

**EEMAAN AND KUFR SERIES**  
**VOL.12**

**Shaykh Mashhoor Hasan Aal Salmaan**  
**(hafidhahullaah)**  
**ON WHO THE MURJI'AH ARE<sup>1</sup>**

---

**Question:**

I request clarification on what the intent of the word “Murji’ah” is?

**Answer from Shaykh Mashhoor (hafidhahullaah):**

We seek refuge in Allaah from the Murji’ah and the *madhdbab* of the Murji’ah! They are deviant misguided sect and they say that the *eemaan* of the most sinful sinner is the same as that of the Angel Jibreel (*alayhis-salaam*) because actions do not enter into *eemaan* and sins do not effect *eemaan*. Therefore, according to them the *eemaan* of one who commits a major sin is the same as that of the angels. For this reason, the Murji’ah do not say that *eemaan* increases and decreases because *eemaan* according to them is not *eemaan Shari’* only *eemaan Ma’nawi* which is just *tasdeeq* (affirmation). However, the Pharaoh was a Musaddiq (affirmer), and so was Iblees but he was haughty and arrogant (*takabbur*) so there is *Kufr ul-Iba* (kufr of refusal) and *Kufr ul-Traadhb* (kufr of turning away). So the intent of *eemaan* is not just *tasdeeq* and for this reason the Murji’ah say that *eemaan* neither increases nor decreases and they do not allow for a person to say “I’m a believer, insha’Allaah” and that if it is allowed for a person to say “I’m a believer insha’Allaah” then it means he has doubt in *eemaan* and whoever has doubt in *eemaan* has disbelieved. Ahl us-Sunnah say that *eemaan* increases and decreases because actions are connected to *eemaan* and that it is allowed for a person to say “I’m a believer insha’Allaah”<sup>2</sup> because *eemaan* is not only *tasdeeq*.

---

<sup>1</sup> From Shaykh Mashhoor’s Saheeh Muslim lesson dated 12 June 2008 which can be heard here: <http://www.mashhoor.net/>

<sup>2</sup> **Translator’s Note:** According to Ahl us-Sunnah it is allowed to make *istithnaa’* in *eemaan* which is to exempt oneself and free oneself from having complete faith, such as by saying “I am a believer, *inshaa’Allaah* (if Allaah wills)” or “I hope that I am a believer.”

Ibn Battah al-Ukbaree noted in *al-Ibaanah* (vol.2, p.872):

So the Murji'ah are a filthy misguided *madhhab* of innovation and they do not have a major presence in these times.

Some people, and I do not wish to describe them, think that our Shaykh al-Albaanee (*rahimabullaah*), was from the Murji'ah! If we say to them: "Why is our Shaykh al-Albaanee a Murji'?" They reply with: **"Because he does not make takfeer of the one who abandons the prayer."** This is not sufficient to say that Shaykh al-Albaanee is a Murji', if you refer to what al-Mardaawee says in *Kitaab ul-Insaaf fee Bayaan il-Khilaaf 'ala'l-Madhhab Imaam il-Mubajjal Ahmad ibn Hanbal<sup>3</sup>* it states that the most accurate opinion according to Imaam Ahmad is that the one who abandons the prayer is not a disbeliever. So if it was allowed for us to say that the one who does not make *takfeer* of the one who leaves the prayer out of laziness is a Murji' then it would be allowed for us to say that the ones who make *takfeer* of the one who leaves the prayer out of laziness is from the Kharijee! Yet both this and that are misguided! So the issue of not making takfeer of the one who abandons the prayer is one of *fiqh* and not *'aqeedah*. However it is greatly unfortunate that some of them even say **"people in Jordan do not pray because Shaykh al-Albaanee said the one who abandons the prayer is not a disbeliever"** and that **"people in Jordan they know Shaykh al-Albaanee and follow him and his way of thought"** and these masaakeen who say this do not know about Shaykh al-Albaanee.

Indeed some of them even say, as occurred to me from some of the students who were at the *Islamic University of Madeenah*, that "women in Jordan do not cover their faces because of Shaykh al-Albaanee!" "Tabarruj and uncovering is widespread in Jordan because of Shaykh al-Albaanee not viewing that it is obligatory for the woman to cover her face." SubhaanAllaah! On

---

**So this is the path of the believers, and the way of the intelligent from the scholars, adhering to Istithnaa, fear and hope. They do not know how their condition is with Allaah! And they do not know about their actions, if they are to be accepted or rejected!**

Ibn Battah also said:

**With this, the way of the Muslims has passed and this is how their common habits have stayed, those who came after them took it from those who were before them. No one opposes this Istithnaa' in eemaan except a filthy misguided murji' whose heart has been deceived by Shaytaan.**

Imaam 'AbdurRahmaan bin Mahdee said:

**The basis of Irjaa' is leaving off Istithnaa' (i.e. exempting oneself and freeing oneself from having complete and perfected eemaan).**

See: *As-Sunnah* (1061) of Imaam al-Khalaal.

<sup>3</sup> **Translator's Note:** the full title which our Shaykh Mashhoor was alluding to, which may have slipped his memory, is: Alaudeen Abu'l-Hasan Ali bin Sulaymaan ibn Ahmad al-Mardaawee (d. 885 AH/1481 CE), *al-Insaaf Fi Ma'rifat al-Raqijh Min Al-Khilaaf* (Beirut: Daar Ihyaa Turaath al-'Arabi, 1980 CE), M.H. al-Fiqi (ed.).

The book is one of the best sources for understanding different views within the *Hanbali madhhab* and the author also wrote *at-Tanqeeh ul-Mushbi'ah*.

one occasion it was said to someone who said this: “Have you visited Jordan?” The person replied “No.” Unaware that in Jordan it is not just faces which are exposed but there are also other evils which are also exposed and upper parts of the chest (*nuboor*) exposed not just the face being uncovered! Yet they think that *tabarruj* is having the face uncovered and this is incorrect as the issue of covering the face is an issue of *fiqh* wherein there is a difference of opinion in which one could be right or wrong, not one of deviation and misguidance. The issue of leaving the prayer out of laziness is an issue wherein one can be right or wrong and it is not to say that whoever takes an opinion in regards to it is misguided and deviated and apply it as being representative of another creed. Either one makes *takefeer* on account of it or not.

So whoever says that actions are a part of *eemaan* and says that *eemaan* increases and decreases and allows making *istithnaa'* in *eemaan* – then all of this makes the person free and innocent of *irja'*! If this is a person's foundation in regards to *eemaan* then it renders a person being upon the *usool* of Ahl us-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah! **If you want to find an error then discuss these issues of eemaan and speak, and the ruling of whether so and so is from the Murji'ah or not has to be based on this criteria.**<sup>4</sup> There is no one who says (from us) that the *eemaan* of a sinner is the

---

<sup>4</sup> **Translator's note:** This is an excellent point by our Shaykh, for there are many who merely throw the term “Murji'ah” all over the place yet do not understand *irja'* in the way the Salaf did. Refer to: [http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj\\_EemaanAlAlbaanee](http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/SalafiManhaj_EemaanAlAlbaanee)

This is also superb advice for those who from the late 1990s accused Imaam al-Albaanee of *Irja'* based on their blind following of Safar al-Hawaali. Indeed certain individuals, have become ideologues of this claim due to being heavily influenced by the likes of Safar al-Hawaali, Salmaan al-'Awdah, Aboo Baseer at-Tartoosee (the fake Shaykh of south-east London) and via ridiculous public debates with 'Ali Tamimi. Along with utilising *al-Muntada al-Islami* as his base from which to operate, one individual even began to propagate to the youth that Imaam al-Albaanee did not understand “the reality of eemaan”?! This was due to hasty and partisan support of Dr Safar and Aboo Baseer and also on account of changing *manhaj* more times than a baby changes its nappies! Indeed, some of their confusion in this matter is but a result of a confused *manhaj* which has seen more ups and downs than a yo-yo! Some of them are thus now confusing of a new set of temper tantrum throwing *takfeeree* teens some of whom are left in the lurch while they philosophise a new *manhaj* for the contemporary zeitgeist!

Recently an individual, Abu Zubayr Saleem al-“Azzaami”, boldly claimed on his ‘*Islamic awakening*’ forum that he has **“accused greater than Albani of having irja’”**!?! Hereby claiming to have an in depth understanding of matters regarding *'aqeedah* that in someway allows him to have more knowledge than the *Mujaddid* of the era. He is particularly characterised by his *ghuloo* and *mubaalaghaa* in this issue and delving into it in order to baffle the common Muslim. This results in Abu Zubayr even stooping to the level wherein he compares the *'aqeedah* of Imaam al-Albaanee with that of the Jahmiyyah and 'Ashaa'irah?! Such cowardice is also evident in his unjust personal attacks on Salafis, without having the nerve to face them directly, and also by his vile manners which are not befitting for one who is taken as a *taalib ul-'ilm*. He has also asserted that Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabi al-Athari is **“a plagiarising thief”**! Others in the West who accuse Imaam al-Albaanee of this are the likes of Tibyan (*Tughyan!*) Publications.

Imaam Ahmad bin Hanbal was asked about the one who says “eemaan increases and decreases” and he replied **“this person is free from irjaa’”**, see: al-Khallaal, *as-Sunnah*, vol.3, p.581. Imaam ibn ul-Mubarak

same as that of the one who is obedient, or that the *eemaan* of one who commits a major sin is the same as *eemaan* of Jibreel (*'alaybis-salaam*). The *madbdbab* of the Murji'ah is a filthy disgusting *madbdbab* as they say that whatever sins one does will not have any effect on *eemaan*, this is a vile *madbdbab* and no one is to say that, and Allaah knows best!

---

stated to Qadi Abee Ya'la, as is mentioned in *Tabaqaat ul-Hanaabilah*, vol2, p.40: **“Whoever says eemaan is speech and action that increases and decreases, then irjaa’, from the first of it to the end of it, has left such a person.”** Imaam al-Barbahaaree said similar to this in *Sharh us-Sunnah*, p.132. This is what the Imams of the Salaf re-iterate as being from the creed of the Salaf, yet some of the contemporaries from the Khalaf (!) go further than this and mention other limits which have no *daleel* or proof for.

The difference between the Murji'ah and Ahl us-Sunnah has also been exemplified by Imaam Sufyaan ath-Thawree (*rahimahullaah*) who said: **“We say eemaan is speech and action, while they (the Murji'ah) say eemaan is speech and not action. We say eemaan increases and decreases, while they say eemaan neither increases nor decreases.”** See *al-Eemaan* (Maktabah al-Islamiyyah), p.184. Also from the signs of the Murji'ah according to the Salaf is that the Murji'ah view that obedience should not be given to the leaders. See the narration which has an authentic chain of transmission that Ahmad bin Sa'eed ar-Ribaatees said that 'Abdullaah bin Taahir said to him that the most hated people to him were the Murji'ah due to them viewing that obedience should not be made to the leaders, see Imaam as-Saabooni, *'Aqeedat us-Salaf wa As-haab ul-Hadeeth*, p.109. Also refer to the narration of Sufyaan ath-Thawree who said: **“How can I be a Murji'ee when I don't view that the sword be used (to remove the tyrannical leaders).”** Reported by Ibn Shaaheen in *al-Kitaab ul-Lateef*, p.15 which has an authentic chain of transmission.

For more on this see Shaykh, Dr Khaalid al-Anbaree, *The Murji'ah of the Era*, translated by Aboo Hayyaan Salal bin 'AbdulGhafoor: [http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/TheMurjiahOfTheEra\\_ebook.pdf](http://www.salafimanhaj.com/pdf/TheMurjiahOfTheEra_ebook.pdf)