

Why the Salaf Made Tabdī of al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ bin Ḥayy, Reviled Him and Abandoned Him After Considering Him an Imām in Ḥadīth: Because He Merely Held the Opinion of the Permissibility of Khurūj Against Oppressive Rulers



Imām al-Dhahabī mentions the biography of **al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ bin Ḥayy** (d. 169H) in al-Siyar (7/361-371) and Ibn Ḥajar likewise in al-Tahdhīb (2/285-289), and he used to be an Imām in ḥadīth, a ḥāfiẓ, a narrator, upright, reliable, trustworthy. He was praised very highly by the scholars of his time. He also had extreme piety and would spend the entire night in worship. However, he harboured the view of the permissibility of rebelling against the sinful, oppressive ruler and so the Salaf made tabdī of him, vilified him, abandoned his narrations and accused him of dissimulation in worship and considered him a misguided innovator, for whom not being born at all would have been better. And the reason for that was that he opposed the ḥadīths of the Messenger of Allāh (صلى الله عليه وسلم) in which it is made clear that rebelling is only permitted in two situations: Clear, open, manifest

kufr from the ruler about which there is no ambiguity and when the ruler prevents people from praying. As for sin and oppression withholding of rights, confiscation of wealth and so on, then it is obligatory to have patience, and this is a matter of creed that the Salaf included in their works. And anyone who opposed this was considered a misguided innovator and abandoned.

As for that which is cited regarding al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ, then from it is the following:

—**Abū Ḥātim**: “Thiqah, ḥāfiẓ, mutqin.”

—**Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal**: “Thiqah” and also “Al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ is authentic in reporting.”

—**Yahyā bin Maʿīn**: “Thiqah maʿmūn” and also “Thiqah, mustaqīm in ḥadīth” and “The opinion of al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ, the opinion of al-Awzāʿī are to be written down, they are thiqāt.”

—**Abu Zurʿah**: “Precision, understanding, worship and asceticism were all combined in him.”

—**Abū Ghassān al-Nahdī**: “I am amazed at a people who put Sufyān al-Thawrī ahead of al-Ḥasan.”

—**Aḥmad bin Yūnus**: “I sat with him for twenty years, and I never saw him raise his head to the sky and nor did he mention the world.”

—**Abu Nuʿaym**: “Al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ narrated to us, and he was not less than al-Thawrī in fear (of Allāh) and strength (in knowledge, ḥadīth).”

—**Ibn ʿAdiyy**: “He is among the people of truthfulness in my view.”

—**Abū Sulaymān al-Dārānī**: “I never saw anyone on whose face fear was more apparent than al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ. He performed

prayer one night with “Ammā yatasā’alūn’ (Sūrah 78, al-Naba’), and he would keep fainting and was not able to complete it till Fajr.”

And there are dozens more statements like these which mention his virtue and excellence in all areas, knowledge, ḥadīth, fiqh, worship, piety and so on.

However, he adopted the view of rebelling against the unjust rulers of his time because of their oppression and tyranny.

Despite holding this view, he never actually rebelled, nor did he call anyone to rebellion, nor did he spread his view. His view only came out in the course of discussions, in which he merely expressed it as an opinion.

The Salaf made tabdī of him and no longer wrote down from him, because he opposed the Sunnah of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and had chosen misguidance over guidance.

—**Ibn Ḥajar**: “He is from the leading Imāms of Islām, if only he had not become involved with bid‘ah.” And also: “Al-Ḥasan used to hold the view of revolting against the rulers of his time due to their oppression and tyranny, but he never ever fought...” And he cited many narrations regarding him from the Salaf:

—**Abu Ma‘mar**: “We were with Wakī and when he would narrate from al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ, we would put down our hands and not write. So he said: ‘What is with you that you do not write ḥadīth that are good?’ So my brother indicated to him with his hand like this [and he raised his hand up as if he was brandishing a sword], meaning that he used to hold the view of raising the sword (rebellion). So then Wakī remained silent.”

—**Yahyā al-Qaṭṭān**: “Sufyān al-Thawrī used to have a very evil opinion about al-Ḥasan bin Ḥayy.”

—**Abu Nu‘aym**: “Sufyān Al-Thawrī entered the mosque on Jumū‘ah from the Qibliyy doorway whereupon he saw al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ praying. So he said: ‘I seek refuge from the awe (of Allāh) that is hypocrisy.’ Then he took his shoes and then went to another area (of the mosque).” And he also said: “Al-Ḥasan was mentioned to al-Thawrī who said: ‘That is a man who holds the view of raising the sword against the ummah of Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ).’”

—**Yūsuf bin Asbāṭ**: “Al-Ḥasan used to hold the view of raising the sword.”

— **Abū Ṣaliḥ al-Farrā’**: “I cited to Yūsuf bin Asbāṭ something about the tribulations from Wakī and he said: ‘That one resembles his teacher’ (meaning al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ). So I said: ‘Do you not fear that you are involved in backbiting.’ He said: ‘Why, O idiot? I am better to them than their fathers and mothers. I prohibit the people from acting upon what they have innovated which would cause them to bear their burdens (of sin). And the one who praises them is more harmful to them.’”

—**Bishr bin al-Ḥārith**: “Zā’idah used to sit in the mosque, warning the people from Ibn Ḥayy and his companions.” He said: “They used to hold the view of raising the sword (rebellious).”

—**Khalaf bin Tamīm**: “Zā’idah used to demand repentance from anyone who came to al-Ḥasan bin Ḥayy.”

—**Aḥmad bin Yūnus**: “If only al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ had not been born, it would have been better for him.”

—**Ibn al-Muthannā**: “I never heard Yaḥyā and nor Ibn Maḥdī narrating anything from Ibn Ḥayy at all.”

—**‘Amr bin ‘Alī al-Fallās**: “I asked ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (bin Maḥdī) about a ḥadīth from the ḥadīths of al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ. But he refused to narrate to me from him. He used to narrate from him and then abandoned him.”

—**‘Abd Allāh bin Idrīs**: And the fainting of al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ (in prayer and out of the fear of Allāh) was mentioned to him, so he said: “The smile of Sufyān (al-Thawrī) is more beloved to us than the fainting of al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ.”

So this makes clear the action of the Salaf towards a lofty, highly regarded man, a man of knowledge, understanding and piety who was a narrator of Prophetic traditions, when he deviated in viewpoint. They would not be deceived by his overt piety. Rather, that piety was treated by them as dissimulation and hypocrisy, because a man cannot truly be pious the while he knows he is opposing the command of the Messenger (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ).

Notes:

1. This is the way of Ahl al-Sunnah, the followers of the Salaf, to whom the consideration is about whether a person is making ittibā’, following the Sunnah and following the doctrine of the Salaf, and venerating the Prophetic traditions and speaking with them and abiding by them. They care not for his knowledge, memorisation or his piety when he deserts and opposes the Prophetic Sunnah and the way of the Salaf. Such people are the ones who—from the time of the Khārijites, to this day of ours—cause the ummah to split and

become divided and weak, because of their innovations and deviations. For this reason, you will see from time to time, the Salafi scholars, after periods of advice, warn from those who were upon the way of the Salaf, and then opposed it, either by way of doctrine or methodology, or by supporting and defending outright innovators and so on, even if they were scholars with recognition. You will not see this with the Innovators, Ḥizbīs and those traversing the methodologies of groups like al-Ikhwān. Rather, you will see between themselves flattery (mujāmalah), cordiality and ignoring of serious errors in creed and methodology. This is the way of people of past scripture who did not distinguish between truth and falsehood and concealed the truth, and thereby allowed their religion to undergo tabdīl (alteration) and taḥrīf (distortion). These are the same people you will see calling to a fake, manufactured, artificial type of unity, all based on emotions and desires, the while they ignore that the calamities they always complain about, then they never descended upon this nation except due to the innovators and deviants. True unity only comes about by holding on to the rope of Allāh and sticking to the Sunnah and the way of the Salaf, and not in simply gathering bodies together on the basis of emotions and feelings.

2. To revolt against sinful, oppressive rulers is a bid'ah in the religion and opposes the command of Allāh and His Messenger, so whoever adopted this as a doctrine, as do the Khārijites, then he is an innovator. As for those who fell into revolt on account of ta'wīl (faulty interpretation), then their actions are erroneous and Ibn Taymiyyah explained the angle of their error and reasons why they

fell into what they fell into in Minhāj al-Sunnah.¹ Their actions are not proof in the religion, and whoever took them as proof in religion is either mistaken or ignorant or a person of deviation who desires misguidance.

3. Also in the affair of al-Ḥassan bin Ṣāliḥ is an exposure of what the Hizbīs and Innovators say of the Salafīs. Namely, that they are so split and divided, and that keep dividing and “dropping” shaykhs and so on. And what they mean by this is when the Salafīs stand to perform the obligation that the People of the Scripture failed to perform of not concealing the truth, and of not mixing truth with falsehood and of not remaining silent upon falsehood, when they refute the opposer—after periods of advice and patience—and then judge that person with the judgement of the Sunnah, irrespective of his prior standing, then they treat all of this as Salafis “splitting” and “dividing” and this is from their own ignorance as is clear.

Alḥamdulillāh, the Salafi scholars refuted the likes of **Shaykh Bakr Abu Zayd** for his defence of Sayyid Quṭb and for giving the Quṭbīs and Surūrīs weapons to attack Ahl al-Sunnah and likewise Shaykh Aḥmad al-Najmī refuted and made tabdī of **Ibn Jibrīn** for his alliance and defence of the Khārijites such as Safar and Salmān and defence of Ḥasan al-Bannā, and likewise they spoke against, **‘Abd Allāh al-Ghunaymān** for his alliance and defence of the Surūriyyah. And likewise, they expelled **Muḥammad al-Maghrawī** from the Sunnah into bid‘ah when he manifested the statements of the Khārijites, and **Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ma’ribī** when he tried to bring stealth Ikhwānī principles among the Salafis as part of a broad

¹ Refer to this article: <http://www.kharijites.com/kj/?bmwaofdhi>

revolution against the Salafi methodology, and likewise **al-Ḥalabī**. And similarly against the likes of **Fāliḥ al-Ḥarbī** and **Yahyā al-Ḥajūrī** and also more recently, **Muḥammad bin Hādī**, when they all manifested the manhaj of the Ḥaddādites of attacking the scholars of the Sunnah and making tabdī and taḍlīl of Salafis and their scholars upon falsehood.

So this is the distinguishing sign of Ahl al-Sunnah, they do not accommodate falsehood, if it appears among their ranks, and they abide by the truth and speak the truth.

This trait is not found in those besides them, and you see the Ḥizbīs and Innovators— those who always find time and opportunity to attack Salafis whilst making excuses for everyone else from the sects, groups, parties and individuals of innovation—you will see them not having any criterion, always accommodating people of misguidance, flattering them, praising them and being blind or pretending to be blind to what is with them of calamities that surpass those of al-Ḥasan bin Ṣāliḥ bin Ḥayy. And this is because they seek numbers and not the truth, they seek to grow followers and not to direct their followers to the truth. So when they see that the Salafi methodology and its adherents and the truth that they call to comes in the way of their desires, goals and agendas—**and perhaps it comes in the way of material interests that many of them have, in that their da'wah is also trade for them**—then often, this is what really motivates their speech against Salafis and what they call to.

All of this indicates that they are deficient in their fiqh of this religion, ignorant of the manhaj of Prophethood, the manhaj of the

Companions, that of the Salaf. ‘Abd Allāh bin Mas‘ūd (رضي الله عنه) related that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: **“There was no Prophet that Allāh sent in a nation before me except that he had Helpers (Ḥawāriyyūn) and Associates (Aṣ-ḥāb) from his nation who would take his Sunnah and guide themselves by his command. Then they were succeeded by generations after them who said that which they did not do and who did that which they were not commanded. So whoever strove against them with his hand is a believer, and whoever strove against them with his tongue is a believer, and whoever strove against them with his heart is a believer. And beyond that there is not a seed’s weight of faith.”**² So the Companions are the ones who strove against the Khārijites, Rāfiḍah, the Qadariyyah and right at the end of their era appeared the Murjī‘ah. And they taught the Tābi‘īn this methodology, so the Tābi‘īn then spoke against the Murjī‘ah, and the Jahmiyyah and Mu‘tazilah. And they taught this to the Tābi‘ Tābi‘īn, and from them did the Imāms of the Salaf inherit it, and the affair continued like this. So this is the way followed by the Imāms of the Salaf, and those upon their way, following behind the Scholars, and those that preceded them, going all the way back to the Ḥawāriyyūn (Helpers) and Aṣ-ḥāb (Companions) of Allāh’s Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم). And the enmity and vengeance of Ahl al-Bid‘ah against them is for no other reason but this.

Abu ‘Iyaad

@abuiyaadsp ♦ salaf.com ♦ kharijites.com

10 Ramaḍān 1440 / 15 May 2019 v. 1.03

² Related by al-Bukhārī (no. 5705) and Muslim (no. 220).