

SHAYKH 'ALI BIN HASAN AL-HALABĪ AL-ATHARĪ  
(*rahimahullāh*)

ON THE IGNORANCE AND RIDICULOUS ERRORS OF  
MUHAMMAD BIN SĀLIM AD-DAWSARĪ<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Abridged from Shaykh 'Ali bin Hasan bin 'Ali bin 'AbdulHameed al-Halabī al-Atharī, *at-Tanbihāt al-Mutawā'imah fī Nusrat il-Haqq il-Ajwibatu al-Mutalā'imah 'alā Fatwa al-Lajnatī'd-Dā'imah* (Cairo: Dār ul-Manhaj, 1424 AH/2003 CE), pp.343-347; 381-393.

The first edition of ad-Dawsarī's book *Raf' ul-Lā'imah* was 88 pages in total and had introductions from Shaykh Sālih al-Fawzān and Shaykh 'Abdul'Azeez ar-Rājihī. The second edition was of 156 pages and had extra introductions from Shaykhs Ibn Jibreel, 'Abdullah Sa'd (currently in prison in Saudi, as he has been for the last six years or so for being linked to Takfīrīs and going against the Saudi state) and Sa'd bin Humayd.

Shaykh 'Ali's response to 'Abdullāh Sa'd's introduction to ad-Dawsarī's book is some 81 pages and is very detailed as it clears up many misconceptions and false perceptions, hopefully we can produce a translation of that in the future inshā'Allāh. Shaykh Sālih al-Fawzān also addresses Shaykh 'Ali with respect by referring to him as “**the brother, Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī**” (see *at-Tanbihāt al-Mutawā'imah fī Nusrat il-Haqq il-Ajwibatu al-Mutalā'imah 'alā Fatwa al-Lajnatī'd-Dā'imah*, pp.189-190) – which is more than can be said of the ignoramuses today who make ridiculous statements about Shaykh 'Ali such as “he is not even a Shaykh”?!

As we stated beforehand, ad-Dawsarī, who Shaykh 'Ali refers to as being “**majhūl**”, is not known for many academic works, edits, studies etc. Moreover, he was part of those who were leading a serious and direct campaign against the students of the *da'wah* of Imām al-Albānī. Interestingly, this is the same Muhammad bin Sālim ad-Dawsarī who was arrested by Saudi Intelligence Services (!!!) in Dammām or al-Ahsa and then put in prison in Saudi for being with al-Qaeda and the Khawārij on 19th Rabi' al-Ākhir 1424 AH/19th June 2003 CE after Fajr, and subsequently imprisoned on regular occasions. Shaykh Ibrāheem ar-Ruhaylī (*hafidhahullāh*) also mentioned this in a visit to Indonesia circa 2004. While ad-Dawsarī's name appears in a list of “imprisoned Saudi Harakīs, Qutbīs and Takfīrīs” many of whom supported al-Qaeda, here:

6. Then Dawsarī appends (on page 18) trying to be a scholar, trying to be big, trying to be elaborate and trying to be detailed about the title of my treatise *al-Ajwibatu al-Mutalā'imah 'alā Fatwa al-Lajnati'd-Dā'imah*, saying:

**What is correct is that al-jawāb (the answer) is about ('an) something and not 'alā (on), so it is said: al-Ajwibatu al-Mutalā'imah 'an Fatwa al-Lajnati'd-Dā'imah. !!!**

### **This is my answer (jawāb) on it (alayhi!):**

This is what the *miskeen* said! Which in itself is evidence, from many evidences, of his compounded ignorance!

**Firstly:** The source of this precious discovery (!) could be, and the knowledge is with Allāh, the book *Mu'jam ul-Akta' ish-Shā'i'ah* by al-'Adnānī and his speech regarding this point is very accurate however it is not as the rough-drafter (i.e. ad-Dawsarī) understands or understood it!! The speech of al-'Adnānī within the book which relates to: **the answer = on = the question**



[http://ahmadalmashari.blogspot.com/2013/03/blog-post\\_1689.html](http://ahmadalmashari.blogspot.com/2013/03/blog-post_1689.html)

Also see here (a Twitter page regarding his arrest which shows 'gifts' he has received while being in prison!):

[https://twitter.com/m3tql\\_1424?lang=en-gb](https://twitter.com/m3tql_1424?lang=en-gb)

This is the **Muhammad bin Sālim ad-Dawsarī author of Raf' ul-Lā'imah 'an Fatwa al-Lajnat id-Dā'imah** who was trying to refute Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī, and even managed to manipulate some of the 'Ulama to write commendations for him, despite the fact that he had no credible works prior whatsoever.

[**al-jawāb = 'an = su'āl**] and what he stated is closest to the truth without a doubt. However, the affair is in regards to the one who did not understand what he said due to his narrow-mindedness and his lack of insight,<sup>2</sup> or due to his fondness for biased partisanship and fault-finding, even with that which is void. This is just like our companion (the rough-drafter) or the discovery that he reached! Or both of them together are well-informed!

**Secondly:** Conversion into the transitive form (*ta'diya*) of the word '*al-jawāb*' (answer) with '*alā*' (on) is totally correct, this is when the (intended) answer is not connected to a direct question that is answered, but rather it refers to an answer which has the meaning of replying,<sup>3</sup> discussing, commenting, criticising and correcting. In this case takes it carries a different meaning so it is allowed within Arabic grammar to convert it (the word '*jawāb*') into the transitive form with: *fee*, '*alā*, *li* and even at some rare times to use '*an*.'<sup>4</sup>

### **This is the evidence unto you:**

**Thirdly:** the evidence for what I have said is plentiful:

1. The *hadeeth* of the Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) which was reported by Muslim in his Saheeh (*hadeeth* no.2166): “wa inna **nujābu 'alayhim**, wa la yujābūna **'alaynā...**” (“...and we answer them but they do not answer us...”)
2. The statement of Imām ash-Shāfi'ī<sup>5</sup>: “The Prophet (*sallallāhu 'alayhi wassallam*) **yujeebu 'alā** nahwi ma yus'alu 'anhu” (“...answered whatever was asked of him...”). Imām at-Tirmidhī transmitted this from him within his *Sunan* (*hadeeth* no.792).
3. The statement of Imām an-Nasā'ī in his *Sunan* (*hadeeth* no.3970): “**Mujāwibatān 'alā qawlika**” (“in answering your saying”).
4. The statement of Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah in *al-Majmū'*, vol.24, p.349: “**al-jawābu 'alā hadha min wujūhin...**” (“the answer to this has a number of aspects...”). In *al-*

---

<sup>2</sup> See *al-Qāmūs al-Muheet*, p.1577

<sup>3</sup> He himself (ad-Dawsarī), may Allāh guide him, fell into the same error that he accused me of making!! He stated: “I decided to refute (**Radd 'alayhi**) what he had written...”!! This is the meaning exactly that I have explained.

<sup>4</sup> In the *Musnad* of Imam Ahmad (18095) within the *hadeeth* of Safwān bin 'Assāl al-Murādī in regards to seeking knowledge is his saying: “*wa ajābahu 'alā nahwin min mas'alahi*” (“and he answered the issue that he had”) and within another copy of the *hadeeth*: “*fa ajābahu 'an mas'alahi*” (“he answered the issue that he had”)!

<sup>5</sup> The proof of his words in regards to language are not hidden from the student of knowledge! See Imam al-Bayhaqī, *Manāqib ush-Shāfi'ī*, vol.2, pp.41-59.

*Fawā'id an-Nūrāniyyah al-Fiqhiyyah* (p.249): “**al-jawābu 'alā qawlihim...**” (“the answer to their saying is...”)

5. The custom of Arabic authors and their ilk in titling the following works do not necessitate the authors to make the conversion (of the word ‘jawāb’) into the transitive form via use of ‘an only:
- Al-Hāfidh Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī (*rahimabullāh*), **al-Ajwibatu al-Wāridah 'alā'l-As'ila al-Wāfidah**.
  - Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn 'Taymiyyah (*rahimabullāh*), **al-Jawābu Saheeh li-man Baddala Deen al-Maseeh**.
  - 'Allāmah al-Luknowī (*rahimabullāh*), **al-Ajwibatu al-Fādilah li-l-As'ilati'l-Asbratil-Kāmilah**.
  - Al-Hāfidh as-Sakhāwī, **al-Ajwibatu al-Mardiyyah fīmā Su'ila 'anhu min al-Abādeeth an-Nabawiyyah**.
  - Al-Hāfidh as-Sakhāwī, **al-Ajwibatu al-'Urfiyyah li'l-Masā'il as-Sarfīyyah**, as is found within *Iktifā' al-Qanū'* (p.469). All of these works are published.
  - Al-Hāfidh as-Sakhāwī, **al-Ajwibatu 'alā Masā'il min al-Mabsool**, as is found within *ad-Durur al-Kāminah*, vol.4, p.299
  - Az-Zurqānī, **al-Ajwibatu al-Misriyyah 'alā'l-As'ilati'l-Maghibiyyah**
  - Az-Zurqānī, **al-Ajwibatu al-Mu'allalah fi'l-Masā'il al-Mujahhalah**, as is found within *Fibri Makhtootāt* of Chester Beatty (p.3847). Also see *Kashf udb-Dhunūn*, vol.1, p.12 and *al-Badr ut-Tālī'*, vol.1, p.330.

And there are plenty of further examples like this!<sup>6</sup>

## Fallen claims

Fifth: his (ad-Dawsarī's) claim against me that:

**“He (i.e. Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī) makes much tajreeh of his brothers who are Du'āt, and also of the students of knowledge who oppose him in these and other issues. Even with whoever does not agree with him in authenticating hadeeth or weakening hadeeth – this is well-known and verified in his books. On the other hand, he does not object to the secularists, atheists,**

---

<sup>6</sup> **Translator's note:** Hence, those who still like to champion what was written by Muhammad bin Sālim ad-Dawsarī now have to account for this ridiculous error from him in regards to the Arabic language.

**heretics and the corrupt at all and does not give them even a quarter of what he dedicates to (refuting) his brothers, Allāhu Musta'an!"**

Yes, Allāhu Musta'an against the people of transgression, enmity, oppression and falsification!

### **An explanation:**

A reply to his claims are from a number of aspects:

1. What you (O Dawsarī) call, in your terms of expression, "Tajreeh" is, in the language of 'Ilm you do not adequately comprehend as maybe you do not know it, is under the issue of al-Jarh wa't-Ta'deel with its acknowledged rules. Within this science terms such as Mukhti', Mudallis, Kadhhāb, Majhūl, Juhūl and the likes are utilised. However, where are you to knowledge O my brother Ibn Sālim?!
2. As for me making "Tajreeh/Jarh" of those who do not agree with me in authenticating or weakening hadeeth – then this is a lie of the drafter (ad-Dawsarī) and his falsification. I know very well that the **science of hadeeth is ijtihād** wherein there can be a view and another view so long as these views emanate from those who are qualified people to give their view. As for mere claimants to the science then their writings soon fall and their words fade away. In order to cover himself in regards to the fact that he does not even mention the least amount of proof of his claim, the drafter states falsely: **"this is well-known and verified in his books."**

### **Samples of Academic Hadeeth Studies**

The opposite of what has been stated about me, all praise is due to Allāh, is abundant and here unto you are some proofs of that:

1. My treatise *Tanqeeh ul-Andhār bi Da'f Hadeeth "Ramadān: Anwaluhu Rahmatun, wa Amsatuhu Maghfirah wa Akbirahu 'Itq min an-Nār"* [Bringing Attention to the Weakness of the Hadeeth "Ramadān – the first of it is mercy, the middle of it is forgiveness and the last of it is salvation from the Hellfire"]. Riyadh, KSA: Dār ul-Maseer, 1418 AH. Within my research I also debated (the view of) Shaykh Abū 'AbdurRahmān adh-Dhāhirī (*bafidhabullāh*) and on page 9 I referred to him as: "al-'Allāmah, al-Muhaqqiq, al-Bāhith, al-Mudaqqiq, Shaykh, al-Ustādh..." So where is this language of praise in comparison to this false claim (of ad-Dawsarī)?
2. My treatise *al-Kashf wa't-Tibyān li 'Ilal Hadeeth: "Allāhumma innī As'aluka bi Haqq is-Sā'ileen"* [Exposing and Clarification of the Defects of the Hadeeth "O Allāh I ask You by the right of the askers"], Dammām, KSA: Dār ul-Hijrah, 1410 AH. Within my research I also

debated (the view of) the respected Shaykh Ismā'eel al-Ansārī (*rahimahullāh*) and on page 5 I described as “the noble Shaykh strove to authenticate the hadeeth and verify its pillars.” On page 9 I stated “...written by the noble Shaykh Ismā'eel al-Ansārī, researcher at Dār ul-Iftā' wa'l-Buhūth al-'Ilmiyyah wa'l-Irshad in Riyādh, may Allāh grant him success in that which is good.” I also said towards the end of my introduction: “If I have been correct in what I have written then that is from the complete favour of Allāh upon me. If I have erred or fallen short then that is from my own weakness and shortcomings, and I ask Allāh for forgiveness, pardon, correctness, steadfastness and for Him, Glory unto Him, to grant success to our dignified Shaykhs and well-versed teachers to accept the truth even if it is against them, and that they do not narrow their hearts to clarity and attention.”<sup>7</sup> So where are my words from his (ad-Dawsarī's) claims?!

3. My treatise *Tanweer ul-'Ayn'ayn fī Turuq Hadeeth fī Kashf al-Wajh wa'l-Kaffayn* [Enlightening the Eyes to the Routes of the Hadeeth Regarding Covering the Face and Hands].<sup>8</sup> 'Ammān, Jordan: Dār 'Ammār, 1410 AH. I stated towards the end of my introduction (pp.10-11): “Verification, narration, precision and patience are gleaming signposts which the student of knowledge and the preacher has to crown himself with in his path of thinking, and his method of study and his methodology in adopting opinions. As for whoever is not a student of knowledge then it is obligatory upon him to adopt the ideas of those whose knowledge has been attested to and whose deen has been assured of. I ask Allāh, glory unto Him, that I be in agreement with what is correct and that I have left error and doubt. From Allāh's success, and all praise is due to Allāh, glory unto Him, along with His abundant virtue and favours, is what if my pen slips and my

---

<sup>7</sup> I repeat these words today, in this instance, after more than ten years since when I first wrote this.

<sup>8</sup> Recently, I came across a new treatise entitled *an-Naqd ul-Bannā' li-Hadeeth Asmā'*, printed about a year or more ago, by our noble brother who is specialised in hadeeth and who is a student of knowledge of the Prophetic hadeeth, Tāriq 'Awadullāh, may Allāh grant him success. Within it he commented on my treatise *Tanweer ul-'Ayn'ayn fī Turuq Hadeeth fī Kashf al-Wajh wa'l-Kaffayn* [Enlightening the Eyes to the Routes of the Hadeeth Regarding Covering the Face and Hands] and critiqued it in an academic manner – even though I do not agree with him! He described me with the following, may Allāh increase him in goodness, on page 187:

**“...he (Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī) is from our brothers who are occupied with this noble science (of hadeeth) and he is from our brothers who have a thankful hand in defending the Sunnah and refuting Ahl ul-Bida'.”**

I say: may Allāh thank him for his justice and uprightness.

understanding leaves that which is true, is that Allāh's Pardon is Greater and His Mercy is Vast. I seek from every loving brother, beloved one, advisor and student of knowledge that if he sees within this Juz' an error of the pen or in judgement to be patient with beautiful patience and to lead us to that which is he truth. The truth, by Allāh, is more beloved to us than our own selves."<sup>9</sup> So where is my right in light of his (ad-Dawsarī's) falsehood?!

### **There is no reason except confusion**

However, it appears that the drafter (i.e. ad-Dawsarī) is mixing things up! It may be that he views some of my strong, and I do not say "harsh", refutations on some of the Ahl ul-Bida' such as the destroyer of the Sunnah, Ibn 'AbdulMannān, Mahmūd Sa'eed Mamdūh, al-Ghumārī, as-Sābūnī, al-Ghazālī and the likes – and ad-Dawsarī, may Allāh guide him, did not distinguish between the Sunnī and the Bidi'ī amid his **"safeguarding of uniting the word and unifying the ranks"**!<sup>10</sup>

3 – As for his (ad-Dawsarī's statement about me that): **"...he does not object to the secularists, atheists, heretics and the corrupt at all..."**

### **The ruling on refuting the secularists and atheists**

I say: the answer to this is from two sides:

**ONE:** general, which is that I say: is "refuting the secularists, atheists, heretics and the corrupt..." Fard 'Ayn or Fard Kifāyah? If he says it is Fard Kifāyah – then he has refuted himself and contradicted his own words! Why is he obligating the individual (fard) with what is being adequately conducted by other than him?! If he says it is Fard 'Ayn then he has come with something which none from the past, or present, has stated!

**TWO:** detailed, which is that I say: I have, all praise is due to Allāh, refuted the "secularists, atheists, heretics and the corrupt..." with many things and not just once, such as with these:

### **Strong Academic Samples**

- a. A refutation of famous secularists such as Muhammad Ahmad Khalafullāh and Husayn Ahmad Ameen – as found in my book *al-'Aqlāniyyūn: Afrākḥ al-Mu'tazilāh al-'Asriyyūn* [The

---

<sup>9</sup> I repeat these words today, and I will continue to repeat these words so long as there is a pulse in my veins , inshā'Allāh.

<sup>10</sup> As ad-Dawsarī says on page 21 of the Second Edition of *his Raḥ ul-Lā'imah!*

Rationalists: Chicks of the Contemporary Mu'tazilah], pp.65-67. Madeenah an-Nabawiyah: Maktabat ul-Ghurabā', 1413 AH.

- b. A refutation of those influenced by some atheists 'who claim to protect the *deen* yet reject what the Messengers came with' as found in the treatise of al-'Allāmah as-Sa'dī, *Intisār ul-Haqq*, p.9 – which I edited, Dammām: Dār Ibn ul-Qayyim, 1408 AH.
- c. A refutation of some of the contemporary atheists and their attempts to utilise the story of the Gharāneeq so as criticise Islām and the Muslims in the form of refuting Salmān Rushdie who wrote on the 'Satanic verses' which caused tremendous reactions in the Islamic world, Western world and across the globe generally. I wrote articles in some Jordanian newspapers about this atheist entitled '*Āyāt Salmān Rushdie Bayna'l-Ams wa'l-Yamm*' [The Signs of Salmān Rushdie Between Yesterday and Today]. Just as in my book *Dalā'il ut-Tahqeeq li Ibtāl Qissat il-Gbrāneeq* (Jeddah, KSA: Maktabat us-Sahābah, 1412 AH), p.17.
- d. A refutation of the "corrupt one" Ibn 'Arabī, the Sūfī and Hulūlī in Shaykh Taqeeuddeen al-Fāsi's *Juz' 'Aqeedat Ibn 'Arabī wa Hayātihī* (Dammām, KSA: Maktabat Ibn al-Jawzī, 1408 AH).
- e. A refutation of all "corrupt ones" who all into resembling the Mushrikeen about whom it is deserving that it be said of them: *Tashbeeh ul-Khasees bi Abl il-Khamees* – which in fact is the name of the treatise written by Imām adh-Dhahabī, printed in Jordan by Dār 'Ammār in 1408 AH.

Other than these are many and Allāh is the Most High and Ever-Able. So where is my situation and reality to his lies and oppression?

Sixth: his (ad-Dawsarī's) statement about me that:

**“He (i.e. Shaykh 'Ali Hasan al-Halabī al-Atharī) views himself as being of the guardians of Salafiyyah and its Manhaj, and that all who disagree with him are Khalafīs and not Salafīs – as if the Salafī Manhaj is a monopoly of just a specific group or restricted to a specific place.”<sup>11</sup>**

---

<sup>11</sup> [TN]: this is an odd observation, all the more strange that he would have the audacity to level this against Shaykh 'Ali (*rahimahullāh*) yet be as oblivious to this within his own country!

## Guardianship or False Claims and Propaganda?!

I say:

1. The claim of possessing “guardianship over Salafiyyah and its Manhaj” is a major and dangerous issue. For many “groups” today claim it and accuse their opposers of contradicting it, so the issue is not restricted to a specific “person” or restricted to a certain “place”! Furthermore, if we want to, or if we strive to, consider ourselves, or view ourselves, as being guardians and protectors of Salafiyyah – then this consideration of us is for our senior Mashā’iykh who we ascribe ourselves to and attach all of the Ummah to: they are the reference points who are to be referred back to, (and this is to be understood) clearly and lucidly.

As for safeguarding this then yes (Na’am) and it is a blessing (Ni’mā)

Yes, I safeguard as much as I can, all praise is due to Allāh, along with our Mashā’iykh and our brothers, the Salafī Manhaj so that it can remain pure with no doubts. This is a matter which should make all of us want to give victory to it

As for his (ad-Dawsarī’s) statement that it is “**...as if the Salafī Manhaj is a monopoly of just a specific group or restricted to a specific place.**”

By Allāh, this statement is probably the most truthful thing that Ibn Sālim has drafted! Yes, the Salafī Manhaj is not a monopoly of just a specific group, be it formal or local!

## The Salafī Manhaj is above all people

(It is not the monopoly of):

*Neither a Hay’a nor a Lajnah,  
Neither a Jam’iyyah nor a Markaz,  
Neither a person nor personalities,  
Neither groups nor individuals,*

And it is not a monopoly of a specific place:

*Neither Najd nor Hijaz,  
Neither Damascus nor ‘Ammān,  
Neither Egypt nor Lubnān,  
Neither Yemen nor Pakistān*

This is what we say and this is what we are upon, so that the connection is more exalted and linked to evidence and textual proof and nothing else from statements and personalities!

