



Abul-Hasan al-Ma'ribee and the Issue of Maligning the Companions

NOTE: This is part of a selection from Shaykh Rabee's refutation of Abul-Hasan's book *as-Siraajul-Wahhaaj fee Bayaanil-Minhaaj*. The refutation is entitled *Intiqaad 'Aqadee wa Manhajee li Kitaab as-Siraajul-Wahhaaj li Abil-Hasan al-Misree al-Ma'ribee*.

Translated by Aboo Zaynab al-Haashimee, KSA.

Shaykh Rabee' Ibn Haadee al-Madkhalee states addressing Abul-Hasan al-Ma'ribee over the 'aqeedah and manhaj mistakes in the latter's book *as-Siraajul-Wahhaaj fee Bayaanil-Minhaaj*:

[Abul-Hasan's Statement]

"On (p. 49) completing point (no. 111) you said after some preceding words, "So whoever maligns the Companions and explicates their *kufr*, or most of them, then he is a rejecter of the *Qur'aan* which declares their integrity, so the proof is to be established against him; if he does not repent he becomes an unbeliever. If he maligns them in a way that necessitates their *fisq* then there is disagreement about him being a *kaafir*..." Thereafter you refer the reader to *as-Saarimul-Maslool* [of Ibn Taymiyyah].

[The Criticism]

Shaykhul-Islam's statement [upon this issue] is clear in *takfeer* of the one who declares them *kuffaar*, or *fussaaq* - without him stipulating the establishment of proof. He says - *rahimahullaah* - after some preceding words,

"As for he who goes beyond that to claim that they left the fold of Islaam after Allaah's Messenger (*sallallaahu 'alayhi wa sallam*) [passed away] - except a few, not reaching even ten odd in number - or claims that most of them became *fussaaq*, then there is also no doubt about him being a *kaafir*; since he has belied what the *Qur'aan* explicitly states in more than one place regarding [Allaah's] being pleased with them and praising them. Indeed whoever doubts the *kufr* of the likes of this person himself must be considered a *kaafir*. This is because the belief [that the Companions were *kuffaar* or *fussaaq*] really means that those who transmitted the Book and *Sunnah* were *kuffaar* or *fussaaq* and that this verse 'You are the best nation brought forth for mankind...' - and the best of it is its first generation - means most of them were *kuffaar* or *fussaaq* and really that this *Ummah* is the worst of all

peoples and that the early members of this *Ummah* were the worst of it. The *kufir* of such a person is one of those things known by necessity in the Religion of Islaam. Therefore we find that most of those upon whom these sayings become apparent are revealed to be heretics (*zindeeq*), and most of the heretics hide behind their creed particularly. Allaah's signs have appeared amongst the likes of these people and numerous (*tawaatur*) reports exist that their faces are transformed into that of swine in this life and in death." Refer to (p. 586-587) Muhammad Muhyiyud-Deen edition.

Shaykhul-Islaam explains that the *kufir* of this type of person is known by necessity in the Religion of Islaam because he is clearly belying what the *Qur'aan* explicitly states in more than one place regarding [Allaah's] being pleased with them and praising them and that whoever doubts such a person's *kufir* is himself to be considered a *kaafir* etc.

So this falls in the same category as the one who denies something known in the Religion by necessity, like the obligation of five daily Prayers, or *zakaat*, fasting, Hajj, or the fact that Muhammad is Allaah's Messenger and other necessities of the Religion, so it is best that you quote on this important subject these words of Shaykhul-Islaam, may Allaah grant you success."

These are the words of Shaykh Rabe'e' in his original advice to Abul-Hasan. The Shaykh adds a footnote in a more recent issue of his critique, "The noble reader should know that I finished this critique on 30/7/1420H and then sent it to him after this date, before the publication of the first edition [of Abul-Hasan's *as-Siraaaj*]. He contradicted Shaykhul-Islaam on this issue; in both the ruling and the reasoning, and didn't accept. I spoke to him directly about this after the appearance of the first edition but he - obstinately - didn't pay any attention until the book reached its third edition. Then when he entered into the dispute, which he himself kindled he displayed his retraction without explaining the reason for it, and without explaining the evidences, which caused him to recant. He has recanted in recent days a number of times after being requested to do so by some people but there remains some doubt (*naqr*) about his retraction.

The most important thing to me is his obstinacy towards the Imaams of *Sunnah* in major issues, some of which he could become *kaafir* over, like this issue about which Shaykhul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah - *rahimahullaah* - says, "Indeed whoever doubts the *kufir* of the likes of this person himself must be considered a *kaafir*."

Abul-Hasan has seen these words of Shaykhul-Islaam and I have alerted him of this danger but despite this he doubted, was obstinate and insisted for years, then displayed recantation at a time when there is doubt about the sincerity of his retraction, the cause of which he has not clarified and during which there has been no apparent remorse over his contravention and obstinacy..."