند هذه القصة ، وهي أنهم يقولون : إن بني إسرائيل لم يكفروا بذلك وكذلك الذين قالوا للنبي صلى الله عليه وسلم : (إجعل لنا ذات أنواط لم يكفروا

**"Also, some of the companions said, "Make for us O Messenger of Allah, Dhaat Anwat." So, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) swore that their statement was similar to that of Bani Isra'il, "make for us a god." But the mushrikin have an argument that they use to try to refute the proper understanding of this story, and that is that they say, that Bani Isra'il did not become disbelievers by their actions, neither did the Companions when they asked the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) for Dhaat Anwat."**

And he says,

فالجواب : أن نقول : إن بني إسرائيل لم يفعلوا ذلك ، وكذلك الذين سألوا النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) لم يفعلوا ذلك

**"We respond by stating, Bani Isra'il did not actually do this act and likewise nor did the Companions..."**

So, he's saying here that when Bani Isra'il asked for this, Musa (عليه السلام) didn't give it to them and it wasn't legislated for them, so they never followed through with it.

And he says,

ولا خلاف أن بني إسرائيل لو فعلوا ذلك لكفروا

**"There's not difference of opinion if Bani Isra'il went ahead with this act..."**

Meaning that they took a god with Allah, then they would have become disbelievers."

وكذلك لا خلاف في أن الذين نهاهم النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) - لو لم يطيعوه ، واتخذوا ذات أنواط بعد نهيه - لكفروا ، وهذا هو المطلوب ولكن هذه القصة تفيد : أن المسلم - بل العالم - قد يقع في أنواع من الشرك لا يدري عنها

“...Likewise, there’s no difference of opinion if the Companions disobeyed the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) when he prohibited them and instead had taken a Dhaat Anwat after this prohibition, then they would have become disbelievers and this is the point. But this story has a number of benefits that we can derive from it. The first of these is that a Muslim, even if he is a scholar, might fall into some types of shirk while he is unaware.”

So, if we look at this, these were companions of Musa and these were companions of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم). Despite this, they asked for something that was wrong. So, this idea that anything a scholar does can’t be wrong, and we have to accept it, “he wouldn’t have done it if it was wrong”, how often do we hear that or “he wouldn’t say something that wasn’t correct”, if the Sahabah could be mistaken, to the point where the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) declared their statement to be almost like Bani Isra’il or exactly like Bani Isra’il said, “make a god for us like they have a god”, what do we expect from people after the Sahabah, but we give them more of an excuse. So, this is the first benefit that the author says.

فتفيد التعلم والتحرز، ومعرفة أن قول الجاهل التوحيد فهمناه: أن هذا من أكبر الجاهل ومكايد الشيطان

“A second benefit, is to teach us to and to warn us, so we realise that an ignorant person’s statement, we understand Tawhid is of the greatest types of ignorance, rather it is a plot of the Shaytan.”

So, he’s saying that, if the Sahabah, because they were new in Islam, had misconceptions about Tawhid, and the Sahabah of Musa, had misconceptions, despite the fact that they were with the Prophet, they were with the person on Earth who Allah sent this knowledge to, so they were there when it was being revealed, they could have misconceptions about Tawhid, why would we think that someone after them from the scholars can’t have a misconception, or even worse someone who has never picked up a book, never sat through a lesson, he understands Tawhid, and he’s in a good space and he doesn’t have to put in any effort in learning his religion.

He says,

وتفيد – أيضا أن المسلم المجتهد إذا تكلم بكلام كفر – وهو لا يدري – فنبه على ذلك فتأب (من ساعته ، أنه لا يكفر ، كما فعل ، والذين سألوا النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم

“And a third benefit, if a Muslim strives to understand the truth and utters a statement of disbelief, without realising that it is disbelief, then it is pointed out to him and he repents immediately, such a person has not committed disbelief, and this is what

occurred with Bani Isra'il and the Companions when they asked the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).”

So, he's saying here that, if someone does their best to learn and he does something that's wrong, even if it was kufr, if it was something that there was a misunderstanding about, and as soon as they clarify it to them and they stop it and go back to the truth, they don't leave Islam.

So, this idea that people might say, “you're saying that every Muslim is disbeliever”, or “there's no excuses” or “no-one can make a mistake”, this is completely wrong. We're saying that if it's something that a mistake is acceptable in or if it's possible that someone can make a mistake and then they turn away from the mistake, when the knowledge comes to them, of course they wouldn't leave Islam, because they're doing their best in trying to learn what is correct from the Qur'an and the Sunnah, and they're trying to follow Tawhid.

And then he says,

وتفيد – أيضا - أنه لو لم يكفر ، فإنه يغلط عليه الكلام شديدا ، كما فعل رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم)

**“And the final benefit is that even if a person does not enter into disbelief, he should be rebuked and reprimanded severely as the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did.”**

So, this is the last point, benefit that he mentions from this hadith, that even if someone does something wrong, and we say he had an excuse so he doesn't leave Islam, or he had an excuse so he's not deserving of punishment, it doesn't mean that we say it's fine what he said, or that we can't say anything wrong to him, or we can't be harsh with the person to an extent that we show him what he said was actually wrong.

So, this idea that we don't want to tell anyone anything because we don't want to offend them, this isn't the point. The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) what did he say to the Sahabah, the best of creation after the Prophets, “by Allah, you've said exactly what Bani Isra'il said to Musa”. So, he didn't say, “you're new in Islam, I'll let it go”, he was very harsh with them to an extent that it was acceptable.

So, this is the final point that the author mentions, so this is the final issue on this ninth misconception. So, this is the end of the authors words, next week I'll add a few points and clarify a few issues from this, and then we'll have finished the second part of the book. So, insha'Allah we'll stop there. Wallahu A'lam.

Note: Sh. Haytham Sayfaddīn (may Allāh reward him) misunderstood the statement (at the end of his sharh #15), as Imam Muhammad Ibn 'Abdīl-Wahhāb stated elsewhere that this is considered a statement of minor shirk/minor kufr by his statement "kufr", and they become kuffār due to opposing the command of the prophets, not due to the statement turning from minor to major kufr. [May Allah reward the one who pointed this out]

## Lesson 16:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

Last week, we read the ninth and final Shubuha' that the Imam, that the author of this book mentioned and what this Shubuha' was or essentially the summary of what the Shubuha' was, or this misconception, was that, anyone who says La ilaha ila Allah, he can never...essentially he can never leave Islam, he can never be considered non-Muslim, as long as he says La ilaha ila Allah. Despite what he says, despite what he does, even despite what he believes in his heart, as long as someone says on their tongue, La ilaha ila Allah, that this is something that would prevent them from ever leaving Islam, or prevent them from ever being thought of as disbelievers or anything like this.

So, this was what the author mentioned, and we finished reading it, so now just going to add a bit of extra comments to it where some things are needed. So, firstly, this Shubuha' or this misconception, the author himself called it, or he said that it's the greatest misconception, or from all the Shubuhah, it's the greatest of them.

The reason for this is it's the most widespread misconception, it was in the time of the Salaf, or the later Salaf it began, and it continued up until the time of the author, and it even continues to our time today, and it's the biggest misconception when it comes to Islam and kufr. It's the biggest misconception when it comes to what's called Musallam Iman, or the reality of Iman. It's the biggest misconception on this topic, because people think or they read certain ahadith, such as when the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said,

*"Whoever's last words in the dunya is La ilaha ila Allah, that he'll enter Jannah."*

Or that, *"Whoever says La ilaha ila Allah sincerely from his heart, that he'll enter Jannah,"* and so on.

So, they'll assume that anyone who says this, they can then worship anyone besides Allah, or they can claim that someone is a Prophet besides the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), and they can reject things from the Qur'an and so on and so on, but because they say La ilaha ila Allah, that they still remain your brother in religion and they still remain a Muslim. And alhamdulillah, the author, he mentioned a number of evidences against this misconception.

Just to mention that this misconception was spread during his time as well, and it was one of the main ones that was spread. Some of the main opponents of this da'wah spread this misconception, and from the first people who spread this was someone named Sulayman ibn Suhaim an-Najdi. He was the first one or he wrote books and letters about this misconception and tried to state that anyone who considers that someone could leave Islam, even if they say La ilaha ila Allah, that they're not from Ahlus-Sunnah and even worse.

And also, this was also spread by al-Qabbani and we talked about this person before, in his book, *"Faslil Kitab"* and Ibn Afalaqal al-Ihsa'I and that he claimed that people who follow

this idea, meaning that someone could leave Islam, they're considered all of the Ummah to be non-Muslims.

So, this is how far people take things, if you say someone could actually leave Islam if they swear at Allah, or if they worship other than Allah, instead of people looking at this and saying, "yes this makes sense because there's evidence from the Qur'an and the Sunnah and so on", they say that, "if you say this, you're considering the whole Ummah to be not Muslim", and they make these ridiculous, outrageous statements, because if you were to sit down with someone and discuss this topic based upon evidence of the Qur'an and the Sunnah, there'd be no way to refute it, there'd be no way to reject this idea. So, instead they make wild accusations as a means to get people away from those who are calling to the correct Tawhid.

So, just to talk about what the author mentioned, as we've been doing with each one of these misconceptions, we go through what the author said, and the steps that he mentioned as far as refuting or discussing this misconception.

So, the first thing is if someone says, "Whoever says La ilaha ila Allah, can never be considered a non-Muslim."

The first thing that we would say to him, is "what do you say about someone who accepts some of the Qur'an and rejects the other part?, so for example if he says, the first-half I accept it, the second-half, I don't accept it, it's not from Allah and Allah didn't speak these words, the first-half is and the second-half isn't." Obviously, any Muslim would say that this person isn't a Muslim, he's a kafir. Even if he prays, even if he does such and such, how can someone reject half of the Qur'an and still say that he's Muslim. So, this is something that any Muslim would agree to.

The next thing would be to say, what about someone who accepts Tawhid, so they say, "I believe La ilaha ila Allah but they reject the Salat, and reject the Zakat, and the fasting, and the Hajj and the Umrah and so on and so on. So, I accept the idea of Tawhid, but each of these things, I don't accept them, that they're from Islam." Obviously, again, we would say that this person isn't Muslim. How can you reject the four of the five pillars of Islam, but say because I accept the first one, I'm still Muslim. So, obviously this is something that would be agreed upon as well.

The next step is to say, "What if someone accepts Tawhid, and the Salat, but they reject the Zajat, the fasting and the Hajj." Obviously, because, so far each one of these things are based on rejecting some and accepting some. So, they would say, "No, of course that person can't be Muslim. How can you reject three of the five and still be Muslim, obviously."

And then, after that, you would take them to the next step and say...and you could walk them down each one to the point where you get to the Hajj. So, obviously if someone said, "Hajj isn't from Islam, I don't accept it, but I accept the other four pillars", this person wouldn't be Muslim either, because how can you reject one of the five, and it's the one that Allah said,

وَلِلَّهِ عَلَى النَّاسِ حِجُّ الْبَيْتِ مَنِ اسْتَطَاعَ إِلَيْهِ سَبِيلًا ۚ وَمَنْ كَفَرَ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ غَنِيٌّ عَنِ الْعَالَمِينَ

Or that, **“Allah has the duty of Hajj upon whoever is able to do so, and whoever disbelieves then indeed Allah is un-needing of all of the ‘Alamin [or all of the creation].”**  
[3:97]

So, Allah called the ones who don't accept Hajj, the ones who didn't follow it as the author mentioned in the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), he said that they've disbelieved, and we know, if we look at there's a narration from one of the Tabi'in, Ikrimah, he said that this was at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), that the Jews, when Allah revealed the statement,

وَمَنْ يَبْتَغِ غَيْرَ الْإِسْلَامِ دِينًا فَلَنْ يُقْبَلَ مِنْهُ

Or that, **“Or whoever seeks a religion other than Islam won't be accepted from him.”**  
[3:85]

That the Jews said, “We're the Muslims” meaning that we follow our Prophet and we're claiming to be Muslims. But then they rejected the Hajj, they refused to perform the Hajj, because we know that the Hajj was never from...or the Jews at the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), they never performed Hajj. We know Quraysh did because they considered themselves to be upon the Ibrahim (عليه السلام), but they still considered this to be from their rights, meaning the rights and rituals from their religion. But the Jews didn't, so then Allah revealed,

وَلِلَّهِ عَلَى النَّاسِ حِجُّ الْبَيْتِ مَنِ اسْتَطَاعَ إِلَيْهِ سَبِيلًا ۚ وَمَنْ كَفَرَ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ غَنِيٌّ عَنِ الْعَالَمِينَ

Or that, **“Allah has the duty of Hajj upon whoever is able to do so, and whoever disbelieves then indeed Allah is un-needing of all of the ‘Alamin [or all of the creation].”**  
[3:97]

So, Ikrimah, the Tabi'in, said that when they made this claim, Allah revealed this verse telling them that this claim that you're Muslims, it's not accepted because your refuse to perform Hajj. So, if this is the case for Hajj, then obviously we know that all five of these pillars need to be accepted. Then the author used for evidence for this idea or for this belief,

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَكْفُرُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَرُسُلِهِ وَيُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يُفَرِّقُوا بَيْنَ اللَّهِ وَرُسُلِهِ وَيَقُولُونَ نُؤْمِنُ بِبَعْضٍ وَنَكْفُرُ بِبَعْضٍ وَيُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يَتَّخِذُوا بَيْنَ ذَلِكَ سَبِيلًا أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ حَقًّا

Or that Allah said, **“Indeed, those who disbelieve in Allah and His Messengers, and they want to differentiate between Allah and His Messengers, and they say, “We believe in**

some of it, and we disbelieve in some of it,” and they want to take a path in between one of the two [meaning they’re not going to reject it all, and they’re not going to accept it all, they want to go somewhere in between] Indeed those are the true disbelievers.” [4:150-151]

So, Allah didn’t say because there’s some people who reject everything, accepting some and rejecting some is better. Allah said,

أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ حَقًّا

“Those are the true disbelievers.”

So, this is the evidence that the author was using this belief of Ahlus-Sunnah wa’l-Jama’ah. Then he said, or then if we look at his words, we can say that he said that after proving this point to these people, so walking them through and saying, “You don’t accept someone to be Muslim if they reject this or they reject this...” So, you walk them through the five pillars.

Then, after that we would say, “You [meaning these people], you say that if someone says La ilaha ila Allah, and he prays and he fasts but they don’t perform Tawhid [meaning that they perform shirk with Allah, they ask other than Allah, for things that’s only from Allah’s rights, and they perform acts of worship for other than Allah] so, even based upon the things that you’ve accepted [meaning that if you accept some and reject someone that you’re not Muslim] even by your own words, by your own rules that you’ve accepted, you’re not Muslims, because you’re rejecting the first of the five.”

So, we know that the first of the five of the pillars is saying La ilaha ila Allah Muhammadur Rasullulah, and in some of the narrations, it’s that you have Tawhid with Allah, so how could we say that, if you’ve accepted that if someone rejects the Zakat, but accepts all the other ones, that he wouldn’t be Muslim, but somehow these people are saying we’re going to reject the first one, we’re not even going to follow the first one, that somehow this person could still be Muslim. Obviously, even by their own rules, they’re bearing witness or they’re testifying upon themselves.

The second step is what they call “*Qiyas al-Awla*” or it’s Qiyas or it’s an analogy that’s based upon a better example. So, what does this mean, we would say that, what would we say about someone who says that, after the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), there was another Prophet?

Obviously, this is a consensus, no-one would dispute that this type of person wouldn’t be Muslim, he would leave Islam. We know that this was the case with the Ahmadiyyah, who claim that there was a Prophet after the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in Punjab and India and so on, and any groups like this, they claim that there’s a Prophet after the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), there’s no dispute of all the Muslims from their time up until now, that these people aren’t Muslim.

So, if this is the case with someone who claims that there’s a Prophet with the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), what would be the case with someone who’s claiming through their action, that there’s a God with Allah? If this level, doing an act of this level is kufr and would take someone out of Islam, how could it be that doing an act that’s this high and how evil it is,



wouldn't take someone out of Islam. Obviously, any normal human being would say, if one thing is bad, there's something that goes further, that things worse, it would take at least the same ruling, if not worse.

So, this is the second step, because even they accept that, if someone reject the Resurrection or that Allah will resurrect all of the creation, or all the human beings and the jinn on the Day of Judgement, if someone rejected this and said there's no afterlife, obviously this person wouldn't be Muslim. So, what if someone isn't even performing the most basic aspect of Tawhid that every Prophet was sent to teach their people. So, this is the second.

The third step is giving examples of when the 'Ulama' and when the scholars of the Ummah, considered people who did these actions to not to be Muslims. So, he gives a number of examples. The first one that he gave was, Banu' Hanifah, who were the followers of Musaylamah al-Khadab, and we talked a little bit about him last week.

Musaylamah al-Khadab, was someone who, during the time of the Prophet (ﷺ), he lied that he was a Prophet. And we know that in the time of the Prophet (ﷺ), this taghut, and this false Prophet sent a letter to the Prophet (ﷺ) saying, "From Musaylamah the Messenger of Allah to Muhammad the Messenger of Allah", so here we see, up until our time today, so 1400 years, where we get the name Musaylamah al-Khadab. The Prophet (ﷺ) wrote back, and we know that Allah said about him,

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ ۖ إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ

**"He doesn't speak anything of his desire, indeed it is only a revelation that's being revealed." [53:3-4]**

The Prophet (ﷺ) wrote back and said, "From Muhammad the Messenger of Allah to Musaylamah the liar or the extreme liar". Al-Khadab is different from Al-Khadib, so it's an extreme liar. Someone who lies often, or makes great lies.

So, we see here that the Prophet (ﷺ) wrote back, rejected this claim of his, and we know that the Sahabah (رضي الله عنهم) as this is what the author's talking about, they fought against Musaylamah, and they fought against all of his false followers, and they treated them as apostates, or disbelievers, or people who had left Islam, and they didn't treat them as regular kuffar, because the murtaddin, if we look at, what they call "*Hurub ar-riddah*", or "The wars of apostasy", that were fought by Abu Bakr (رضي الله عنه) and the Sahabah with him at the time, we see that they dealt with them differently then they dealt with the Yahud, or the Jews, or the Christians or the Nasara at the time.

There was different rulings in how the Sahabah dealt with them. So, for example, when it comes to fighting someone who isn't Muslim, but they, for example they're a Jew or Christian, there's specific rulings for them.

So, for example, when it comes to, if they're going to give up, or if they're captured, at this point, if it's an apostate, it still becomes obligatory upon you to execute those prisoners, as opposed to if it is someone who's originally a non-Muslim. Also, there's a difference between a Muslim who's fighting another Muslim, for example what they call "Bughat" or

the transgressors, or rebels, so if a Muslim group is fighting against Muslimin, they have specific rulings.

For example, if a Muslim is rebelling against the Muslim authority, and he flees, he runs away, you're not allowed to chase him. If he's injured on the ground, you can't finish him off and say "he's fighting us, we're going to finish him off as a lesson to him," you can't do that. You can't touch their wealth, there's many other rulings with regards to when you're fighting Muslims who are fighting against you because you're the authority, as opposed to apostates, people who are claiming Islam but aren't actually Muslims.

So, if we look at how the Sahabah (رضي الله عنهم), and this wasn't just any of the Sahabah, we know that it was Abu Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthman, 'Ali, Abu Hurayrah, major Sahabah, because this was right after the death of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), so the vast majority of the Sahabah and the scholars, were still around or at least still reachable with regards to their opinions. So, they dealt with them, despite the fact that they were claiming La ilaha ila Allah, and they even claimed that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), was a Prophet. They just said, there's also this other idiot, piece of garbage, that is claiming Prophethood with him, despite this, look how they treated him. So, this is the first evidence, or the first example that he gives.

The second is that he says, or he refers to, those who believe that 'Ali ibn Abi Talib (رضي الله عنه) was Allah. So, this took place in the time of 'Ali (رضي الله عنه). They came to him and they said, "You are Him", meaning you are Allah, and this hadith is in Sahih al-Bukhari, that 'Ali (رضي الله عنه) called for a large pit to be dug, and they lit large fires in them, and he threw them all in it. So, despite the fact that these people were saying La ilaha ila Allah, and they were claiming to be Muslims, and the person who they were raising at an high status was 'Ali (رضي الله عنه).

We know that he's from the family of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), he's the cousin of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم); his son-in-law that he married Fathimah (رضي الله عنها) too. We know that he's from the 10 that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) gave specific news too that they're in Jannah. And we know that his virtues are many, but despite this, look how he dealt with them. And they were saying it about him, it wasn't like they were saying it about an enemy of his. He built a fire, and he threw them in it, and none of the Sahabah rejected this from him, as far as executing them, all they disputed with was, how he did it.

So in Sahih al-Bukhari, Abdullah ibn 'Abbas (رضي الله عنه), he said or he came to 'Ali and he said, "If it was me, I would have just executed them because I heard the Messenger of Allah (صلى الله عليه وسلم) say, "Do not punish with the punishment of Allah." So, Ibn 'Abbas (رضي الله عنه) didn't say to 'Ali, "What are you doing?", these people claim Islam, how can you touch them. He said, "If it was me, I wouldn't have done it this way because the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said this, I would have just executed them as the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, "Whoever changes his religion, then execute him."

So, this famous hadith that everyone knows from Ibn 'Abbas, there's a story behind it and the reason he was mentioning it was to 'Ali (رضي الله عنه), to explain to him that the punishment with fire, shouldn't be done in the dunya. It's only for Allah in the Akhirah. So, this is second example that he gives.

The third is he says, Bani ‘Ubaydd, these people would call themselves the Fatimiyyah or the Fatimmin, and they were a group that took over Egypt and Northern Africa, and the scholars of Islam were unanimous at the time in considering them to be out of Islam, to the point that Ibn Taymiyyah said that they were from the worst of the creation, and they were more in misguidance and more in evil than the Jews and the Christians.

So, he gave this example to the point where the Maliki scholars at the time, and this is from al-Qadi ‘Iyyad, he has a book in which he collected many of the fatawa of the scholars of the Malikiyyah in Northern Africa. He was asked or he mentioned a story in which one of the Maliki Imams was asked, what do we say about a person who says on the mimbar, that he gets up on the Mimbar and he says, or he praises Allah and then he sends the salat and the salam upon the Prophet (ﷺ) and then after that he said, “O Allah give victory or O Allah preserve or set something nice or something good about their hakm at the time”, so the leader of Banu Ubbayd or the leader of the Fathimiyyah.

So, he said, this Imam he said, “What would you say about someone who stood up on the mimbar and said good things about Allah, and sent the salat and the salam upon the Prophet (ﷺ) then he said Abu Jahl is in Jannah. So on the mimbar, what would you say about a person like this? Everyone said, he would be a kafir, he wouldn’t be a Muslim. So, he said, this person is worse than Abu Jahl. So, not only did they consider, the people who were claiming Islam to be non-Muslim, they considered the person who made du’a for them to also be a non-Muslim.

This is how severe these ‘Ulama’ held this issue to be. And who were these people? Bani ‘Ubbayd. They were people who, they took many of the Hudud of Allah, or the prescribed penalties and they had done away with them, and they said we’re not going to implement them anymore, and they invented many laws that they began to implement and so on and so on. So, most of their outward disbelief was because they were decommissioning the Shari’ah, and not implementing the Shari’ah, and bringing laws other than it.

So, if this was something to the point where the Imams of the Maliki madhab at time said, even the one who makes du’a for them to stay healthy and so on, would leave Islam, what would we say about the person who’s not making du’a for them, but the person himself is doing it, and then on top of that, someone who’s not only leaving the Shari’ah of Allah, that he’s worshipping other than Allah. Obviously, each one is a worst step than the other, to the point where it’s impossible that someone could claim any ignorance on it, because it’s such an easy or such an obvious matter.

Another point is if we look at...everyone talks about when they mention the wisdom of Abu Bakr (رضي الله عنه), they often mention a story in which he was disputing with ‘Umar ibn Khattab about the people who had rejected the Zakat at the time of Abu Bakr, and Abu Bakr considered them non-Muslims, and ‘Umar at first, how can you fight them and so on.

So, the whole story is that Abu Hurayrah, he said, “When the Prophet (ﷺ) passed away and Abu Bakr succeeded him and he took the authority over the Prophet (ﷺ), and those from the Arab who disbelieved, ‘Umar said, “How can you fight the people when the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said, “I was commanded to fight the people until they say La ilaha ila Allah, and if they say La ilaha ila Allah, or whoever says La ilaha ila Allah then he’s protected from me, his wealth and his blood and his self, except in its right [so the right of the Shahadah], and his reckoning is with Allah.”

So, Abu Bakr said, “By Allah, I will fight everyone or anyone who disputes or who differentiates between the Salat and the Zakat...[so meaning they perform one and they reject or they don’t perform the other], because indeed the Zakat is the right of the wealth and by Allah if they were too refuse to pay on...[there’s different narrations, one that it’s a type of animal and one is that it’s the reigns or the thing you hold the animal with] ...that which they used to give to the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم), I would fight them for refusing it.”

So, ‘Umar said, “By Allah, it wasn’t except that I saw that Allah had opened Abu Bakr’s heart to the matter or to the fighting except that I knew it was the truth.”

So, the point here is if we look at how the Sahabah (رضي الله عنهم) fought these people, they fought them the exact same way that they fought the ones who claimed that Musaylamah was a Prophet. And we’ll see that the ones who claimed that Tulayhah al-Asadi was a Prophet. So, they dealt with these people as non-Muslims, despite the fact that they said La ilaha ila Allah, they accepted the Salat, they prayed, many of them accepted that Zakat was wajib to begin with, they just didn’t want to pay it anymore. Some said, because it’s not from Islam. Some said because the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was like a king, he’s not around anymore, we don’t owe it to him anymore, and the others just refused to pay it for no reason, they didn’t give a reason.

Abu Bakr, and ‘Umar, and ‘Uthman and ‘Ali and all the Sahabah, they didn’t go to them and say, “why aren’t you paying it? Is it because you don’t think it’s from Islam? Is it because you’re cheap?”, they didn’t check what’s the reason. They said this is part of Islam, Allah in many Ayat in the Qu’ran, made Zakat a part of Iman, and a part that’s required for Iman, so they fought them this way. Despite the fact that they claimed to be Muslimin.

And the last story, is a story that I’ll mention that it’s narrated that, the delegation of Bouzaka came from Azad and Ghatfan [so this is from some of the tribes that claimed there was a Prophet after the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)], they came to him and said or they were asking for a Sulh, or a truce from Abu Bakr, because this is when Abu Bakr and the Sahabah were fighting them, and it was to the point that the Sahabah were clearly winning and these people were giving up.

So, the narrator says, “He gave them a choice between what he called, a bankrupting war or a humiliating peace.” So, these people are coming and giving up, and Tulayhah al-Asadi, it’s important to know, he was originally from the Sahabah, he was from the Sahabah of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), after the death of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), he claimed to be a Prophet as well. Alhamdulillah, later on he came back to Islam, he made tawbah from his claim that he was the Prophet, and he fought alongside the Muslimin, he fought in a war with Khalid ibn Walid, and he made ‘Umrah and so on and so on. So, alhamdulillah in the end, he returned to Islam.

But, if we look at this, so Abu Bakr gave them this choice. So, they said, this bankruptcy, we know what it is, because we’re in the middle of a war, it’s going terribly for them, they’re fighting against the Sahabah of the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم), they know what it is, but they say, “what is this humiliating thing that you’re giving us a choice?”

So, Abu Bakr said, “We will take all of your weapons and your riding animals away from you, and we will keep what we took from you as spoils of you, and you will return to us what you took from us.”

And then he continued, “And you will pay the blood-money for all the Muslims that you killed, and your dead will be in the Fire, and you will left as a people who are left to just follow the tails of camels until Allah shows the Khalifah of His Messenger and His muhajirin, a matter that they can give you an excuse for.”

So, meaning that, you’ll just be left, all you can do is work in the desert, you can work as farmers and so on, and you’ll have no weapons or you’ll have no weapons, have no ‘Izzah or no nobility, you’re nothing anymore, you can be Muslimin...until Allah lets his Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم)’s Khalifah see something that your tawbah was real, it wasn’t just that you still believe what you believe and you still do what you do, but you just didn’t want to lose the war. When it becomes known that you were sincere, then you can join the society again.

So, then after this, Abu Bakr took this opinion to the Sahabah. So, what was the reaction? ‘Umar stood and up and he said, “you’ve given your opinion and we’ll advise you with regards to it, as to what you mentioned... [so, he mentioned the first two things, he didn’t have any problem with it]...the first things that you mentioned was good except that you said, they will [meaning the kuffar, the people that are making tawbah] when you have to pay for our dead, and your dead are in the fire, our dead were fighting for La ilaha ila Allah, and they were fighting in a matter for Allah, so their ‘ajr is with Allah, it doesn’t take any blood-money.”

Then the narrator says, “So all of the Sahabah at the time agreed with what ‘Umar said.”

So, all of these matters, we see how the Sahabah dealt with them, in the war they dealt with them as people who had left Islam, despite the fact with whatever they claimed, even after they came to make tawbah, they didn’t say “you’re Muslim”, because of that kufr that was performed, they still dealt with them in such a harsh manner, until it became known that it was very sincere from them. But even the ones that were killed, what did they say? “Your dead, they’re in the Fire”, they didn’t say, “We don’t know, maybe they had an excuse, we can’t say anything”. They said, “Your dead, they’re in the Fire.” And there’s tens of thousands up to hundred thousand of the people, depending on the book of history you pick or read from, that it’s says that this was the number of these people.

So, we see that all of these examples, were people who claimed Islam, performed many of the fundamental acts of Islam, such as Salat and Zakat and so on. Some didn’t pay the Zakat, some claimed that there was a Prophet with the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), some claimed that ‘Ali (رضي الله عنه) was Allah, others rejected or they refused to implement the Shari’ah and so on, but despite all of this, we see that the Sahabah and the ‘Ulama’ after them dealt with them as non-Muslims despite their claim.

So, insha’Allah with this, we’ll finish the ninth Shubuha’ or misconception about Tawhid and it’s the second section of the book. So, next the author moves into another section, so we’ll leave that for next week. Wallahul A’lam.

## Lesson 17:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

So, what's left from this book we're going through, is the third and fourth part. The third part of this book is the author mentioning the evidences that the mushrikin use to try to prove their shirk, or try to prove that the shirk that they perform is permissible.

So, he says,

وللمشركين شبهة أخرى يقولون

**“The people who commit shirk in our times employ another argument similar to the one that has gone before, which they use to refute the opponents.”**

So, here when he says opponents, this is talking about Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah, or the Muslimin in general. So, it's talking about when the Muslimin try to prevent shirk, the kuffar or the mushrikin try to use these evidences to say that it's allowed or that calling them non-Muslims isn't allowed.

So, he says that,

: إن النبي : (صلى الله عليه وسلم) أنكر على أسامة قتل من قال : لا إله إلا الله . أو قال  
أقتلته بعد أن قال لا إله إلا الله

**“They say the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) reprimanded ‘Usama ibn Zayd (رضي الله عنه), when he killed the person who said La ilaha ila Allah, and he told him, “Did you kill him after he said La ilaha ila Allah?”**

And the author says,

وكذلك قوله ) :أمرت أن أقاتل الناس حتى يقولوا :لا إله إلا الله .(وأحاديث أخرى في الكف .  
عن قالها ومراد هو لا ء الجهلة :أن من قالها لا يكفر ، و لا يقتل ، و لو فعل ما فعل  
فيقال لهو لا ء ء المشركين :الجهال :معلوم أن رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم )قاتل  
اليهود وسباهم ، وهم يقولون :لا إله إلا الله ، وأن أصحاب رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم )قاتلوا بني حنيفة

“They’ve also used the hadith in which the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, “I was commanded to fight the people until they say La ilaha ila Allah.” And similar hadith that prohibit harming someone who says La ilaha ila Allah. The point is that these ignorant people, they try to prove all of these ahadith that, someone cannot be a disbeliever, can’t leave Islam, or they can’t be killed no matter what they do. It is said to these ignorant people, it is well-known that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) fought the Jews and he took them as Kafirs, even though they say La ilaha ila Allah. And also the Companions fought Banu’ Hanifah...”

And we talked about Banu’ Hanifah before, they’re the ones who fought alongside Musaylamah al-Khadab. And they would say La ilaha ila Allah, but despite this, the Sahabah considered them to be disbelievers and fought them as such.

And then he continues and says,

وأن أصحاب رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) قاتلوا بني حنيفة وهم يشهدون أن لا إله إلا الله وأن محمدا ً . رسول الله ، ويصلون ويدعون الإسلام .وكذلك الذين حرقهم علي بن أبي طالب بالنار

“Also, the Companions fought the tribe of Banu’ Hanifah, even though they testified to La ilaha ila Allah, Muhammadur Rasulullah, and they used to pray, and they claimed to be Muslims, likewise the people whom ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib burnt, used to testify to the same matter.”

And this is going back to what we talked about a few weeks ago, when ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib (رضي الله عنه), the Rafidah came up to him, or the beginning of the Rafidah came to him and said, “You are him” meaning you are Allah, so he commanded for a ditch to be dug, and he light the fire in it, and he burnt them all, and that was his punishment for them. So, despite the fact that they claimed to be Muslimin, and said La ilaha ila Allah, and they were praying, and they were from the students of the Sahabah even, despite this, ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib (رضي الله عنه), not only did he kill them, but he killed them in a way that even other Sahabah made ‘Inkar, or they rebuked him for doing so.

And then he continues, the author, he says,



وهو لا ء الجهلة مقرون :أن من أنكر البعث كفر وقتل ، ولو قال : لا إله إلا الله ، وأن من جحد فرعاً من أركان الإسلام كفر و قتل ، ولو قالها

**“And these ignorant people agree that a person who denies the Day of Judgement, becomes a disbeliever and should be executed, even if he says La ilaha ila Allah, as does the one who denies any of the pillars of Islam, he also becomes a disbeliever and should be executed, even if he testifies.”**

So, he’s saying here, even ignorant people would agree that if someone says La ilaha ila Allah but says there’s no Yawm al-Qiyamah, that this person wouldn’t be Muslim. And likewise, if someone said La ilaha ila Allah, but said there’s no Salat, and no Zakat, and no Hajj, and no fasting, this person wouldn’t be a Muslim.

So, he says, or he continues and says,

**فكيف لا تنفعه إذا جحد فرعاً من الفروع ، وتنفعه إذا جحد التوحيد**

**“So, how is it possible that the testimony (saying La ilaha ila Allah), is of no more benefit, to the one who denies something like this. But if the one denies Tawhid itself, that it would benefit him.”**

So, how can we say that someone who rejects something from the pillars of Islam, wouldn’t be benefitted by La ilaha ila Allah, but someone who rejects the basis of Islam, which is to worship Allah Alone, that somehow saying La ilaha ila Allah, gives him a benefit. When someone who does something lesser than that, isn’t benefitted by it, and even these people agree to these types of things.

And he continues and he says,

**ولكن أعداء الله ما فهموا معنى الأحاديث . فأما حديث أسامة فإنه قتل رجلا ادعى الإسلام بسبب أنه ظن ما ادعى الإسلام . إلا خوفاً على دمه وماله ، والر جل إذا أظهر الإسلام وجب الكف عنه ، حتى يتبين منه مالم يخالف ذلك**

**“But the enemies of Allah (تعالى) did not understand the proper meaning of these ahadith. As for the hadith of ‘Usama, then it must be understood, that the reason he killed the man (‘Usama ibn Zayd, who was the Companion of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم), who professed Islam was he presumed that he only pretended to accept Islam in order to protect his life or his wealth. However, when a person outwardly accepts Islam, it becomes obligatory to hold back from fighting him, unless some other matters appear to contradict his profession.”**

So, he’s saying here that, when ‘Usama bin Zayd (رضي الله عنه) killed this person who said La ilaha ila Allah, ‘Usama’s argument was, he was only doing it because he wanted to protect himself. So, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), he said, “Did you open his hear to know that?”

So, the point was that ‘Usama ibn Zayd (رضي الله عنه), claimed to understand something that was in the heart, because we don’t know what’s in his heart. All we know is in the outside, he’s saying La ilaha ila Allah. So, at this point, it was upon the Sahabi, to only look at the outward appearance of this person and to say, he said La ilaha ila Allah, then we accept it based upon this. And then he says,

**وَأَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى فِي ذَلِكَ : يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِذَا ضَرَبْتُمْ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ فَتَبَيَّنُوا ، أَيُّ فَتَنُوتُوا**

**“So, Allah revealed because of this, “O who you believe, if you go out in the way of Allah, then verify.” [4:94]**

So, Allah revealed this verse to say that, if you are fighting in the way of Allah, verify things before you do something that you might regret.

And then he says,

**فَالْآيَةُ تَدُلُّ عَلَى أَنَّهُ يَجِبُ الْكَفُّ عَنْهُ وَالتَّثَبُّتُ ، فَإِذَا تَبَيَّنَ مِنْهُ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ مَا يَخَالِفُ الْإِسْلَامَ قُتِلَ**

**“Meaning, make sure the person you are fighting is not a Muslim. This verse shows that it is obligatory to refrain from fighting a person who declares himself to be a Muslim, and that verification is needed. So, if after this declaration, something becomes apparent from him that contradicts his Islam, he is to be executed.”**

So, the point here is that the author’s saying, if all we have from a person is that they weren’t Muslim, and then now they’re saying La ilaha ila Allah, we take it as them being Muslim, then after that, if we see them as for example worshipping ‘Isa, or making du’a to other than Allah, then we say that claim that he made was false and we don’t accept it anymore, but until we have something else to show us that it was wrong, then we accept it. So, this was the correct understanding of this hadith.

And then he continues and he says,

**لِقَوْلِهِ تَعَالَى : فَتَبَيَّنُوا**

**“Proof for this, is the condition “verify”.**

So, meaning that, Allah didn’t say in this verse to never look into the matter again or to accept it unrestrictedly, regardless of what the person does. So, Allah didn’t say, as soon as someone says La ilaha ila Allah, never accept anything that contradicts it from him. So, if you see him worshipping other than Allah, it doesn’t matter, if you see him swearing at Allah, it doesn’t matter, if he rejects the Qur’an, it doesn’t matter. He said, “then verify”. So, if you see something, look into it further, verify, is this the whole story or is there something else going on.

And then he says,

ولو كان لا يقتل إذا قالها ، لم يكن للتثبت معنى

**“And, if he were not killed after he professes Islam, no matter what he did, then there would be no point in verifying this claim.”**

So, meaning that, if regardless of what he said, it never affected him again, then why did Allah tell us to verify. If we say that, anyone who says La ilaha ila Allah, no matter what he does, he is protected unrestrictedly and will always be Muslim, then Allah told us to verify something pointlessly, so then if we say that, we’re saying that Allah told us to do something that is pointless and that doesn’t make sense, and obviously, no Muslim would accept that.

And then he continues, he says,

وكذلك الحديث الآخر وأمثاله ، عن ما ذكرناه : أن من أظهر التوحيد و الإسلام وجب الكف عنه إلى أن يتبين منه ما يناقض ذلك ، و الدليل على هذا : أن رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) قال : أقتلته بعد ما قال لا إله إلا الله ؟ وقال : أمرت أن أقاتل الناس حتى يقولوا لا إله إلا الله ؟ . هو الذي قال في الخوارج : أينما لقيتموهم فاقتلوهم

**“And likewise, all of these other ahadith, that were mentioned, must be understood in the same light. Whoever professes Islam, and claims to be following Tawhid, then it is obligatory to stop harming in except if some matter becomes apparent which contradicts his claim. And another proof for this is the statement of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) who is the same person who said, “Did you kill him after he said La ilaha ila Allah?”, he said about the Khawarij, “Anywhere that you find them, then kill them.”**

So, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was the one who said, “Did you kill him after he said La ilaha ila Allah?”, he’s also telling us in other instances, there’s going to be people who say La ilaha ila Allah, anywhere you find them, kill them. So, do we then say that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said things that don’t make sense, and they’re contradictory, and we can’t reconcile them, so do we say that, this applies in some instances and this applies in some instances. Obviously, we can’t attribute to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) that what he said doesn’t make sense, or that it contradicts each other, because this obviously would go against our beliefs as Muslimin.

And then he continues, and he says,

لئن أدركتهم لأقتلنهم قتل عاد

**“And he also said (meaning the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم)), “If I was to meet them (meaning these Khawarij), I would kill them in the way that ‘Ad was killed.”**

So, the people of ‘Ad, the way Allah killed them, meaning that none were left. The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), had the same intention to deal with the Khawarij in that way.

So, then he says, the author,

مع كونهم من أكثر الناس عبادة وتهليلاً وتسبيحاً

**“This verdict, was given even though they were of those who worshipped Allah fervently and used to praise Allah frequently.”**

So, meaning that, these people not only were they Muslimin, but the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said in some ahadith that you’ll despise your Salat, when you compare it to their Salat, and you’ll despise their ‘Ibadah, when you compared it to your ‘Ibadah. And there’s narrations where, when people would enter the military camps and the armies of the Khawarij, they would hear a noise that sounded like it was bees buzzing, and they would say, “this is from the people, they’re making their Tasbih.” So, the people were so extreme or so strict in their worship of Allah, but despite this, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, “If I meet them, I’ll kill them, the same way that ‘Ad was killed.”

And then he continues and he says,

حتى أن الصحابة يحقرون صلاتهم عندهم وهم تعلموا العلم من الصحابة ، فلم تنفعهم لا إله إلا الله ، ولا كثرة العبادة ، ولا ادعاء الإسلام لما ظهر منهم مخالفة الشريعة

**“In fact, the Companions would feel humbled in front of them due to their extreme worship, even though the Khawarij learnt from the Sahabah. Their profession of La ilaha ila Allah did not benefit them, and neither did their worship and their claim to be Muslims, because they openly showed to other matters, their rejection of Islamic law.”**

So, he’s saying here that, just because someone says La ilaha ila Allah, and worships Allah, there’s going to be other things, or there could be other things that would show that, what they’re doing is invalid, or it’s not accepted from them.

So, if someone worships Allah and they fast every other day, the fast of Dawud, and they pray in the night and so on, and during the day, you also see them, fighting against Muslimin, or they go to a grave and they worship the person in that grave, or they do something else that would be a nullification of Islam. Then we would say, these actions are correct, except they’re nullified by the other thing, and it doesn’t benefit them whatsoever.

So, just like, in these examples, when the people with ‘Ali, sure they were from the Companions of the Companions or the students of the Companions, and they claimed to be Muslims, but when they said, ‘Ali was Allah, everything else went out the window, it had no benefit, and when Banu’ Hanifah, when they fought alongside Musaylamah, against the Sahabah (رضي الله عنهم), this nullified everything else that they did, and all of these other examples.

And he says,

وكذلك ماذكرناه من قتال اليهود ، و قتال الصحابة بني حنيفة وكذلك أراد النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) (أن يغزوا بني المصطلق لما أخبره رجل أنهم منعوا الزكاة حتى أنزل الله تعالى :يا أيها الذين آمنوا إن جاءكم فاسق بنبأ فتبينوا وكان الرجل كاذباً عليهم و كل هذا يدل على أن مراد النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) (في الأحاديث التي احتجوا بها ماذكرناه

“Another proof was the fact that, what was mentioned concerning the fighting against the Jews, and that the Companions fought against Banu’ Hanifah, is that furthermore, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) intended to attack Bani’ Mustalaq, when a person informed him that they refused to pay Zakat, so Allah revealed, **“O you who believe, if an evil person comes to you with news, then verify it.” [49:6].** It was discovered that the person had lied against them. So, all of these evidences show that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) intended with these ahadith is the explanation that has been given.”

So, we say that, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), someone came to him and said, this group or this tribe Banu’ Mustalaq, has refused to give the Zakat, and we talked about the Zakat before. Some ‘Ulama’ of Ahlus-Sunnah wa’l-Jama’ah say not paying Zakat, takes you out of Islam in and of itself. Others say, if you fight against paying it, it would remove you from Islam. But, in any case, the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) upon hearing this news, had the intention to fight them, even though they claimed Islam, and in the end, Allah revealed this verse to show that, if a action is going to be taken in this type of matter, you need to verify the situation, before you act upon it. So, this is what the author mentioned, for this *Shubuha*’ or this misconception.

So, just to add a bit about this, first of all, the hadith of ‘Usama ibn Zayd (رضي الله عنه), it’s agreed upon, it’s narrated by Bukhari and Muslim, which is the first evidence that they use. And they try to use it to say that, if someone says La ilaha ila Allah, nothing would ever remove them from Islam, and obviously we know that this is false. And we know from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), that someone who says La ilaha ila Allah, could be fought at certain times.

So, this is the first thing to mention about this hadith – is to clarify what’s the actual meaning of the hadith of ‘Usama. So, what it means is that, it doesn’t matter that whoever says La ilaha ila Allah, never can leave Islam. What it actually means is, we look on the outside. If someone’s outward appearance happens to be on Islam, then we go with that, until we’re shown otherwise. If someone’s outward appearance appears to be kufr or disbelief, we don’t say, we don’t know what’s in his heart. If he’s a priest, and he dies upon that, we don’t say “We don’t know, maybe he was Muslim inside.” No, we go on...all we saw from him ever was disbelief, we go on that.

If someone was a Muslim, and we don’t know any disbelief from him, we don’t say, “We don’t know what was in his heart, so we can’t bury him with the Muslimin”, or “We can’t pray on him.” We only go on the outside, and this applies both ways. So, this is one thing to mention about the hadith of ‘Usama.

The other thing is that if we look at the way the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) dealt with the Yahud, we know that the Yahud, the majority of them, used to say La ilaha ila Allah, as Allah said,

Or that, Allah said in Surah Ali-Imran, which means,

قُلْ يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ تَعَالَوْا إِلَى كَلِمَةٍ سَوَاءٍ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ أَلَّا نَعْبُدَ إِلَّا اللَّهَ وَلَا نُشْرِكَ بِهِ شَيْئًا  
وَلَا يَتَّخِذَ بَعْضُنَا بَعْضًا أَرْبَابًا مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ

**“Say: “O the people of the Book, come to an equal word between us and none of us will take others as Lords.” [3:64]**

So, this was referring to the saying of La ilaha ila Allah. So, this is the second thing to mention. So, even the Yahud, we know that they rejected the Prophethood of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and before him, ‘Isa (عليه السلام), and we know that they rejected the Qur’an, and the Injil and so on and so on, but they said La ilaha ila Allah. So, do we then say that, because they say La ilaha ila Allah, they’re Muslimin, or do we say, they say La ilaha ila Allah, but certain beliefs, and actions, and statements that they have, that they do contradict or nullify this testimony. Obviously it’s the second.

So, this is just a few things to add to this, and insha’Allah, we’ll stop there for tonight. Next time, we’ll finish with the rest of the arguments, then after that, we’ll talk about the ending of the book, which is talking about a person who leaves actions, or someone who never does any good deeds and only believes with the heart. Wallahul A’lam.

## Lesson 18:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

So, today we'll finish the third part of the book and there's four parts of the book as we said. So, this third part as we talked about last time, as we said is the specific evidences that the mushrikin use to try to justify performing shirk with Allah.

So, the next thing that the author says, he says,

ولهم شبهة أخرى ، وهو :ماذكر النبي (صلى الله عليه وسلم) :أن الناس يوم القيامة يستغيثون بآدم ، ثم بنوح ، ثم بإبراهيم ، ثم بموسى ، ثم بـعيسى ، فكلهم يعتذرون ، حتى ينتهوا إلى رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم)

**“And those who justify shirk have yet another evidence. Which is the fact that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) mentioned that on the Day of Resurrection, people will come and seek help from Adam and then from Nuh, then Ibrahim, then Musa, then ‘Isa (عليه السلام) and all of them will give some type of excuse, until they finally reach the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).”**

So, here, he's referring to the hadith of the Shafa'a on the Day of Resurrection in which the people will go to the Prophets, seeking for them or seeking from them to ask Allah to begin the judgement, so that they can be relieved from waiting and standing in the hardships of that day. So, he mentions this hadith, then he says, or he refers to the hadith and he says,

قالوا :فهذا يدل على أن الإستغاثة بغير الله ليست شركا

**“And they say, “That this is clear evidence that seeking help from other than Allah is not considered shirk.”**

So, meaning that the fact that they go to these people and ask for their help, this shows that it wouldn't be shirk, because how could I be approved of and how could the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) tell us that this would take place, and there's no mention of it being shirk or anything like that. So, the author continues, and he says,



والجواب أن تقول :سبحان من طبع على قلوب أعدائه ، فإن الإستغاثة بالمخلوق فيما يقدر عليه لا ننكرها

“The response to this is to say, “Subhan’Allah, the One who has sealed the heart of His enemies. For we ourselves don’t deny the legality of seeking help from a created object, in matter that it is capable of.”

Allah says,

كما قال الله تعالى في قصة موسى :فاستغاثه الذي من شيعته على الذي من عدوه

Or he mentions the verse in Surat Qasas that Allah spoke about Musa and,

**He said, “So, the one who was from his tribe [meaning the tribe of Musa] sought help from him against his enemy.” [28:15]**

So, this goes to the story where Musa came to the city and saw two people fighting with each other, one was from his tribe, and one wasn’t, then Musa helped the one that was from his tribe. So, the author here is showing that, Allah mentioned Isthigatha from Musa from this person. And then says,

. وكما يستغيث الإنسان بصاحبه في الحرب أو غيره ، في أشياء يقدر عليها المخلوق ونحن أنكرنا استغاثه العباداة التي يفعلونها عند قبور الأ ولياء ، أو في غيبتهم ، في الأشياء التي لا يقدر عليها إلا الله إذا أثبت ذلك :فاستغاثتهم بأ لآ نبياء يوم القيامة يريدون منها أن يدعوا الله أن يحاسب الناس ، حتى يستريح أهل الجنة من كرب الموقف وهذا جائز في الدنيا و الآخرة

“And the person in battle, or any other situation seeks help from another, in matters that he could do and are not supernatural and beyond the normal capabilities of man. But, we do object to the supernatural help that is sought. The religion seeking of help that is done at the graves of the righteous, or in their absence concerning matters that none except Allah has the power to do. Once this is understood, then realise that the help that is sought from the Prophets on the Day Judgement, is that they want from them to pray to Allah to hasten the reckoning, so that the people of Paradise can be relieved from agonies of that Day. This type of asking is allowed in this world and in the Hereafter.”

And then he gives another example, and he says,

وذلك أن تأتي عند رجل صالح حي يجالسك ويسمع كلامك فتقول له : ادع الله لي ، كما : كان أصحاب رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) سيألونه ذلك في حياته وأما بعد موته فحاشا ولا أنهم سألوه ذلك عند قبره ، بل أنكر السلف الصالح على من قصد دعاء الله عند قبره ، فكيف بدعائه نفسه ؟

**“That you go to a righteous person that is front of you and can listen to you, and then you ask him to pray for you. And this is just as the Companions used to do with the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) when he was alive. After his death, however, then by no means did they ask anything from him, or even ask at his graveside. Rather, the scholars of the earlier generations would rebuke those who used to pray to Allah at his grave, so what would be the response to someone who actually prayed to him.”**

So, here he mentions the...he calls it an evidence, but really in reality, what he means is, it resembles or they think it's an evidence so obviously it's not an actual evidence for this topic, which is the hadith of the Shafa'a and asking help from a creation to help you with something. So, again, the author showed how this is invalid and how to respond to it.

So, we can break it down into the steps again like we've done before with a number of the misconceptions. So, the first step in refuting this would be to show that seeking help from something that's created in something that they're able to do, while they're alive, and they have the ability and they can hear you, this is something that's permissible.

So, if we see here, in this story, these people they went to the Prophets at that time they were alive, and they asked them for something that they were able to do. So, they were dead, obviously this is the Day of Resurrection, every living thing that will be judged is brought back to life, so they're obviously alive.

Secondly, the thing that they asked them for is du'a to Allah, and we know that human beings can perform du'a, especially the Anbiya' obviously, they can perform du'a, so the thing that they asked for, was something that technically, they were able to do. And the excuse each one gave was something that they had done, and that they were shy to ask for it in a number of the examples, or the number of Prophets that were mentioned, they would mention the mistake that they'd done and they were shy, and they would come to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and they would ask...

Or the fact that he...we know that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) would make du'a to Allah, and we know that Allah will grant or answer this du'a, shows that he was able to do what they were asking from him, and he heard them, as opposed to someone who is dead or someone who is faraway or someone who is being asked to do something that they're not able to do.

So, this is the first step, to show that what you're using this hadith for, it doesn't actually even apply to that situation.

The second step is to mention that, you are asking from these 'Awliya or the people that you call 'Awliya something that they're not able to do as right now they're dead, and we can bring the hadith in which the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, “Or if the child of Adam, then

his actions are cut off...” Then he says except for three and he mentions the things that can benefit them, and none of them are actually being performed at the time by the dead person.

So, meaning if we look at the hadith that’s narrated by Muslim, An-Nasa’i and Tirmidhi and others, we see in the hadith that one of the things that would benefit the person or that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) made an exception to his actions is, the du’a of a righteous child, so the person performing the du’a is the child, not the person who’s dead. Or knowledge that was left behind that people learn from, or wealth that was left behind that people benefit from.

So, all of these things were done during his life, and then he continues to benefit from them, after his death as opposed to if someone said that, the person who has died can make du’a in the grave and that they would benefit the person who’s alive, and they would benefit themselves with that du’a.

So, we see that the asking of these people, now they’re dead, so obviously it doesn’t apply and so they’re asking something that they’re not able to do for a number of reasons.

The third or the third step is what the author mentions is when he mentions in the Qur’an that Allah said,

فَاسْتَعَاثَهُ الَّذِي مِنْ شِيعَتِهِ عَلَى الَّذِي مِنْ عَدُوِّهِ

Or that, **“The one from his tribe sought help from him against the one who was his enemy.” [28:15]**

And this is referring to the story of Musa. So, we see here that the person who sought something from Musa, Musa was there, as opposed to not being there, he was alive as opposed to being dead, and he was able as opposed to being unable. Because we know that he ended up hitting that person and he killed him, so obviously he was able to do the thing he was being asked, as opposed to asking someone who is dead on the other side of the world to forgive you your sins, or to cure you.

So, each of the things that were present in Musa, in this story aren’t present in the people who are being sought something from or the ‘Awliya. So, again we say that there’s a difference between this and what the people are trying to apply it to.

And the fourth thing that the author mentioned is a ‘Aql or intellectual argument or a proof, which is when he said, “This is similar to if you went to someone who is alive and he can hear you and you sat right in front of him and asked him to make du’a and then he was to do that.”

So, we see that in that situation, this person would be present, secondly they would hear you, thirdly the thing that’s being asked, they’re able to do, and they’re able to have that effect. As opposed to if you ask someone to heal you and not in a medical way, but to actually heal you through whatever power that the person attributes to them, this is something that they’re not able to do as opposed to asking someone to make du’a for you, because obviously the person is able to make du’a.

And then he finished that section by mentioning that, during the lifetime of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) this is what they would do. It's often we see that they would go to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and ask him to make du'a for them for a number of different things, so he would hear them, he was present and he was able to make that du'a, as opposed to when he would die or after he died, we see that Abu Bakr, and 'Umar, and 'Uthman and 'Ali and the wives of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and the scholars and the Sahabah, none of them is it ever narrated from them, that they would make du'a to him, whether beside his grave or faraway from his grave.

So, if we see that they would specifically go to him during his lifetime and ask him to make du'a for them, there's some benefit or there's something special about his du'a. So, if it was permissible to do so after his death, why would they avoid doing that and either make du'a on their own, and some of them would ask other Sahabah to make du'a for them because they're righteous people.

So, if it was still possible to do something that was great and had a great effect and was something that was accepted Islamically, then why would they turn away from that or shy away from that and no longer do it, so this shows that the Sahabah (رضي الله عنهم), the fact they stopped doing something that they used to do with the death of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) shows that obviously they understood that either it had no effect anymore.

And then he, the author concludes that by saying, not only did the Salaf, from the Sahabah, from the Tabi'in or Atba at-Tabi'in and so on, not only would they not make du'a to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) but they would rebuke people for making du'a to Allah besides his grave, assuming that it was a special place as opposed to anywhere else. So, if the mere making du'a to Allah besides the grave of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) was something that was rebuked, then how about if you're not even making it to Allah, but you're making it to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم).

So, we could say that this is Qiyas al-Awla, or this is showing something that if we show the invalidity of something at one level, then something that's at a greater level than it, would be even more invalid or more deserving of being invalid.

So, that's what the author says with regards to that evidence which is the hadith of the Shafa'a. Then, he continues and he says, and this is the last partial evidence or false evidence that he discusses. So, he says,

ولهم شبه أخرى ، وهي : قصة إبراهيم لما ألقي في النار ، اعترض له جبريل في الهواء فقال له : ألك حاجة ؟ . فقال إبراهيم : أما إليك فلا

**“And those who justify shirk have yet another evidence, and that is the story of Ibrahim, when he was thrown in the Fire that Nimrod built for that purpose then the Angel Jibril came flying to him and asked him, “Do you have any need?” So Ibrahim responded, “From you? No”**

And this hadith, it's narrated by Ibn Jarir in his tafsir, and the story was mentioned was Imam al-Baghawi in his tafsir and others as well. So, this is where the story comes from and we'll talk about a bit about its authenticity in a little bit.

But then the author continues and he says,

قالوا :فلو كانت إلا ستغاثة بجبريل شركا . َّ قالوا : فلو كانت لم يعرضها على إبراهيم

**“They say that this story has evidence that had seeking help from Jibril been considered shirk, then he would not have offered Ibrahim any help.”**

So, meaning that if asking for help or seeking help from someone other than Allah was shirk then why would Jibril be sent by Allah to not only to a person but to a Prophet nonetheless, and have this thing offered to him. So, meaning essentially that Allah sent Jibril (alayhi salatu wasalam) to offer Ibrahim to perform shirk.

So, then the author he says,

فالجواب :أن هذا من جنس الشبهة الأولى ، فإن جبريل عرض عليه أن ينفعه بأمر يقدر عليه ، فإنه كما قال الله فيه : شديد القوى

**“So, the response to this is exactly the same as the previous story. Because Jibril offered to help him in a matter that he was capable of, for Allah describes him as being “...of great strength.” [53:5].”**

So, meaning that the thing that Jibril was offering to Ibrahim which was to help him when he was in the fire, this was something that Jibril was able to do.

So, he says,

فلو أذن الله أن يأخذ نار إبراهيم وما حولها من الأرض و الجبال ، ويلقيها في المشرق أوالمغرب ، لفعل ، ولو أمره أن يضع إبراهيم في مكان بعيد عنهم لفعل ، ولو أمره أن يرفعه إلى السماء لفعل وهذا كرجل غني له مال كثير يرى رجلا محتاجاً ، فيعرض عليه أن يقرضه أو أن يهبه شيئاً يقضي به حاجته

**“If Allah had given him permission to take the fire of Ibrahim, and even all that was surrounding it of the earth and the mountains, and to throw it all into the far corners of the east and the west, he could’ve done so, and if Allah had commanded him to transport Ibrahim to a faraway place, he could’ve done so. And if he had commanded him to raise him to the skies, he could’ve done so. The example of this story is like the example of a rich wealthy person who sees a poor person in need and offers him help, either by giving him a loan, or a gift with which he can fulfil his needs.”**

And the author finishes this by saying,

، فيأبى ذلك الرجل المحتاج أن يأخذ ، ويصبر إلى أن يأتيه الله برزق لا منة فيه لأحد  
فأين هذا من ستغاثة العبادة والشرك لو كانوا يفقهون

**“Instead of accepting any help, the poor person refuses his help and his content at being patient until Allah provides him with a means of sustenance in which he will not owe anyone any favour. Such is Ibrahim’s example when he relied on his Lord instead of any other being. So where is this example from seeking religious help or committing shirk, if they only understood.”**

So, here he’s saying, just to do what we have done with all the other examples, that this is the same example as before. So, no-one is rejecting the fact that seeking help from someone of the creation who is able to hear you, and who’s able to provide you the help that you’re asking, that this is something that’s fine.

So, how can we say that asking someone for something that they’re able to do is proof that you can ask someone for something they’re not able to do, and asking someone who’s alive is proof that you can ask someone who’s dead. How can these things when they’re actually the completely opposite, ability for something and inability – being alive or being dead, hearing you and not hearing you. These are the complete opposites and it’s the essential description and characteristic that has the effect on the ruling itself.

So, if someone can’t hear you, as opposed to someone who can. So, we say, he helped me because he heard what I was asking him, as opposed the person who can’t hear it. The exact characteristic or attribute that’s needed in that instance isn’t even present. So, the author he mentions this.

So, the first thing to talk about this is where the hadith was. So, as we said it’s mentioned by at-Tabari in his tafsir, and al-Baghawi, and Ibn Iraq and “Tamzi ash-Shari’ah” and others. Ibn Taymiyyah said about this that it’s mawdu’ and Albani in his book, “Silsilah ahadith as-Sahih a’da’ifah”, said there’s no basis for it.

So, it has no basis to begin with, it’s not an authentic narration, and it actually has no sanad or no chain of narration to begin with. So, Imam al-Baghawi mentioned in his tafsir of Suratul Anbiya, and then he narrated it from Ka’ab al-Ahbar, which is, we know that he’s from the Tabi’in, and that he was a Rabi’ before his Islam. So, it’s attributed to him but without any sanad to begin with.

So, first of all it’s not from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and it’s not even from the Sahabi, it’s from someone later on, so already, even if it was authentic to Ka’ab al-Ahbar, it would be unusable as evidence. How about on top of that, not only is it not authentic to him, but there’s no chain even to track to see whether it’s authentic or not.

On top of this, we see that this story is confirmed, so the story of Ibrahim being put in the fire, and Jibril coming to him, Ibrahim being put in the fire is confirmed in the Qur’an and in the Sunnah and Jibril coming to him and asking him or its confirmed however that Ibrahim, his statement was “*HasbunAllahu wa ni’mal Wakeel*”, or Allah is sufficient for me and He is the best of those Who we would trust upon.

And this is also mentioned in the Qur'an when Allah said or described Ibrahim being put in the fire and he said this, and this was what the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said when all of the groups had gathered around him on the Day of Khandaq, so we know that this is a confirmed or saying this when a person is in a time of trials and tribulations is something that's definitely permissible and something that the person should do.

So, just to go through the steps again. So the first is to say that Jibril (عليه السلام) presented something to Ibrahim that he was able to do, and he heard him and so on and so on as we talked about before. And then, second thing as the author discussed, this is similar to someone who is poor and a rich man comes to him and offers him money, and then the person refuses and he hopes that Allah would give him his rizq through working or similar means so that he won't owe anything to anyone and that he can have complete Tawhid, and nothing that even resembles any reliance on any of the creation.

So, this is how we would understand the story of Jibril with Ibrahim (عليه السلام). And then the last thing would be to show that this is an invalid story, and that even if you wanted to use it, obviously you know if you want to use something as evidence, it needs to be proven first with a sanad. So, if it's not from the Qur'an then someone needs to prove that first of all, it has a sanad, and not only it has a sanad or chain of narration, but the chain of narration is authentic.

And just to mention that like I said, this story of Jibril coming to the Prophet Ibrahim (عليه السلام) was mentioned by al-Baghawi without any chain, and Ibn Jarir mentioned the story but he didn't actually mention Jibril coming to him and offering him this help, and actually it was a slip of the tongue, I think I had said earlier that al-Bukhari narrated and Jibril coming to him. Al-Bukhari did narrate it, and he narrated it with "*HasbunAllahu wa ni'mal Wakeel*", but there's no mention of Jibril offering him this help. It was just that when he was placed in the fire, he said this.

That was, if I had said that, and that was a slip of the tongue. So, these are the last two evidences that the author mentions and just a bit of commentary on it and insha'Allah we'll stop there, and next time, we'll finish the last part of the book which is kind of a summary of some of the things we talked about, also specific issues related to Tawhid or the reality of Iman, and the fact that actions are needed for Iman to be present, just like statements and beliefs are, and it's a refutation of the group the Murji'ah and a number of their misconceptions.

So, insha'Allah either next time we'll finish that or we'll have two more talks on that. Wallahu A'lam.



## Lesson 19:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمداً عبده ورسوله

So, now we are onto the fourth and final part of the book “*Kashf ash-Shubuhat*” by Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab and so this is the fourth and final as we said.

So, the **first** part of the book was the Introduction, the **second** was a general mentioning of a refutation against the misconceptions that people use to justify shirk, and there were nine of those. So, we mentioned them in general and then there was also a specific or a more detailed refutation of those misconceptions. The **third** part of the book was the evidences that the people use themselves, and there were a number of evidences that they use.

So, the first was the hadith of ‘Usama (رضي الله عنه), also the hadith of ‘Umar. So, the hadith of ‘Usama was the one where the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) rebuked him for killing a person who said La ilaha ila Allah, and the hadith of ‘Umar is the hadith of “*I was ordered to fight the people until they say La ilaha ila Allah*” and then the hadith of the Shafa’a or the intercession, in which the people will ask the Prophets to intercede on their behalf on the Day of Judgement.

And the last evidence that they used was the story of Jibril with the Prophet Ibrahim (عليه السلام) and how or the evidence what they claim is that, Ibrahim (عليه السلام) when he was placed in the Fire, Allah sent Jibril to ask him if he had any need, and then Ibrahim (عليه السلام) said, “*As from you, then no*”, so they say that this is evidence that seeking help from the creation isn’t shirk because Jibril offered Ibrahim (عليه السلام) the opportunity to receive help from him, so had it been shirk, he wouldn’t have offered it to him.

So, these were the three parts of the book that the author...or how he divided it in, and now we’re in the fourth part.

And this **fourth** part is kind of a summary of the importance of Tawhid and some of the matters that relate to it, specifically with regards to Iman, or the reality of Iman and kufr, as well as the importance of actions with regards to Tawhid, and the requirement of the actions of the body and actions of the heart in order for a person to be Muslim.

So, we can entitle this fourth part as being the ruling on the person who leaves acting upon Tawhid while he has the ability to do so while using these false arguments or false excuses. So, the author he will discuss the evidences for the obligation of actions and how they’re required for Tawhid, as well as a refutation of some of the false arguments that people use to justify or to say that it isn’t required.

And we say here, that the person needs to be able, so meaning if the person is unable to act for whatever reason, then there’s an excuse there, otherwise if there’s no excuse, or the ability is there, then there would be no excuse. So, just to add to this as well would be that, if the person is compelled or coerced, then this would be an excuse and we’ll get into it in more detail later on, but it would be an excuse with regards to what takes place on the tongue as

well as what takes place on the body. But if we're talking about what takes place in the heart, whether it's the statements of the heart which we'll get into later, then there's no excuse in this whatsoever.

So, now just move onto what the author himself says. So, he says,

**ولنختم الكلام - إن شاء الله تعالى - بمسألة عظيمة مهمة تفهم مما تقدم**

**“Let us conclude this book by mentioning an important matter that will clarify what has previously been said.”**

So, as we said, this is kind of a summary.

So, he says,

**ولكن نفرّد لها الكلام لعظم شأنها ، ولكثرة الغلط فيها ، فنقول : لا خلاف أن التوحيد لا بد أن يكون بالقلب واللسان والعمل ، فإن اختل شيء من هذا لم يكن الرّجل مسلماً فإن عرف التوحيد ولم يعمل به . فهو كافر عاند**

**“We will discuss it separately because of its importance and because many people fail to understand correctly. So, we say, there is no difference of opinion that Tawhid must exist and be manifested with the heart, the tongue, and the deeds, or the outer deeds, and if one of these matters is missing then a person will not be Muslim. So, if a person knows Tawhid but does not act upon it, then he is an arrogant disbeliever.”**

So, meaning he's arrogant, he knows of it but doesn't do it.

He says,

**كفّرعون وإبليس وأمثالهما . وهذا يغلط فيه كثير من الناس ، يقولون : هذا حق ونحن نفهم هذا ، ونشهد أنه الحق ، ولكننا لا نقدر أن نفعله ، ولا يجوز عند أهل بلدنا إلا من وافقهم ، أو غير ذلك من الأ عذار**

**“As was the case with likes of Fir'awn and Iblis and others like them and this is the matter that many people misunderstand. They say, “This matter of what you have explained is true and we fully understand it, and we testify to its correctness, however we are not able to do it and to put it into practice, and it is not allowed by our countrymen to act upon these matters, unless it agrees with them and their beliefs and their customs, and they give other excuses so that they do not act upon the correct beliefs.”**

So, then he continues and says,

ولم يدر المسكين : أن غالب أئمة الكفر يعرفون الحق ، ولم يتركوه إلا لشيء من الأعداء  
كما قال تعالى : اشتروا بآيات الله ثمنا ،

“However, such a wretched person does not realise that most of the leaders of falsehood know the truth and they only leave acting upon it due to some excuse. As Allah mentions, **“They purchased with the signs of Allah a miserable price.” [9:9]**

Then he says,

قايلا وغير ذلك من الآيات ، كقوله

“Other verses also explain this point such as when Allah...”

So, this verse when Allah was speaking about the Yahud when they were waiting for the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) to merge or to be sent, Allah sent about them,

يعرفونه كما يعرفون أبناءهم

“Or they recognise him, just as they recognise their own sons.” [2:146]

So, here he gives evidences or these two evidences to show that in these situations about these disbelievers, their disbelief wasn't due to a lack of knowledge or it wasn't due to them rejecting something actually being from the truth, it was because they didn't act upon it.

Then he continues and says,

فإن عمل بالتوحيد عملا ظاهرا وهو لا يفهمه ، أو لا يعتقده بقلبه ، فهو منافق ، وهو  
شر من الكافر الخالص : إن المنافقين في الدرك الأسفل من النار

“Now if he acts upon Tawhid with his outward actions, while he does not understand, nor believe in his heart, then he is a hypocrite who is more evil than the pure disbeliever. As Allah says, **“Indeed, the hypocrites are in the lowest depths of the hell-fire.” [4:145]**

And then he continues and he says,

وهذه المسألة مسألة كبيرة طويلة ، تتبين لك إذا تأملتها في السنة الناس . ترى من يعرف الحق ويترك العمل به ، لخوف نقص دنيا أو جاه ، أو مداراة لأحد وترى من يعمل به ظاهراً لا باطناً، فإذا سألته عما يعتقد بقلبه فإذا هو لا يعرفه ولكن عليك بفهم آيتين من . كتاب الله أولاًهما : قوله تعالى : لا تعتذروا قد كفرتم بعد إيمانكم

“And this is a prolonged matter to discuss, however if you ponder over it, two categories of people would become clear to you in your discussions with them. You’ll see one who knows the truth but leaves acting upon it for fear of some loss in this world, such as his prestige or property and you will also see one who outwardly acts on the truth but not inwardly. If you were to ask him, what he truly believes in his heart, he would not know, but upon you is to understand two verses from the Book of Allah. The first of them has already been mentioned and it is the verse, **“Do not give excuses, you have disbelieved after your faith.” [9:66]**

And then he says,

فإذا تحققت أن بعض الصحابة الذين غزوا الروم مع الرسول (صلى الله عليه وسلم) كفروا بسبب كلمة قالوها على وجه المزح واللعب ، تبين لك أن الذي يتكلم بالكفر أو يعمل به خوفاً من نقص مال وجاه ، أو مداراة لأحد ، أعظم ممن يتكلم بكلمة يمزح بها

“So, if it is confirmed that some of the Companions who actually fought with the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) against the Romans, disbelieved because of a statement they made jokingly, and then it will become clear to you that a person who makes a statement of disbelief or acts upon it because of fear of loss or money, prestige and so on, are ordered to please one greater than he, is greater in sin than one who said such a statement in jest.”

So, he’s saying here that, we have evidence in the Qur’an that, people made statements of disbelief that they didn’t believe in their heart, but they only did so out of joking, so if this was the case who said it out of joking, then what would we say about someone who does so because they fear a loss of their money, their status or something like this, obviously someone who says so joking will be a lower level of danger or wouldn’t be as bad as someone who says so out of fear of wealth and so on, loss of wealth and so on.

Then he goes on and he says, so he’s still taking about the two verses that a person should know from the Book of Allah or should remember from the Book of Allah, and the second verse is when Allah said,

والآية الثانية : قوله تعالى : مَنْ كَفَرَ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ بَعْدِ إِيْمَانِهِ إِلَّا مَنْ أُكْرِهَ وَقَلْبُهُ مُطْمَئِنٌّ بِالْإِيْمَانِ وَلَكِنْ مَنْ شَرَحَ بِالْكُفْرِ صَدْرًا فَعَلَيْهِمْ غَضَبٌ مِنَ اللَّهِ وَلَهُمْ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٌ

Or that, the meaning of which is that Allah said,

**“Whoever disbelieves after having faith, except he who is coerced while his heart is firm with belief but is upon him whose heart opened to disbelief [so meaning willingly].”  
[16:106]**

Then he continues and says,

ذلك بأنهم استحبوا الحياة الدنيا على الآخرة الآية فلم يعذر الله من هو لا ء إلا من أكره  
مع كون قلبه مطمئناً بالإيمان وأما غير هذا فقد كفر بعد إيمانه ، سواء فعله خوفاً ، أو  
طمعاً أو مداراةً ، أو مشقة بوطنه أو أهله ، أو عشيرته أو ماله ، أو فعله على وجه المزح  
أو لغير ذلك من الأعراض ، إلا المكره ،

**“So Allah does not excuse such people except if they were forced into doing something while their hearts were still firm and content with belief, so anyone besides such a person has disbelieved after having faith, regardless of whether he does it out of fear or greed or wanting to please someone or out of love for his country, his family, relatives or money, or even if he does it jokingly or any other excuse. The only acceptable excuse is the one who was unwillingly forced.”**

And then he says,

فالآية تدل على هذا من جهتين : الأولى قوله : إلا من أكره فلم يستثن الله تعالى إلا  
المكره

**“So the verse proves this in two ways. First the phrase إلا من أكره or “Except one who is coerced”, so only such a person is excused.”**

So obviously, the author’s showing that, because the exception was made to the coerced one.

And then he says,

ومعلوم : أن الإنسان لا يكره إلا على الكلام ، أو الفعل ، وأما عقيدة القلب فلا يكره  
عليها أحد

**“And it is well known, that a person can only be forced to do an act or to say something verbally. He cannot be forced to believe with his heart for no-one can coerce another’s heart.”**

Then he says,

والثانية قوله تعالى : ذلك بأنهم استحبوا الحياة الدنيا على الآخرة

**“Secondly, [so the second part of the verse that proves this, the next verse in 107], “That is because they preferred the life of this world over the life of the Hereafter.” [16:107]**

So, he says,

فصرح أن هذا الكفر والعذاب لم يكن بسبب الإعتقاد أو الجهل ، ، أو البغض للدين أو محبة الكفر ، وإنما سببه : أن له في ذلك حظاً من حظوظ الدنيا فأثره على الدين و الله سبحانه وتعالى أعلم وصلى الله على نبينا محمد وآله ، وصحبه وسلم

**“So, it is clearly mentioned that the reason for their kufr and punishment was not due to any heart-felt belief, or because of ignorance or a hatred of religion, or a love of disbelief, rather, the reason for their eternal punishment in the Hereafter was due to the fact that he achieved some benefit in this world preferring this benefit over the religion. And Allah knows best.”**

So, this is the end of the book. So, now just to add some commentary. So, as we said, the point of this is to show that actions are needed in order for Iman or the religion of the person to be accepted and for it to be valid.

So, the author started this section of by telling us that it's an extremely important great matter and the reason for this, for anyone who's been listening to these lessons from before or anyone who is involved in da'wah to the 'Aqidah of Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah obviously would see why. Because the number of people who fall into mistakes with regards to this are a very high number of people, and the issue of Iman was the first matter of bid'ah that came about in the Ummah of Muhammad (صلى الله عليه وسلم), which was at the end of the time of the Sahabah, with the Khawarij, and then it start to grow from there and later on the Murji'ah and so on.

So, the Shaykh (رحمه الله) as well as the scholars of Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah in his area at that time, and elsewhere in the world were dealing with these matters with regards to people giving false excuses to people who would believe things of disbelief, or make statements of disbelief, or perform actions of disbelief or shirk, at the time, they were obviously dealing with this, and this was one of the reasons why the author mentioned this.

As the author said, there's no dispute that Tawhid must be in the heart, on the tongue and in the actions, and if one of these is absent, then the person would not be Muslim, and this is the 'Aqidah of Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l Jama'ah and we talked about this many times before, that Iman is belief in the heart, or the actions and statements of the heart, as well as the statements on the tongue and actions of the body.

And Tawhid is part of Iman in general, so it is a must that each part of Tawhid would contain each part of Iman, so meaning that just as Iman needs to be at least three areas, then Tawhid would need to be in these three areas as well. And as the author mentioned, there's no dispute about this. And we talked about this many times before, the number of early scholars that not

only said this statements but stated that, it's a matter of consensus, is more than that can really be discussed in one lesson, so it's not really a matter of dispute.

So, this is the 'Aqidah of *Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah*. If we're talking about the 'Aqidah of the *Murji'ah*, and any of the type of the *Murji'ah*, or any group that falls under the banner of the *Murji'ah* when we talk about the issues of Iman and kufr, so this would include the *Asha'irah*, or the Ashari's, the *Marturidiyyah*, the *Jahmiyyah*, the *Rafidah* or the extremist *Shi'a*, the *Karamiyyah*...so the Marturidi's and the Jahmi's and the Rafidi's and the Karami's, and as well as a number of scholars have included in this in our time, *Jama'at at-Tabligh* as well as what they call, *al-Asrana'in* which are a type of modernist group.

According to these people, or these groups, the Tawhid according to them is only in the heart, and some of them would say on the tongue as well. So, meaning that, all that's held accountable for, all that a person needs to be Muslim is whatever is in their heart, and some of them would add to this, what's on the tongue, so meaning that they state or make the statement *La ilaha ila Allah* and this would be sufficient for the person to be Muslim, and the vast majority if not all of these groups, don't include actions in Iman or Tawhid. And it would include the actions of the heart and actions of the body.

So, when we say the actions of the body, this is obvious, Salat, fasting, Hajj, giving Zakat, performing Jihad, giving da'wah, teaching...anything that's on the actions of the body. Actions of the heart are things that take place in the heart that aren't related to belief or what the person's 'Aqidah or actual belief is, so meaning that the actions of the heart are things like, fear, love, hope, desire, all of these types of things. While the statements of the heart are things like, 'ilm, and ma'rifah, and tasdiq, and yaqin, and things like this.

So, the person, what he believes, his knowledge in his heart of Allah and the religion, as well as his certainty in this, so the things that relate to the person's beliefs can be said that it's statements of the heart, and the things that relate to how the heart feels and acts in different situations would be actions of the heart.

Next is, the *Khawarij*, and the *Mu'tazilah*, so the early groups of the *Khawarij* and the *Mu'tazilah*, they agreed with *Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah* in including actions in Iman and Tawhid. So, they also agreed that in order for a person to be Muslim, they would have to have the beliefs in the heart or the statements and actions of the heart, as well as statements on the tongue and the actions of the body. However, they also disputed or differed with *Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah* on issues related to this.

So, for example the *Khawarij* and the *Mu'tazilah*, they considered every single action to be a condition for Iman. So what does this mean? So, *Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah*, we say, in general, a person has to have the different things in their heart, so they need to have the statements and actions in the heart, and statements on the tongue, and actions of the body. We don't say that if a person didn't do every single thing that's obligatory, that they've left Islam, or if they didn't state every single thing that's obligatory on them, that they would leave Islam. So, we say that each one of these things needs to be present. A person needs to have some actions of the body, some statements of the tongue, some actions of the heart, and some statement of the heart.

And we say that, there's certain things in the heart that need to be present in order for the person to be Muslim. Some might not be present sometimes, and some might be present



sometimes as well as the actions of the body and statements of the heart. While the Khawarij and the Mu'tazilah, they say that every single action of the heart that was obligatory has to exist all the time, otherwise the person isn't Muslim, and likewise with the statements of the tongue, statements of the heart, the actions of the heart and the actions of the body.

So, if a person left something that was obligatory or left a statement that was obligatory, they would leave Islam. If they left an action that was obligatory, they would leave Islam and so on. So, Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah and these groups agree in considering these things from Iman, but Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah doesn't consider that every single action needs to be present in order for a person to be Muslim, or if someone leaves one thing that's obligatory, that they've left Islam, or if they do one thing, or two things or a number of things that are haram, that they leave Islam. We don't say this, we say that there's things that can remove a person from Islam, if they say them on their tongue, or do them with their body or believe them in their heart.

Likewise, there's things in these three areas that are required for a person to be Muslim, but there's also ones that aren't required, and this is more of matter to get into when we get into when we talk about the reality of Iman. So, for this part, the take away would be that, we differentiate between, or we say that statements of the heart and the tongue, and actions of the heart and the body, need to be present in some way in order for a person to be Muslim. We also say that there's some of these things that actually are required for a person to be Muslim.

So, there might be certain beliefs that a person has to have in order to be a Muslim. So, for example if someone doesn't believe that Allah exists, we would say obviously they're not Muslim. If someone doesn't know a specific detail that Allah told us in the Qur'an about Himself, for example a person doesn't know that Allah, as the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) mentioned in the Sunnah, doesn't know that Allah descends in the last third of the night, this wouldn't be required for the person to be Muslim, as long as if he knew, or if he heard of it, he accepted it. But for example, someone isn't even Muslim if they don't believe Allah exists, so we say that each of the actions of the heart and the body, the statements of the heart and the tongue are different levels as well.

So, this is another matter from the 'Aqidah of Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah, that we differentiate or we say that each thing has different levels. So, some things are a requirement for the person to be Muslim, if they didn't have them, they wouldn't be Muslim. Other things aren't a requirement to be Muslim, but they're obligatory, so if a person didn't do them, they would be sinful, but they wouldn't leave Islam. And last there are things that aren't even obligatory but they're recommended, so if a person didn't do them, they wouldn't leave Islam, and they wouldn't be sinful, but they would have lost the opportunity to gain those rewards, and likewise when it comes to bad deeds.

So, there's certain beliefs, actions or statements a person can do, or say or believe, that can remove a person from Islam. There's also other things where if they did these, any of the three, they wouldn't leave Islam, but they'd be sinful. And lastly, there's other things where if they did them, they wouldn't leave Islam, and they wouldn't even be sinful, but they'd have lost the opportunity to gain the reward by abandoning those things. So, we don't say that Iman is all one things, it's either present or absent, we say it's different levels, and it can increase and it can decrease, and it's at different parts of the body.

So, this is just a very quick explanation of the matters of Iman according to Ahlus-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah, as well as the Khawarij and the Murji'ah. So, the authors point here is that, each part of these things on the body, or from the body, so the heart, the tongue and the actions or the outward actions of the body, need to be present in order for the person to be upon Tawhid, or to be considered a Muslim. So, if either of these are gone, whether it's just one of them, or two of them, or three of them, the point is all three of them need to be present, if any of them are gone, then the person wouldn't be Muslim.

So, if we look at what the author said, we see that he mentioned that there's three types of Tawhid, one in the heart, and this is the greatest type of it, and it's the basis for everything and it's impossible that anyone could be compelled or coerced with regards to anything like this, or that there would be some sort of excuse given for someone in not having Tawhid in their heart, because no-one can force you to do otherwise, or fear can't actually make you stop believing in your heart, so this wouldn't be something that would be excused.

And equal to this, is the different types of the things that would happen in the heart. So, if a person with regards to...we talked about the actions and statements of the heart, so the statements are, things like knowledge and acceptance and belief and certainty and things like this that relate to actual beliefs, and then the actions of the heart are love, and hate, and fear and tawakkul, and sincerity and things like this.

The second thing is obviously we talked about is Tawhid on the tongue, and that's saying La ilaha ila Allah and no-one would be given an excuse for not doing this, except for the person who is physically unable to do so, because they can't actually speak, or the person who is forced or prevented from doing so for whatever reason with an acceptable type of coercion. And things that would fall under Tawhid on the tongue as well would be, calling to Tawhid, and clarifying the shirk, or clarifying shirk if its being seen and people are unaware of it, as well as the insulting shirk and its people, and declaring the non-Muslims to be non-Muslims, and declaring someone who's a Taghut to be a Taghut and so on.

And the last of these sections is the Tawhid on the body, and this is acting upon La ilaha ila Allah, for example, seeking help from Allah Alone, slaughtering for Allah or sacrificing for Allah Alone, performing the Salat for Allah Alone, and any of the other actions of Tawhid, and then based on these types of or where Tawhid would take place or where Iman would take place, the author mentioned different groups, or different categories that people would fall into.

So, the first that he mentioned is a person who knows Tawhid but doesn't act upon it. So, he brings the statement of La ilaha ila Allah and he may believe in his heart, and he knows about Allah, but he doesn't act upon on his body. Or even better to say would be that the person who knows it in their heart, and believes it in their heart, but doesn't act upon it outwardly. So, they don't even say La ilaha ila Allah. So, they don't attest to the Shahadah or they don't act upon anything from that, and this is what the author referred to when he talked about Iblis and Fir'awn and their likes.

So, the person who knows it inwardly, or even believes it inwardly and they don't act upon it or say anything about it outwardly would fall into this category. And this is the type that the author focused mostly on, because it's less likely for you to know about someone acting upon Islam and not believing in, this would require some strong evidences to show that they actually don't believe it in their heart, but mostly what we would deal with would be people

who know about it, or maybe even attest to it, but never act upon it, or they act contrary to it by performing shirk and so on.

And this is the second type that the author mentioned. It's the person who acts upon Tawhid, but doesn't understand it or doesn't believe it in his heart. So, outwardly you would see him as a Muslim, but inwardly there would be kufr and shirk and hypocrisy and these types of things. And this is what the hypocrite or the munafiq is, and as the author mentioned, that their worse than the regular kafir. Or, the plain kafir, and the reason for this is because Allah said,

إِنَّ الْمُنَافِقِينَ فِي الدَّرَكِ الْأَسْفَلِ مِنَ النَّارِ

Or that, **“Indeed the hypocrites are in the lowest depths of the Fire.” [4:145]**

And the reason for this is because they outwardly to claim to be Muslim to receive the benefits of this in the dunya and they try to fool the Muslimin, and some of them might believe that they're fooling Allah, as Allah said,

إِنَّ الْمُنَافِقِينَ يُخَادِعُونَ اللَّهَ وَهُوَ خَادِعُهُمْ

Or that, **“They try to fool Allah, but Allah is fooling them.” [4:142]** and so on.

So, these are some of the reasons why the munafiq would be worse. And also we can also theoretically or even practically see that there would a third type of person that the author didn't mention, but that's the person who doesn't have any Islam or Iman or Tawhid inwardly or outwardly. So, they don't believe in it in their heart and they don't fear Allah and they don't love Allah and so on, and they never upon it, so they don't say the Shahadah and they don't perform the Salat or anything else.

And so just to go back to the first category because that's what the author focuses on mostly in this book as the majority of his books, and even really the majority of the people who's spoken about Tawhid because that's the actual one Muslimin would encounter, this type of person. So, we can say that, this category can be divided into two types as well:

The first would someone who isn't excused in the way that they leave or they leave their acting upon Tawhid. So, the person doesn't act upon Tawhid in whatever way, and they're not excused for it.

The second would be someone who is excused and as we'll get into...this is someone who's coerced or compelled or forced and we'll talk about what's acceptable in that category and what isn't.

So, the first, someone who isn't excused, the author did talk about and that's why we're talking about it. So, this is the person who leaves Tawhid, doesn't act upon Tawhid and it's out of stubbornness and it's out of pride or something like this.

The second, or another type of person who would fall under this category, or another group of people that would fall under this category are the people who have left Tawhid and acted upon shirk, and they don't have an acceptable excuse, so meaning they don't have a acceptable misconception where we would say this is acceptable that the person actually was confused by this, as opposed to someone who does something and isn't actually convinced by what they're saying

And the author referred to this when he talked about, he said that it's not possible for the people of our area or the people of our country, and those who comply with them, and those who do things like them. And the author spent time on this type because this is the majority of what he would encounter and what we would encounter as well.

So, it's unlikely or it's very...it's not very common that we would encounter people acting in a way that contradicts Tawhid when they know that it's wrong but they're just refusing to do so, like in a similar manner, like Fir'awn and Iblis. It's more likely that you would find someone who would act upon shirk or leave Tawhid and they would bring some sort of false excuse, so they would actually think that this excuse is...they might bring an Ayah to try to prove what they're saying, or a hadith to try to prove what they're saying, or make a claim about the Sahabah to try to prove what they're saying, to prove that it's actually right, as opposed to Fir'awn and Iblis, they knew that they were wrong, but they did so or they refused to follow the truth that came to them, or that they knew of, and this was out of pride or out of stubbornness.

So, some of the examples that the author...or some of the false arguments or false excuses that the author refers to, one of them is that the person leaves Tawhid, or they act upon shirk out of fear that they will lose something from their dunya. So, they'll lose a job, or they'll lose some of their wealth, or they'll lose part of their status, or something like this. So, this is the first thing that the author referred to.

And an example of this as well could be that, if a person knew that you were upon Tawhid, that they wouldn't buy from your store or from your business, or they wouldn't sell things to you for whatever you need, or they wouldn't help you out if you are poor, or they wouldn't lend you money if they knew you were in need of a loan, and this is the type of that would fall under this category. And other things, is when he says, so he refers to a loss of dunya as well as a loss of wealth. So, here we can say the loss of wealth is a type of loss of dunya, and the loss of something in the dunya could be even more general. So, for example that the person might lose their wife, or their husband, or they might be refused to marry someone, that, that person wouldn't accept him to marry them, or the person wouldn't accept for that person to marry them cause of their din and so on.

Another example that the author gives of a false argument or a false excuse is that the person would do something from shirk, or leave something out of their Tawhid that's required for Islam out of the claim that they're trying to please or they're trying to get near to, or whatever you want to call it, suck-up or anything like this to the disbelievers, and obviously this isn't an excuse because there's no evidence for it, so the claim that we're going to do something of kufr, or leave something of Tawhid, as a means to please someone else from the mushrikin is obviously a false argument.

Another example that the author gives, is a person not acting upon Tawhid or performing shirk and the reason for this would be due to his love or his desire for his own country and

this could be his own province or his own state or his own country or city or anything like this and this would become this way if he was in a area that was full of shirk and kufr and he feared that if he rejected it, or rebuked it, or made 'inkar on it, that he would have to leave that country because the people wouldn't accept for him to be there, or that he might have to...or he wouldn't be able to stay in the place that he loves and he would have to go to somewhere that is less beloved to him, so this is what the author is referring to when he mentions like this, or he mentions this.

The next which is the fifth false excuse that the author refers to is if the person leaves Tawhid or acts upon shirk out of love for his people or his family or this tribe, which can be similar to the land or his country as well. In the sense that it's his love for something and this would be end up leading him to leave acting upon Tawhid, whether it's by him leaving the Salat or not rejecting or rebuking something upon them when they're doing open shirk and so on and not declaring his disavowal from it and the likes.

And other examples of this that we would see today, that weren't around in the time of the author, would be examples of people going into parliaments where shirk is performed, and they might say because that it's part of their job or something like this, or they want to make the money or they would like to...they like the status and things like this, or they might say we want to help our country or bring our country together and things like this, but at the same time this job requires them to do things that contradict Islam, to legislating laws that contradict Islam, or rejecting laws that follow Islam, or working in a way that works against the da'wah and the Jihad of the Muslimin and so on. So, this is one of the modern day or contemporary example that some of the scholars have mentioned that would fall under this category.

And the author proved his point that these were false arguments, by mentioning people who disbelieved before from the actions of shirk or kufr, and they had brought up these false arguments or these false excuses, and these excuses weren't accepted from them and they weren't taken into account, and these people were held accountable for their actions or their statements.

So, one of the things that he mentioned was the story of the people in the time of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) who mocked the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and the Sahabah (رضي الله عنهم) and we talked about this a number of times before, in Suratul Tawbah when Allah mentioned their story, and then Allah said,

لَا تَعْتَذِرُوا قَدْ كَفَرْتُمْ بَعْدَ إِيمَانِكُمْ

**“Do not give an excuse, indeed you have disbelieved after your Iman.” [9:66]**

So, Allah, despite the fact that they said we were only joking, He didn't give them an excuse. And there is other evidence which we can mention as well like when Allah said,

قُلْ إِنْ كَانَ آبَاؤُكُمْ وَأَبْنَاؤُكُمْ وَإِخْوَانُكُمْ وَأَزْوَاجُكُمْ وَعَشِيرَتُكُمْ وَأَمْوَالٌ اقْتَرَفْتُمُوهَا وَتِجَارَةٌ تَخْشَوْنَ كَسَادَهَا وَمَسَاكِنُ تَرْضَوْنَهَا أَحَبَّ إِلَيْكُمْ مِنَ اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ وَجِهَادٍ فِي سَبِيلِهِ فَتَرَبَّصُوا حَتَّى يَأْتِيَ اللَّهُ بِأَمْرِهِ ۗ وَاللَّهُ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الْفَاسِقِينَ

Or when Allah said, in Surahatul Tawbah, Verse 24,

**“Say, “If your fathers, your sons, your brothers, your wives, your relatives, wealth which you have obtained, commerce wherein you fear decline, and dwellings with which you are pleased are more beloved to you than Allah and His Messenger and jihad in His cause, then wait until Allah executes His command. And Allah does not guide the defiantly disobedient people.”**

So, here Allah mentioned that all of these things, or giving false excuses about any of these things which is love for anyone in your family, or your tribe, or your wealth or your business, or your homes, meaning your places of dwellings or your country or whatever it may be, that all of these things would be considered false arguments.

And another point that would fall under this issue as well that some scholars or some contemporary scholars have mentioned is that just as all of these false arguments or these false excuses that are given by individuals, likewise these false arguments or false excuses can be given by larger groups of people or even countries or even leaders of countries and so on. So, what some of the scholars have mentioned is that, certain organisations to certain states or countries or whatever these large entities might be, won't follow the Shari'ah in the way that they need to follow it.

So, if it's a country, they might not rule with the Shari'ah or they might not perform the things that need to be performed, or they might perform things that shouldn't be performed and they would contradict Tawhid, and then they would give essentially the same arguments that the individual would give that we just talked about.

So, they might say that, “If we were to implement the Shari'ah, then we wouldn't receive full support from our people and that we would be called to step down.” Or that, “We wouldn't receive international support”, whether it be military support, or things like financial support or even just support by means of just support in words, these types of things. “... We might be put on the sidelines, or we might be marginalised as a country, as a state”, and so on, all of these things would fall exactly under what the individual person would give as an excuse, or they might say, “We've always been ruling with things that go with our culture, so we can't start implementing the Shari'ah because this would get rid of some of the things in our culture,” whatever it may be, whether it's matters of shirk, or matters that are less than shirk, but in any case, just as these excuses wouldn't apply to an individual, they also wouldn't apply to larger groups of people whether they're organised or not organised.

Just as we just talked about the first type of person, the one who wouldn't be excused, there's also a second category of people who would be excused. So, they would be excused by leaving something that's required for Tawhid, or performing something that might nullify Tawhid.

And the condition for this to be accepted is that their heart remains pure, so they haven't accepted these things of kufr and shirk in their heart, and they've continued to believe and contain or hold onto the requirements of Tawhid in their heart, but there was something outward that forced them to perform or to leave something that was required – to perform something that would nullify or to leave something that was required.

And due to this, this is when the author said that Allah didn't give an excuse to anyone except the ones who were compelled or coerced while their heart was tranquil with Iman. And obviously this is based on the verse that we talked about,

مَنْ كَفَرَ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ بَعْدِ إِيمَانِهِ إِلَّا مَنْ أُكْرِهَ وَقَلْبُهُ مُطْمَئِنٌّ بِالْإِيمَانِ

Or that, **“Whosoever disbelieves in Allah after his faith, except for those who are compelled while his heart is tranquil with Iman.” [16:106]**

And the author didn't go into what are the types of things that would lead to compulsion or coercion and he didn't go into the different types of compulsion or coercion, and what would actually be acceptable, not acceptable, however we can go into that for a little bit, or a little bit just to give a better idea.

So, we can say that when the scholars talk about compulsion or coercion, they divide it into two different categories.

So, the first type is what we call, *Al-Ikrah al-Mulji*, and this is what the author referred to when he said that it's a type that the person performing it would be excused, and *Al-Ikrah al-Mulji*, or *Al-Ikrah* is compulsion or coercion, *Al-Mulji* relates to refuge, so it's something that the person sought refuge in this compulsion to stop something, or it was something that did give him refuge in leaving Islam in the sense that it was an acceptable type of...an acceptable type of coercion or compulsion.

And the likes of this, or some examples of this is, someone who, for example is given or threatened with death or threatened with execution in the sense that if he acted upon Tawhid then he would be killed, and the situation would or the condition would be that the person who's making the threat is able to do so. So, for example, if someone was kidnapped and was being threatened, and the weapons were in front of him, and the person doing it, doing the threatening was well-known to follow through his threats, or the person was quite sure if he didn't do what the person said, that he would be executed, then this would be considered an excuse.

While on the other hand, if someone who has no physical power and has no say in the society, and has no means of enforcing anything, they're just a person on the street who's very weak, and they said, “If you don't leave Islam, then I'm going to kill you,” and there was no threat whatsoever, even though verbally a threat was given, this wouldn't be an excuse. And this is obvious to anyone who looks at the topic with just or with justice.

Another example of this is, beating or torture that would lead to injuries or severe pain and the person isn't able to withstand it, they can't leave, they can't do something to get away and at the same time they don't feel they would be able to take it and that it would have a very



harsh effect on them, again with the condition that for example, the person is able to do that. So, if it's someone who physically was able to hurt you or they might be able to hurt you but there was people around to protect you and so on, then this wouldn't be an excuse as opposed to a small type of beating where the person might receive the cut or they might break a finger or something like this, then most scholars if not all of them considered these things to be unacceptable because there's no long-term harm.

Other examples that the scholars have given is the threat of prison or actual prison, so for example of if it was one day, or two days as opposed to life in prison, than life in prison would obviously be something that would be considered an excuse or even long-term like 10 or 15 years, if the person felt like they couldn't handle it as opposed to sitting in a cell for a couple of hours, or overnight or a day or these types of things, then this wouldn't be considered an excuse.

The next type of Ikrah is *Al-Ikrah Ghayril-Mulji*, or Ikrah that isn't Mulji, it doesn't fall into or it doesn't have the conditions that need to be met for this first type. And things like that would be someone who for example is threatened to be beaten, or even they are beaten but with something that doesn't hurt, or with something that might sting, but there's no real harm behind it, or someone who's threatened with a fine of \$50 or something like this, while they're quite well off and \$50 isn't going to affect them, or that they're threatened with a night in prison, things like this wouldn't be considered an excuse because there is no actual coercion being taken place here, rather it's just empty threats, or threats that don't actually have an effect on the person's well-being.

Other things that don't fall into this or things that don't fall into this is, someone being embarrassed or someone being spoken about in a poor manner, or someone being considered an extremist or being called certain names like Khawarij, or takfeeri or Wahhabi, or anything like this, because in reality a name call, isn't a reason to leave something of Tawhid or to perform something of shirk.

So, if someone says, "My family will think bad of me or they'll call me an extremist, so I'm not going to pray", or "I'm going to take part in matters of shirk that they have whether it's celebrating their democracy...", things like this, none of these things would be considered valid excuses, and rather it's from the Shaytan, and it's from the plans of the Shaytan or the plot of the Shaytan as a means to try to scare the people of Tawhid. And this is when Allah said,

إِنَّمَا ذَلِكُمُ الشَّيْطَانُ يُخَوِّفُ أَوْلِيَاءَهُ فَلَا تَخَافُوهُمْ وَخَافُوا إِن كُنْتُمْ مُؤْمِنِينَ

Or that, in Surah Ali-Imran, Verse 175, Allah said,

**“Indeed, that is only the Shaytan who is scaring his allies, so do not fear them but fear me if you are indeed believers.”**

So, we know that a fear of something or minor harms or minor annoyances or things like this, they're not considered actual acceptable means of coercion. And an example of this, even though the hadith is weak, has a slight weakness in the chain, some have accepted the hadith, but as we said Allahu Alam, the stronger opinion is that it's a slightly weak hadith, that was

narrated by Imam Ahmad and Ibn Majah that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), it's attributed to him that he said, Allah will say to a slave on the Day of Judgement who saw something that was evil, but he did not rebuke it, or stop it, or try to stop it, Allah will say, "What prevented you from rebuking or making 'Inkar upon that?", so the slave will say, "Fear of the people", so Allah say "I was more deserving of being feared."

It's attributed to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) that he said,

And again we said that it's a weak hadith, there's a narrator of the hadith, Abu Sa'id al-Khudri, and the narrator from him is Abu Bakhtari, but he didn't actually meet him, so there's a break in the chain. However, obviously the meaning or general meaning of the hadith which is the obligation of rebuking, or censoring, or making Inkar upon something when you see it as being wrong is well-known in evidences from the Qur'an and the Sunnah, and just the general rules of Islam.

So, here a few things that remain is, is a threat sufficient for the person to follow through with the leaving of something of Tawhid and performing shirk, or does he actually have to be afflicted before they can follow through with it. So, meaning that...and this is a matter that there's a difference of opinion on among the scholars. So, some say that the being threatened is sufficient, so some of the scholars, the majority say that it's sufficient to have a verbal threat, with the condition that the person who's making the threat is able to implement whatever they're threatening. So, if the person threatens to kill or execute or they threaten to torture, or they threaten to rape or they threaten to...whatever the threat is, if they able to follow through with that, then this would be considered sufficient.

And they use the generality of the verse when Allah said,

إِلَّا مَنْ أَكْرَهَ وَقَلْبُهُ مُطْمَئِنٌّ بِالْإِيمَانِ

**"Except those who are compelled or coerced, and their heart is tranquil with Iman."  
[16:106]**

The second opinion is that it's necessary for them to actually be afflicted by something before they can actually follow through it. And this was narrated from Imam Ahmad, and as many know the story in which Imam Ahmad was tortured by the rulers at the time to try to get him to say that the Qur'an was created, but he refused too, and other scholars at the time followed through with this when they were threatened to be beaten, they followed through with this and they said that the Qur'an was created, and Imam Ahmad made 'Inkar on them, and some of them, he refused to speak to for the rest of their lives and from amongst them was the Imam Yahya ibn Ma'in, and actually the cast majority of the scholars at the time.

And what Imam Ahmad at the time for those who don't know the story was, the scholars at the time used the hadith of 'Ammar, so 'Ammar ibn Yasir, the well-known story where the kuffar of Quraysh were torturing him and 'Ammar said some statements of kufr, and he came to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and mentioned what he had done, and the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) asked him about how his heart, what state he found his heart in, he said it was calm and tranquil with Iman, so he said if they returned to that, then return to what you had done.

So, Imam Ahmad in this situation, he said, they used the hadith of ‘Ammar, but ‘Ammar was actually tortured, while those ones or it was said to them, “We will torture you”, so Imam Ahmad was of the view that a mere threat in this situation wouldn’t be sufficient, because how can you use the hadith in which the Sahabi was actually tortured and say that, this actually gives the excuse to anyone that isn’t even tortured yet, to follow through with whatever they’re being asked to do. However, there’s different ways of reconciling, so some way that, if the threat is with death, then obviously, you can’t wait for it to happen because once it happens, there’s no turning back and if it’s other things like imprisonment and torture and these types of things, then you’d have to wait for it to happen. So, this is one way that the scholars have reconciled between the evidences.

Other ways is that they differentiate between who is being forced to do something. So, if the person is from the scholars, or the major students of knowledge or he’s a person that the people follow and look up to, that if he followed through with this, it would have a major effect on the Muslimin, then this person would actually have to be tortured first or wouldn’t be allowed to even give in while if the person was someone who was, their statements don’t have a major effect on the Muslimin, and by them following through with it, it wouldn’t have a major effect, then this person, being threatened would be sufficient and they wouldn’t have to go through any major affliction.

And in any case, the scholars say that holding steadfast on what you’re on is better, even if it leads to death, and they give examples of the Sahabah who refuse to give in, and what the Sahabah went through.

Another issue to bring up with regards to Ikrah or compulsion is that, it’s an excuse only when it refers to you yourself. But if you are compelled or being compelled to do something to someone else, then it would no longer be an excuse for you. So, for example, if a person said, I was compelled or coerced into swearing at the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) this would be acceptable for him to accept the concession to follow through with that statement, even though it would be better not to, but it would be acceptable with the conditions that we talked about before.

That the person who’s doing the threat is able to follow through with it, and that’s something that would actually have a major effect on the person and so on. But if it’s something that carries on to someone else, for example, you’re being threatened or coerced to kill a Muslim, or to rape a Muslim or to severely beat a Muslim or anything like this, than in this situation, it wouldn’t be considered an excuse for the person, the person who’s doing it or the people who’s using it as an excuse.

And the scholars have spoken about this, the reason why is because if you’re being threatened to be killed, if you don’t kill someone else, then you’re not at a higher state to kill someone else in your place, or your blood isn’t more protected than the person you’re going to kill, or that person’s blood isn’t at a lower level than your blood, or your life isn’t at a higher level than their life, so for you to put someone else’s life in place of yours would not be allowed, because you can’t make that decision on behalf of that person, and it’s not the time to go into the evidences statements of the scholars right now, but in general, that would be the rule.

So, to sum up we can say that, or we can finish by talking about what is, or where can compulsion actually take place, or what are the situations in which a person might claim compulsion. So, the first would be performing a statement, or performing an action of shirk

and kufr. So, for example, making Sujud to other than Allah, or sacrificing to other than Allah and so on.

The second would be statements on the tongue such swearing at the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) or Allah or the religion or anything like this. And the third would be the actions of the heart. So, if we talk about the actions of the body, then it's possible and it's acceptable that a person would fall into an action of kufr due to this compulsion, and that would be similar to what we talked about before, which is the different types of things that...if the person says that, "if you don't do this, we're going to kill you", or they beat him until he's in pain and he can't take it anymore so he says a statement of kufr. So, this is the first thing, that the harm from your action doesn't transgress over to anybody else and this is what we talked about before as well.

The second type would be what we talked about before, it does carry over to someone else, so you're harming someone else at this point, and this obviously wouldn't be allowed and we talked about this already, and Allah said about the Angels when they took the souls of certain people, that they said, or Allah said,

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَوَفَّاهُمُ الْمَلَائِكَةُ ظَالِمِي أَنْفُسِهِمْ قَالُوا فِيمَ كُنْتُمْ ۖ قَالُوا كُنَّا مُسْتَضْعَفِينَ فِي الْأَرْضِ ۗ قَالُوا أَلَمْ تَكُنْ أَرْضُ اللَّهِ وَاسِعَةً فَتُهَاجِرُوا فِيهَا ۚ فَأُولَٰئِكَ مَأْوَاهُمْ جَهَنَّمُ ۖ

Or in Suratul Nisa, Verse 97, Allah said,

**“They said: “What state were you in?” They said: “We were weak and oppressed in the land”, They said: “Was not the land of Allah widespread so that you would make Hijrah therein, indeed those people’s destination is Jahannam.”**

So, Allah revealed this verse concerning Muslimin who did not emigrate from Makkah to Madinah with the Muslimin and they remained in Makkah, and the kuffar of Makkah went out to fight the Muslimin in the battle of Badr, this verse came down about them, in that they weren't considered excused in going out and fighting against the Muslimin. Because Allah would give you an excuse if you were forced, if you had no way around it, as well as if the thing that you were doing wasn't hurting any other Muslim. But if you had a way around it, and refused too, or you did something that was a transgression against another Muslim, then obviously this wouldn't be excused.

And Allah said,

وَلَا تَعْتَدُوا ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْمُعْتَدِينَ

Or, **“And do not transgress. Indeed Allah does not love the transgressors.”**

And that's from Surah Baqarah, verse 190.

And other evidences from the Qur'an and the Sunnah that can be talked about in another time.

If we're talking about the Ikrah on statements, then this also falls exactly under the Ikrah or compulsion when it comes to actions, because its outward, it doesn't relate to belief, and also it doesn't...some of the evidences were revealed and came down like the hadith of 'Ammar is related to statements and it's not related to actions. So, everything that we said about actions being excused or not being excused due to compulsion then it would apply as well to statements of the tongue.

And the last thing is actions of the heart or the things that take place in the heart. This is something that it's not possible for compulsion to affect. So for example, if someone said, "We're going to kill you if you don't hate the Prophet (ﷺ)". There's no way for this to be tested or there's no way for you to prove in your heart, or to prove to people in your heart that you hate the Prophet (ﷺ) and there's no real way for a person to do anything to change that. As opposed to a statement, you can say the statement and it might make them stop whatever they're doing and it might not make them stop, but it's something that's visible and it's something that you have control over, you can control what you say and you can control what you do. As for the things that take place in the heart, then it's not possible to have compulsion over it.

And this is when the author said, **"As for the beliefs of the heart, then no-one is compelled or coerced with regards to that."**

So, with this, we would've finished the explanation or commentary of the book "*Kashf ash-Shubuhat*" by Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhab, and insha'Allah those who heart it all or partially have benefited from it. Wallahul A'lam.