

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

THE STRONG ROPE (A.S.)



وَاعْتَصِمُوا بِحَبْلِ اللَّهِ جَمِيعًا وَلَا تَفَرَّقُوا...

And hold fast by the rope of Allah all together and be not disunited...

Encouraging one and all to fasten unto The Strong Rope of Allah i.e. the Wilaayah of Imam Ali Ibn Abi Talib & the Imams from his pure progeny (peace be on them).

WWW.THESTRONGROPE.COM

Abaqāt al-Anwār

Fi Imamate Al-Aimma Al-Athār (a.s.)

Hadees-e-Saqalain Volume 3

by

Mir Hāmid Husain Kinturi (r.a.)

Translated by:

Dr. Shabeeb Rizvi

Title : **Abaqāt al-Anwār Fi Imamate Al-Aimmah
Al-Athār (a.s.) - Hadees-e-Saqalain – Vol. 3**

By : Mir Hāmid Husain Kinturi (r.a.)

Translator : Dr. Shabeeb Rizvi

First Edition : June 2025

Printed By : The Strong Rope Foundation
Whatsapp: +91-8070151412
Email: thestrongrope@gmail.com

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

اللَّهُمَّ كُنْ لَوْلِيِّكَ الْحُجَّةِ بْنِ الْحَسَنِ
الْعَسْكَرِيِّ صَلَوَاتِكَ عَلَيْهِ وَعَلَى
آبَائِهِ فِي هَذِهِ السَّاعَةِ وَفِي كُلِّ
سَاعَةٍ. وَلِيًّا وَحَافِظًا وَقَائِدًا
وَنَاصِرًا وَدَلِيلًا وَعَيْنًا. حَتَّى
تُسْكِنَهُ أَرْضَكَ طَوْعًا وَتُمَتِّعَهُ
فِيهَا طَوِيلًا.

Table of Contents

HADEES-E-SAQALAIN: THE PROOF OF IMAMATE OF THE AHLE BAIT (A.S.).....	12
Response To The Fifth Contradictory Tradition.....	13
Indication:.....	13
Response To The Sixth Contradictory Tradition.....	42
Indication:.....	42
The criticism (jarh) and weakening (qadh) of Ibn Baylamani, Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman, and his father (Abd al-Rahman Ibn Zaid), who are the narrators of this report, have been well- documented in the books of the scholars (Ahl-e-Tasannun).....	45
Criticism and Disparagement of Abd al-Rahman Baylamani from the biographical books of Ahle Tasannun.....	54
Criticism and Appraisal of Zaid Ami, another narrator of the tradition on the knowledge of Muaz, as reported from the books of Ahle Tasannun.....	59
The Criticism and Condemnation of Salam Ibn Sulaim Sa'di by Prominent Scholars of Ahle Tasannun	63
Exploitation of slaves by Muaz Ibn Jabal gifted to him by the people of Yemen.	71
Misuse of Muaz Ibn Jabal regarding the wealth he had acquired through trade using the property of Allah.....	76
Response To The Seventh Contradictory Tradition	80
Indication.....	80
Reason 1: Explanation of the Criticism by Hafiz Abu Haatim Raazi on the Tradition of Following (Hadees-e-Iqtida).....	81
Indication.....	81
First Point:.....	81
Hafiz Abu Hatim Raazi:	82

Reason 2: Criticism and weakening (قدح و جرح) of Tirmizi, who is one of the compilers of the Sihah-e-Sittah (the six authentic books of traditions), regarding the ‘Tradition of Following’ (Hadees-e-Iqtida)	94
Indicator	94
Criticism and Discrediting by the Ahle Tasannun scholars of Ibrahim Ibn Ismail Kufi, one of the narrators of the Hadees-e-Iqtida (The Tradition of Following).....	95
Critique and Discrediting by the experts of transmitters of Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail, another narrator of this tradition.....	98
Critique and Discrediting by the Ahle Tasannun scholars of Yahya Ibn Salama Ibn Kuhail, another narrator of the Tradition of Following Abu Bakr and Umar (Hadees-e-Iqtida)	99
Reference to the Critique and Evaluation by Hafiz al-Bazaar, the author of Musnad, of the Hadees-e-Iqtida (The tradition of following Abu Bakr and Umar).....	102
Biography of Hafiz Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Umar Ibn Abd al-Khaliq al-Bazaar:.....	104
The criticism of the scholar of traditions Abu Jafar Muhammad Ibn Hammad Uqayli concerning Hadees-e-Iqtida and his biography	105
The criticism of Hafiz Abu Bakr Muhammad Ibn Hasan Mosuli, known as al-Naqqash, concerning Hadees-e-Iqtida.....	106
The criticism of Hafiz Abu al-Hasan Ali Ibn Umar Daraqutni regarding Hadees-e-Iqtida and the sources of his biography ...	107
The criticism of Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Hazm, a Zahiri, of Hadees-e-Iqtida, the five lessons derived from his statements and his biography	109
The criticism of Hadees-e-Iqtida by Allamah Burhan al-Deen Obaidullah Farghani, commentator of Minhaj al-Baizawi, and his biography	118
The criticism by Hafiz Shams al-Deen Muhammad Zahabi, the author of Mizan al-Itidal, of Hadees-e-Iqtida.....	124

The criticism of Hadees-e-Iqtida by Hafiz Shahab al-Deen Ahmad Ibn Hajar Asqalani	126
Quoting Sharh al-Mawaqef on Hadees-e-Iqtida, and exposing the corruption and invalidity of its claim through five reasons	136
Shah Sahab’s Assertion “Thus, it is necessary that all these persons should be Imams” and Its Response	144
Response To The Eighth Contradictory Tradition	146
Proving the Falsity of Hadees-e-Nujoom from the quotes of scholars of Ahle Tasannun with sixty-nine reasons.....	147
Criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Imam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, the author of “Musnad”	147
Criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Ismail Ibn Yahya Muzani, a prominent student of Imam Shafei	148
Indication.....	148
Biography of Ismail Ibn Yahya Muzani, a prominent student of Imam Shafei in the biographical works of Ahl-e-Tasannun.....	149
Criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Umar Bazaar	155
Criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Ibn Qattan Abdullah Ibn Adi Jurjani.....	157
Indicator.....	157
The biography of Hafiz Ibn Qattan, as narrated from the reliable biographical works of Ahl-e-Tasannun	158
Criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Abu al-Hasan Ali Ibn Umar Daraqutni.....	161
Criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Ibn Hazm Zaaheri in his treatise “Ibtaal al-Rayy wa al-Qiyas”	162
The discrediting of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Bazaar as transmitted by Ibn Hazm in his treatise Ibtal al-Rayy wa al-Qiyas	163
The critique and evaluation of Jawab Ibn Ubaidillah Taimi where Ibn Hajar has refrained from condemning him	164
The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Husain al-Baihaqi.....	164
The critique and evaluation of Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi,	

about whom Ibn Hajar has taken a general approach, indicates that he is regarded as unreliable in transmitting traditions.....	166
The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Yusuf Ibn Abd al-Birr Qurtubi in his book Jaame' Bayaan al-Ilm.....	166
The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Abu al-Qasim Ali Ibn Asaakir Dimishqi and the reference of his biography.....	169
Indicator	169
References for Ibn Asaakir's biography.....	169
The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Abu al-Faraj Ibn Jauzi in his book "al-Elal al-Mutanaahiyah"	170
The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Umar Ibn Hasan Ibn Dahiyah Kalbi Aandalusi, and the references of his biography	171
The criticism and discrediting of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Ibn Taimiyyah Hanbali	172
The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Abu Hayyan Muhammad Ibn Yusuf Gharnaati in Tafseer al-Bahr al-Muheet.....	172
The criticism of Abu Hayyan of this tradition (Hadees-e-Nujoom) in another commentary written by him called "Al-Nahr al-Maadd"	175
Biography of Abu Hayyan Aandalusi.....	177
Excerpts from his poetry:.....	206
♦ On adversity and virtue:	206
♦ On separation and sorrow:.....	207
♦ The Tamer of Love"	207
The critique and evaluation of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Zahabi in his book Mizan al-Itidal.	219
The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Taj al-Deen Ahmad Ibn Abd al-Qadir Qaysi in his book Al-Durr al-Laqaet Min al-Bahr al-Muheet.....	222
The criticism and discrediting of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Muhammad Ibn Abi Bakr Ibn Qayyim Jauziyyah Hanbali.....	224
The criticism and discrediting of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Najm al-Deen Iraqi in his book "Takhreej-o-Ahaadees-e-Minhaj"	226
The criticism and appraisal of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Iraqi in	

the margins of the book Takhreej	227
The criticism and disparagement of Hadees-e-Nujoom by the aforementioned Hafiz from another aspect and mention of the sources of his biography	229
The criticism and discrediting of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Ibn Hajar Asqalani in Talkhees al-Khabeer	229
The critique and evaluation of the mentioned tradition (i.e. Hadees-e-Nujoom) by the esteemed Hafiz Ibn Hajar in Takhreej Ahaadees al-Kashshaaf	232
Eight insights of Hafiz Ibn Hajar in his views.....	233
Indication.....	233
Twenty-Sixth Reason: The criticism by Hafiz Ibn Hajar Asqalani in his book Takhreej-o-Ahaadees-e-Mukhtasar Ibn al-Hajib regarding Hadees-e-Nujoom	253
Twenty-Seventh Reason: The criticism and disparagement of the Hafiz (Ibn Hajar) in the stated tradition are found in the book Lisan al-Mizan.....	254
Twenty-Eighth Reason: The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Allamah Ibn Humam, Kamaal al-Deen Muhammad Sivasi, is mentioned in his book Tahreer.....	254
Twenty-Ninth Reason: The criticism and discrediting of Hadees- e-Nujoom by Allamah Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Amir al- Haaj Halabi is mentioned in the book al-Taqreer wa al-Tahbeer.....	255
Indication.....	255
Biography of Allamah Ibn Amir Haaj Halabi.....	257
Thirtieth Reason: The criticism and disparagement of Shaikh Muwaffaq al-Deen Abuzar Ahmad Ibn Ibrahim Halabi, the author of Sharh al-Shifa, regarding Hadees-e-Nujoom and his biography.....	258
Indicator	258
Biography of Shaikh Mufawwaq al-Deen Abuzar Halabi	259
Thirty-First Reason: The criticism and disparagement by Hafiz Shams al-Deen Muhammad Sakhaawi regarding Hadees-e- Nujoom.....	263
Thirty-Second Reason: The Criticism and Disparagement by	

Kamal al-Deen Muhammad Ibn Abi Sharif Qudsi Regarding Hadees-e-Nujoom and His Biography.....	278
Indicator	278
The Biography of Ibn Abi Sharif Qudsi	278
Thirty-Third Reason: Suyuti explicitly states in his book Itmam al-Diraayah li-Qurra' al-Niqaayah the weakness of Hadees-e-Nujoom.....	287
Thirty-Fourth Reason: Suyuti has mentioned Hadees-e-Nujoom in “Jaame’ Saghir” and annotated it with the letter “ض” in the margin, which signifies that it is weak (ضعيف)	287
Thirty-Fifth Reason: Suyuti’s criticism and disparagement in Jam’ al-Jawaame’	288
Thirty-Sixth Reason: Mulla Ali Muttaqi reported Hadees-e-Nujoom in “Kanz al-Ummaal” along with the criticism and discrediting of Suyuti.....	289
Thirty-Seventh Reason: Mulla Ali Muttaqi has also mentioned Hadees-e-Nujoom in “Muntakhab Kanz al-Ummaal”	289
Thirty-Eighth Reason: Mulla Ali Qari, in Mirqaat al-Mafatih (the commentary on <i>Mishkat al-Masaabih</i>) declared Hadees-e-Nujoom to be flawed and criticized	290
Thirty-Ninth Reason: Criticism of Mulla Ali Qari in “Sharh al-Shifa”	292
Fortieth Reason: The criticism and disparagement Hadees-e-Nujoom by Abdul Rauf Ibn Taj al-Aarifeen Manavi.....	297
Forty-First Reason: The criticism of Abd al-Rauf Ibn Taj al-Aarifeen Manavi.....	298
Forty-Second Reason: The criticism and discrediting of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Shihab al-Deen Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Umar Khafaji Misri Hanafi.....	298
Forty-Third Reason: Allamah Muhammad Moeen Ibn Muhammad Amin Sindi has declared Hadees-e-Nujoom to be fabricated (<i>mauzoo</i>) with certainty and conviction.	303
Forty-fourth Reason: Qazi Mohibullah Bihari, in his book Musallam al-Suboot, has weakened the authenticity of Hadees-e-	

Nujoom.....	305
Forty-Fifth Reason: Mulla Nizam al-Deen Sahaalvi has explicitly and clearly stated that Hadees-e-Nujoom is fabricated	308
Forty-Sixth Reason: Maulvi Abdul Ali Lucknawi has criticised and invalidated Hadees-e-Nujoom.....	308
Forty-Seventh Reason: The Imam, memorizer, and jurist of Ahle Tasannun Qazi Muhammad Ibn Ali bin Muhammad Shaukani has deemed Hadees-e-Nujoom as condemned and invalid.....	310
Forty-Eighth Reason: Allamah Shaukani, in his book Irshad al-Fuhool, criticized and refuted Hadees-e-Nujoom, highlighting its flaws and weaknesses	311
Forty-Ninth Reason: Allamah Shaukani, in his book al-Qaul al-Mufid fi Adillah al-Ijtihad wa al-Taqleed, has also criticized and disparaged Hadees-e-Nujoom	312
Fiftieth Reason: Waliullah Ibn Habibullah Lakhnawi criticized the authenticity of Hadees-e-Nujoom.....	314
Biography of Maulvi Waliullah Ibn Habibullah Lakhnavi.....	316
Beautiful Research with Subtle Precision Indication.....	319

HADEES-E-SAQALAIN: THE PROOF OF IMAMATE OF THE AHLE BAIT (A.S.)

Response To The Fifth Contradictory Tradition

The citation of the tradition “I am pleased for you with what Ibn Umm Abd (Ibn Masud) is pleased with for you” by the author of ‘Tuhfa’ as a counter to the Hadees-e-Saqalain (the Two Weighty Things).

His (s.a.w.a.) saying, “I am pleased for you with what Ibn Umm Abd (Ibn Masud) is pleased with for you.”

The Author’s (Mir Hamid Husain) Response to this False Objection and the Refutation of Shah Sahab’s argument in five ways:

Indication:

I (Mir Hamid Husain) state, “This tradition is not suitable for argument or reasoning against the people of truth and acceptance for several reasons:

First: This tradition is undoubtedly from the narrations of single narrator (*aahaad*), while Hadees-e-Saqalain is from the consequently transmitted (*mutawaatir*) narrations, without any doubt. Comparing a consecutively narrated tradition with that from a single narrator is far from fairness and justice.

Second: This tradition is exclusively narrated by scholars of Ahle Tasannun, and the people of truth (Shias) never accept it. Therefore, mentioning it in debates and arguments with them is not only against the promises of Shah Sahab but also clearly outside the realm of fairness and equality. Relying on it in opposition to them would undoubtedly be an act of prejudice.

Third: This tradition is one that both Bukhari and Muslim refrained

from including it in their compendia. We have previously hinted that the omission of a tradition by these two scholars is considered by the leading scholars of Ahle Tasannun as evidence of its weakness and insignificance. Some extremists of the opponents reject the tradition of Ghadeer, despite it being consecutively narrated and numerous chains of narrators, simply because Bukhari and Muslim did not record it. Hence, the tradition “*I am pleased for you with what Ibn Umm Abd is pleased with for you*” is even less worthy of being used as evidence or argument, and anyone with even a minimal sense of justice would consider the people of truth justified in refuting it.

Fourth: Besides Bukhari and Muslim, Abu Dawood, Ibn Majah, Tirmizi and Nasai also did not include this tradition in their Sihah. It is evident that if the omission of a tradition by Bukhari and Muslim is considered by some Sunni scholars as evidence of its weakness, then the omission of a tradition by all six authors of the Sahih collections is even stronger evidence of its discredit and lack of credibility. From this, it can be understood to what extent this tradition ‘*I am pleased...*’ is weak, and what benefit can the disputant gain from using it as evidence except loss and disgrace?!!

Fifth: For the sake of argument, even if we accept this tradition, using it to counter Hadees-e-Saqalain is a distant deviation and extremely misguided. The Hadees-e-Saqalain clearly proves, in numerous ways and under various titles, the caliphate, Imamate, infallibility, purity, superior knowledge and virtue of the Ahl-e-Bait (a.s.), as has been explained in detail earlier. In contrast, this tradition, even if it is authentic, is so limited in its implication that it does not even prove that Ibn Masud was a scholar or a leader, let alone any of the mentioned virtues. In fact, anyone familiar with the context of this tradition, would certainly know that its only inference is would be that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a) approved for his companions what is pleasing to Allah and His Messenger. (s.a.w.a).

The explanation of this summary is that Hakim Nishapuri narrated this tradition in “al-Mustadrak ala al-Sahihain” in the following

manner, “Informed us Abu al-Fazl Hasan Ibn Yaqub Ibn Yusuf Adl from Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Wahhab Abdi from Jafar Ibn Awn from Masudi from Jafar Ibn Amr Ibn Hurais, from his father, who reports, ‘The Prophet (s.a.w.a.) said to Abdullah Ibn Masud, ‘*Recite (the Quran)!’* He asked, ‘Shall I recite to you when it has been revealed to you?’ He (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘*I love to hear it from others.*’ So, he began to recite Surah Nisaa until he reached (the verse). **‘When We bring from every nation a witness, and We bring you as a witness against these’**¹. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) wept, and Abdullah stopped. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said to him, “*Speak!*” So, he praised Allah in the beginning of his speech, and extolled Him, sent blessings upon the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), professed his testimony to the truth, and said “We are pleased with Allah as our Lord, with Islam as our religion, and I am pleased for you with what Allah and His Messenger are pleased with.’ The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) remarked, ‘*I am pleased for you with what Ibn Umm Abd is pleased with for you.*’ This is a tradition with an authentic chain of narration, but it was not recorded by Bukhari or Muslim.²“

It is apparent from this narration that one day the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) instructed Abdullah Ibn Masud to recite something from the Quran. Abdullah Ibn Masud, in a gesture of humility, said, ‘Is it appropriate for me to recite the Quran to you when it has been revealed to you?’ The Prophet (s.a.w.a.) explained the wisdom behind this instruction by saying, ‘I want to hear the Quran from someone else.’ So, Ibn Masud began reciting Surah Nisaa until he reached the verse where Allah says, **‘So how [will it be] when We bring from every nation a witness and We bring you as a witness against these?’** Upon hearing these words, the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) was deeply moved, and his blessed eyes filled with tears. Seeing this, Abdullah Ibn Masud stopped his recitation. The Prophet (s.a.w.a.) ordered him, ‘*Speak!*’—intending for him to deliver a speech. In obedience to this

¹ Surah Nisaa (4): Verse 41

² Al-Mustadrak ala al-Sahihain, vol. 3, p. 360, H. 5394

noble command, Ibn Masud began by praising and glorifying Allah, sending blessings upon the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), and bearing witness to the truth. He said, 'We are pleased with Allah as our Lord, with Islam as our religion, and I am pleased for you with what Allah and His Messenger are pleased with.' Because this statement of Ibn Masud was correct and filled with sincerity, the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) affirmed it by saying, '*I am pleased for you with what Ibn Umm Abd is pleased with for you.*'

The intention behind this is that the pleasure of Allah and His Messenger, which Ibn Masud has chosen for you, is also what I choose for you.

Regarding the behaviour of the Second Caliph and his followers towards Ibn Masud (Ibn Umm Abd) and the transmission of many statements by Ahle Tasannun historians on this matter.

"Detention accompanied with Harshness" It is truly astonishing that Shah Sahab adheres to the traditions "*Hold on to the covenant of Ibn Umm Abd*" and "*I am pleased with what Ibn Umm Abd is pleased with*" and uses these to oppose the people of truth (Shias) to counter the Hadees-e-Saqalain. He adopts a path of deceit and obstinacy and does not even consider that the Second Caliph prevented Ibn Masud from issuing religious edicts (*fatwas*) and reproached and admonished this great and noble companion in this regard.

As Abu Muhammad Abdullah Ibn Abd al-Rahman Darimi has recorded in his Musnad, "Muhammad Ibn Sult narrated to us from Ibn Mubarak from Ibn Awn from Muhammad, who reports, Umarsaid to Ibn Masud, 'Have I not been informed (or) I have been informed that you are issuing religious edicts while you are not an Amir (leader)?! Let him who assumes its heat, bear its cold as well.'¹⁴

Shah Waliullah (Dehlavi), in "Izaalah al-Khifaa" under the title "The Discipline of Umar Towards His Subjects" writes, "Darimi records

¹ Musnad Darimi, vol. 1, p. 73, H. 170, The Chapter of Edicts and Their Intensity

from Muhammad Ibn Sirin, who says, Umarsaid to Ibn Masud, ‘Have I not been informed (or) I have been informed that you are issuing religious edicts while you are not an Amir (leader)?! Let him who assumes its heat bear its cold as well!’

It is quite apparent that this vile action by the second caliph is explicitly contrary to the tradition, “*Hold on to the covenant of Ibn Umm Abd*” and other similar sayings. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the scholars of Ahle Tasannun to either consider such traditions as invalid and abandon them, or recognize that the second caliph, knowingly and deliberately, disobeyed the command of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). Furthermore, the most severe aspect of this matter is that the second caliph accused Ibn Masud of dishonesty in narrating the sayings of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.), prevented him from narrating traditions, and by imprisoning this noble companion along with other senior companions in Madina and forbidding them from traveling to other regions and lands, he extended his oppression and injustice to the utmost limit.

Muhammad Ibn Sa’d Basri, known as Katib Waqidi, in his book “al-Tabaqaat al-Kubra”, in the section discussing those who issued religious/legal edicts in Madina, chronicles, “Hajjaj Ibn Muhammad narrated to us from Shu’bah from Sa’d Ibn Ibrahim from his father, who says, Umar Ibn Khattab said to Abdullah Ibn Masud, Abu Darda and Abuzar, ‘What is this tradition that you are narrating from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.)?’ I believe he also said, ‘He did not allow them to leave Madina until they died’.”¹

Abu Abdillah Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Haakim Nishapuri in his “Al-Mustadrak ala al-Sahihain” writes, “Abu Bakr Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Ibn Balwayh narrated to us from Muhammad Ibn Ghalib from Affan from Shu’bah; and Ahmad Ibn Yaqub Saqafi informed me from Muhammad Ibn Ayyub from Abu Umar Hausi from Shu’bah from

¹ Al-Tabaqaat al-Kubra, vol. 2, p. 336, Discussion of those companions of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) who delivered religious edicts in Madina and were followed.

Sa'd Ibn Ibrahim from his father, who reports, Umar Ibn Khattab said to Ibn Masud, Abu Darda and Abuzar, 'What is this tradition that you are narrating from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.)?' I believe he even detained them in Madina until they passed away'."

Zahabi in "Tazkirah al-Huffaz" in the biography of Umar pens, "Ma'n Ibn Isa narrates from Maalik from Abdullah Ibn Idris from Shu'bah from Sa'id Ibn Ibrahim from his father that Umar detained three individuals viz. Ibn Masud, Abu Darda and Abu Masud Ansari, saying, 'You have excessively narrated traditions from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.)'.¹"

Therefore, it is also obligatory upon the Ahle Tasannun to either declare the tradition, "*Hold on to the covenant of Ibn Umm Abd*" and similar ones as false and invalid, and to follow the example of the second caliph by accusing Ibn Masud in his narration of the Prophet's traditions, or to consider the second caliph guilty of committing a great oppression and injustice by accusing this noble companion and other esteemed companions, unjustly imprisoning these revered individuals, and recognize his (Umar's) clear opposition to the direct guidance of the Divine Messenger (s.a.w.a.). By doing so, they would expose the caliph as a transgressor and a misguided oppressor, subjecting him to condemnation and disgrace, and acknowledging his enmity. In either case, we achieve victory, success, and triumph, while they, in both instances, are left with disgrace, defeat and dishonour.

What is most astonishing is that these individuals, when mentioning the virtues of Ibn Masud, never pay attention to how the third caliph and his followers treated him and to what extent they acted upon the guidance of the noble Messenger (s.a.w.a.) concerning him. If an inexperienced observer were to be overtaken by doubt or suspicion in this matter, and considering the Ahle Tasannun's veneration of the companions, inclines toward a favourable view, here are several proofs that will tear away the veil, uncover the shroud, lift the covering, and sever the very roots of Ahle Tasannun beliefs. Upon

¹ Tazkerah al-Huffaz, vol. 1, p. 7, No. 2

seeing these, with the guidance of sound judgment, diligent reasoning, keen understanding, and insightful thought, one would choose the clear truth and sincere honesty over disgraceful falsehood and ugly lies.

Ahmad Ibn Abi Yaqub Ibn Jafar Ibn Wahb Ibn Waazeh al-Kaatib al-Abbasi, famous as Yaqubi, in his “Tarikh” records, “Usman gathered and compiled the Quran, arranging the long chapters with the long and the short chapters with the short. He wrote to gather the copies of the Quran from different regions until they were collected. Then, he washed them with hot water and vinegar. It was said that he burnt them. No copy of the Quran remained except that he did this to it barring the Quranic copy (*mus’haf*) of Ibn Masud. Ibn Masud was in Kufa and refused to hand over his copy to Abdullah Ibn Aamir. Usman wrote to him, ‘Send him if he has not caused harm to this religion and corruption to this nation!’ Ibn Masud entered the mosque while Usman was delivering a sermon and said, *إِنَّهٗ قَدْ قَدَمَتْ عَلَيْكُمْ دَابَّةٌ سَوِيءٌ* ‘An evil creature has come to you’. Usman spoke harshly to him. Then, Usman ordered that Ibn Masud be dragged by his leg until two of his ribs were broken. Thereafter, Aisha spoke, and she talked a lot. Then, Usman sent the Quranic copies to the provinces, sending one copy to Syria, another to Bahrain, yet another to Yemen, and one to Jazira. He ordered the people to read from one version. The reason for this was that he had heard people saying, ‘The Quran of such-and-such family’. Hence, he wanted there to be only one version. It was said that Ibn Masud had written to him about this, but when he heard that the copies were being altered, he said, ‘This is not what I intended’. It is said that Huzaifah Ibn Yamaan wrote to him about this. Ibn Masud fell ill. Usman visited him to inquire about his health and asked him, ‘What is this talk I have heard about you?’ Ibn Masud replied, ‘I mentioned what you did to me, that you ordered me to be trampled on my stomach until I lost consciousness during the Zuhr and Asr prayers, and you withheld my stipend from me.’ ‘Usman replied, ‘I will compensate you. So, do to me as I did to you.’ Ibn Masud answered, ‘I would not be the one to initiate retribution

against the caliphs.’ Usman requested, ‘Here is your stipend, take it!’ Ibn Masud replied, ‘You withheld it from me when I needed it, and now you offer it to me when I am no longer in need of it! I have no need for it!’ Then, he turned away, and Ibn Masud remained angry with Usman until he passed away. Ammar Ibn Yasir led his funeral prayers, when Usman was absent. This matter was kept a secret. When Usman returned and saw the grave, he asked, ‘Whose grave is this?’ He was told, ‘The grave of Abdullah Ibn Masud.’ He asked, ‘How was he buried without my knowledge?!’ They replied, ‘Ammar Ibn Yasir led the burial, and it was said that Ibn Masud had willed that he (Usman) should not be informed.’ Usman did not live much longer after that until Miqdad passed away. Ammar led the prayer over him as well, as he had also entrusted him, and Usman was not informed. Usman became extremely angry with Ammar and said, ‘Woe to me because of this son of a black woman (referring to Ammar)! Indeed, I was aware of him!’¹⁶

Abu al-Hasan Ali Ibn Husain Masudi, in “Muruj al-Zahab” said, “In the year 35 A.H., criticism against Usman increased. Objections were raised against him for various actions, among them being the issues between him and Abdullah Ibn Masud, which caused the tribe of Huzail to turn away from Usman because of him.”

Abu Muhammad Abdullah Ibn Muslim Ibn Qutaibah Dinawari, in his book “**al-Ma’arif**” under the chapter ‘The Caliphate of Usman Ibn Affan’ writes, “Among the things for which Usman was criticized were that he took in Hakam Ibn Abi Aas and gave him one hundred thousand dirhams, although the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) had exiled him, and neither Abu Bakr nor Umar had allowed him to return. They said that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) had donated at Mahzool, the location of the market in Madina, to the Muslims, but Usman transferred it to Haaris Ibn Hakam, the brother of Marwan. He also granted Fadak to Marwan, although it was a charitable endowment (*sadaqah*) of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.).

¹ Tarikh Yaqubi, vol. 2, p. 159

Usman conquered Africa and took the Khums (one-fifth of the spoils of war) and gave it entirely to Marwan. In response, Abd al-Rahman Ibn Hanzala Jumahi, whom Usman had exiled, said, 'I swear by Allah, the Lord of all people! Nothing is left in vain by Allah. But you have created a trial (*fitnah*) for us so that we may be tested by you or you by us. The two trustworthy ones (Abu Bakr and Umar) made clear the path of guidance and clarity. They did not take a single dirham deceitfully, nor did they spend a dirham in vain. But you gave Marwan the fifth of the people. Far be it from you to be compared with those who strove!'

Then, Abdullah Ibn Khalid Ibn Asid requested financial aid from Usman, who gave him four hundred thousand dirhams from the Muslim treasury. Abdullah Ibn Masud objected to this. So, Usman had him beaten until two of his ribs were broken! Usman also exiled Abuzar Ghaffari to Rabzah and sent Aamir Ibn Abd Qais from Basra to Syria.¹

Abu Jafar Muḥammad Ibn Jarir Ṭabari, in his “**Tarikh**” relates an incident from the year 26 A.H.:

Ṭabari writes that Sari from Shuaib from Saif from Amr from Sha'bi said, “The first time there was a conflict among the people of Kufa, and the first instance of Satan sowing discord among them in Islam, was when Sa'd Ibn Abi Waqqaṣ borrowed money from the public treasury (Bayt al-Maal) through Abdullah Ibn Masud. When Abdullah asked Sa'd to repay the debt, Sa'd was unable to return it on time, leading to a heated argument between them. Abdullah enlisted the help of others to demand the repayment, while Sa'd sought the support of others to delay it. The people split into two groups, with some blaming Sa'd and others blaming Abdullah.

Sari from Shuaib from Saif from Ismail Ibn Abi Khalid from Qays Ibn Abi Ḥazim, who says, “I was sitting with Sa'd, and with him was his nephew, Hashim Ibn Utbah. Abdullah Ibn Masud came to Sa'd and

¹ Al-Maarif, p. 113

said, ‘The money that is with you!’ Sa’d replied, ‘It seems you will face something bad! Are you not just Ibn Masud, a servant from Huzail?’ Abdullah replied, ‘Yes, by Allah! I am indeed Ibn Masud, and you are the son of Ḥumaynah!’ Hashim said, ‘Yes, by Allah! You are both companions of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.), and he is watching you.’ Sa’d then threw a stick that was in his hand and, being a man of strong temper, raised his hands and said, ‘O Allah, Lord of the heavens and the earth!’ Abdullah said, ‘Woe to you! Speak good and do not curse!’ At that, Sa’d retorted, ‘By Allah, if it weren’t for the fear of Allah, I would have prayed against you a supplication that would not miss you!’ Abdullah quickly left.

Sari from Shuaib from Saif from Qasim Ibn Walid from Musayyib from Abd Khair from Abdullah Ibn Akki, who said, ‘When the argument occurred between Ibn Masud and Sa’d regarding the loan that Abdullah had given him, and Sa’d was unable to repay it, Usman became angry with both. He removed Sa’d from his position and was displeased with Abdullah, but he kept him in office. Usman appointed Walid Ibn Uqbah to replace Sa’d, as he had previously served as a governor for Umar over Rabi’ah in the Jazirah region. Walid arrived in Kufa but did not install a door on his house until he eventually left the city.

Sari from Shuaib from Saif from Muhammad and Talha, said, “When Usman heard of what happened between Abdullah and Sa’d, he was angry with both and initially planned to act, but then refrained from doing so. He removed Sa’d from office, took what was due from him, kept Abdullah in his position, and ordered that Walid Ibn Uqbah replace Sa’d. Walid had been the governor over the Arabs of the Jazīrah under Umar Ibn Khattab. He arrived in the second year of Usman’s caliphate after Sa’d had served for a year and a bit more.¹⁴

In the events related to 30 A.H., Ṭabari pens, “Sari wrote to me from Shuaib from Saif from Muhammad and Talha that when Usman learned of the dispute between Abdullah and Sa’d, he became angry

¹ Tarikh Ṭabari, vol. 4, p. 251, Incidents of 26 A.H.

with both and considered to act against them. However, he later refrained from doing so. Instead, he removed Sa'd from his position, took what was owed from him, confirmed Abdullah in his post and gave him further instructions. He appointed Walid Ibn Uqbah, who had been the governor over the Arabs of Jazirah under Umar Ibn Khaṭṭab, to replace Sa'd. Walid arrived in Kufa in the second year of Usman's caliphate, after Sa'd had served there for a year and a bit longer.¹

Again, in the events related to 30 A.H., TEbari records, "Sari wrote to me from Shuaib from Saif from Ghusn (or Is Ibn Qasim) from Amr Ibn Abdullah, who said, 'Jundab and a group of people came to Ibn Masud and said, 'Walid drinks wine.' They spread this rumour until it became widely spoken among the people. Ibn Masud responded, 'If someone conceals something from us, we will not seek out their faults or expose their private matters.' Walid summoned Ibn Masud, who came to him. Walid reproached him, saying, 'Does it befit someone like you to respond as you did to people bearing grudges? What exactly was he concealing? This is something one says only to someone suspicious!' They argued and parted in anger, but the disagreement did not go beyond that."²

Abu Umar Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Abd Rabbih Qurtubi, in "Al-'Iqd al-Farid", in the Chapter on the killing of Usman, reports a narration transmitted from Sa'd Ibn Musayyab, "Before this, there were grievances from Usman against Abdullah Ibn Masud, Abuzar, and Ammar Ibn Yasir. As a result, the tribe of Huzail and Banu Zuhrah held in their hearts what they did concerning Ibn Masud, and Banu Ghaffar and their allies, along with those who were angered on behalf of Abuzar, held in their hearts what they did. Banu Makhzum were enraged at Usman due to the situation of Ammar Ibn Yasir."

In this narration, it is also mentioned, "There was no one left in Madina except that they were enraged at Usman, and the anger

¹ Tarikh Ṭabari, vol. 4, pp. 271 and 274, Incidents of 30 A.H.

² Tarikh Ṭabari, vol. 4, pp. 271 and 274, Incidents of 30 A.H.

increased among those who were already upset on behalf of Ibn Masud, Abuzar and Ammar Ibn Yasir.¹

Ibn Abd Rabbih Qurtubi also reports in his book “al-’Iqd al-Farid” under the title “What the people criticized about Usman”, “From the narration of Ibn Abi Qutaibah from Amash from Abdullah Ibn Sinan, who said, “Ibn Masud came to us while we were in the mosque. He oversaw the public treasury in Kufa, while Walid Ibn Uqbah Ibn Abi Mu’ait was the governor of Kufa. Ibn Masud said, “O people of Kufa! One hundred thousand [coins] have been lost from your treasury tonight; no letter has come to me from the Commander of the Faithful, and I have not received any discharge concerning it.” Walid Ibn Uqbah wrote to Usman about this, and Usman removed him from the public treasury!²“

Abu Hilal Hasan Ibn Abdillah Askari, in his book “al-Awaail”, while mentioning the matters that caused the companions to oppose Usman, said, “Regarding the affair of Ibn Masud: Abu al-Qasim narrated to us through his chain of narrators from Madaaeini, from Bishr Ibn Aasim from Amash from Abdillah Ibn Sinan, who reports, “Ibn Masud came to us and said, ‘Some money is missing from your treasury, and I have not received a written clearance for it, nor any notification.’ So, Walid Ibn Uqbah wrote to Usman complaining about him, and Usman removed him from the treasury. While Walid was giving a sermon, Abdullah [Ibn Masud] stood up to pray. Walid said, ‘Has the Commander of the Faithful (Usman) ordered this, or is it something you have initiated?’ Ibn Masud replied, ‘I have not received any order, nor have I initiated anything new, but Allah refuses that we wait for you to finish playing before we perform our prayer!’ Usman wrote to have him sent to Madina, and he left. When he arrived, Usman taunted, ‘A weak beast will come to you. If anyone eats from it, they will die.’ When Ibn Masud arrived, Usman reprimanded him and withheld his stipend for three years. When death approached Ibn

¹ Al-Iqd al-Farid, vol. 2, p. 186

² Al-Iqd al-Farid, vol. 2, p. 192

Masud, Usman sent his stipend to him, but Ibn Masud refused, saying, 'You withheld it when it would have benefited me. Now you give it when it will no longer benefit me?' He returned it and instructed Zubair to perform his funeral prayer. When he died, Zubair led his funeral prayers. Usman rebuked him (Zubair) and said, 'I nearly exhumed his body to pray over him myself!' Zubair retorted, 'If you try that, you will be prevented from doing so!' Usman then stood over the grave, prayed for mercy upon him, and sent his stipend to his children. Zubair said, 'Do not lament me after today (my death) when in my life you did not provide for my sustenance!'¹

Fakhr al-Deen Muhammad Ibn Umar Raazi, in his book "**Nihaayah al-Uqul**", in response to the criticisms against Usman, writes, "Sixth point: The claim that Usman struck Ibn Masud and Ammar, and exiled Abuzar (may Allah be pleased with them) to Rabazah, we reply that, as Usman did this, it has also been said about these individuals that they had committed actions that made them deserving of such treatment."

Izz al-Deen Ali Ibn Muhammad Shaibani, famous as Ibn Asir Jazari, writes in "**Al-Kaamil**" in the events of the year 26 Hijri, "In this year, Usman Ibn Affan dismissed Sa'd Ibn Abi Waqqas from Kufa, according to some, and replaced him with Walid Ibn Uqbah Ibn Abi Mu'ait. The father of Abu Mu'ait was Awan Ibn Abi Amr, whose name was Zakwan Ibn Umayya Ibn Abd Shams. He was Usman's half-brother through their mother, Arwa Ibnt Kuraiz, whose mother was Baiza, daughter of Abd al-Muttalib.

The reason for this was that Sa'd had borrowed from Abdullah Ibn Masud from the public treasury. When Ibn Masud demanded repayment, Sa'd was unable to do so. A heated argument ensued. Sa'd said to Ibn Masud, 'I see that you will face harm! Are you not but the son of a slave of Huzail?' Ibn Masud shot back, 'By Allah! Indeed, I am the son of Masud, and you are the son of a mean woman!' Hashim Ibn Utba Ibn Abi Waqqas, who was present, intervened, 'You both are

¹ Al-Awaail, Abu Hilal Askari, p. 152

companions of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) and he is watching you!’ Sa’d then raised his hand to curse Ibn Masud, as he had a temper, and said, ‘O Allah, Lord of the heavens and the earth!’ Ibn Masud replied, ‘Woe to you! Say something good and do not curse!’ Sa’d said, ‘By Allah, if not for fear of Allah, I would have prayed against you a supplication that would not miss you!’ Ibn Masud turned back and left quickly.

Abdullah sought help from people to recover the money while Sa’d asked assistance from people for reprieve. The people became divided; some blaming Sa’d, others blaming Abdullah. This was the first discord that arose among the people of Kufa, and the first instance of Satan’s interference among the people of Kufa. When the news reached Usman, he became angry with both. Consequently, he dismissed Sa’d, retained Abdullah, and replaced Sa’d with Walid Ibn Uqba. Walid had been a governor of the Arab tribes in Jazira under Umar Ibn Khattab and Usman Ibn Affan. He arrived in Kufa as its governor and ruled for five years, and he was one of the most beloved to its people. When he arrived, Sa’d said to him, ‘Did you become clever after us, or were we foolish before you?’ Walid replied, ‘Do not grieve, O Abu Ishaq! None of that happened. It is merely that kingship (i.e. power) is a meal taken by some for breakfast and by others for dinner!’ Sa’d replied, ‘I see that you have made it kingship!’ Ibn Masud said to him, ‘I do not know if things have improved after us or if the people have become corrupt’.¹⁴

Ibn Asir Jazari also narrates in “**Usud al-Ghaabah**” in the biography of Ibn Masud, “Salamah Ibn Tamam reports, ‘A man met Ibn Masud and said, ‘You will not lack a dream interpreter! I saw you last night, and I saw the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) on a high pulpit, and you were below him. He (s.a.w.a.) was saying, ‘O Ibn Masud! Come to me, for indeed you have been estranged after me.’ Ibn Masud asked, ‘By Allah! Did you see this?’ The man replied in the affirmative. Ibn Masud said, ‘I

¹ Tarikh Kamil, Izz al-Deen Jazari Ibn Asir, vol. 3, p. 82, Incidents of the year 25 A.H.

am determined to leave Madina until you pray over me.’ He did not live long after that before he passed away.’

Abu Tayyibah narrates, ‘Abdullah (Ibn Masud) fell ill. Usman Ibn Affan visited him. Usman asked, ‘What do you complain of?’ Ibn Masud replied, ‘My sins!’ Usman inquired, ‘And what do you desire?’ Ibn Masud answered, ‘The mercy of my Lord!’ Usman asked again, ‘Shall I call a doctor for you?’ Ibn Masud responded, ‘The doctor has made me sick!’ Usman offered, ‘Shall I order for you to receive a stipend?’ Ibn Masud replied, ‘I have no need for it!’ Usman mollified, ‘It could be for your daughters.’ Ibn Masud reacted, ‘Do you fear poverty for my daughters? I have instructed my daughters to recite Surah Waaqiah¹ every night. I heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) say, ‘*Whoever recites Surah Waaqiah every night will never suffer from poverty.*’

The reason Usman asked, ‘Shall I order your stipend?’ was because he had withheld it from Ibn Masud for two years. When Ibn Masud passed away, Usman sent the stipend to Zubair, who distributed it to Ibn Masud’s heirs. It is also said that Abdullah (Ibn Masud) had renounced the stipend out of self-sufficiency, as others had done as well.²

Saif Aamudi, in “**Abkaar al-Abkaar**”, responded to the criticisms against Usman (regarding the claim), “They say that he (Usman) beat Ibn Masud until two of his ribs were broken. We say, ‘If it is true that he beat him, it has been said that when Usman sought to unite the people upon his copy of the Quran due to their differences regarding the Book of Allah, he requested Ibn Masud’s copy. Ibn Masud refused, as his copy contained some additions and omissions (compared to Usman’s standardized version), so Usman disciplined him for that.”

Ibrahim Ibn Abd Munim Hamdani, known as Ibn Abi Dum, records in “**Tarikh al-Muzaffari**”, as follows, “The year 35 (of Hijri) entered. During this year, unrest spread in the provinces against Usman, and

¹ The 56th Chapter of the Holy Quran

² Usud al-Ghaabah, vol. 3 p 386

they wrote to him from various regions demanding his removal or death. Various grievances were held against him, including those previously mentioned, and among them were his exile of Abuzar to Rabzah, his beating of Ammar Ibn Yasir, and his insulting of Ibn Masud.¹

Muhib al-Deen Ahmad Ibn Abdillah TEbari, in “**al-Riyaz al-Nazerah**”, narrates an account from Saeed Ibn Musayyib regarding the killing of Usman, as follows, “Before this, there were grievances from Usman against Abdullah Ibn Masud, Abuzar and Ammar Ibn Yasir. Huzail and Banu Zuhra harboured feelings of resentment on account of Abdullah Ibn Masud. Likewise, Banu Ghaffar and their allies, and those angered for Abuzar (al-Ghaffari), had their own grievances. Banu Makhzum were also enraged with Usman on account of Ammar Ibn Yasir.”²

In the same narration, it is mentioned, “There was none left among the people of Madina except that they were enraged with Usman. This anger was further intensified by those who were infuriated on account of Ibn Masud, Abuzar and Ammar.”

In “**al-Riyaz al-Nazerah**”, Muhib al-Deen TEbari, in response to the criticisms against Usman, justifies, “As for the third issue, which is the claim regarding the withholding of Ibn Masud’s stipend, this was in response to what had reached Usman concerning him. This has always been the practice of leaders, and both Usman and Ibn Masud were exercising *ijtihad* (independent reasoning); either both were correct, or one was right and the other mistaken. Usman’s intention was never to deprive Ibn Masud entirely, but rather a delay until a time that his judgment deemed appropriate, simply to discipline him (viz. Ibn Masud). Once the matter was resolved, either upon reaching that point or before it, the stipend was given to Ibn Masud’s heirs, and perhaps this was more beneficial for them.”³

¹ Tarikh al-Muzaffari, Ibn Abi Dum

² al-Riyaz al-Nazerah, vol. 2, p. 163

³ Ibid.

Again, Muhib al-Deen TEbari, in “**al-Riyaz al-Nazerah**”, in his response to the criticisms against Usman, writes, “As for the tenth issue, which is what they narrated about what happened to Abdullah Ibn Masud at the hands of Usman, and that he (Usman) ordered his servant to beat him—along with the rest of their claims—is all slander and fabrication, none of which is true. These ignorant people do not shy away from lying when it suits their agendas, as there is no piety that restrains them from it!

We say: Assuming that it is true that the servant acted in such a manner, it would have been out of personal anger for his master. It is said that Ibn Masud had spoken to Usman in a way that displeased him (i.e. the servant). If such an incident truly happened, it would be interpreted as a form of discipline. The position of the caliphate cannot tolerate such behaviour, and it would be necessary to address such actions in front of the public. This is no greater than when Umar struck Sa’d Ibn Abi Waqqas on the head with a whip because Sa’d did not stand for him. Umar said to him, ‘You do not show respect for the caliphate, so I wanted to let you know that the caliphate does not fear you!’ Sa’d was not diminished by this, nor did he consider it a flaw. Similarly, Umar struck Ubayy Ibn Ka’b when he saw him walking with people following behind him. Umar struck him with a whip and said, ‘This is humiliation for the follower and a temptation for the one being followed!’ Ubayy did not criticize Umar for this but saw it as a beneficial form of discipline.

Such behaviour has always been the practice of *caliphs and rulers* in disciplining those they see opposing them. It has also been narrated that Usman apologized to Ibn Masud and visited him in his home when he heard of his illness. Usman asked Ibn Masud to seek forgiveness for him and said, ‘O Aba Abd al-Rahman, here is your stipend, take it!’ Ibn Masud replied, ‘Why are you bringing it to me now, when it would no longer benefit me? You bring it to me at my death?! I will not accept it!’ Usman then went to Umm Habibah and asked her to speak to Ibn Masud so that he might be pleased with him. Umm Habibah spoke to him, and then Usman came to Ibn Masud

again and said, ‘O Aba Abdillah! Will you not say what Yusuf said to his brothers, **‘There is no blame upon you today, may Allah forgive you?’**¹ But Ibn Masud did not respond to him.’

If this story is true, then Usman did everything that was possible and appropriate for someone in his position, both at the beginning and the end. Even if it is assumed that he made a mistake, he showed repentance, sought forgiveness, and apologized for the wrongdoing. If his repentance was not accepted by Ibn Masud, that does not diminish Usman’s repentance. After all, Allah has informed us that He accepts repentance from His servants and encourages them to follow His example.

It has also been narrated that Ibn Masud eventually forgave Usman and sought forgiveness for him. Salamah Ibn Saeed said, ‘I visited Ibn Masud during his illness, in which he passed away. There were people present who were criticizing Usman. Ibn Masud told them, “Wait! If you kill him, you will not find anyone like him.’

As for Usman’s dismissal of Ibn Masud from Kufa, summoning him to Madina, and estranging him—this has always been the practice of caliphs before and after Usman, as has already been explained. Usman’s estrangement of Ibn Masud is no greater than Ali’s estrangement of his brother Aqil Ibn Abi Talib and Abu Ayyub al-Ansari when they left him after the Battle of Siffeen and went to Muawiya. This did not lead to criticism of Ali, nor was it considered a flaw in him.

It has been narrated that a Bedouin from the tribe of Hamdan entered the mosque and saw Ibn Masud, Huzaiyah, and Abu Musa Ashari criticizing Usman. The Bedouin said to them, ‘I urge you by Allah! If Usman restored you to your positions and gave you back your stipends, would you be content?’ They replied, ‘By Allah, yes!’ The Hamdani man then said, ‘Fear Allah, O companions of Muhammad, and do not criticize your leader!’ This indicates that the criticisms

¹ Surah Yusuf (12): Verse

against Usman were primarily due to his dismissal of certain people, his appointment of others, and the cutting of stipends, all of which are permissible for an Imam if his *ijtihad* leads him to do so.¹

Yet again, Muḥib al-Deen TEbari in “**al-Riyaz al-Nazerah**”, while responding to the criticisms of Usman, argues, “The fifteenth issue is the burning of Ibn Masud’s manuscript. This is not something that needs to be excused, but rather it was one of the greatest benefits (*masaalih*). For, if it had remained in people’s hands, it would have led to great discord in religion due to the numerous anomalies it contained, which were rejected by those knowledgeable about the Quran. One such anomaly was the omission of the two Surahs (*al-Maoozatain*) from his manuscript, even though it was widely known among the Companions that they were part of the Quran. Usman, when criticized for this, said, “I feared discord over the Quran!’ The disagreement among them had already begun to the point that one man would say to another, ‘My Quran is better than yours!’ Huzaifah requested him (Usman), ‘Save the people!’ So, Usman gathered the people on a single manuscript to remove the discord concerning the Quran, and the manuscript they agreed upon was Usman’s.

Furthermore, it should be said to the people of innovation and desires: If Usman’s manuscript was not the truth, why did Ali and the Syrians (i.e., Muawiya and his army) agree to use it for judgment when the Syrians raised their copies? Those copies were written according to the version of Usman’s manuscript.²

Husain Ibn Muhammad Diyar Bakri in “**Tarikh al-Khamis**”, in the mention of Usman’s assassination narrates from Saeed Ibn Musayyib, “Before that, there were issues between Usman and Abdullah Ibn Masud, Abuzar, and Ammar Ibn Yasir. The tribe of Huzail and Banu Zuhrah had feelings in their hearts because of Abdullah Ibn Masud. The tribe of Ghaffar and its allies, and those who were angered for Abuzar, had grudge in their hearts. Banu Makhzum were enraged

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.

with Usman because of Ammar Ibn Yasir.¹

Also, Diyar Bakri in “**Tarikh al-Khamis**”, in response to the imprisonment of Ata Ibn Masud, writes, “As for what they claimed about the imprisonment of Ata Ibn Masud, it was in response to what reached him (Usman) about him, and the Imams have always acted in such a way. Both were striving to make legal judgments (*ijtihad*), so either they were both correct, or one was correct and the other was mistaken. Usman did not intend to deprive him at all. As for the delay until the time was appropriate according to his judgment, it was done out of courtesy. When the reason was fulfilled—either upon reaching that time or even before it—his inheritance was passed on to his heirs, and perhaps that was more beneficial for them.”²

Again, Diyar Bakri in “**Tarikh al-Khamis**” in response to the claim about Usman beating Ibn Masud, pens, “As for what they narrated about what happened to Abdullah Ibn Masud at the hands of Usman, and that he ordered his servant to beat him — this is all slander and fabrication, and none of it is true. These ignorant people do not refrain from lying in what they narrate if it suits their purposes, as they have no religious integrity to prevent them from doing so.

Assuming that this did happen by the servant, he would have done it out of his own anger for his master, for Ibn Masud used to rebuke Usman verbally and used words (for Usman) that displeased him (the servant). Even if it were true, it would be taken as an act of discipline, for the position of the caliphate cannot tolerate such behaviour, and it would lower him (Ibn Masud) in the eyes of the public. This is not greater than when Umar struck Sa’d Ibn Abi Waqqas with a stick on his head when he did not stand for him and said to him, ‘You did not show respect to the caliphate, so I wanted to show you that the caliphate does not show respect to you!’ This did not change Sa’d or cause him any disgrace. Similarly, Umar struck Ubayy Ibn Ka’b when he saw him walking with people following him, hitting him with a

¹ Tarikh al-Khamis, vol. 2, p. 261

² Ibid.

stick and saying, ‘This is humiliation for the follower and a trial for the one being followed.’ Ubayy did not criticize Umar for this; rather, he saw it as discipline that benefited him. This has always been the way of the caliphs and rulers, disciplining those who act against them. It has also been narrated that Usman apologized to Ibn Masud, visited him in his house when he heard of his illness and asked him to forgive him. He said, ‘O Aba Abd al-Rahman! Here is your payment, take it!’ But Ibn Masud replied, ‘Why didn’t you bring it when it could benefit me, and now you bring it to me when I am on my deathbed? I will not accept it!’ Usman went to Umm Habiba and asked her to speak to Ibn Masud so that he would be pleased with him. Umm Habiba spoke to him. Then, Usman came to him and said, ‘O Aba Abd al-Rahman! Will you not say as (Prophet) Yusuf said to his brothers, **‘No blame upon you today, may Allah forgive you’?**’ But Ibn Masud did not relent.

If this is proven, Usman did what was possible and appropriate for his position both at the beginning and at the end. Even if we assume it was a mistake, he showed repentance, sought forgiveness, and apologized for his wrongdoing to the one who did not accept it at the time. Allah has informed that He accepts the repentance of His servants and encourages them to follow His example. It has also been reported that Ibn Masud was pleased with him and forgave him. Salama Ibn Saeed said, ‘I went to Ibn Masud during the illness in which he died. Some people were mentioning Usman and criticizing him. Ibn Masud said to them, ‘Hold back! If you kill him, you will not find anyone like him’.

As for Usman removing him from Kufa, summoning him to Madinah, and his avoidance and neglect of him, this has always been the way of the caliphs before and after him, as has been previously explained. His avoidance of him is no greater than Ali’s avoidance of his brother Aqil Ibn Abi Talib and Abu Ayyub Ansari when they left him after the battle of Siffeen and went to Muawiya, and this did not cause any blame or shame upon him (Ali). It has been narrated that a Bedouin from Hamdan entered the mosque and saw Ibn Masud, Huzaifah, and

Abu Musa criticizing Usman. He said, ‘I ask you by Allah! If Usman were to restore you to your positions and return your stipends, would you be satisfied?’ They said, ‘By Allah, yes!’ The man from Hamdan said, ‘Fear Allah, O companions of Muhammad! Do not criticize your leaders.’

This indicates that those who criticized Usman did so because he removed them from their positions, appointed others, and cut off their stipends, which is within the authority of the Imam if his *ijtihad* leads him to do so.¹⁴

Also, Diyar Bakri in “**Tarikh al-Khamis**”, in response to the criticisms of Usman, argues, “The fifteenth criticism – They say: Usman burned the copies of the Quran belonging to Ibn Masud and Ubayy, and he gathered the people around the Quran of Zaid Ibn Sabit. When Ibn Masud heard that his copy had been burned, and there was a copy of it with his companions in Kufa, he ordered them to preserve it and said to them, ‘I have recited seventy Surahs (chapters) while Zaid Ibn Sabit was still a young boy.’

Response: As for the burning of Ibn Masud’s copy, it is not something that one should defend; rather, it was one of the greatest benefits. If it had remained in the hands of the people, it would have led to a great trial (*fitnah*) in religion due to the many anomalies it contained, which are rejected by those knowledgeable in the Quran. For example, it excluded the two Maoozatain (the last two chapters of the Quran), even though the consensus among the companions was that they are part of the Quran. Usman, when criticized for this, said, ‘I feared a trial (*fitnah*) regarding the Quran!’ There was already a dispute among them to the point where one man would say to another, ‘My recitation is better than yours.’ Huzaifah said to him, ‘Save the people!’ So, he (Usman) gathered the people around one Quran to end the *fitnah* regarding the Quran, and the Quran they agreed upon was the one compiled by Usman.

¹ Ibid.

Then it is said to the people of whims and innovations, ‘If the Quran compiled by Usman was not correct, then why did Ali and the Syrians (i.e., Muawiya’s army) agree to resolve the conflict through it when the Syrians raised copies of the Quran during the arbitration, and these copies were written according to the version compiled by Usman?’¹“

Jalal al-Deen Suyuti, in “Tarikh al-Khulafa” (History of the Caliphs), while mentioning the killing of Usman, narrates from Saeed Ibn Musayyib, “There had already been previous grievances (or issues) with Usman concerning Abdullah Ibn Masud, Abuzar and Ammar Ibn Yasir. As a result, Banu Huzail and Banu Zuhra harboured what they did due to the situation of Ibn Masud, and Banu Ghaffar and its allies, and those angered for Abuzar, also held what they did in their hearts. Likewise, Banu Makhzum bore resentment toward Usman due to the situation of Ammar Ibn Yasir.”²“

Within this narration, he also mentions, “There was not a single person left among the people of Madinah who was not resentful towards Usman. This resentment and anger increased among those who were already upset for the sake of Ibn Masud, Abuzar, and Ammar Ibn Yasir.”³“

Ibn Hajar Makki, in “**Al-Sawaaeq al-Muhreqah**”, in response to the removal of prominent companions by Usman, writes, “As for Ibn Masud, he had many grievances against Usman. It became apparent to him (Usman) that it was in the best interest to remove him.”⁴“

Again, Ibn Hajar, in “**Al-Sawaaeq al-Muhreqah**”, while discussing the criticisms of Usman and his response to them, chronicles, “Among the criticisms: that he imprisoned Ata Ibn Masud and Ubayy Ibn Ka’b, exiled Abuzar to Rabzah, summoned Ubaadah Ibn Saamit from Syria to Madina when Muawiya complained about him, shunned Ibn

¹ Ibid.

² Tarikh al-Khulafa, p. 158

³ Ibid.

⁴ Al-Sawaaeq al-Muhreqah, p. 114

Masud, told Ibn Auf, ‘You are a hypocrite!’ and struck Ammar Ibn Yasir, violated the sanctity of Ka’b Ibn Abduh by striking him with twenty lashes and exiling him to some mountains, and similarly violated the sanctity of (Maalik) Ashtar al-Nakhai.

The response to this: His imprisonment of Ata Ibn Masud and his shunning of him were due to what had reached him, which necessitated such actions, especially since both were acting according to their legal judgments (*ijtihad*), so what one did to the other is not a point of objection. Yes, the claim that Usman ordered his beating is false. Even if its truth were assumed, it would not have been worse than when Umar struck Sa’d Ibn Abi Waqqas on the head with a stick because he did not stand for him and said to him, ‘You did not show respect for the caliphate, so I wanted to show you that the caliphate does not show respect for you!’ And this did not affect Sa’d. Ibn Masud is more deserving (of such treatment) because he responded to Usman in ways that left no respect or dignity for him at all! Even Umar saw Ubayy walking with a group of people behind him and struck him with a stick, saying, ‘This is a trial for you and them.’ Ubayy was not affected by this. As for Usman, he went to Ibn Masud and made great efforts to reconcile with him. It is said that Ibn Masud accepted it and sought forgiveness for him, while others said he did not.¹

Yet again, Ibn Hajar Makki in “**Al-Sawaaeq al-Muhreqah**”, in the context of mentioning the killing of Usman, within the narration of Saeed Ibn Musayyib, has stated, “And indeed, prior to this, Usman had caused issues (troubles) with Abdullah Ibn Masud, Abuzar, and Ammar Ibn Yasir. Thus, Banu Huzail and Banu Zuhra had what they had in their hearts regarding the matter of Ibn Masud. And Banu Ghaffar and their allies, and those who were angered for Abuzar, had what they had in their hearts. Banu Makhzum too were enraged with Usman over the matter of Ammar Ibn Yasir.”²

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.

Ibn Hajar also mentioned within this narration, “No one remained among the people of Madina except that they were enraged with Usman. This increased the fury and resentment of those who were already furious (with Usman) for Ibn Masud, Abuzar, and Ammar.¹“

Jamal al-Deen, the traditionalist from Shiraz, in “**Rawzah al-Ahbab**” while narrating the killing of Usman, from Saeed Ibn Musayyib, has reports, “Before this incident, inappropriate matters had taken place from Amir al-Momineen Usman toward Abdullah Ibn Masud, Abuzar Ghaffari and Ammar Ibn Yasir (may Allah be pleased with them). The hearts of the tribes of Huzail and Banu Zuhra were not pure toward Usman due to Ibn Masud, and the hearts of Banu Makhzum because of Ammar Ibn Yasir, and the hearts of Banu Ghaffar and their allies were not clear with Usman due to Abuzar.”

Again, in “**Rawzah al-Ahbab**”, while discussing the killing of Usman, he writes, “The story became widespread and well-known among the people of Islam, and there was no one from the people of Madina except that they criticized and blamed Usman for that matter. When this news reached the dissenters in Basra and Kufa, they returned to Madina. The tribes of Banu Zuhra, Banu Makhzum and Huzail, who were already upset with Usman because of Abdullah Ibn Masud, Ammar Ibn Yasir, and Abuzar Ghaffari (may Allah be pleased with them), increased their opposition.”

Mulla Mohsin Kashmiri writes in “**Risaalah Najaah al-Momineen**” regarding the criticisms against Usman as follows, “And among the criticisms is that inappropriate actions were carried out by him against the companions. He beat Ibn Masud until two of his ribs were broken, burned his (Ibn Masud’s) copy of the Quran, struck Ammar until he suffered a rupture, and struck Abuzar and exiled him to Rabzah. The answer to this is that the beating of Ibn Masud was because Usman requested his copy of the Quran when he intended to gather the people upon a single Quran, with a single arrangement of the chapters, so that there would be no disagreement like the Jews

¹ Ibid.

and Christians had with their books. However, Ibn Masud refused and did not agree with the prominent companions. Hence, Usman disciplined him to ensure his compliance with this great and significant matter, which carried immense benefit for the people of faith. Is there anything in this but the perfection of Usman? May Allah reward him for this act of kindness, for the Quran of Allah Almighty does not deserve the differences that are suitable for the book of Seebawayh and others like him, as the harms from such differences are too numerous to count. The leader (Imam) was not appointed except for matters such as this. As for the burning of the Quran, it was to remove the source of division and disagreement, and there is no blame in this. Moreover, it included the supplication of *qunut* and omitted the two Surahs (*Maoozatain*) and al-Fatiha, with exaggeration that these were not from the Quran, even though al-Fatiha is the mother (of the Quran). Then, the acceptance of this action by the senior companions from among the members of the Shura, and Ali's following him in prayer and receiving sustenance from him, is evidence of the correctness of his action."

The father of our addressee Shah Sahab, Shah Waliullah Dehlavi in "**Izalaah al-Khifaa an Khilaafah al-Khulafa**" regarding the criticisms of Usman is as follows, "And among those criticisms is that he dishonoured a group of the senior Muhajir and Ansar, such as Abuzar Ghaffari and Abdullah Ibn Masud. The satisfactory response is: If a person has a discerning eye and a wise heart, they will undoubtedly realize that the respected Zu al-Nurain (Usman) did none of these reprimands and threats except out of consideration for the welfare of the majority of the Ummah and for the betterment of the affairs of the nation. Abuzar was dealt with so that no disruption would arise in the established principles of the Shariah, and Abdullah Ibn Masud was disciplined so that there would be no disorder among the people concerning the Quran compiled by the two Shaikhs (Abu Bakr and Umar). As for Ammar Ibn Yasir, he was reprimanded for his harshness toward the Caliph. What is necessary in this matter has been summarized here, though much more could be said."

The addressee himself (Shah Sahab – Abd al-Aziz Dehlavi) in this very book “**Tuhfa Isna Ashariyyah**” regarding the criticisms of Usman is as follows, “And what has been mentioned regarding Abdullah Ibn Masud’s displeasure is also false and slanderous, as there is no evidence of it in authentic books. What is correct is that when Usman saw the extent of the people’s disagreements over the recitation of the Quran, to the point that most of the common people were reading non-revealed words and using these variations in recitation as an excuse, upon the counsel of Huzaiifa Ibn Yamaan and other prominent companions, including Amir al-Momineen (Ali Ibn Abi Talib), Usman decided that all the different tribes of Arabs and non-Arabs should be unified upon one codex of the Quran, and no one should deviate from it. He implemented this plan. Abdullah Ibn Masud and Ubayy Ibn Ka’b had written some irregular readings (Qiraat-e-Shaazzah) in their personal copies of the Quran, some of which were phrases from the **qunut** supplication, while others were explanations of meanings that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) had provided during his recitation. They refused to give up their personal copies, and this refusal could have caused a great trial (*fitnah*) in the religion, as it would have led to differences in the Quran itself, resulting in many evils over time.

When the slaves of Usman took away these personal copies, they were indeed rough with Ibn Masud, and he was injured, though Usman had not ordered them to do this. As for Ubayy Ibn Ka’b, he handed over his codex without resistance, and there was no argument or bitterness between him and Usman. Even so, Usman did everything he could to make amends with Ibn Masud and offered many apologies. If Ibn Masud did not accept, the blame would fall on Ibn Masud, not on Usman.

When Ibn Masud fell ill, Usman went to his house, sought forgiveness, and brought him his share of the stipend. Ibn Masud said, ‘I will not accept your stipend. When I was in need, you did not give it to me, and now that I am free from worldly needs and nearing my departure from this world, you bring it to me?!’ Usman replied, ‘Then give it to your daughters!’ Ibn Masud retorted, ‘I have instructed my daughters

to recite Surah Waaqiah every night, as I heard from the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) that *whoever recites Surah Waaqiah every night will not suffer from poverty.*'

Usman then went to Umm Habiba, the pure wife of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), and asked her to help reconcile Ibn Masud with him. Umm Habiba conveyed Usman's message to Ibn Masud several times. Finally, Usman went back to Ibn Masud and said, 'O Abdullah! Why don't you, like the Prophet Yusuf (s.a.w.a.), say to your brothers, '**No reproach shall be upon you today; may Allah forgive you, and He is the Most Merciful of the merciful**' (Surah Yusuf (12): Verse 92)?' Ibn Masud remained silent and did not respond.'

Thus, Usman did not fall short in seeking reconciliation and forgiveness, and he made every possible effort in this regard, clearing himself of any obligation."

Ahmad Zayni Dahlan, the Shafie Mufti of Makka, writes in "**al-Fath al-MuIbn**" regarding the criticisms against Usman is as follows, "Among the doubts that they cast upon those with weak faith is what occurred between Usman and Abdullah Ibn Masud. This happened when Usman compiled the Quran, wrote out copies, and included in them only the recitations that were transmitted by numerous reliable sources (*mutawaatir*). He then gathered the codices that contained irregular recitations (*qiraat-e-shaazzah*) that differed from the *mutawaatir* versions and burned them, among them were the codices of Abdullah Ibn Masud and Ubayy Ibn Ka'b.

Abdullah Ibn Masud (may Allah be pleased with him) was angered by this, and there were words exchanged between him and Usman, which resulted in a break between them. Both were exercising independent reasoning (*ijtihad*), and both are rewarded for their opinions, with no blame upon either of them. However, the *Raafizah* (those who reject the caliphate of the first three caliphs) exaggerate this story and claim that Usman ordered his black servant to push Ibn Masud, drag him out of the mosque, throw him to the ground, and strike him. They mention many other details, but all of this is false

and fabricated; none of it is valid. These ignorant people do not shy away from distorting the truth in what they narrate, aligning it with their personal interests, as they have no religious piety to restrain them from such acts.

The Ahl al-Sunnah have said, ‘Even if any of this were true, such as the servant’s actions, it would have been of his own doing, out of anger for his master, as Abdullah Ibn Masud (may Allah be pleased with him) used harsh words toward Usman and spoke to him in a manner that displeased him (the servant). Usman, however, remained patient. If any of the servant’s actions were carried out on Usman’s orders, it would have been for the purpose of discipline, as the office of the caliphate cannot tolerate such behaviour, given that it would diminish respect for the leader among both the elite and the public. The caliphs and rulers have always disciplined those who opposed them for the sake of maintaining order.

They also claim that Usman withheld Ibn Masud’s stipend for five years. Even if this were true, it would also have been for disciplinary reasons. Usman never intended to deprive him of it entirely but delayed it until the time he deemed appropriate as a means of correction. When Ibn Masud passed away, the stipend was given to his heirs.”

It should not remain hidden that from these clear and evident statements, the oppression and injustice of Usman and his followers toward Abdullah Ibn Masud, in many ways, become apparent and obvious. What the supporters/defenders of Usman have presented in some of the statements mentioned above—words of foolishness in an attempt to defend Usman—their falsity and disgrace are clearly established and proven in detail in the work “**Tashyeed al-Mataaen**” by my esteemed father, Allamah Sayed Muhammad Quli (may Allah place him in the abode of peace). The other statements that have been mentioned here will themselves make the discerning observer aware of the true situation, bringing to light the weakness of the cobweb-like defence of Usman’s supporters and presenting it to the witness stand.

Response To The Sixth Contradictory Tradition

The author of **Tuhfa** presents the tradition, “And the most knowledgeable of you in regard to the permissible and the forbidden is Muaz Ibn Jabal” in opposition to Hadees-e-Saqalain.

He says, “And the most knowledgeable of you in regard to the permissible and the forbidden is Muaz Ibn Jabal.”

The author (Mir Hamid Husain (r.a.)) responds with sixteen counterarguments and refutes Shah Sahab’s reasoning.”

Indication:

I (Mir Hamid Husain) say:

The opponent’s argument based on this fabricated, clearly flawed, and evidently weak narration is invalid for several reasons:

First: This tradition is never part of the Shia narrations. Hence, citing it in opposition to their beliefs reflects extreme weakness, foolishness, and utter ignorance.

Second: According to the opponent’s own father’s (Shah Waliullah Dehlavi) teaching, using this tradition as evidence is not permissible, as his father did not consider even the authentic traditions of Sahihain (Bukhari and Muslim) as admissible in debates with the people of truth (i.e. Shias). How much less, then, would this tradition be, which is not even found in the Sahihain.

Third: Quoting this tradition against the people of truth violates the repeated promises and commitments made by the opponent himself. These promises were mentioned several times, in terms that strike back at the mistakes of the one quoting it with force.

Fourth: From the perspective of its chain of narration, this tradition is

highly criticized, weak, and utterly rejected. This tradition is part of the longer tradition, “*The most merciful of my nation towards my nation is Abu Bakr*” which fabricators, liars, and scoundrels have fabricated in various forms. By doing so, they severed the chain of their faith and religion through this blatant lie. By the grace of Almighty Allah, this lengthy fabrication has been thoroughly refuted with detailed arguments in the volume “**Tradition of the City of Knowledge**” (of Abaqāt al-Anwār) in response to Aasimi. Upon reviewing it, one will see that all the chains, paths, and aspects of this tradition are invalid, weak, and nullified.

Fifth: Ibn Taymiyyah Harrani, who has misled many scholars of Ahle Tasannun with his baseless ideas, extremism, and delusions, admits in his book “**Minhaj al-Sunnah**” that some scholars of Ahle Tasannun have considered the tradition of Muaz’s superior knowledge as weak. In response to the tradition, “*The most judicious among you is Ali*” after narrating a series of flawed arguments and mentioning the tradition of Muaz’s superior knowledge, he (Ibn Taymiyyah) says, “Some of them weaken the tradition, while others consider it good.”¹⁴

It is quite evident that the position of the scholars of Ahle Tasannun who have considered this tradition as weak provides a solid and firm argument, which serves as a strong proof. Through this, the arrogance of the deniers is silenced, and the tongues of the opponents hushed in the best possible way. As for Ibn Taymiyyah’s statement that some scholars of Ahle Tasannun consider this tradition to be good, poses no harm to the people of truth and certainty (i.e. Shias). For soon, you will hear from the great scholar Ibn Abd al-Hadi that this claim is followed by a refutation.

Sixth: Although some scholars of Ahle Tasannun, out of audacity, have praised and even authenticated the tradition of Muaz’s superior knowledge, the great scholar Ibn Abd al-Hadi, in his work “*Tazkirah*”, has pursued them, aiming to refute and invalidate their statements.

¹ Minhaj al-Sunnah, vol. 4, p. 138 Chapter Concerning “Surely, he was the most knowledgeable of the people.”

Thus, it becomes evident, clear, and undeniable that the praise and authentication of this tradition is so flawed and inappropriate that even Ahle Tasannun researchers and their fair-minded scholars have made great efforts to refute and invalidate it. They strived to reveal the truth, demonstrating the weakness and failure of this tradition, thereby exposing the foolishness of the falsehood and the absurdity of the corrupted.

Seventh: The great scholar Ibn Abd al-Hadi, in his “*Tadhkirah*”, has admitted, with complete fairness, that there is strangeness in the text of this tradition. After this skilled scholar’s admission of the strangeness in the text of the tradition, the action of the short-sighted opponent in using this entirely false tradition as proof, especially in opposition to Hadees-e-Saqalain, shows the unashamed audacity and boldness, as well as the pits of brazenness and impudence.

Eighth: The great scholar Ibn Abd al-Hadi, in his “*Tadhkirah*” has conveyed that his teacher considered this tradition as weak. It is evident that after Ibn Abd al-Hadi’s teacher deemed it to be weak, the argument of the rebellious and aggressive opponent based on this flawed tradition is clearly unjust and baseless.

Ninth: The great scholar Ibn Abd al-Hadi also stated in his “*Tadhkirah*” that his teacher not only considered this tradition as weak but further inclined toward the opinion that it was fabricated. Indeed, the opponent’s reliance on this fabricated tradition and his adherence to this manufactured report shows a deep attachment to falsehood and a strong inclination toward misguidance.

Tenth: The great scholar Shams al-Deen Zahabi, upon whom the opponent has relied in responding to the “**Tradition of the Bird**” (Hadees-e-Tair), has classified the tradition of Muaz’s superior knowledge as a criticized and weak narration. He made this clear by mentioning it in his book “*Mizan al-Itidal*” under the biography of Salam Ibn Salam, a narrator who was abandoned and discredited, thus showing the utmost weakness and invalidity of the tradition. You will soon come to understand this, God willing.

The criticism (jarh) and weakening (qadh) of Ibn Baylamani, Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman, and his father (Abd al-Rahman Ibn Zaid), who are the narrators of this report, have been well-documented in the books of the scholars (Ahl-e-Tasannun)

Eleventh: The great scholar Manavi, in “*Faiz al-Qadir - Sharh al-Jaami’ al-Saghir*”, has criticized and weakened the tradition of Muaz’s superior knowledge by showing that it is narrated through Ibn Baylamani and pointing out the well-known discrediting of Ibn Baylamani among the critics of narrators. He has prominently raised the banners of exposing and condemning this tradition. Furthermore, the lofty remarks of the great scholar Ibn Abd al-Hadi, aimed at demonstrating the falsehood and corruption of this baseless tradition and clarifying its collapse and bankruptcy, have been mentioned. Ibn Abd al-Hadi’s work serves as the tool of a skilled blacksmith, as he thoroughly dismantles and demolishes the weak foundation of this criticized tradition. Manavi, without any rejection or objection, has presented and accepted these statements.

Now, one must listen to the words of Manavi containing these points and reach the core of the falsehood and disgrace of this forged lie and fabricated slander.

Manavi, in “*Faiz al-Qadir*”, in his commentary on the tradition of Muaz’s superior knowledge, which is transmitted in a lengthy manner, says, “[It is narrated] through Ibn Baylamani, from his father from Ibn Umar Ibn al-Khattab. Ibn Baylamani’s condition is well-known, but in this chapter, there are also narrations from Anas, Jabir, and others, recorded by Tirmizi, Ibn Majah, Haakim, and others. However, in their versions, instead of “most kind” (*ar’af*), they used “most merciful” (*arham*). Tirmizi said, ‘It is reliable (*hasan*) and correct (*sahih*).’ Haakim said, ‘It meets the criteria of Bukhari and Muslim.’ Ibn Abd al-Hadi, in his “*Tazkirah*”, critiqued them by saying that there is strangeness in its text and that his teacher considered it

weak, and even went further by declaring it fabricated.¹

It should be noted that Ibn Baylamani and his father, who are the narrators of this fabricated report from Ibn Umar, are both criticized and discredited. Their faults and disgrace are more apparent than the sun and clearer than yesterday. It is mostly for this reason that Manavi, in his eloquent statement regarding Ibn Baylamani, simply says, “And Ibn Baylamani’s condition is well-known.” He avoids delving into a detailed explanation of his discrediting. However, in this context, to silence the opponents and expose the fabricators’ falsehoods, I will write and document a portion of the conditions of both Ibn Baylamani and his father.

As for Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, the evidence for his discrediting is so overwhelming that it cannot all be enumerated.

Bukhari, in “**Kitab al-Zu’afa wa al-Matrukin**”, writes, “Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, who narrates from his father, is a rejected narrator of traditions (*munkar al-hadees*), and Humaidi criticized him.”²

Nasai, in “**Kitab al-Zu’afa wa al-Matrukin**”, also said, “Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, who narrates from his father, is a rejected narrator of traditions (*munkar al-hadees*).”³

Muhammad Ibn Tahir Ibn Ahmad Maqdisi, in “**Tazkirah al-Mauzooat**”, repeatedly mentioned Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani with criticism and discredit, pointing out his fabrications in several traditions. For example, in the aforementioned book, he says, “When the end times come and desires conflict, follow the religion of the desert and women. In it, is Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani. Ibn Maeen said, ‘He is nothing’.”

He also says in the same book, “When you meet the pilgrim, greet him, shake his hand, and ask him to seek forgiveness for you. In it, is

¹ Faiz al-Qadir, vol. 1, p. 460, Explanation of Tradition 908

² Bukhari’s “Kitab al-Zu’afa wa al-Matrukin”, p. 103, No. 329

³ Nasai’s “Kitab al-Zu’afa wa al-Matrukin”, p. 93, No. 526

Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and he is nothing in tradition.”

Again, he says, “If you want to be among the devout, do not be familiar with the one on your right. In it, Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and he is nothing in tradition.”

He also says, “A believer performs good deeds to protect seven generations of his offspring. In it, is Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and he is nothing in tradition.”

Furthermore, he states: “Which people are the hungriest? He said, ‘The one who is never satisfied with knowledge.’ In it, is Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and he is nothing in tradition.”

He also says, “Stick to the religion of the elderly women. It has no authentic or weak basis, except from Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, though in different words. He has a manuscript and was accused of fabrication.”

He says, “Whoever breaks the fast for one day in Ramazan. In it, Abu al-Matus, who narrates from his father things that no one else supports. And in it, is Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and he is nothing.”

Again, he says, “Whoever fasts on the morning of the Eid al-Fitr has fasted for eternity. In it, is Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and he is nothing in tradition.”

He further states, “Whoever fasts on Friday will be rewarded with ten days. In it, is Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and he is nothing in tradition.”

He also says, “Whoever believes in Allah and the Last Day should not sit at a table where alcohol is consumed. In it, is Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and he is nothing.”

He also mentions, “A child born of adultery does not inherit or is not inherited from. In it, is Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and he is nothing. He narrates a fabricated version from his father from Ibn Umar.”

He says, “There is no night prayer during the day and no day prayer during the night, but neglect occurs in between. In it, is Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and he is nothing.”

Finally, he mentions, “There is no pre-emption (*shuf’ah*) for a child or an absentee. If a partner precedes another in pre-emption, there is no pre-emption, and pre-emption is like untying a rope. In it, is Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and he is nothing.”

He also says, “There are always forty people through whom Allah protects the earth, and whenever one dies, another replaces him. In it, is Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and he is nothing.”¹⁴

Abu al-Faraj Abd al-Rahman Ibn Ali Ibn Muhammad, known as Ibn Jauzi, in his book “**al-Mauzooaat**” (The Fabricated Traditions), repeatedly criticized Muhammad Ibn Abdul Rahman Baylamani in the context of establishing a clear method of discrediting his narrated traditions with complete clarity and openness. In his book “**al-Mauzooaat**”, whose ancient manuscript, thanks to Allah, is currently under my observation, he writes, “[Chapter on what to do when disagreements arise.] Ibn Khayrun narrated to us from Jauhari from Daraqutni from Abu Haatim from Muhammad Ibn Yaqub Ibn Ishaq Khateeb narrated to us from Abdullah Ibn Muhammad Haarisi, who said that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, “*When the end of time approaches and desires differ, adhere to the religion of the people of the desert.*”

In another narration, “*Adhere to the religion of the people of the desert and the women.*” The author says, “This tradition is not authentic from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). Yahya Ibn Maeen said, ‘Muhammad Ibn Haaris and Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman are nothing.’ Abu Haatim said, ‘Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman narrated from his father a collection of nearly two hundred traditions, all of them fabricated. It is not permissible to use them as evidence, nor to

¹ Maqdisi’s “Tazkirah al-Mauzooaat” p. 25, Condemnation of a Non-Practising Scholar

mention them in books, except in amazement (i.e. disbelief).¹⁴

Ibn Jauzi also mentions in his book “**al-Mauzooaat**” [Chapter on the virtues of Jeddah]. Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Maalik narrated to us from Ismail Ibn Masada from Hamza from Abu Ahmad Ibn Adi from Muhammad Ibn Ibrahim Zibili from Abd al-Hamid Ibn Sabih from Salih Ibn Abd al-Jabbar from Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani from his father from Ibn Umar, who said, “The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) prophesied, ‘*A time will come upon the people when the best frontier defence (ribaah) will be the ribaah of Jeddah.*’

Another tradition on this matter: Muhammad Ibn Abi Tahir narrated to us from Jauhari from Daraqutni from Abu Haatim Busti from Muhammad Ibn Musayyib from Ismail Ibn Maalik from Hajjaj Ibn Khalid from Abd al-Maalik Ibn Harun Ibn Antarah from his father from his grandfather from Ali (a.s.), who said, “The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) prophesied, ‘*Four gates of Paradise are opened in this world, the first of them being Alexandria, Ascalon, and Qazvin, and the excellence of Jeddah over these (cities) is like the excellence of the Sacred House of Allah over other houses.*’

The author said, “These two traditions are not authentic. As for the first one, it includes Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman, about whom Yahya [Ibn Maeen] said, ‘He is nothing.’ Ibn Hibban said, ‘He narrated from his father a collection of nearly two hundred traditions, all fabricated, and it is not permissible to use them as evidence.’ As for the second one, Yahya said about Abd al-Maalik Ibn Marwan, ‘He is a liar’ and Sa’di said. ‘He is a deceitful liar’ and Ibn Hibban said, ‘He fabricates traditions.’”

In “**Mizan al-Itidal**”, Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Zahabi pens, [Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani, narrated from his father: they (the scholars) considered him weak. Bukhari and Abu Haatim said, ‘His tradition is denounced (*munkar*), and Daraqutni and others said, ‘Weak’. Ibn Hibban said, ‘He narrated from his father a

¹ Al-Mauzooaat, vol. 1, p. 271, Chapter on what to do when disagreements arise

collection of approximately two hundred fabricated traditions. Salih Ibn Abd al-Hamid Hazrami said, 'Ibn Baylamani narrated from his father, who narrated from Ibn Umar (a marfu' narration), *'Whoever touches the (Black) Corner, it is as if he placed his hand in the hand of the Most Merciful, Exalted and Glorified.'*

Muhammad Ibn Yaqub Khatib in Ahwaz narrated to us from Ubayd Ibn Muhammad Haarisi from Muhammad Ibn Haarisi Haarisi from Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani, the freed-slave of Ibn Umar, who narrated from his father, who narrated from Ibn Umar (a marfu' narration), *'When desires differ, hold fast to the religion of the people of the desert.'* Also, *'A child born out of wedlock neither inherits nor is inherited from.'* Again, *'Whoever fasts on Friday, Allah will record for him ten radiant, glorious days unlike any other days of the world.'* Yet again, *'Whoever fasts the morning of the day of Eid, it is as if he fasted for a lifetime.'* Again, *'The one who knows (or performs) acts of obedience, Allah preserves him in seven generations of his descendants.'* Yet again, *'When you meet a pilgrim, shake his hand and ask him to pray for forgiveness for you, for he is forgiven.'* Again, *'Forty people constantly preserve the earth by Allah's will.'*¹⁴

Muhammad Ibn Abi Bakr Maqdisi narrated to us from Muhammad Ibn Haarisi from Ibn Baylamani from his father from Ibn Umar (a marfu' narration), *"There is no pre-emption for a minor or an absentee, and pre-emption is like untying a tether."* Ibn Adi said, 'Everything narrated by Ibn Baylamani is problematic and stems from him! And Muhammad Ibn Haarisi is also weak.'

Zahabi also writes in "**al-Mughni**", "Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani narrated from his father. They (the scholars) have considered him weak. Ibn Hibban writes, 'He narrated from his father a collection of fabricated traditions.'"

Hafiz Zain al-Deen Abd al-Rahim Ibn al-Husayn al-Iraqi, in his book "**Al-Mughni an Haml al-Asfaar fi al-Asfaar**", writes, "Regarding

¹ Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 3, p. 617, No. 7827

the tradition ‘*Follow the religion of the elderly women (deen al-ajaez)*’, Ibn Tahir in his book “**al-Tazkira**” says, ‘This expression has been widely circulated among the common people, but I have not found any authentic or weak chain of narrators for it until I came across a tradition from Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani from Ibn Umar from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), ‘*When it is the end of times and desires differ, adhere to the religion of the people of the desert and the women.*’ Ibn Baylamani has a collection of narrations from his father from Ibn Umar, which he was accused of fabricating’. This wording from this source was narrated in his work ‘**al-Zuafa**’ in the biography of Ibn Baylamani. And Allah knows best.”

Ali Ibn Abi Bakr Ibn Sulayman Haysami, in “**Majma’ al-Zawaaed**”, in the chapter on the “Prayer of Fear” (Salat al-Khauf), after narrating a tradition from Ibn Umar, says, “Narrated by Bazzaar, and in the chain of narrators is Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and he is very weak (*zaeef jiddan*).¹”

In “**Al-Kashf al-Hasees amman Rumeya bi Waz’ al-Hadees**” of Sibṭ Ibn Ajami Halabi, it is mentioned, “Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani narrated from his father. Several scholars have considered him weak, and Kh [likely referring to Khateeb] and Abu Haatim said, ‘His tradition is rejected (*munkar*).’ Ibn Hibban said, ‘He narrated from his father a collection of about two hundred traditions, all of which are fabricated. Zahabi mentioned several traditions in his Mizan, and at the end of the list, he quoted Ibn Adi saying, ‘Everything that Ibn Baylamani narrates is problematic and stems from him.’ Muhammad Ibn Haaris is also weak. In al-Siqaat of Ibn Hibban in the biography of his father, it is mentioned, ‘He fabricated and attributed strange things to his father.’”

Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in “**Talkhees al-Khabir**”, while discussing the tradition of Usman regarding wiping one-third of the head, said, “Daraqutni narrated it through the chain of Ibn Baylamani from his father from Usman. Ibn Baylamani is very weak (*zaeef jiddan*), and his

¹ Majma’ al-Zawaaed, vol. 2, p. 196

father is also weak (*zaeef*).”

Again, Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in “**Talkhees al-Khabir**”, while discussing the tradition, “There is no prayer after the dawn prayers (*fajr*) except the two units of the dawn prayers,” states, “Ibn Adi narrated it in the biography of Muhammad Ibn Haaris from Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani from his father from Ibn Umar. Both Muhammads are weak (*zaeefaan*).”

Yet again, Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in “**Talkhees al-Khabir**”, when discussing the tradition narrated from Ibn Abbas about “**Alaaeq**” (a term that could refer to relationships or certain attachments), states, “Its chain of narrators is very weak (*zaeef jiddan*), for it is from the narration of Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani from his father from Ibn Abbas.¹”

Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in “**Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb**”, pens, “Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, the Kufi grammarian and freed slave of Umar’s family, narrated from his father and from his father’s maternal uncle (whose name he did not mention). Saeed Ibn Bashir Bukhari, Abdullah Ibn Abbas Ibn al-Rabee’ Haarisi, Muhammad Ibn Haaris Ibn Ziyad Haarisi, Muhammad Ibn Kathir al-Abdi, Abu Salama Musa Ibn Ismail, and others narrated from him. Usman Rumi reported from Ibn Maeen, ‘He is nothing.’ Bukhari, Abu Haatim, and Nasai said, ‘His tradition is rejected (*munkar*).’ Bukhari also said, ‘Humaidi used to criticize him and consider him weak.’ Abu Haatim also said, ‘His tradition is inconsistent (*muztarib*).’ Ibn Adi said, ‘Everything narrated by Ibn Baylamani is problematic and stems from him! If Muhammad Ibn Haaris narrates from him, then both are weak.’ I (Ibn Hajar) say, ‘Ibn Hibban said, ‘His son narrated from him (or from his father) a collection of about 200 fabricated traditions. It is not permissible to rely on him, and he should only be mentioned for the sake of amazement (at his weakness).’ Saji said, ‘His hadees is rejected.’ Aqili said, ‘Salih Ibn Abd al-Jabbar and Muhammad Ibn Haaris narrated rejected traditions from him.’ Haakim said, ‘He

¹ Talkhees al-Khabir, vol. 1, p. 84, H. 85, Chapter of the Traditions of Ablution

narrated problematic (*mu'zalaat*) reports from his father who reported from Ibn Umar.¹

Ibn Hajar Asqalani in “**Lisan al-Mizan**” writes, “Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani Adawi, their mawla, narrated from his father, and Muhammad Ibn Kasir Abdi narrated from him. Bukhari said, ‘His tradition is rejected (*munkar al-hadees*).”

Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in “**Taqreeb al-Tahzeeb**”, writes, “Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani...is weak, and Ibn Adi and Ibn Hibban accused him (of fabrication). He is from the seventh generation (of narrators).”

Kamal al-Deen Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Wahid Sivaasi, known as Ibn Hamam, writes in “**Fath al-Qadeer**” regarding the issue of the determination of the dowry: “The tradition of the affections: It is weak due to Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani. Ibn Qattan, ‘Bukhari said, ‘It is a rejected tradition’.”²

Shams al-Deen Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Sakhaawi writes in “**Maqaasid al-Hasanah**”, “The tradition ‘*Adhere to the religion of old women*’ has no basis in this wording. However, Dailami narrated it from the tradition of Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani from his father from Ibn Umar from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), ‘*When it is the end of times and desires diverge, adhere to the religion of the Bedouins and women.*’ Ibn Baylamani is very weak. Ibn Hibban said, ‘He narrated from his father a collection of approximately two hundred traditions, all fabricated, and it is not permissible to rely on him! He is only mentioned as a point of astonishment.’³

Safi al-Deen Ahmad Ibn Abdillah Khazraji said in “**Mukhtasar Tahzib al-Tahzib**”, “Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani Adawi, their freed slave, narrated from his father, and Muhammad Ibn Kasir Abdi narrated from him. Bukhari said, “His tradition is rejected (*munkar*).”

¹ Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb, vol. 7, p. 276, No. 6312 under the alphabet ٤

² Fath al-Qadeer, vol. 2, p. 308, Chapter of Dowry

³ Al-Maqaasid al-Hasanah, p. 297 under H. No. 714

Rahmatullah Ibn Abdillah Sindi said in “*Mukhtasar Tanzih al-Shari’ah*”, “Muhammad Ibn Abdul Rahman Baylamani narrated from his father a collection, all of which is fabricated.”

Mulla Ali al-Qari, in his treatise “*al-Mauzooaat*”, quoting Ibn Qayyim, writes, “And among them is the tradition, ‘*Whoever fasts on the morning of Eid al-Fitr, it is as if he has fasted for a lifetime.*’ This is a false, fabricated tradition attributed to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). Ibn Baylamani narrates strange traditions. Bukhari, Abu Haatim Raazi and Nasai say, ‘His tradition is rejected (*munkar al-hadees*). Yahya Ibn Maeen writes, ‘He is nothing (i.e., insignificant).’ Daraqutni and Humaidi said, ‘He is weak.’ Ibn Hibban wrote, ‘He narrated from his father a collection (like two hundred traditions), in which he compiled eighty traditions, all of which are fabricated. It is not permissible to use him as evidence, and he is only mentioned as a point of astonishment.¹”

Criticism and Disparagement of Abd al-Rahman Baylamani from the biographical books of Ahle Tasannun

Abd al-Rauf Ibn Taj al-Arifeen Manavi, in “*Faiz al-Qadir – Sharh Jaami’ al-Saghir*”, in the commentary on the tradition, “*When it is the end of times and desires diverge,*” writes, “Ibn Hibbaan – in the “**Book of Weak Narrators**” in the biography of Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, referring to one of his narrations. Ibn Farrah, from the chain of narrators from Ibn Umar. Ibn Tahir said in his biography, ‘Ibn Baylamani has a collection of narrations from his father from Ibn Umar, which he is accused of fabricating, and it is not permissible to use it as evidence, nor should it be mentioned except in the context of astonishment, and that is the end of it.’”

Muhammad Murtaza Zubaidi, in “*Sharh-o-Ihya-e-Uloom al-Deen*”, writes, ““According to Dailami, from the tradition of Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani from his father from Ibn Umar, it is

¹ Al-Mauzooaat, p. 419 under the tradition, “*Whoever fasts on the Day of Fitr*”

narrated, ‘When it is the end of times and desires diverge, adhere to the religion of the Bedouins and women.’ Ibn Baylamani is very weak, as noted by Sakhaawi in “**al-Maqaasid**.”

Qazi al-Quzaat (Chief Justice) Muhammad Ibn Ali Shaukani, in “**Nayl al-Awtaar**” after mentioning a tradition about repeating the wiping of the head from Daraqutni, pens, “And in it is Ibn Baylamani; he is very weak, and his father is also weak.”

Shaukani also said in “**Nayl al-Awtaar**”, “A point of benefit – among the traditions related to pre-emption is the hadees of Ibn Umar, narrated by Ibn Majah and al-Bazzar with the wording, ‘There is no pre-emption for the absent, nor for the minor, and pre-emption is like the untying of a rope.’ In its chain is Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and he has many strange narrations.”

Shaukani further writes in “**Nayl al-Awtaar**”, after quoting the tradition “Perform Hajj, and you will become wealthy” “In its chain of narrators is Muhammad Ibn Haaris from Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, and both are weak.”¹

As for Abd al-Rahman Baylamani, there are also many pieces of evidence regarding his discreditation. The eminent Hafiz Abu al-Hasan Ali Ibn Umar Daraqutni, in his book “*Al-Mujtana*”, whose old manuscript in Arabic handwriting is present before me, when discussing the criticism and discrediting of the tradition about the killing of Muslim in a covenant which Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani narrated, writes, ‘Ibn Baylamani is weak, and no argument can be established by him when he relates with a chain of narrators, so how can one rely on what he narrates without a chain (i.e., a mursal tradition). And Allah knows the best!’

Abu Abdillah Haakim Nishapuri in “**Al-Mustadrak ala al-Sahihain**”, in the book of Tafseer, after mentioning a tradition in whose chain Ibn Baylamani appears, said, ‘And the two Shaikhs (viz.

¹ Nayl al-Awtaar, Muhammad Ibn Ali Shaukani, vol. 1, p. 197 and vol. 6, p. 87

Bukhari and Muslim) did not rely on Ibn Baylamani.¹

Zahabi in “*Mizan al-Itidal*” pens, “Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani, one of the well-known Taabein has narrated from Ibn Umar. Abu Haatim considered him soft (i.e., lenient or unreliable), and Daraqutni said, ‘He is weak, and no argument can be established by him’.²”

Zahabi also writes in “**al-Mughni**”, “Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani, a well-known Tabe’i. Abu Haatim said, ‘His tradition is soft (i.e., lenient or unreliable). Ibn Hibban mentioned him in *Al-Siqaat* (The Trustworthy Ones), and Daraqutni said, ‘He is weak’.³”

Zahabi also writes in “**al-Kashif**”, “Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani narrated from Ibn Abbas and Ibn Umar, and his son Muhammad, Rabi’a, and Ibn Ishaq have narrated from him. Abu Haatim said, ‘He is lenient (in tradition). Ibn Hibban mentioned him among the trustworthy ones, and he was one of the prominent poets.’⁴”

Again, Zahabi, in “*Talkhees al-Mustadrak*”, in the Book of Laws (Kitab al-Ahkam), after mentioning the tradition of ‘Sarraq’, writes, ‘Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani is lenient (i.e., unreliable), and Bukhari did not rely on him.’⁵”

Yet again, in “**Talkhees al-Mustadrak**”, in the Book of Trials (Kitab al-Fitan), after mentioning the tradition of Ibn Umar concerning the “beast of the earth”, he writes, ‘I say: Ibn Baylamani is weak.’⁶”

Ibn Hajar Asqalani in “**Tahzib al-Tahzib**”, in his (Ibn Baylamani’s) biography, writes, “Abu Haatim said: He is lenient (i.e., unreliable). Ibn Sa’d said: He was one of the fifth group under Umar Ibn Khattab. Abd al-Mun’im Ibn Idris said: He was among the *Abnaa* (ابناء) (those of mixed Arab-Persian descent) who lived in Yemen, and he resided in Harran. It is said that he was a skilled poet who visited Walid (the

¹ Al-Mustadrak ala al-Sahihain, vol. 4, p. 531, H. 8492

² Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 2, p. 551, No. 3827

³ Al-Mughni, p. 377, No. 3536

⁴ Al-Kashif, vol. 2, p.141, No. 3198

⁵ Talkhees al-Mustadrak, vol. 1, p. 224

⁶ Talkhees al-Mustadrak, vol. 1, p. 224

caliph), and Walid showered him with generous gifts. He died during his rule while performing the Farewell Circumambulation as per Tirmizi. Nasai mentioned his tradition about the story of Amr Ibn Anbasa's conversion to Islam and other similar stories. Ibn Majah cited him, and Ibn Hibban mentioned him in **al-Siqaat** (The Trustworthy Ones). I (Ibn Hajar) say, 'He (Ibn Hibban) also said: He died during the rule of Walid Ibn Abd al-Maalik. It is not permissible to consider his tradition when narrated by his son Muhammad, because his son attributed strange things to his father. Daraqutni said, 'He is weak, and no argument can be established by him. Azdi said, 'His tradition is rejected, and he narrated falsehoods from Ibn Umar. Salih Jazrah said, 'His tradition is rejected, and we do not know that he heard from any of the companions except from Sarraq.'

I (Ibn Hajar) say, "According to this, his tradition from the named companions would be considered *mursal* (disconnected) according to Salih (Jazrah)."

Ibn Hajar Asqalani also writes in "**Taqrib al-Tahzib**", "Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani, the freed slave of Umar, a resident of Madina who settled in Harran (Syria), is weak, from the third generation (of narrators)."

Safi al-Deen Khazraji in "**Mukhtasar Tahzib al-Tahzib**" pens, "Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani...the freed slave of Umar, narrated from Ibn Abbas and Amr Ibn Anbasa. His son Muhammad and Zaid Ibn Silm narrated from him. Abu Haatim said, 'He is lenient (i.e., unreliable), Ibn Hibban considered him trustworthy, and Hafiz Abd al-Azim said, 'He is not reliable enough to be used as evidence'.¹"

Allamah Ibn Amir al-Haaj in "*al-Taqrir wa al-Tahbir*", in the discussion on the issue of the denial of equality between a believer and a disbeliever, writes, 'Then, in the reports (*asaar*), there is what supports the view of the Hanafis. Among them is the tradition of Abd al-Rahman Ibn Baylamani...one of the well-known Tabe'in. He

¹ Khazraji's "Mukhtasar Tahzib al-Tahzib", vol. 2, p. 127

narrated from Ibn Umar. Abu Haatim considered him lenient (i.e., unreliable), Ibn Hibban mentioned him in “*al-Siqaat*” (The Trustworthy Ones), and Daraqutni said, ‘He is weak, and no argument can be established by him.’

He (Ibn Baylamani) reports, ‘The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) killed a Muslim for [killing] a person under covenant (*mu’ahid*). The tradition (continues), meaning his statement, ‘And he said, ‘I am the one most entitled to fulfil his covenant’.’ It was narrated by Abu Hanifa and Abu Dawud in his *Mursal* (disconnected) narrations, and by Abd al-Razzaq. Daraqutni also transmitted it from Ibn Baylamani, from Ibn Umar as a tradition without chain of narrators (*marfu*) and criticized it. A full discussion on this topic belongs elsewhere.”

Mulla Ali Muttaqi Hindi in “*Kanz al-Ummal*” said, “Ibn Umar reports, “The Prophet (s.a.w.a.) was asked, ‘What is acceptable in witnessing for breastfeeding?’ He said, ‘A man and a woman.’ (Abu Shuja’). In this narration, there is Ibn Baylamani, who is weak¹.”

Abd al-Rauf Ibn Taj al-Aarifin Manavi in “*Faiz al-Qadeer*” while explaining the tradition “*The hungriest of people is the seeker of knowledge*” writes, “And Ibn Baylamani was considered weak by Daraqutni and others.²”

Shaukani in “*Nayl al-Awtaar*” while mentioning the tradition about killing a Muslim with a treaty, said, “It has been responded to that it is *mursal* (a type of narration where the chain of narrators is incomplete) and such a tradition cannot be used as proof, and that the aforementioned Ibn Baylamani is weak and cannot be relied upon for proof when the tradition is having a chain of narrators, let alone when does not, as Daraqutni said.³”

Muhammad Murtaza al-Zubaidi in “*Taj al-Urus*” in the lexicon entry for the root “Bilm” writes, “Abd al-Rahman Ibn Abi Yazid Baylamani, the freed slave of Umar Ibn Khattab, was a Tabe’i (one

¹ Kanz al-Ummaal, vol. 6, p. 146

² Faiz al-Qadeer, vol. 1, p. 163

³ Nayl al-Awtaar, vol. 1, p. 197

who saw the companions but did not see the Prophet) who narrated from Ibn Abbas, Ibn Umar, Nafi', and Ibn Jubair, and from him narrated his son Muhammad, Rabi'ah al-Ra'y and Ibn Ishaq. Abu Haatim said, "He was lenient, and Ibn Hibban mentioned him in "**al-Siqaat**" (the reliable narrators). He was one of the prominent poets."

Criticism and Appraisal of Zaid Ami, another narrator of the tradition on the knowledge of Muaz, as reported from the books of Ahle Tasannun

Twelfth: Allamah Manavi, in another place, has thoroughly criticized and weakened the tradition of Muaz's knowledge of what is lawful and unlawful by clearly explaining and elaborating on the weaknesses of its narrators, **Zaid Ammi** and **Salam Ibn Salim**, following a path of fairness. As he mentions in "**Faiz al-Qadeer - Sharh Jaami' al-Saghir**" in explaining the tradition, "*Muaz Ibn Jabal is the most knowledgeable of people about what is lawful and unlawful according to Allah,*" he says, "Recorded by Halabi from Abu Saeed Khudri, and in it is Zaid Ammi, whose weakness has been previously mentioned, and Salam Ibn Salim. Ibn Adi said, "The majority of what he narrates is not corroborated by others."¹

From this statement, it is apparent that **Allamah Manavi**, while critiquing this tradition, explains that its chain of narration includes **Zaid Ammi**, whose weakness has already been mentioned, and **Salam Ibn Salim**. Ibn Adi said about him that the majority of what he narrates is not corroborated by others. Although Allamah Manavi sufficed with this brief mention in his critique and criticism of these two narrators, we, by the grace of Allah, will mention it in full detail to silence the opponents and complete the argument.

As for **Zaid Ammi**, many prominent scholars and notable critics of Ahle Tasannun traditions have criticized him in various ways, pointing out his flaws and shortcomings. They have regarded him to be weak and discredited him as is appropriate, exposing his faults and

¹ Faiz al-Qadeer, vol. 5, p. 524, Explanation of H. No. 815

revealing his hidden defects.

Nasai, in his book “**al-Zuafa wa al-Matrukin**” (The Weak and Abandoned Narrators) writes, “Zaid Ammi is weak.¹”

Abd al-Rahman Ibn Abi Haatim Raazi in “**Kitab al-Elal**” writes, “*This is my ablution (wuzu) and the ablution (wuzu) of the Prophets before me.*” My father said, ‘Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid is abandoned in traditions, Zaid Ammi is weak in traditions, and this tradition is not authentic from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.). Abu Zur’ah was asked about this tradition. He replied, “In my opinion, this tradition is weak, and Muawiya Ibn Qurra did not meet Ibn Umar. I said to my father, ‘Rabi’ Ibn Sulaiman narrated this tradition to us from Asad Ibn Musa, from Salam Ibn Sulaim, from Zaid Ibn Aslam from Muawiya Ibn Qurrah from Ibn Umar from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.).’ He said, ‘Salam is Salam al-Tawil, and he is abandoned in traditions, and Zaid is Zaid Ammi, and he is weak in traditions.’²”

Ibn Jauzi, in his book “**al-Mauzooaat**” (The Fabricated Narrations), after mentioning the traditions about cupping on Tuesday, writes, “These are traditions in which none are authentic. As for the first, it includes **Abu Hormoz**, about whom Yahya said, ‘He is nothing, a liar.’ Nasai said, ‘He is not trustworthy.’ Daraqutni said, ‘He is abandoned.’ As for the second and third, they include Zaid Ammi. Ibn Hibban said, ‘He narrates fabricated things that are baseless, to the point that it inclines the heart to believe he deliberately concocted them.’³”

Zahabi writes in “**Mizan al-Itidal**”, “Zaid Ibn Hawaari Ammi, Abu al-Hawari al-Basri, judge of Herat, narrated from Anas, Saeed Ibn Musayyib, and a group. His narrations were transmitted by his two sons, Abd al-Rahim and Abd al-Rahman, as well as Shu’bah and Hushaim. Ibn Maeen said, ‘He is acceptable’ and another time said, ‘He is nothing.’ Yet another time, he said, ‘He is weak, but his

¹ Al-Zuafa wa al-Matrukin, Nasai, p. 111, No. 226

² Kitab al-Elal, vol. 1, p. 63

³ Al-Mauzooaat, vol. 3, p. 315

tradition can be written.’ Abu Haatim said: ‘He is weak, but his hadees can be written.’ Daraqutni said, ‘He is acceptable,’ but Nasai considered him weak. Ibn Adi said, ‘Perhaps Shu’bah did not narrate from anyone weaker than him.’ **Al-Sa’di** said, ‘He is mediocre,’ and among his rejected narrations are:

Qays Ibn Rabi’ from Habib Ibn Abi Sabit from Ayyub Ibn Musa from Zaid Ibn Hawari from Anas, with a chain in which one link is missing (*marfu*), ‘It is likely that paralysis (*al-falaj*) will spread among people until they wish for the plague in its place.’

Salam Tawil from **Zaid Ammi** from **Qatadah** from **Anas**, with a missing link in the chain of narrators, ‘It is disliked for the muezzin to also be the Imam.’ This tradition likely contains the error of **Salam**.

Zaid Ammi from **Muawiya Ibn Qurrah**, from **Ma’qil Ibn Yasar**, with a *hadees-e-marfu*, ‘Whoever performs cupping on a Tuesday, the seventeenth of the month, it will be a cure for the year.’

Their disagreement, in my view, is a sign of being on the right path. However, this is false. Abd al-Rahim was abandoned (by scholars), and Nuaim transmitted strange narrations.

Zahabi in “**al-Kashif**” says, “Zaid Ammi, son of Hawari, Abu Hawari Basri, the judge of Herat, transmitted from Anas and Ibn Musayyib, and from him narrated his sons Abd al-Rahim and Abd al-Rahman and Shu’bah. There is weakness in him (i.e., in his narration). Ibn Adi said, ‘Perhaps Sho’bah did not narrate from anyone weaker than him’.¹”

Abd al-Rahim Ibn Husain Iraqi in the book “**Al-Mughni an Haml al-Asfar**” writes, “It is narrated by Ahmad and Abu Ya’la from the tradition of Anas, ‘For every prophet’ and Abu Ya’la said, ‘For every nation, there is monasticism, and the monasticism of this nation is to struggle in the way of Allah.’ In this narration, there is Zaid Ammi, and he is weak.²”

¹ Al-Kashif, vol. 1, p. 265, No. 1749 under the alphabet ;

² Al-Mughni an Haml al-Asfar

Ibn Hajar Asqalani in “**Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb**” in the biography of Zaid Ammi, writes, “Ishaq Ibn Mansur reported from Ibn Maeen, ‘His tradition is acceptable.’ But he (Ibn Maeen) also said on multiple occasions, ‘He is nothing.’ Abu Walid Ibn Abi Jarud reported from Ibn Maeen, ‘The tradition of Zaid Ammi and Abu Mutawakkil can be written down, though both are weak.’ Abu Haatim said, ‘He is weak in tradition, but his tradition can be written down, though they are not relied upon.’ Abu Zur’ah said, ‘He is not strong, weak in tradition, and unreliable.’ Juzajani said, ‘He is somewhat stable.’ Aajuri reported from Abu Dawud, ‘Sho’bah narrated from him but he (Zaid) is not of that rank, although his son Abd al-Rahim’s traditions should not be written down.’ Aajuri also said, ‘I asked Abu Dawud about him. He replied, ‘Zaid Ibn Murrah.’ I asked, ‘What is he like?’ He said, ‘I have heard nothing but good from him.’ Nasai writes, ‘He is weak.’ Daraqutni said, ‘He is acceptable.’ Ibn Adi said, ‘Most of what he narrates is weak, although Sho’bah did narrate from him. Perhaps Sho’bah did not narrate from anyone weaker than him.’ Ali Ibn Musab said, ‘He was called ‘Ammi’ because whenever he was asked about something, he would say, ‘I will ask my uncle (*ammi*).’ I (Ibn Hajar) say, ‘Rashaati said he was (called Ammi) because he was associated with Banu Amm from the Tamim tribe.’ Ibn Sa’d said, ‘He was weak in traditions.’ Ibn Madini said, ‘He was considered weak by us.’ Abu Haatim said, ‘Sho’bah did not praise his memory.’ Ijli said, ‘He was from Basra and weak; his narration is nothing.’ Ibn Adi said, ‘He is among the weak narrators whose traditions can be written down’.¹⁴

Also, in “*Tahzeeb*” in his (Zaid Ammi’s) biography, it is said, “Ibn Hibban said, ‘He narrates fabricated things from Anas that have no basis, to the point that it would make one think he intentionally did so. Yahya would avoid making definitive statements about him, and to me, it is not permissible to rely on his reports. I only write them down for the sake of consideration. He is the one who narrated from Anas

¹ Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb, vol. 3, p. 223, No. 2203 under the alphabet ;

in a *marfu'* (i.e. with a missing link) form, 'Whoever gets cupped on Tuesday, after seventeen days of the month have passed, will be cured for a year'."

Ibn Hajar also writes in "*Taqreeb*", "Zaid Ibn Hawari, Abu Hawari Ammi Basri, the judge of Herat, it is said that his father's name was Murrah. He is weak and from the fifth generation (of narrators)."¹

The weakness of Zaid Ammi is also clear and evident from "*Talkhees al-Khabir*" of Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani, as you will hear later, God willing.

Muhammad Tahir Gujarati in "*Qanun al-Mauzooaat*" writes, "Zaid Ammi is nothing. He is abandoned (*matruk*). Zaid Ibn Hawari Ammi, Abu Hawari Basri, was a judge. Nasai and Ibn Adi declared him weak. It was also said, 'He is acceptable' and it was also said, 'He is weak, but his traditions can be written down.'"

Shaikh Rahmatullah Sindi in "*Mukhtasar Tanzeeh Shariah*" writes, "Zaid Ibn Hawari Ammi narrates fabricated things that have no basis, to the point that one would think he intentionally fabricated them."

The Criticism and Condemnation of Salam Ibn Sulaim Sa'di by Prominent Scholars of Ahle Tasannun

As for Salam, his being defective, criticized, discredited, and weak, with various forms of disqualifications, accusations, and types of faults and defects, is clear and evident from the statements of the great Sunni Imams and prominent scholars.

Bukhari in "*Kitab al-Zuafa'*" (The Book of Weak Narrators) pens, "Salam Ibn Sulaim Sa'di Tawil, who narrated from Zaid Ammi, was abandoned (*matruk*) by them (the scholars)."²

Nasai in "*Kitab al-Zuafa wa al-Matrukin*" (The Book of Weak and Abandoned Narrators) writes, "Salam Ibn Sulaim is abandoned in

¹ Taqreeb al-Tahzeeb, vol. 1, p. 274

² Kitab al-Zuafa, p. 57, No. 152

traditions (*matruk al-hadees*).¹

In “*Kitab al-Ilal*”, Ibn Abi Haatim Raazi, as you heard earlier, quotes his father as saying, “Salam is Salam al-Taveel, and he is abandoned in traditions (*matruk al-hadees*).”

Again, Ibn Abi Haatim Raazi writes in “*Kitab al-Ilal*”, “I heard my father, and he mentioned a tradition that was narrated to us by Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Ibn Bakr San’aani from Abu Saeed, the freed slave of Bani Hashim, who said, “Abu Salam narrated to us from Zaid Ammi from Abu Siddiq from Aisha that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) kissed her and then went on his way without performing ablution.” I heard my father say, ‘This Abu Salam is an error; it is Salam al-Taveel. The tradition is denounced (*munkar*), and Salam is abandoned in traditions (*matruk al-hadees*).’²

Abu Nuaim Isfahani, in “**Hilyah al-Auliya**”, in the biography of al-Sha’bi, after narrating the tradition about the intercession of the angels, pens, “And the blame in it is on Salam, for he is unanimously considered abandoned (*matruk*).”³

Ibn Jauzi, in “*Kitab al-Mauzooaat*” (The Book of Fabricated Traditions), while criticizing a lengthy tradition about the virtue of those who call for prayers (muezzin), pens, “In it is Salam al-Taveel. Yahya [Ibn Maeen] said, ‘He is nothing, his tradition is not written.’ Bukhari said, ‘They abandoned him.’ Nasai and Daraqutni said, ‘He is abandoned (*matruk*).’ Ibn Hibban said, ‘He narrates fabricated traditions from reliable narrators, as if he intentionally did so.’”

Again, Ibn Jauzi, in “*Kitab al-Mauzooaat*” (The Book of Fabricated Traditions), after mentioning a tradition regarding Zakat al-Fitr, pens, “The author [Ibn Jauzi] comments, ‘This addition, which mentions the Jew and the Christian, is fabricated and falsely attributed to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). It was solely narrated by Salam al-Taveel.’ Yahya [Ibn Maeen] said, ‘His tradition is not noted.’ Nasai

¹ Kitab al-Zuafa wa al-Matrukin, p. 117, No. 249

² Kitab al-Ilal, Ibn Abi Haatim Raazi, vol. 1, p. 63

³ Hilyah al-Auliya, vol. 4, p. 336

writes, ‘He is abandoned (*matruk*).’ Ibn Hibban says, ‘He narrated fabricated traditions from reliable narrators, as if he intentionally did so.’”

Yet again, Ibn Jauzi, in “*Kitab al-Mauzooaat*” (The Book of Fabricated Traditions), after mentioning a tradition about the virtue of the first day of Ramazan, pens, “This tradition is not authentic. Yahya [Ibn Maeen] said, ‘Salam is nothing.’ Bukhari, Nasai, and Daraqtunni said: ‘He is abandoned (*matruk*).’”

Again, Ibn Jauzi, in “*Kitab al-Mauzooaat*” (The Book of Fabricated Traditions), while criticizing the traditions about cupping (*hijamah*) on Tuesdays, writes, “And in the second tradition, there is also Salam. Yahya [Ibn Maeen] said, ‘He is nothing.’ Bukhari said, ‘He is abandoned (*matruk*).¹⁴”

Zahabi in ‘**Mizan al-Itidal**’ said, “Salam Ibn Silm, also called Ibn Salim Tamimi Sa’di Khorasani, Madaaeni, Taveel from Zaid Ammi, Mansur Ibn Zaazaan, Humaid, and the scholars of Basra. (Possibly) Bukhari said: Salam Ibn Muslim Sa’di Taveel narrated from Zaid Ammi. He was abandoned (as a narrator) (*matruk al-hadees*). Ahmad Ibn Abi Maryam said, “I asked Ibn Maeen about Salam Ibn Silm Tamimi, and he said, ‘He is weak, and his tradition is not written.’ Ibn Dauraqi narrated from Yahya, ‘Salam Taveel is nothing. Abbas also narrated from Yahya, ‘Salam Tamimi is nothing. Ahmad said, ‘Salam Taveel’s tradition is rejected (*munkar*). (Possibly) Nasai said, ‘Salam Ibn Silm is abandoned. Abu Zur’a said, ‘He is weak’.”

“Narrated to us Salam Taveel from Zaid Ammi from Muawiya Ibn Qurrah from Ibn Umar regarding the tradition of performing ablution once, twice, or three times. He was followed in this by Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi. Shabaabah narrated from Salam from Zaid from Muawiya Ibn Qurrah from Anas from the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) regarding wiping over the leather socks (*khuff*) for three days and nights for the traveller and one day and night for the resident. Zaid

¹ Al-Mauzooaat, vol. 2, p. 89, Chapter Concerning the Excellence of Those Who call towards Prayers (Muezzin)

Ammi narrated from Abu al-Siddiq Naaji from Abu Saeed from the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) similar to this. Ahmad Ibn Yunus narrated from Salam who narrated from Zaid Ammi from Abu al-Siddiq Naaji from Abu Saeed a tradition with a missing link (*marfu*) saying, ‘The most merciful of this nation is Abu Bakr, the strongest in the religion of Allah is Umar, the most knowledgeable in Islamic inheritance is Zaid, the best judge is Ali, the most modest is Usman, the trustworthy of this nation is Abu Ubaydah Ibn Jarrah, the best reciter is Ubayy, and Abu Hurairah is a container of knowledge. Salman possesses knowledge that cannot be reached, and Muaz is the most knowledgeable in the lawful and unlawful matters of Allah. Neither the sky nor the earth has shaded or carried a more truthful person in speech than Abuzar.’ Ibn Adi followed up on a group of his narrations and said, ‘None of them are supported by others.’ One of these narrations is that he narrated from Zaid Ammi, from Qatada from Anas a *marfu* tradition, ‘It is abominable for the muezzin to also be the Imam.’ Ibn Adi said, ‘The calamity might be either from him or from Zaid.’ It is said that he died around the year 177 AH.¹

Zahabi in “**Mizan al-Itidal**” writes in the biography of Zaid Ammi, “Salam Taveel narrated from Zaid Ammi from Qatada from Anas a *mursal* narration, ‘It is abominable for the muezzin to also be the Imam.’ This is likely where the issue lies with Salam’.”

Zahabi also writes in ‘**al-Mughni**’, “Salam Ibn Silm, also known as Ibn Salim Madaaeni Sa’di, originally from Khorasan, Taveel. He narrated from Zaid Ammi, Humaid Taveel, and Mansur Ibn Zazaan. He is abandoned (as a narrator), and Abu Zur’a said, ‘He is weak’.²”

Zahabi pens in “**al-Kashif**”, “Salam Ibn Silm Tamimi Madaaeni Taveel, also called Ibn Salim, narrated from Zaid Ammi and Mansur Ibn Zaazaan. Qubaysa, Khalaf Ibn Hisham and Abu al-Rabi’ Zahrani narrated from him. Bukhari said, ‘They abandoned him (as a

¹ Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 1, p. 175

² Al-Mughni, p. 271, No. 2500

narrator)'.¹

Ala al-Deen Ali Ibn Usman, known as Ibn al-Turkamani, writes in his book "**Al-Jawhar al-Naqi fi al-Radd ala al-Baihaqi**", [Chapter on the Virtue of Repetition in Ablution (Wuzu)]. He (meaning al-Baihaqi) mentions on p. 62, "There is a tradition from Muawiya Ibn Qurrah, from Ibn Umar, '*This is my way of performing ablution and the ablution of the Prophets before me.*' I say, 'In its chain of transmission, there is Salam Ṭaveel, who was silent about it, and he said in the chapter on the time of cupping, 'Salam Ibn Silm Ṭaveel is abandoned'."

Ali Ibn Abi Bakr Ibn Sulaiman Haisami, in "**Majma' al-Zawaed**" in the Chapter on Istinja, after mentioning a tradition from Tabarani's al-Mojam al-Awsat, pens, "In its chain of narrators is Salam Ṭaveel, and they are unanimous on his weakness."

Sibt Ibn Ajmi Halabī, in his book "**Al-Kashf al-Hasees amman Rumiya be Waz' al-Hadees**" (The Diligent Investigation into those Accused of Fabricating Traditions), writes, "Salam Ibn Silm, also known as Ibn Sulaym Tamimi Sa'di Ṭaveel. Several scholars have criticized him. Ibn al-Jauzi, in "**Al-Mauzooat**" (Fabricated Narrations), pens, 'He narrates fabrications from reliable narrators as if he deliberately intended it!' He mentioned him in relation to the virtue of the callers to prayer (*muezzineen*) and in another place regarding *zakat*, and he quoted this statement from Ibn Hibban. And Allah knows best."

Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in "**Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb**", in his biography [of Salam Ibn Silm], chronicles, "Ahmad [Ibn Hanbal] said, 'He narrated strange (*munkar*) traditions. Ibn Abi Maryam reported from Ibn Maeen, 'He has strange traditions. Al-Duri and others reported from Ibn Maeen, 'He is nothing (i.e., of no reliability)'. Ibn al-Madini was of the view, 'He is weak.' Ibn Ammar said, 'He is not a reliable authority.' Jauzajani said, 'He is not trustworthy.' Bukhari said, 'They

¹ Al-Kashif, vol. 1, p. 330, No. 2225

abandoned him.’ On another occasion, he (Bukhari) said, ‘People speak ill of him.’ Abu Ḥatim said, ‘His narration is weak, they abandoned him.’ Abu Zur‘ah wrote, ‘He is weak.’ Nasai said, ‘He is abandoned.’ On another occasion, he (Nasai) said, ‘He is not trustworthy, and his tradition is not to be written. Ibn Kharraash said, ‘He is a liar.’ On another occasion, he (Ibn Kharraash) said, ‘He is abandoned. Abu al-Qasim Baghawi said, ‘His narration is very weak.’ Ibn Adi narrated some of his traditions and said, ‘No one supports any of them, and he mentioned the tradition that Ibn Majah recorded, which is the only one he has with him, and it is the tradition of Anas, ‘The Prophet (s.a.w.a.) set a time for the postpartum bleeding of forty days.’ I say, ‘Among them is the narration of Zaid Ammi, from Qatada, from Anas, which is attributed to the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), ‘*It is disliked for the muezzin to be the Imam.*’ Ibn Adi said, ‘Perhaps the problem is either with him or with Zaid. Ibn Ḥibban said, ‘He narrated fabrications from reliable narrators, as if he intended to do so. He is the one who narrated from Humaid, from Anas, that the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) set a time for the postpartum bleeding of forty days.’ Ijli said, ‘He is weak.’ Saji said, ‘He has strange narrations.’ Ḥakam said, ‘He narrated fabricated traditions.’ Abu Nuaim said in **Hilyah al-Auliya** in the biography of Sha’bi, ‘Salam Ibn Sulaym Khorasani is abandoned by consensus.’ I read in the handwriting of Zahabi, ‘It is said that he died around the year 177 A.H.’¹“

Ibn Hajar Asqalani also writes in “**Taqreeb al-Tahzeeb**”, “Sallam - with a stress on the alphabet ‘laam’ - Ibn Sulaym or Salam, Abu Sulaiman, and it is said he is known as Taveel Madaaeni. He is considered abandoned from the seventh category and died in the year seventy-seven.”²“

Again, Ibn Hajar Asqalani pens in “**Talkhees al-Khabeer**” while discussing the tradition of Ibn Umar regarding ablution (*wuzu*), “Ibn Abi Haatim said, ‘I asked Abu Zur‘ah Al-Rabi’ Ibn Sulayman narrated

¹ Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb, vol. 3, p. 568, No. 2778 under the alphabet س

² Taqreeb al-Tahzeeb, vol. 1, p. 236, No. 2778 under the alphabet س

to us, Asad Ibn Musa narrated to us from Salam Ibn Sulaym, from Zaid Ibn Aslam from Muawiya Ibn Qurrah from Ibn Umar. He (Abu Zur'ah) said, 'Salam is Salam Taveel, and he is abandoned. And Zaid is A'ma (the blind one), and he is also abandoned.'¹⁴

Yet again, Ibn Hajar Asqalani also writes in "**Talkhees al-Khabeer**" after citing a tradition on the matter of postpartum bleeding, "Nawawi said, 'The statement of a group of jurists who classified this tradition as weak is refuted against them, and it has supporting evidence. Ibn Majah has narrated it through the chain of Salam from Humaid from Anas that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) set the duration for postpartum bleeding at forty days, except if purity is observed before that. He says, 'No one narrated it from Humaid except Salam, and he is weak.'"

Ibn Hajar Asqalani in "**Talkhees al-Khabeer**", after mentioning a tradition in the chapter of the call to prayer (*azaan*), said, "And Ibn Adi narrated from Anas in a report with a missing link (*marfu*), 'It is disliked for the Imam to also be the one giving the *azan*. Ibn Adi said, 'This is unacceptable (*munkar*), and the problem lies in Salam Taveel or Zaid Ammi.'"

Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani in "**Talkhees al-Khabeer**", when mentioning the tradition 'The most knowledgeable of you in religious obligations is Zaid,' said:

And from Abu Saeed narrated by Qasim Ibn Asbagh from Abu Khusaimah and Aqili in **al-Zuafa** from Ali Ibn Abd al-Aziz, both from Ahmad Ibn Yunus from Salam from Zaid Ammi from Abu Siddiq from him. Both Zaid and Salam are weak narrators."

Safi al-Deen Khazraji in "*Mukhtasar Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb*" said, "Salam Ibn Silm Tamimi Sa'di Abu Sulaiman Madaaeni Taveel narrated from Zaid Ammi a lot, and from Humaid Taveel. Among those who narrated from him are Abu al-Rabi' Zahrani and Ali Ibn al-Ja'd. Abu Zur'ah said, 'He is weak.' Baghawi said, 'He died around the year 177

¹ Talkhees al-Khazbeer, vol. 1, p. 82, H. 81 Chapter on the Traditions of Ablution

A.H.’¹

Shaikh Rahmatullah Sindi in “*Mukhtasar Tanzeeh al-Shari’ah*” writes, “Salam Taveel narrates fabricated (traditions) as if he is deliberately doing so.”

Muhammad Ibn Tahir Fattani in “*Qanun al-Mauzooaat*” said, “Salam Taveel narrates fabricated (traditions) from trustworthy narrators as if he is deliberately doing so.”

Abu Faiz Muhammad Murtaza Zubaidi in “*Taj al-Urus*” said, “Salam Ibn Silm, and it is also said, Ibn Salim, and it is also said, Ibn Sulaiman, Abu Abbas Madaaeni Sa’di Tamimi, narrated from Zaid Ammi and Mansur Ibn Zaazaan from Khalaf Ibn Hisham. Bukhari said, “They abandoned him.”

The Chief Judge Muhammad Ibn Ali Shaukani in “**Nayl al-Awtar**”, after mentioning the tradition of Umm Salamah in the Chapter of Postpartum Women, writes, “Nawawi said, ‘The statement by a group of jurists who compiled books on jurisprudence that this narration is weak is rejected, as it has a supporting narration. Ibn Majah reported it through the chain of Salam from Humaid from Anas that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) set the duration for postpartum bleeding at forty days, unless she sees purity before that.’ He said, ‘No one narrated it from Humaid except Salam, and he is weak.’ Ibn Maeen and others among the Imams considered him a liar.”

Abd al-Wahhab Ibn Muhammad Ghaus al-Madarisi in “**Kashf al-Ahwal fi Naqd al-Rijal**” pens, “Salam Ibn Silm, and it is also said, Ibn Sulaiman, and it is also said, Ibn Salim, Abu Abbas Tamimi Taveel from the people of Khorasan, who resided in Madaaen, is abandoned (*matruk*). He narrates fabricated reports from trustworthy narrators, as if he deliberately does so. He heard from Abbad Ibn Kasir, Abu Bishr, Fuzail Ibn Marzuq, Zaid Ammi, Ziyad Ibn Maimun, and others. Hakam Ibn Marwan Sulami, Yazid Ibn Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Samad, Sulaiman Ibn Mihran, Hashim Ibn Qasim, Qabisa, Zuhayr Ibn Abbad,

¹ Mukhtasar Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb, p. 160

and others narrated from him regarding prayer, charity, fasting, illness, and resurrection.”

The thirteenth point: Allamah Manavi in “*al-Taysir fi Sharh Jami’ Saghir*” also criticized and questioned the tradition regarding the superiority (A’lamiyyah) of Muaz vis-à-vis knowledge. After mentioning it, he says, “[It is narrated] from Abu Saeed, and its chain of transmission is weak.”¹

Praise be to Allah, the Exalted. This solid statement and eloquent explanation are sufficient and comprehensive for weakening and discrediting this insignificant tradition for discerning researchers and critics.

The fourteenth point: Allamah Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Ibrahim Azizi also weakened and discredited the tradition regarding the knowledge superiority of Muaz, acknowledging the weakness of its chain of transmission and opening the door for criticism by discerning scholars. As he states in “*Siraj Munir - Sharh Jami’ Saghir*” in his commentary on the mentioned tradition, “[It is narrated] from Abu Saeed, and its chain of transmission is weak.”²

Exploitation of slaves by Muaz Ibn Jabal gifted to him by the people of Yemen.

The fifteenth point: Among the clear invalidations of the traditions regarding Muaz’s knowledge of the permissible and the prohibited is the story of his actions with the slaves that the people of Yemen had gifted to him. He considered them his own property until he witnessed what he witnessed.

Muhammad Ibn Sa’d Ibn Mani’ Zuhri, known as the scribe of al-Waqidi, in **al-Tabaqat al-Kubra**, in the biography of Muaz Ibn Jabal, chronicles, “Obaidullah Ibn Musa told us, saying, ‘Shaiban narrated to us from Amash from Shaqeeq who said, ‘The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) appointed Muaz as the governor of Yemen. The Prophet (s.a.w.a.)

¹ Al-Taysir fi Sharh Jami’ Saghir, vol. 2, p. 376, the alphabet ʔ

² Al-Siraj al-Munir, vol. 3 p. 302

passed away while Muaz was still there, and then Abu Bakr became the caliph. At that time, Umar was overseeing the Hajj pilgrimage. Muaz came to Makkah with servants and slaves separately. Umar said to him, 'O Aba Abd al-Rahman! Who are these servants?' Muaz replied, 'They are mine!' Umar asked, 'Where did you get them from?' He replied, 'They were gifted to me.' Umar said, 'Listen to me and send them to Abu Bakr. If he allows them for you, they will be yours.' Muaz responded, 'I will not obey you in this matter. These were gifted to me, and now you want me to send them to Abu Bakr?!' Muaz spent the night and, in the morning, said, 'O son of Khattab! I think I will obey you. For, I saw a dream last night as if I were being dragged or led—something like that—toward the fire, and you were holding onto my waist. So, take me and them to Abu Bakr!'

Consequently, they went to Abu Bakr, who said, 'You have more right to them.' Muaz took them back to his family, and they lined up behind him for prayer. After the prayer, Muaz asked them, 'For whom do you pray?' They replied, 'For Allah, Blessed and Exalted.' He said, 'Go, for you are now free for the sake of Allah'.¹

Again, Ibn Sa'd in **al-Tabaqat al-Kubra**, in the biography of Muaz, says:

"He was among the most handsome people, with the best manners, and the most generous of them in donation. He incurred a great deal of debt, and his creditors pressed him so much that he remained hidden in his house for several days until his creditors complained to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) sent for Muaz and summoned him, and he came with his creditors. They said, 'O Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.)! Take our right from him!' The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, 'May Allah have mercy on whoever is generous towards him.' Some people waived off their right to relieve him, but others refused and said, 'O Messenger of Allah! Take our right from him!' The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) replied,

¹ Al-Tabaqat al-Kubra, vol. 3, p. 585, Biography of Muaz Ibn Jabal

‘Be patient with him, O Muaz!’ Then, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) stripped Muaz of his wealth and gave it to his creditors, and they divided it among themselves. They received five-sevenths of their claims.

They said, ‘O Messenger of Allah! What remains for us?’ The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) retorted, ‘Leave him, for you have no further claim against him!’ So, Muaz returned to Banu Salamah. Someone said to him, ‘O Aba Abd al-Rahman! Why don’t you ask the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.), as you have become destitute today?’ He replied, ‘I will not ask him.’ After a day, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) summoned him and sent him to Yemen, saying, ‘Perhaps Allah will compensate you and help you repay your debt.’ Muaz went to Yemen and remained there until the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) passed away. Muaz returned during the year Umar Ibn Khattab performed the pilgrimage. Abu Bakr had appointed Muaz to supervise the pilgrimage. They met on the Day of Tarwiyah¹ in Mina, embraced each other, and condoled one another over the loss of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). Thereafter, they sat on the ground, talking. Umar noticed that Muaz had some slaves with him and asked, ‘What are these, O Aba Abd al-Rahman? Muaz replied, ‘I acquired them on my journey.’ Umar inquired, ‘From where?’ Muaz responded, ‘They were gifted to me, and I honoured them.’ Umar advised, ‘Mention them to Abu Bakr.’ Muaz contested, ‘Why should I mention this to Abu Bakr?’ Muaz slept, and in his sleep, he saw himself standing on the edge of a fire, and Umar was holding onto his waist, preventing him from falling into the fire. Muaz woke up frightened and said, ‘This is what Umar instructed me to do’. Hence, Muaz went to Abu Bakr and mentioned the slaves to him. Abu Bakr permitted him to keep them and settled the remaining debts for Muaz, saying, ‘I heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) say, ‘Perhaps Allah will compensate you’.²“

¹ 8th of Zilhajj

² Ibid.

Shah Waliullah Dehlavi, the father of our addressee (viz. Muhaddis Dehlavi, the author of Tuhfa), in “**Izalat al-Khafa**”, chronicles, “From Abdullah Ibn Masud, who reports, ‘When the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) passed away and Abu Bakr was appointed as the caliph, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) had already sent Muaz to Yemen. Abu Bakr appointed Umar to oversee the Hajj pilgrimage. They met Muaz in Makkah, and Muaz had slaves with him. Umar asked, ‘Who are these?’...Muaz replied, ‘I am holding onto your advice, and I see no other option but to obey you.’ So, he brought them to Abu Bakr and said, ‘These were gifted to me, and these are for you.’ Abu Bakr replied, ‘We have accepted your gift.’ Muaz then went out to pray, and the slaves were praying behind him. Muaz asked, ‘For whom are you praying?’ They replied, ‘For Allah, the Exalted.’ He said: ‘Then you belong to Him,’ and freed them.”

This narration is reported by Haakim (Nishapuri).

Shah Waliullah has also recorded in “**Qurrah al-Ainain**”, “Haakim narrated from Abdullah Ibn Masud, who said, ‘When the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) passed away and Abu Bakr was appointed as caliph, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) had already sent Muaz to Yemen. Abu Bakr appointed Umar to oversee the Hajj pilgrimage. They met Muaz in Makkah, and Muaz had slaves with him. Umar asked, ‘Who are these?’ Muaz replied, ‘These were gifted to me, and these are for Abu Bakr.’ Umar said to him, ‘I think you should bring them to Abu Bakr.’ Muaz refused, but on the following day he met Umar again and said, ‘O son of Khattab! Last night I saw myself leaping toward the fire, and you were holding onto my waist! I see no other option but to obey you.’

So, Muaz brought them to Abu Bakr and said, ‘These were gifted to me, and these are for you.’ Abu Bakr said, ‘We have accepted your gift.’ Muaz then went to pray, and the slaves were praying behind him. Muaz asked them, ‘For whom are you praying?’ They replied, ‘For Allah, the Exalted.’ He said, ‘Then you belong to Him,’ and he freed them’.”

From these gathered narrations, it becomes clear that when Muaz returned from Yemen and met Umar Ibn Khattab in Makkah, Umar saw that a group of slaves and servants was with Muaz. When Umar inquired about them, asking, “Where did you get these?” Muaz replied, “The people gifted them to me.” Umar advised, “Obey me, and send them to Abu Bakr. If he deems them lawful for you, they will belong to you.” However, due to his great ignorance, Muaz did not accept his advice and said, “I will not obey you in this matter. These were gifted to me, so why should I send them to Abu Bakr?”

But when the night came, and Muaz went to sleep, he saw in his dream that he was being dragged towards the fire, and Umar was holding onto his waist, preventing him from falling into the fire. Muaz became frightened by this terrifying dream and said, “This is what Umar instructed me to do.” The following morning, Muaz went to Umar and said, “I see no option but to obey you. Indeed, I saw such and such in my dream,” and he described the dream to him in detail. After this, he went to Abu Bakr and presented his slaves and servants to him, who out of kindness, gave those slaves back to him.

This strange story and unusual event clearly demonstrate Muaz’s complete ignorance regarding the permissible and the prohibited. It reveals that Muaz was extremely immoderate in accumulating wealth and never gave thought to what was permissible or prohibited; rather, he insisted on claiming what was unlawfully obtained. It is evident that if Muaz Ibn Jabal’s state of confusion and disorder had reached this level, considering him to be knowledgeable in the permissible and the prohibited of the Shariah of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) is a great injustice and a grave wrong! How then, one might ask, could they—God forbid—consider the fabricated narration of Muaz’s superior knowledge (*a’lamīyyah*) to be valid, and mention it as a challenge to Hadees-e-Saqalain, thereby taking absurdity and ignorance to its lowest pits? Such an act is extremely shocking and outrageous. May Allah protect us from falling into such disgrace and humiliation!

Furthermore, it should be noted that some of the unjust predecessors

of the Ahle Tasannun, in their zeal to defend Muaz and absolve him of this grave error, have fabricated a great slander against the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). In doing so, they have scarred their faith and religion with the nails of insolence. But, praise be to Allah the Exalted, we have, in a detailed and excellent manner in the volume of *Hadees-e-Madinah al-Ilm*, refuted the statements of Aasimi, as was appropriate. We have thoroughly debunked and nullified this argument, exposing the truth in full detail. You may refer to it if you wish.

Misuse of Muaz Ibn Jabal regarding the wealth he had acquired through trade using the property of Allah.

The sixteenth point: Among the clear refutations that invalidate the tradition regarding Muaz’s knowledge of the permissible and the prohibited is the story of his misuse of the wealth he obtained through trade using Allah’s property. He falsely believed that he had rightful ownership of it and persisted in his error.

Allamah Ibn Abd al-Barr, in his book “*al-Isteeaab*”, in the biography of Muaz, writes, “Khallaf Ibn Qasim informed us from Ibn Mufassir from Ahmad Ibn Ali from Yahya Ibn Maeen from Abd al-Razzaq from Ma’mar from Zuhri from Abd al-Rahman Ibn Abdillah Ibn Ka’b Ibn Maalik, from his father, who said, “If anyone were to be excused from paying for the sake of someone else, Muaz would have been excused for the sake of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). The Prophet (s.a.w.a.) sold all of Muaz’s possessions to settle his debts, leaving Muaz with nothing. Then, in the year of the Conquest of Makkah, the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) sent him to a group in Yemen to support him financially. Muaz remained in Yemen as a governor, and he was the first to engage in trade using Allah’s property. He stayed there until the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) passed away. When Muaz returned, Umar said to Abu Bakr, “Send someone to take a portion of his wealth and leave the rest for his sustenance.” But Abu Bakr said, “The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) sent him to support him, and I will not take anything

from him unless he willingly gives it.”

So Umar went to Muaz since Abu Bakr did not heed his request, and Umar mentioned this to Muaz, who replied, “The Prophet (s.a.w.a.) sent me to support me, and I will not comply.” Later, Muaz met with Umar and said, “I will obey you, and do as you instruct. I had a dream in which I was in deep water and feared drowning, but you saved me, O Umar!”

Thereafter, Muaz went to Abu Bakr and told him about the matter, swearing that he would not withhold anything from him. Abu Bakr replied, “I will not take anything from you. I have given it to you as a gift.” Muaz said, “Now it is lawful and good.” After that, Muaz left for Sham (ancient name for Syria).¹

Mulla Ali Muttaqi in “*Kanz al-Ummal*” in the section on the caliphate narrates, “Ma’mar narrated to us from Zuhri from Ka’b Ibn Abd al-Rahman Ibn Ka’b Ibn Maalik, from his father, who said, ‘Muaz Ibn Jabal was a generous young man, handsome, and among the best youth of his people. He could not hold onto wealth and was always in debt until all his possessions were seized due to his debts. He came to the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) asking him to request his creditors to grant him some leniency, but they refused. Had anyone been excused from paying for the sake of someone else, they would have excused him for the sake of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.). The Prophet (s.a.w.a.) sold all of Muaz’s possessions to settle his debts, leaving Muaz with nothing. When the year of the Conquest of Makkah came, the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) appointed Muaz as a governor over a group in Yemen to support him financially. Muaz remained in Yemen as a governor and was the first to engage in trade using Allah’s property. He remained there until he earned enough and until the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) passed away.

When Muaz returned, Umar said to Abu Bakr, ‘He told him about it and swore that he had not hidden anything from him until he clarified

¹ Al-Isteeaab, vol. 3, p. 461, No. 2445 in the biography of Muaz

everything. Abu Bakr said, ‘By Allah! I will not take anything from you, I have given it to you as a gift. Umar said, ‘Now it is lawful and good.’ After this, Muaz left for Sham.’

Ma’mar said, ‘A man from the Quraish told me, ‘I heard Zuhri say, ‘When the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) sold Muaz’s property, he announced to the people, ‘Whoever buys any of this, it is invalid’.¹“

From these statements, it is evident that Muaz Ibn Jabal, out of ignorance and lack of understanding, believed that the wealth he had obtained through trade using Allah’s property during his stay in Yemen, like the slaves and servants, was his own. He was unwilling to relinquish or give it up. Even though Umar had made sincere efforts to explain this to him, Muaz stubbornly rejected the advice and cast it aside. He justified his claim to that wealth by citing the Messenger of Allah’s (s.a.w.a.) appointment of him to Yemen for financial support. Ultimately, Muaz reached a point where, in a dream, he saw himself on the verge of drowning, which forced him to seek the lawful validation of that wealth from the first caliph.

This incident, like the previous one, demonstrates Muaz’s complete ignorance regarding the permissible and the prohibited and his audacity in taking the wealth belonging to the Creator of all. His actions, much like a lost merchant selling faulty goods, are laid bare before discerning observers.

From this, it becomes clear to esteemed observers that not only is the tradition of Muaz’s supposed superiority in knowledge of the permissible and the prohibited a fabrication and falsehood, but also the other narrations, reports, and incidents that some scholars of Ahle Tasannun have cited in their books, with outlandish audacity, to establish Muaz’s knowledge are nothing but heinous fabrications and dreadful lies.

The words of the author of “Tuhfa” who said, “**And there are many such examples.**”

¹ Kanz al-Ummal, vol. 5, p. 591, H. 14054 (The Book of Caliphate)

Response to the words of the author of “Tuhfa” who said: “And there are many such examples”:

I say: Yes! Examples of such fabrications in the books of Ahle Tasannun are abundant and numerous. They are well-known and frequently mentioned by those smitten with the three [Caliphs] and their factions. However, the evidence of fabrication and invention upon them is clear and radiant, as it is not hidden from anyone with even the slightest bit of experience and insight. Moreover, their narrators, according to the critics within their own ranks, are weak and disparaged, accused of lying and falsehood. Thus, relying on them is a serious transgression, indeed a grave one.

Even disregarding that and overlooking the faults of their narrators—those who have cast themselves into destruction—these narrations remain solely from the sources of Ahle Tasannun. Therefore, they cannot be used as proof against the people of truth (viz. Shias), except by one who has lost all sense of fairness. Indeed, I swear by my life, that to oppose the Hadees-e-Saqalain, which is consecutively narrated (*mutawaatir*) according to both sects, with such falsehoods fabricated by the creators of lies and deceptions—those known for disgrace and ignominy—is only acceptable to those with an impaired vision.

By the grace of Allah, the Benevolent, we have addressed every fabricated claim relied upon by the dishonoured addressee, exposing each of these clear falsehoods and fraudulent constructions by the people of hatred and enmity (against the Ahle Bait (a.s.)). We have refuted every long and short claim of theirs. We shall address the slanders and lies they utter in praise of the companions of rebellion and transgression. We will strike them down with hail of evidence and proofs and destroy them with the arguments and authority that come to us, by the help of Allah, who has recorded every small and great crime of the wrongdoers.

Response To The Seventh Contradictory Tradition

The presentation of the fabricated tradition “*Follow two persons after me: Abu Bakr and Umar*” by the author of **Tuhfa** in opposition to the Hadees-e-Saqalain, and the claim that it has reached the level of widespread fame and conceptual consecutiveness (*tawaatur-e-ma’navi*).

He (Dehlavi) says, “Especially ‘*Follow two persons after me: Abu Bakr and Umar*’ which has reached the level of widespread fame and conceptual consecutiveness.

The author’s (Mir Hamid Husain (r.a.)) response to this tradition and the establishment of its fabrication and falsity based on the views of prominent scholars.

Indication

I say: Presenting this fabricated tradition in opposition to the Hadees-e-Saqalain and claiming its widespread fame and consecutiveness without any critique of its falsehood and deceit is one of his heinous and absurd errors that leaves any intelligent and discerning person in utter amazement. His boundless audacity and excessive insistence on falsehood and deception, in preferring falsehood over truth, is as clear as the noon sun.

For by the grace of Allah, the One who bestows generosity and goodness, in the volume on **Hadees-e-Tair** (Tradition of the Roasted Bird), it has been thoroughly and impressively proven to the satisfaction of those of sound judgment that this tradition is fabricated, and all its chains and forms are false, void, and corrupt. By the grace of Allah, this matter has been explained in such a way in

that volume that even if the Ahl-e-Tasannun were to sew the earth to the heavens, burn their minds for a lifetime, tear apart the veils of modesty and shame a thousand times, and employ all forms of deception and trickery, they would never be able to prove the authenticity of this tradition, let alone claim its consecutiveness.

Although referring the discerning reader to that same volume would suffice, here as well, with the help of Allah the Loving, for the purpose of refuting and obligating the erring opponent, I will clarify the weakness, lowliness, corruption, and falsehood of the tradition of following (Abu Bakr and Umar). Also, I will add numerous points to humiliate and shame the claimant of its fame and consecutiveness.

Reason 1: Explanation of the Criticism by Hafiz Abu Haatim Raazi on the Tradition of Following (Hadees-e-Iqtida)

Indication

First Point:

Abu Haatim Muhammad Ibn Idris Hanzali Raazi, who is considered one of the foremost memorizers of traditions (*huffaz*) and expert critics (*naqqaad*) and a peer of Bukhari and Muslim in the view of the Ahle Tasannun, has critiqued and invalidated the Hadees-e- Iqtida (the narration of following Abu Bakr and Umar). He exposed its lack of authenticity without hesitation. As Allamah Manavi mentioned in **Faiz al-Qadir - Sharh Jami' al-Saghir** while explaining this tradition, which is reported from Huzaifa, he writes, 'Abu Haatim criticized it (the tradition) and Bazzaar, like Ibn Hazm, says, 'It is not authentic because Abd al-Maalik did not hear it from Rabi', and Rabi' did not hear it from Huzaifa, but it has a supporting witness (*shaahid*).'¹

Even though the high status and esteemed position of Abu Haatim

¹ Faiz al-Qadir - Sharh Jami' al-Saghir, vol. 2, p. 56, Explanation of Tradition 1318

Raazi in the field of traditions and reports is well-known among the Ahle Tasannun, and most researchers are aware of it, for further enlightenment of the readers, some statements about him will be mentioned here.

Hafiz Abu Hatim Raazi:

Sam'ani writes in **al-Ansaab**, "Jazzi – this is an attribution to the village of Jazz in Isfahan (Iran). Among its people is Abu Haatim Muhammad Ibn Idris Ibn Munzir Hanzali Raazi, who used to say, 'We are from the people of Isfahan, from the village of Jazz.' He also said, 'The people from there used to visit us during my father's lifetime, but then they stopped coming to us.'

Additionally, he mentioned that from Jazz there were many scholars, including Abu Amr Ibn Hakim, and numerous other scholars whose number cannot be counted. Abu Haatim passed away in the month of Shaban, 277 A.H.¹

Again, Sam'ani writes in *al-Ansab* under the entry for "Hanzali", "*In Rayy, there is a famous street called Darb-e-Hanzala. Among its inhabitants is Abu Haatim Muhammad Ibn Idris Ibn Munzir Ibn Dawud Ibn Mehran Raazi Hanzali, the Imam of his time and the one to whom people would refer in matters of traditions. He was from this street, and among the well-known scholars, praised for his knowledge, memorization, and extensive travels in search of traditions. He met many scholars and heard traditions from Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Ansari, Abu Zaid Nahvi, Obaidullah Ibn Musa, Hawzah Ibn Khalifa, Abu Mushir Dimishqi, Usman Ibn Haisam Muazzin, Saeed Ibn Abi Maryam Misri, Abu Yaman Himsi, and others of similar stature. He began recording traditions in the year 209 A.H.*"

Great scholars transmitted from him, such as Yunus Ibn Abd al-A'laa and Rabi' Ibn Sulaiman from Egypt, who were both older than him and started learning earlier, and Abu Zur'ah Raazi, Dimishqi, and Muhammad Ibn Auf Himsi, who were his peers. There were countless

¹ Al-Ansaab, vol. 3, p. 252

others who learned from him.

Abu Haatim says, *“The first year I travelled in pursuit of traditions, I spent years counting how far I walked. I walked more than a thousand farsakhs (a measure of length). I kept track until I exceeded a thousand farsakhs, and then I stopped counting!”*

He also writes, *“Once, at the door of Abu Walid Tayalisi, I said, ‘If anyone narrates to me a unique narration, with a connected and authentic chain, which I have not heard before, I will give him a dirham as charity.’ There was a large crowd present at the door, including Abu Zur’ah and those below him in status. My goal was to get them to tell me something I hadn’t heard so they would say, ‘This tradition is from so-and-so,’ and then I could go and listen to it. I wanted to extract from them what I did not already have. But none of them managed to narrate to me a unique tradition.”*

Ahmad Ibn Salama said, *“After Ishaq (meaning Ibn Raahwaih) and Muhammad Ibn Yahya, I have not seen anyone who had greater memorization of traditions or more knowledge of its meanings than Abu Haatim Muhammad Ibn Idris.”*

Abu Hatim says, *“Once, Hisham Ibn Ammar asked me, ‘What do you memorize from the ‘Zu’ titles?’ I replied, ‘Zu al-Asabi’ (the one with the fingers), Zu al-Jawshan (the one with the armour), Zu al-Zawaaed (the one with the extra parts), Zu Yadain (the one with two hands), and Zu al-Lihyah al-Kalabi (the one with the beard from Kalab).’ I counted six for him. He laughed and said, ‘We memorized three, and you added three more.’”*

Abu Haatim passed away in Rayy in Shaban in the year 277 A.H.¹

Abu al-Hasan Ali Ibn Muhammad, known as Ibn al-Asir, mentioned in **“al-Tarikh al-Kaamil”** in the events of the year 277 A.H., *“And in it - Abu Hatim Raazi passed away, and his name was Muhammad Ibn Idris Ibn Munzir, and he was a contemporary of Bukhari and*

¹ Al-Ansaab, vol. 4, p. 251

Muslim.¹

Shams al-Deen Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Zahabi writes in “**Siyar A’laam al-Nubala**”, “Abu Hatim Raazi and his son, Muhammad Ibn Idris Ibn Munzir Ibn Dawud Ibn Mehran, the Imam, the memorizer of traditions (*hafiz*), the critic, the master of the traditional scholars, Ḥanzali Ghaṭafani, from the tribe of Tamim Ibn Ḥanzalah Ibn Yarbu’. It was said he was known as Ḥanzali because he lived on Ḥanzalah Street in the city of Rayy. He was a vast ocean of knowledge, traveling to many lands, excelling in text and chains of transmission (*isnaad*). He collected, classified, critiqued, authenticated, and determined defects in traditions. He was born in the year 195 A.H. and began writing traditions in the year 209 A.H. He was among the peers of Bukhari and from his generation but survived him by more than twenty years. He heard (traditions) from Ubaydullah, Muhammad Ibn Musa, Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Ansari, Aṣma’i, Qabiṣah, Abu Nuaim, Affan, Usman Ibn Haysam Muazzin, Abu Musher Ghassani, Abu Yaman, Saeed Ibn Abi Maryam, Zuhair Ibn Abbad, Yahya Ibn Bukair, Abu Walid, Adam Ibn Abi Iyyas, Sabit Ibn Muhammad Zahid, Abu Zaid Ansari the grammarian, Obaidullah Ibn Salih Ijli, Abdullah Ibn Salih Katib, Abu Jamaahir Muhammad Ibn Usman, Huzah Ibn Khalifah, Yahya Waḥāzi, Abu Tauba Halabi, and many others. He narrated to Bundar, Abu Hafs Fallaas, Rabi Muradi, and then to Ibn Warah and Muhammad Ibn Auf. It is difficult to count all his teachers, but Khalili says, “Abu Ḥatim Labban, the memorizer of traditions (*hafiz*), said to me, ‘I collected those from whom Abu Hatim Raazi narrated, and they numbered close to three thousand.’”

The following narrated traditions from him: His son, the memorizer of traditions Imam Abu Muhammad Abd al-Rahman Ibn Abi Hatim, Yunus Ibn Abd al-A’laa, Rabi’ Ibn Sulaiman Muazzin, his two Shaikhs, Abu Zur’ah Raazi, his companion and relative, Abu Zur’ah Dimishqi, Ibrahim Harbi, Ahmad Ramadi, Musa Ibn Ishaq Ansari, Abu Bakr Ibn Abi Dunya, Abu Abdillah Bukhari. It is also said, Abu Dawud, Abu

¹ al-Tarikh al-Kaamil, vol. 7, p. 439

Abd al-Rahman Nasai in their **Sunan**, Ibn Saeed, Abu Awaanah Isfaraini, Ḥaajib Ibn Dukkin, Muhammad Ibn Ibrahim Kinani, Zakariyya Ibn Ahmad Balkhi, the judge Muḥamili, Muhammad Ibn Mukhallad Ibn Ibrahim Attar, Abu al-Hasan Ali Ibn Ibrahim Qaṭṭaan, Abu Umar Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Ibn Hakeem, Sulaiman Ibn Yazid Faami, Qasim Ibn Ṣafwan, Abu Bishr al-Dulabi, Abu Hamid Ibn Ḥanawiyyah, and a large group of others. He mentioned in his travelogue different places, and travelled with his son, where they met with the companions of Ibn Uyaynah and Waki’.”

Again, Zahabi writes in “**Siyar A’laam al-Nubala**”, in the biography of Abu Hatim, “Ali Ibn Talha informed us from Salih that Abd al-Rahman Ibn Abi Hatim said, ‘I heard Musa Ibn Ishaq, the judge, say, ‘I have not seen anyone more proficient in memorization than your father. He met Abu Bakr Ibn Abi Shaybah, Ibn Numair, and Yahya Ḥammani.’ Khatib says, ‘Abu Hatim was one of the reliable, trustworthy Imams and memorizers of traditions. His first hearing of tradition was in the year 209 A.H.’.”

Abu Shaikh, the memorizer, says, ‘Abdullah Ibn Muhammad Ibn Yaqub narrated to us, ‘I heard Abu Hatim say, ‘We are from the people of Isfahan, from the village of Jazz. Its people used to visit us during my father’s lifetime, but they stopped coming to us afterward’.’

Khalili says, ‘Abu Hatim was knowledgeable about the differences among the companions, and he was aware of the views of the Tabieen and those who came after them. I heard my grandfather and a group of others who heard Ali Ibn Ibrahim Qattan say, ‘I have never seen anyone like Abu Hatim.’ We said to him, ‘You saw Harbi and Ismail Qazi.’ He replied, ‘I have not seen anyone greater than Abu Hatim, nor anyone better than him’.”

Ali Ibn Ibrahim Raazi said, “Ahmad Ibn Ali Riqam informed us, ‘I heard Hasan Ibn Husain Darastani say, ‘I heard Abu Hatim say, ‘Abu Zur’ah said to me, ‘I have not seen anyone more eager for traditions than you.’ I replied to him, ‘Indeed, my son Abd al-Rahman is (more)

eager (than me).” He said, ‘One who resembles his father does no wrong’.

Riqam says, ‘I asked Abd al-Rahman about the extent of his father’s hearings and questions. He replied, ‘Sometimes my father would be eating, and I would read traditions to him. He would be walking, and I would read to him. He would go to relieve himself, and I would read to him. He would enter the house to retrieve something, and I would read to him’.

Ahmad Ibn Salamah Nishapuri said, ‘After Ishaq and Muhammad Ibn Yahya, I have not seen anyone more proficient in traditions or more knowledgeable about its meanings than Abu Hatim Raazi.’

Ibn Adi said, “I heard Qasim Ibn Safwan say, ‘I heard Abu Hatim say, ‘The most pious people I have seen are four: Adam, Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, Sabit Ibn Muhammad Zahid, and Abu Zur’ah Raazi.’ Qasim says, ‘I mentioned this to Usman Ibn Kharrazad, and he said, ‘I say that the best memorizer I have seen are four: Muhammad Ibn Minhal Darir, Ibrahim Ibn Ar’arah, Abu Zur’ah, and Abu Hatim’.

Ibn Abi Hatim said, “I heard Yunus Ibn Abd al-A’laa say, ‘Abu Zur’ah and Abu Hatim are the two Imams of Khorasan, and he prayed for them and said, ‘Their existence is a blessing for the Muslims.’ Muhammad Ibn Husain Ibn Mukarram said, ‘I heard Hajjaj Ibn Shaair, and I mentioned to him Abu Zur’ah, Ibn Waarah, and Abu Jafar Darimi. He responded, ‘There is none nobler in the East than Abu Hatim.’”

Ibn Abi Hatim said, ‘I heard my father say, ‘Hisham Ibn Ammar said to me, ‘How many people do you remember with “Zu” in their names?’ I said, ‘Zu al-Aṣabi’, Zu al-Jaushan, Zu al-Zawaed, Zu al-Yadain, Zu al-Leḥyah al-Kilabi, and I counted six of them. He laughed and said, ‘We memorized three, and you added three.’

Hafiz Abd al-Rahman Ibn Kharrash said, ‘Abu Hatim was among the trustworthy and knowledgeable people.’ Hibatullah Lalakai said, ‘Abu Hatim was an Imam, a memorizer (of traditions), and precise in his knowledge.’ Lalakai also mentioned him among the Shaikhs of

Bukhari.

Nasai said, 'He is trustworthy.'

Ibn Abi Hatim said, 'I heard my father say, 'One day, Abu Zur'ah and I were discussing the discernment of traditions and their understanding. He began mentioning traditions and their defects, and I also pointed out mistakes in traditions, their defects, and the errors of the Shaikhs. He said to me, 'O Aba Hatim! How few people understand this! How rare it is to find someone who can do this! If you raised this to one or two people, how few would understand it! Sometimes I have doubts or uncertainty about a tradition, and I feel that I need to meet with you because I can't find anyone else who can clarify it.' My father said, 'That's how it was with me as well'.'

In the book "**Siyar A'laam al-Nubala**", under the biography of Abu Hatim, Zahabi writes, "Ibn Abi Hatim said at the beginning of his book "**Al-Jarh wa al-Ta'deel**" (Criticism and Endorsement), 'I heard my father say, 'A man from the notable scholars of opinion, one of the intelligent ones, came to me with a notebook. He presented it to me, and I said regarding some of its contents, 'This is a mistaken narration where one narration has been merged into another; this is false, and this is objectionable, while the rest are authentic.'"

The man asked, 'How do you know that this one is a mistake, this one is false, and that one is fabricated? Did the narrator of the book tell you that I made an error or that I lied in such-and-such narration?'

I replied, 'No, I don't know this from the narrator, but I know that this is wrong, and that is false.'

He asked, 'Do you claim to know the unseen?'

I replied, 'No, this is not a claim of knowledge of the unseen.'

He inquired, 'Then what is your evidence for what you said?'

I responded, 'Ask those who know like I do, and if we agree, then you will know that we are not being reckless.'

He questioned, 'Does Abu Zur'ah say as you do?'

I said, 'Yes.'

He said, ‘That is amazing!’

Then he wrote down my words regarding those narrations and said, ‘You said it’s a **lie**, but Abu Zur’ah said it is **false**.’ I retorted, ‘Falsehood and lie are one and the same.’ He said, ‘What you said is objectionable, and he said it is objectionable as well, just as you said. And what you said is authentic, he said it is authentic too.’

Then he continued, ‘How amazing is this! You two agree without prior coordination between you!’ I replied, ‘This is how we know we haven’t been reckless and that we are speaking with knowledge and understanding that has been granted to us. And to prove the validity of what we say, a counterfeit coin may be taken to an appraiser, and he says, ‘This is counterfeit.’ If asked, ‘Did the person who made it tell you it was counterfeit?’ He says, ‘No!’ And if asked, ‘Then how do you know?’ He says, ‘I have been given knowledge.’ The same is with us—we have been given the knowledge to differentiate this.

Similarly, when a jeweller is presented with a ruby and a piece of glass, he knows which is which and states it accordingly. Likewise, we have been given the knowledge to recognize such things, and we cannot explain how we know that this is a lie, this is objectionable, and that we know the authenticity of a narration by the reliability of its narrators, and that it is speech that is fitting to be prophetic words. We also recognize the weakness and objectionability of narrators whose integrity is not sound.’

I also heard my father say, ‘I said at the door of Abu Walid Tayaalisi, ‘Whoever presents me with a rare authentic narration will get a dirham from me for charity, and there were many people, including Abu Zur’ah and those below him. My intention was that they present me with something I had not heard before, and they would say, ‘It is with such-and-such person, so I would go and listen to it.’ But no one was able to present me with a rare narration.’

I also heard my father say, ‘Muhammad Ibn Yazid Asfaati was obsessed with the commentary (*tafseer*) and memorizing it. One day, he said, ‘What do you know about the verse ‘**So travel through the**

earth¹? The scholars of traditions looked at each other. I said, ‘Abu Salih narrated to us from Muawiya Ibn Salih from Ali Ibn Abi Talhah from Ibn Abbas who said, ‘It means they travelled through the lands.’

I heard my father say, ‘Muhammad Ibn Yahya Nishapuri came to Rayy, and I presented him with thirteen traditions from the traditions of Zuhri. He only acknowledged three of them, and the rest were not known to him, nor did he accept them.’

Yet again, Zahabi records in “**Siyar A’laam al-Nubala**” in the biography of Abu Hatim, “The memorizer (*hafiz*) Abu Hatim died in Shaban of the year 277 A.H. It is said that he lived for eighty-three years. Abu Muhammad Ayadi, the poet, composed a long elegy for Abu Hatim, which was narrated by his son, Ibn Abi Hatim. The beginning of the elegy is as follows:

*‘O my soul! Why do you not grieve?
And O my eyes! Why do you not shed tears?
Did you not hear of the eclipse of knowledge,
In the month of Sha’ban, a great calamity?
Did you not hear the news of the chosen one,
Abu Hatim, the most knowledgeable of the scholars?’*

Again, Zahabi chronicles in “**Tazkirah al-Huffaaz**”, “Abu Hatim Raazi, the great Imam and memorizer (*hafiz*), Muhammad Ibn Idris Ibn Munzir Hanzali, was one of the prominent scholars. He was born in the year 195 A.H. He said, ‘I started writing traditions in the year 209 A.H.’ I (Zahabi) say, He travelled for knowledge while he was still young, and he heard narrations from scholars such as Ubaydullah Ibn Musa, Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Ansari, Asma’i, Abu Nuaim (Isfahani), Huwazah Ibn Khalifah, Affan, Abu Mushir, and many others. He continued traveling for a long time and said, ‘When I first set out on my journey, I stayed away for seven years. I counted that I had walked more than one thousand *farsakh* (about 5,000 kilometres), and

¹ Surah Aale Imran (3): Verse 137 and Surah Nahl (16): Verse 36

then I stopped counting. I left Bahrain for Egypt on foot, then travelled to Ramlah on foot, and then to Tarsus when I was twenty years old.’

He said, ‘I managed to reach Ubaydullah (Ibn Musa) two months before his death.’ He also said, ‘I wrote about fourteen thousand narrations from Nufaili, and Muhammad Ibn Musaffa heard narrations from me.’

I (Zahabi) say, ‘Among those who narrated from him are Yunus Ibn Abd al-A’laa, Muhammad Ibn Awn Tai, Abu Dawood, Nasai, Abu Awaanah Isfaraini, Abu al-Hasan Ali Ibn Ibrahim Qattan, Abu Amr Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Hakim, Abd al-Rahman Ibn Hamdan Jallaab, Abd al-Momin Ibn Khalaf Nasafi, and many others.’

Musa Ibn Ishaq Ansari, the judge, said, ‘I have not seen anyone more knowledgeable of traditions than Abu Hatim.’ Muhammad Ibn Salamah Hafiz said, ‘After Muhammad Ibn Yahya, I have not seen anyone who memorized more traditions or had a deeper understanding of their meanings than Abu Hatim.’ Nasai reports, ‘He is trustworthy.’ Ibn Abi Hatim said, ‘I heard my father say at the door of Abu Walid Tayalisi, ‘Whoever presents me with a rare, authentic tradition, I will give him a dirham.’ Many people were present, including Abu Zur’ah and others below him. My father’s purpose was for someone to present him with a tradition he had not heard before, so that he could go to its narrator and hear it directly. But no one was able to present him with a rare tradition.’¹

Yet again, Zahabi writes in “**Al-Ebar fi Khabar man Ghabar**” regarding the events of the year 277 A.H., “In this year, the memorizer (of traditions) of the East, Abu Hatim Muhammad Ibn Idris Hanẓali Raazi, passed away in the month of Shaban, at the age of around ninety. He was exceptional in his memorization, widely travelled, and one of the great repositories of knowledge. He heard traditions from Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Ansari, Abu Mushir, and countless others.

¹ Tazkirah al-Huffaaz, vol. 2, p. 455

He was in the same league as Bukhari and Abu Zur'ah Raazi.¹

Again, Zahabi records in his book "**Duwal al-Islam**", "In the year 277 A.H., the memorizer of his time, Abu Hatim Muhammad Ibn Idris Hanzali Raazi, passed away in the month of Shaban, at the age of around ninety. He was on par with Abu Zur'ah and Bukhari in terms of scholarship."²

Zahabi mentions in "*Al-Kashif*", "Muhammad Ibn Idris Ibn Munzir Ibn Abi Hatim Raazi, the memorizer, narrated from Abdullah Ibn Musa Ansari and many others. Among those who narrated from him were 'D. S.' (likely referring to Abu Dawood Sajistani), his son, Muhamali and many others. Musa Ibn Ishaq Ansari said, 'I have not seen a better memorizer than him.' Ahmad Ibn Salama said, 'After Ibn Rahwayh and Zahli, I have not seen a better memorizer of traditions or one having a deeper understanding of its meanings than Abu Hatim.' He passed away in Shaban in the year 277 A.H."³

Abd al-Wahhab Ibn Ali Subki writes in "**Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah**", "Muhammad Ibn Idris Ibn Munzir Ibn Dawud Ibn Mehran al-Ghatafani Hanzali, known as Abu Hatim Raazi, was one of the eminent Imams. He was born in the year 195 A.H. He heard traditions from Ubaydullah Ibn Musa, Abu Nuaim (Isfahani), and their peers in Kufa, Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Ansari, Asma'i, and their peers in Basra, Affan, Huwazah Ibn Khalifah, and their peers in Baghdad, Abu Mushir, Abu Jamahir Muhammad Ibn Usman, and their peers in Damascus, Abu Yaman, Yahya al-Wahazi, and their peers in Homs, Saeed Ibn Abi Maryam, and their peers in Egypt, and from many others in different regions and cities. He travelled extensively in pursuit of traditions.'

His son narrated that Abu Hatim said, 'In the first year I set out to seek traditions, I spent seven years traveling, and I counted that I had walked more than a thousand *farsakhs* (around 5,000 kilometres), after

¹ Al-Ebar fi Khabar man Ghabar, vol. 2, p. 158

² Duwal al-Islam, vol. 1, p. 248, Incidents of the year 277 A.H.

³ Al-Kashif, vol. 3, p. 16, No. 4782

which I stopped counting. I travelled on foot from Bahrain to Egypt, then to Ramlah, then to Damascus, then to Antioch, then to Tarsus, and returned to Homs, then to Raqqa, and from there I went to Iraq. All this happened when I was twenty years old.'

Among those who narrated from his teachers were al-Saffar, Yunus Ibn Abd al-A'laa, Abdoh Ibn Sulaiman Marwazi, and Rabi' Ibn Sulaiman al-Muradi. Among his peers were Abu Zur'ah Raazi and Dimishqi. Among the compilers of the Sunan, Abu Dawood and Nasai narrated from him. It was also said that Bukhari and Ibn Majah narrated from him, but this has not been definitively confirmed. Others who narrated from him include Abu Bakr Ibn Abi Dunya, Ibn Saeed, Abu Awaanah, the judge Muhamali, Abu al-Hasan Ali Ibn Ibrahim Qattan (a student of Ibn Majah), and many others.

Abu Hatim's son, Abd al-Rahman, reports, 'Musa Ibn Ishaq the judge stated, 'I have not seen anyone with better memorization than him.' Ahmad Ibn Salama Hafiz said, 'After Ishaq Ibn Rahwayh and Muhammad Ibn Yahya, I have not seen anyone with better memorization of traditions than Abu Hatim, nor anyone more knowledgeable about their meanings.'

Ibn Abi Hatim narrated that Yunus Ibn Abd al-A'laa said, 'Abu Zur'ah and Abu Hatim are the Imams of Khorasan, and their presence is a blessing for the Muslims.' Ibn Abi Hatim also narrated that his father once said at the door of Abu Walid Tayalisi, 'Whoever presents me with a rare, authentic tradition, I will give him a dirham.' There were many people present, including Abu Zur'ah and others. His father's intention was for someone to present him with a tradition he had not heard before so that he could seek out its narrator and hear it. However, no one was able to present him with a rare tradition.'

I also heard my father say, 'Muhammad Ibn Yazid Asqati was obsessed with the commentary (of Quran) and its memorization. One day, he asked, 'What do you know about the verse of Allah, 'So

travel through the earth¹?” Everyone remained silent. I said, ‘Abu Salih narrated to us from Muawiya Ibn Salih from Ali Ibn Abi Talhah from Ibn Abbas, who said, ‘They travelled through the lands.’”

I also heard my father say, ‘Muhammad Ibn Yahya Nishapuri came to Rayy, and I presented him with thirteen traditions from the traditions of Zuhri, but he only acknowledged three of them.’ Our teacher, Zahabi, says, ‘The reason he presented him with traditions from Zuhri was that Muhammad was considered the foremost authority in the knowledge of Zuhri’s traditions. He had collected, compiled, and followed them to such an extent that people used to call him ‘**Zuhri**.’”

Subki continues, “Abu Muhammad Ayadi composed an elegy for Abu Hatim, as follows:

*‘O my soul! Why do you not grieve?
And O my eyes! Why do you not shed tears?
Did you not hear of the eclipse of knowledge,
In the month of Sha’ban, a great calamity?
Did you not hear the news of the chosen one,
Abu Hatim, the most knowledgeable of scholars?’*

Abu Hatim Raazi passed away in Shaban in the year 277 A.H. at the age of eighty-two.²

Abu Muhammad Abdullah Ibn As’ad Yamani Yafei writes in “*Mirat al-Jinan*”, “In the year 277 A.H., the memorizer of the East, Abu Hatim Muhammad Ibn Idris Hanzali Raazi, passed away in Shaban. He was exceptional in memorization, widely travelled, and one of the repositories of knowledge. He was on par with Bukhari and Abu Zur’ah Raazi.³”

Ibn Hajar Asqalani writes in “**Taqreeb al-Tahzeeb**”, “Muhammad Ibn Idris Ibn Munzir Hanzali, known as Abu Hatim Raazi, was one of the

¹ Surah Aale Imran (3): Verse 137 and Surah Nahl (16): Verse 36

² Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah, vol. 2, p. 237, Chapter about those who expired between the fourth and the fifth centuries

³ Mirat al-Jinan, vol. 2, p. 192, Incidents of 277 A.H.

prominent memorizer-scholars. He belonged to the eleventh generation and passed away in the year 277 A.H.¹

Jalal al-Deen Suyuti chronicles in “**Tabaqaat al-Huffaaz**”, “Abu Hatim Muhammad Ibn Idris Ibn Munzir Ibn Dawud Hanẓali Raazi was one of the leading memorizer-scholars. He narrated traditions from Ahmad, Adam Ibn Abi Iyas, Abu Khaisamah, Qutaibah, and many others. Among those who narrated from him were Abu Dawood, Nasai, Ibn Majah, and others. Khatib says, ‘He was one of the leading, trustworthy memorizer-scholars, renowned for his knowledge and mentioned for his virtue.’ Nasai and others vouched for his reliability. Ibn Yunus said, ‘He came to Egypt long ago, wrote traditions there, and had others write from him.’ He passed away in Rayy in the year 275 A.H., or according to some, in 277 A.H.”²

Reason 2: Criticism and weakening (قدح و جرح) of Tirmizi, who is one of the compilers of the Sihah-e-Sittah (the six authentic books of traditions), regarding the ‘Tradition of Following’ (Hadees-e-Iqtida)

Indicator

Second: Abu Isa Muhammad Ibn Isa Ibn Surah Tirmizi, one of the authors of the **Sihah Sittah** (the six major collections of traditions of the Ahle Tasannun), although he has repeatedly mentioned the tradition on following (others) as narrated by Huzaifah in his **Jaame’** (encyclopaedia), and despite narrating it from men who are criticized and narrators who are unreliable, he has boldly and daringly authenticated it. However, in the case where he narrated it from Ibn Masud, by the will of the Omnipotent Allah, he has explicitly criticized and castigated its narrators, increasing the reproach and discrediting it. As he states in his **Jaame’**, “Ibrahim Ibn Ismail Ibn

¹ Taqreeb al-Tahzeeb, vol. 2, p. 143, No. 32 under the alphabet م

² Tabaqaat al-Huffaaz, p. 278, No. 575

Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail narrated to us from Abu Zur'ah from Ibn Masud, who said, "The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, 'Follow those after me from my companions, Abu Bakr and Umar, and follow the guidance of Ammar, and adhere to the covenant of Ibn Masud.' This tradition is strange (*ghareeb*) from this chain of narration of Ibn Masud. We do not know it except through the narration of Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail, and Yahya Ibn Salamah is weak in traditions, and Abu Zur'ah's name is Abdullah Ibn Hani, and the Abu Zur'ah from whom Sho'bah, Sauri, and Ibn Uyaynah narrated is named Amr Ibn Amr, and he is the nephew of Abu al-Ahwas, a companion of Ibn Masud.¹"

From this passage, firstly, Tirmizi considers this tradition to be strange (*ghareeb*) when narrated by Ibn Masud. Secondly, he conveys that 'We do not know this tradition except through the narration of Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail.' Thirdly, he explicitly states that Yahya Ibn Salamah is weakened (considered unreliable) in traditions. Fourthly, to clarify the matter so that the truth regarding Abu al-Za'raa, the narrator of this tradition, does not become unclear to an inexperienced observer, he explains that the Abu al-Za'raa mentioned in this chain is named Abdullah Ibn Hani, whereas the Abu al-Za'raa from whom Sho'bah, Sauri, and Ibn Uyaynah narrated is named Amr Ibn Amr. Although Tirmizi has sufficed with this much criticism of the tradition, we, with the help of Allah the Most Generous, say that the men in the chain of this tradition are all criticized and castigated.

Criticism and Discrediting by the Ahle Tasannun scholars of Ibrahim Ibn Ismail Kufi, one of the narrators of the Hadees-e-Iqtada (The Tradition of Following)

As for Ibrahim Ibn Ismail, he is extremely lowly and insignificant, and greatly criticized and discredited by the critics despite outward respect. The prominent scholar Abu Zur'ah, a pioneer in the field of

¹ Sunan Tirmizi, vol. 5, p. 672, H. 3805, Chapter 38, Chapter of Excellence of Abdullah Ibn Masud

critique and investigation (of traditions), and an expert in examination and verification, has considered him weak and blasted him with criticism, disparagement, and rebuke. According to the report of Ibn Abi Hatim, Abu Zur'ah directed that it was said that he narrated several traditions from his father, and later he abandoned narrating those traditions from his father, attributing them falsely to his uncle because his uncle was more famous and well-known among the people. Abu Hatim, the distinguished scholar, dismissed him into the abyss of insignificance and loss. Ibn Numair, a discerning critic, did not approve of him and followed the path of weakening, dishonouring, criticizing, and condemning him, accusing him of narrating strange and rejected reports.

On page 82, it is further mentioned that Aqili, with intelligence and insight, and full discovery, directed the precise statement that 'this Ibrahim was not reliable in traditions', confirming the extent of his inadequacy and weakness. Moreover, for his dishonour, he mentioned a story about his insertion and mingling of one tradition with another. Even though Ibn Hibban listed him among the trustworthy narrators (*seqaat*), he still pointed out that Ibrahim's narration from his father contains some rejected reports.

Clearly, the tradition we are concerned with criticizing belongs to this category, as Ibrahim narrated it from his father Ismail. Therefore, there is no doubt or hesitation in considering it discredited and rejected.

In "**Mizan al-Itidal**", Zahabi writes, "Ibrahim Ibn Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail. Abu Zur'ah criticized him, and Abu Hatim abandoned him. He narrates from his father and he is of the recent ones."¹

Again, Zahabi writes in "**al-Mughni fi al-Zuafa**", "Ibrahim Ibn Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail. Abu Zur'ah criticized him, and

¹ Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 1, p. 20, No. 39

Abu Hatim abandoned him.¹

Ibn Hajar Asqalani writes in “**Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb**”, “Ibrahim Ibn Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail Hazrami, Abu Ishaq Kufi, narrated from his father and Abu Nuaim (Isfahani), and narrated from him Tirmizi, his son Salamah Ibn Ibrahim, Ibn Saeed, Yaqub Ibn Sufyan, Ibn Warah, Sarraj, and others.

Ibn Abi Hatim said, ‘My father wrote down his traditions but did not visit him or take me to him, and did not listen to him due to his irrelevance.’ I asked Abu Zur’ah about him. He replied, ‘It is mentioned that he used to narrate traditions from his father, but then abandoned his father and attributed them to his uncle because his uncle was more famous among the people.’ Aqili narrated from Matin, ‘Ibn Numair did not approve of him and considered him weak, and he said he narrated rejected (*munkar*) traditions.’ Aqili also said, ‘Ibrahim was not reliable in traditions.’ Matin reports, ‘He died in the year 258 A.H.’

I (Ibn Hajar Asqalani) say, ‘The rest of Aqili’s statement is, ‘He narrated from his father from his grandfather from Salamah from Ibrahim from Alqamah from Ibn Masud, ‘We were with the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) in the Battle of Khaibar. When he (s.a.w.a.) wanted to relieve himself, he (s.a.w.a.) distanced himself.’ This tradition contains the story of the two goats, the springing of water, the story of the water skin, and the story of the camel in detail.’ Aqili said, ‘As for the story of the water skin and purification, it has been reported from Ibn Masud through other chains of narrators, but the rest came from other than Ibn Masud. He inserted one tradition into another tradition.’ Ibn Khuzaimah narrated from him in his **Sahih**, and Ibn Hibban mentioned him among the trustworthy narrators (**seqaat**), saying, ‘In his narration from his father, there are some rejected (*munkar*) traditions.’²

Safi al-Deen Ahmad Ibn Abdillah Khazraji pens in “*Mukhtasar*

¹ Al-Mughni fi al-Zuafa, p. 10, No. 36

² Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb, vol. 1, p. 130, No. 161 under the alphabet الف

Tahzeeb Tahzeeb al-Kamal”, “Ibrahim Ibn Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail Hazrami Abu Ishaq Kufi, narrated from his father and Abu Nuaim (Isfahani). Tirmizi narrated from him. Abu Zur’ah accused him of dishonesty. Matin said, ‘He died in the year 258 A.H.’¹“

Critique and Discrediting by the experts of transmitters of Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail, another narrator of this tradition

As for Ismail Ibn Yahya, according to the guidance of Daraqutni, he is abandoned (*matruk*), meaning far from the rank of acceptance and approval, and close to being among the people of deceit and fraud. According to the narration of Ibn Jauzi, the Imam of the scholars of investigation from Azdi, it is also established and verified that he is abandoned and disregarded. Therefore, relying on his narration is pure recklessness and hazardous, and Allah is the one who brings people out from the darkness of falsehood to the truth and light.

In “*Mizan al-Itidal*”, Zahabi writes, “Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail narrated from his father and his uncle, and Ibrahim narrated from him. Daraqutni said, ‘He is abandoned (*matruk*).’²“

Again, Zahabi writes in “*al-Mughni fi al-Zuafa*”, Zahabi pens, “Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhayl; Daraqutni said, ‘He is abandoned (*matruk*).’³“

Ibn Hajar Asqalani writes in “*Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb*”, “Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhayl Hazrami Kufi narrated from his father and his uncle Muhammad. Narrations from him were taken by Ibn Ibrahim and Abu al-Awwam Ahmad Ibn Yazid Riyahi. Daraqutni said, ‘He is abandoned (*matruk*), and the discussion about him has already been mentioned in the biography of his son.’

I (Ibn Hajar) say, ‘Ibn Jauzi quoted from Azdi that he said, ‘He is

¹ Mukhtasar Tahzeeb Tahzeeb al-Kamal, p. 16

² Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 1, p. 254, No. 968

³ Al-Mughni fi al-Zuafa, p. 89, No. 734

abandoned (*matruk*)'.¹

Safi al-Deen Khazraji writes in “**Mukhtasar Tahzeeb Tahzeeb al-Kamal**”, “Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail Hazrami Kufi narrated from his father and his uncle Muhammad, and his son Ibrahim narrated from him. Daraqutni said, ‘He is abandoned (*matruk*)’.²”

Critique and Discrediting by the Ahle Tasannun scholars of Yahya Ibn Salama Ibn Kuhail, another narrator of the Tradition of Following Abu Bakr and Umar (Hadees-e-Iqteda)

As for Yahya Ibn Salama Ibn Kahil, even though Tirmizi sufficed in his critique by stating that Yahya Ibn Salamah is weak in traditions’, a detailed study of the books of Rijal (biographical evaluations) clearly shows that Ibn Maeen sometimes said about him, ‘He is nothing, and sometimes said, ‘He is weak in traditions.’ Bukhari said that his traditions contain anomalies (*munkar*). Moreover, Bukhari in his **Tarikh al-Awsat** said that he is a narrator whose traditions are rejected (*munkar al-hadees*). Abu Hatim Raazi said that his traditions are anomalous and that he is not strong. Nasai said that he is not trustworthy. Nasai also said that he is abandoned (his narrations are not accepted), and Abbas said that ‘he is nothing’, and his traditions are not recorded.’ Although Ibn Hibban has listed him among the trustworthy narrators (*siqaat*), nevertheless, he indicates that his son’s traditions from him contain anomalies (*manaakeer*).

It is very apparent that the tradition of following Abu Bakr and Umar was narrated from Yahya Ibn Salamah by his son Ismail Ibn Yahya, so based on what Ibn Hibban has indicated, there is no doubt about the weakness of that narration. What is astonishing is that Ibn Hibban also enlisted Yahya Ibn Salamah in his **Kitab al-Zuafa** (The Book of Weak Narrators) and stated about him that he is extremely rejected in

¹ Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb vol. 1, p. 345, No. 533 under the alphabet الف

² Mukhtasar Tahzeeb Tahzeeb al-Kamal, p. 36

traditions, and one cannot use him as a source for argumentation. Ibn Numair said that he is one of those whose traditions should not be recorded. Daraqutni said that he is abandoned (*matruk*), and he also said that he is weak. Ijli said that he is weak in traditions. Ibn Sad said that he was extremely weak. Yaqub Ibn Sufyan listed him among those whose narrations should be avoided and noted that he used to hear his companions calling him weak (in traditions). Aajurri reported from Abu Dawud that ‘he is nothing.’

Now, let us listen to the phrases that reveal the statements of the Imams of Rijal (biographical evaluations of narrators).

Bukhari writes in “**Tarikh al-Saghir**”, “Abu Nuaim (Isfahani) said, ‘Salamah Ibn Kuhail died in the year 121 A.H. on the Day of Ashura.’ Abu Abdillah (Bukhari) continues, ‘He is Khazrami, Abu Yahya Kufi, the father of Muhammad and Yahya. As for Yahya, he is rejected in traditions (*munkar al-hadees*).’”

Bukhari also pens in “*Kitab al-Zuafa*” (The Book of Weak Narrators), “Yahya Ibn Salama Ibn Kuhail, narrating from his father, has anomalies (*manaakeer*) in his traditions.¹”

Nasai chronicles in “*Kitab al-Zuafa wa al-Matrukin*” (The Book of Weak and Abandoned Narrators), “Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail is abandoned in traditions (*matrook al-hadees*), and he is a Kufi.²”

Abd al-Ghani Maqdisi writes in “**Al-Kamal**”, “Yahya Ibn Salama Ibn Kahil Hazrami Kufi, Abu Jafar, narrated from his father and from Bayan Ibn Bishr, and a group of others. Those who have narrated from him include his son Ismail along with Qabisah Ibn Uqba, Yahya Hammami, Abu Ghassan Nahdi, Usaid Ibn Zaid Hammal, Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Wahhab Haarisi, and others. Ibn Maeen considered him weak. Abu Hatim said, ‘He is not strong.’ Bukhari said, ‘His tradition contains anomalies (*manaakeer*). Nasai said, ‘He is not trustworthy.’ Tirmizi said. ‘He is weak.’ As for Ibn Hibban, he mentioned him

¹ Kitab al-Zuafa, p. 119, No. 397

² Kitab al-Zuafa wa al-Matrukin, p. 109, No. 631

among the trustworthy narrators (*siqaat*). Matin said, ‘He died in the year 172 A.H.’”

Zahabi pens in “**Al-Kashif**”, “Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail, narrated from his father and Bayan Ibn Bishr, and those who have narrated from him include Qabisa and Yahya Hammami. He is weak and died in the year 172 A.H.”¹

In the margins of **Al-Kashif** it is mentioned, “Ibn Maeen said, ‘He is nothing’, and on another occasion, he said, ‘He is weak in traditions.’ Bukhari said, ‘His traditions contain anomalies (*manaakeer*).’ Nasai said, ‘He is not trustworthy.’ Ibn Hibban mentioned him among the trustworthy ones! Abu Hatim said, ‘His tradition is rejected (*munkar*), and he is not strong’.”

Zahabi also writes in “*Mizan al-Itidal*”, “Yahya Ibn Salama Ibn Kuhail, narrating from his father, was described by Abu Hatim and others as, ‘His traditions are rejected (*munkar al-hadees*).’ Nasai said, ‘He is abandoned (*matruk*).’ Abbas said, ‘He is nothing, and his tradition is not to be recorded.’”

Ibn Hajar Asqalani pens in “**Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb**”, “Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail Hazrami, Abu Jafar Kufi, narrated from his father along with Ismail Ibn Abi Khalid, Bayan Ibn Bishr, Aasim Ibn Bahdalah, Ammar Duhni, Yazid Ibn Abi Ziyad, and others. His narrators include his son Ismail, Abdullah Ibn Numair, Bakr Ibn Bakkar, Abu Saeed the freed slave of Bani Hashim, Musa Ibn Dawud Zabbi, Abdullah Ibn Salih Ijli, Abu Ghassan Nahdi, Yahya Ibn Abd al-Hamid Hammami, and others.

Duri narrated from Ibn Maeen, ‘He is weak in traditions.’ Muzar Ibn Muhammad narrated from Ibn Maeen, ‘He is nothing.’ Abu Hatim said, ‘His tradition is rejected (*munkar al-hadees*), and he is not strong.’ Bukhari said, ‘There are anomalies (*manaakeer*) in his traditions.’ Tirmizi said, ‘He is weak in traditions.’ Nasai said, ‘He is not trustworthy.’ Ibn Hibban mentioned him in **al-Siqaat** with the

¹ Al-Kashif, vol. 3, p. 226, No. 6288

rider that, ‘There are anomalies (*manaakeer*) in the traditions his son narrates from him.’ He died in the year 179 A.H. Matin said, ‘He died in the year 172 A.H.’

I (Ibn Hajar Asqalani) say, “Ibn Hibban also mentioned him among the weak narrators (*al-Zuafa*) and said, ‘His traditions are extremely rejected, and he cannot be used as a source of evidence!’ Nasai said in **al-Kuna**, ‘He is abandoned in traditions (*matruk al-hadees*).’ Ibn Numair said, ‘He is not someone whose traditions should be recorded.’ Daraqutni said, ‘He is abandoned (*matruk*).’ On another occasion, he said, ‘He is weak.’ Ijli said, ‘He is weak in traditions and used to be extreme in his Shiism.’ Ibn Sa’d said, ‘He was extremely weak.’ Bukhari said in “**Al-Awsat**”, ‘His tradition is rejected (*munkar al-hadees*).’ Yaqub Ibn Sufyan mentioned him among those whose narrations should be avoided, saying, ‘I used to hear from my companions that they considered him weak.’ Aajurri narrated from Abu Dawood, ‘He is nothing’.¹“

Safi al-Deen Khazraji writes in “**Mukhtasar Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb**”, “Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail narrated from his father. His son Ismail narrated from him. Ibn Maeen considered him weak. Matin said, ‘He died in the year 192 A.H.”

Reference to the Critique and Evaluation by Hafiz al-Bazaar, the author of Musnad, of the Hadees-e-Iqtida (The tradition of following Abu Bakr and Umar)

As for Abu Za’ra Abdullah Ibn Hani al-Kindi, it is stated that he was weak and criticized, as mentioned earlier in the works of Bukhari, which have recorded and listed the flaws in the tradition “And adhere to the covenant of the son of Umm Abd.” So, keep this in mind.

Thirdly: Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Umar Ibn Abd al-Khaliq Başri al-Bazaar, a prominent transmitter of traditions, renowned scholar and expert critics of narrations among the scholars of Ahle Tasannun, has

¹ Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb, vol. 9, p. 241, No. 7840 under the alphabet ي

declared the Hadees-e-Iqtada (Tradition of following Abu Bakr and Umar) as unauthentic due to criticism and rejection. This has been mentioned earlier by Manavi in **Faiz al-Qadeer**¹.

After the critique and rejection by this great memorizer (of traditions) and famous critic, those who adhere to it should feel ashamed, seek repentance and turn away from fastening unto this falsehood. They should never mention it again, nor claim its widespread transmission. They should count the claim of its fame and multiplicity among their blatant errors. But how could they do that when they have been overwhelmed by the illness of misguidance and destruction? Their hearts have been sealed with obstinacy and stubbornness, and love for the two Shaikhs (Abu Bakr and Umar) has led them to ruin.

Even more astonishing is that Shah Sahab, in his margins on the 92nd conspiracy (of Shias) in the same book, **Tuhfa**, begins to argue and use as evidence the narration from **Musnad al-Bazaar** to support the bravery of the Companion of the Cave (Abu Bakr), in opposition to the people of truth. He demonstrates his complete disregard for the norms of debate and pays no attention to the criticism and rejection of Bazaar's narration regarding Hadees-e-Iqtada. Unabashedly, he defiles his tongue by mentioning it, and without any reservation, he seeks to support this baseless falsehood, walking the path of deviation and misguidance. With bogus claims of its fame and consecutiveness, he shamelessly adds to the fabricated arguments of Musailamah and Sajjaah (the two pseudo prophets).

What is even more astonishing is that Shah Sahab, at the beginning of the same chapter—namely the seventh chapter of **Tuhfa**—in the context of denying the caliphate of Muawiya, the Banu Marwan, and the Banu Abbas, relies on the tradition reported by Bazaar. He describes him as the leader of the scholars of traditions among the Ahle Tasannun. Yet, in this context, he disregards and turns away from the statement of this great scholar of traditions regarding the inauthenticity of Hadees-e-Iqtada. Contrary to the position of this

¹ Faiz al-Qadeer, vol. 2, p. 56, Explanation of Tradition 1318

great critic and noble scholar, Shah Sahab persists in his false claim of the fame and consecutiveness of Hadees-e-Iqteda, continuing his injustice and aggression. Is this not the action of the people of indecency and immorality? Allah is the Protector against the deviation of the misguided and the confused.

Even though it is sufficient to establish the greatness and prominence of Abu Bakr Bazaar by the fact that our opponent (Muhaddis Dehlavi) refers to him as the leader of the scholars of traditions among the Ahle Tasannun and clings to his narrations in opposition to the people of truth, we will still mention some statements of the scholars of *rijaal* (biographical evaluation) and those knowledgeable of the conditions of the Ahle Tasannun about him to further strengthen and affirm our intended purpose.

Hafiz Abu Nuaim Ahmad Ibn Abdullah Isfahani, in his book **Tarikh-e-Isfahan**, of which an old manuscript was found in the library of the Sacred Mosque in Medina, stated, “Ahmad Ibn Umar Ibn Abd Khaliq Basri Abu Bakr Bazaar Hafiz visited Isfahan twice¹.”

Jalal al-Deen Suyuti writes in “*Tabaqaat al-Huffaaz*”, “Bazaar – the famous memorizer and prominent scholar, Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Harun (or Umar, as appears in other versions) Ibn Abd al-Khaliq Başri, the author of *al-Musnad al-Kabir al-Mu’allal*. He travelled towards the end of his life to Isfahan and the Levant (Syria), where he spread his knowledge. He passed away in Ramla in the year 292 A.H.²”

Biography of Hafiz Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Umar Ibn Abd al-Khaliq al-Bazaar:

Muhammad Amir Azhari Maaliki, in his “*Risalaah Asaaneed*” (Treatise on the Chains of Narrations) writes, “*Sunan Bazaar* by Hafiz Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Umar Ibn Abd al-Khaliq Bazaar Ataki, a scholar from Basra, who passed away in 292 A.H. in Ramla. Ibn Abi Khaisama

¹ Tarikh-e-Isfahan, vol. 1, p. 138, No. 88

² Tabaqaat al-Huffaaz, p. 307, No. 651

said, ‘He was a pillar of Islam and was likened to (Ahmad) Ibn Ḥanbal in his asceticism and piety.’ He authored *Al-Musnad al-Kabir* and travelled at the end of his life to the Levant (Syria) and Isfahan, where he spread his knowledge. He died in al-Ramla in the Levant. We narrate it through our chain to Bazzaar from the author of *al-Minh* through Ibn Ataab, from his father from Qazi Abu Ayyub Ibn Khalaf Ibn Amrun from Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Ibn Mufarraaj through Ṣayyarifi from Abu Muhammad Abdullah Ibn Muhammad Ibn Ismail from Abu Amr Ṭalamanki, from Ibn Mufarraaj from Abu al-Ḥasan Ṣamut from Bazzaar.

The criticism of the scholar of traditions Abu Jafar Muhammad Ibn Hammad Uqayli concerning Hadees-e-Iqteda and his biography

Fourthly: Abu Jafar Muhammad Ibn Amr Ibn Musa Ibn Hammad Uqayli, who is among the major memorizers (*huffaaz*) and prominent figures of the Sunni tradition, mentioned “**Hadees-e-Iqteda**” as narrated by Ibn Umar in his book “*Kitab al-Zuafa*” (The Book of Weak Narrators). He classified this tradition as an objectionable one without any basis, as will become clear, God willing, from Ibn Hajar Asqalani’s words in “*Lisan al-Mizan*” concerning the biography of Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Umari.

It is evident that after Uqayli’s critique of this tradition, it would not be a reasonable action to rely upon it or to claim its false popularity and consecutiveness (*tawaatur*).

Although Uqayli’s high status in the critique of traditions and reports is undeniable among scholars of Ahle Tasannun, I will still mention some statements from the scholars of Rijal here as a completion of the argument.

Allamah Zahabi in “*Tazkirah al-Huffaz*” writes, “Uqayli – The Memorizer, Imam Abu Jafar: The biography of Hafiz Abu Jafar Ibn Hammad Uqayli: Muhammad Ibn Amr Ibn Musa Ibn Hammad Uqayli, the author of *al-Zuafa al-Kabir* (The Major Book of Weak Narrators) heard from his grandfather Yazid Ibn Muhammad Uqayli from his

maternal side, and from Muhammad Ibn Ismail Saigh, Abu Yahya Ibn Abi Maysarah, Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Ibn Walid Ibn Burd Antaki, Yahya Ibn Ayyub Allaf, Muhammad Ibn Ismail Tirmizi, Ishaq Ibn Ibrahim Dayri, Ali Ibn Abd al-Aziz Baghawi, Muhammad Ibn Khuzayma, Muhammad Ibn Musa Balkhi, the companion of Abdullah Ibn Musa, and many others. He resided in the two sacred cities (Makkah and Madina). Among those who narrated from him are Abu al-Hasan Muhammad Ibn Naafi' Khuza'i, Yusuf Ibn Burhayl Misri, Abu Bakr Ibn Muqri, and others. Muslim Ibn Qesm said, 'Uqayli was of great stature and highly esteemed. I have not seen anyone like him. He authored many books, and when any of the narrators came to him, he would say, 'Read from your book and do not bring out its original!' We discussed this, saying, 'Either he is the best memorizer, or he is among the greatest liars!' So, we gathered and tested him. When I brought the additions and omissions, he noticed them and took the book from me. He grabbed the pen and corrected them from his memory. When we left him, we were satisfied and knew that he was among the best memorizers.'

Hafiz Abu al-Hasan Ibn Sahl Qattan said, 'Abu Jafar was a reliable figure of great status, knowledgeable in traditions, and advanced in memorization. He died in the year 322 A.H.¹⁴

The criticism of Hafiz Abu Bakr Muhammad Ibn Hasan Mosuli, known as al-Naqqash, concerning Hadees-e-Iqteda

Fifthly: Abu Bakr Muhammad Ibn al-Hasan Mosuli, known as Naqqash, declared Hadees-e-Iqteda narrated by Ibn Umar to be completely weak and disparaged, and belittled that gem of truth with the piercing needle of criticism. Zahabi writes in "*Mizan al-Itidal*" in the biography of Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Ghalib Bahili, 'Among his blunders, he said, 'Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Umari narrated to us from Maalik from Nafi' from Ibn Umar, who said, 'The Messenger of

¹ Tazkirah al-Huffaz, vol. 3, p. 833, No. 814

Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘Follow those who come after me—Abu Bakr and Umar.’ This is attributed to Maalik, and Abu Bakr Naqqash said, ‘It is weak’.¹

It is evident that Naqqash’s criticism of this tradition is clearly confused, especially when he uses the word ‘**weak**,’ which reveals the ultimate corruption and devastation of the narration. This is because Naqqash was deeply fascinated by the collection of fabricated reports, and he filled his own exegesis with such fabricated narrations, as is clear to anyone who refers to **Tabaqat al-Huffaz** by Suyuti. Therefore, if such a person declares a tradition ‘weak’ and chooses to disparage and belittle it, it is inevitable that the tradition has reached the lowest pits of falsehood and has fallen into the deepest depths of degradation and disgrace.

In short, it is obvious and clear to those with insight and perception that the condition of **Hadees-e-Iqteda** after Naqqash’s criticism, is like a drawing on water, and presenting this narration is like the fleeting shimmer of a mirage!”

The criticism of Hafiz Abu al-Hasan Ali Ibn Umar Daraqutni regarding Hadees-e-Iqteda and the sources of his biography

Sixthly: Abu al-Hasan Ali Ibn Umar Daraqutni, who is among the most famous of the great masters of traditions and renowned critics of narrations among the Sunnis, criticized **Hadees-e-Iqteda** transmitted on the authority of Ibn Umar. He declared it to be flawed and unproven. He further emphasized its weakness by pointing out the unreliability of its narrator, thus exposing its lack of authenticity and significance. You will, Allah willing, come to know more about this later through the words of Asqalani in **Lisan al-Mizan**, in the biography of Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Umari.

By Allah’s grace, it becomes clear here as well that the boldness and audacity of the speaker in claiming the fame and widespread

¹ Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 1 p. 142, No. 557

transmission of this fabricated narration is evident and obvious. His (Dehlavi's) impudence and insolence in making this corrupt claim and presenting such worthless speech are manifestly displayed.

The prominence and greatness of Daraqutni among the opponents and his expertise and leadership in the sciences of tradition are evident from the sources of his biography, including *Al-Ansab* (vol. 5, p. 245) by Abdul Karim Sam'ani, *The Treatise of Fakhr al-Deen al-Razi in favour of the Shafi'i school*, *Al-Tarikh al-Kamil* (vol. 9, p. 115, Incidents of 385 A.H.) by Ibn Asir Jazari, *al-Taqrīb wa al-Taysir* (p. 116, Type 60) by Muhyi al-Deen Nawawi, *Wafayaat al-Ayan* (vol. 3, p. 297, No. 432) by Ibn Khallikan, *Minhaj al-Sunnah* by Ibn Taymiyyah Harrani, *Siyar A'lam al-Nubala* (vol. 16, p. 449, No. 332), *Tazkirah al-Huffaz* (vol. 3, p. 991, No. 925), *al-Ebar* (vol. 3, p. 28) by Zahabi, *Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah* (vol. 2, p. 310) by Abd al-Wahhab Subki, *Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah* (vol. 1, p. 246, No. 465) by Abd al-Rahim Isnawi, *Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah* by Abu Bakr Asadi, *Asmaa Rijal al-Mishkat* by Wali al-Deen Khatib Tabrizi, *Tabaqaat al-Qurra* (vol. 1, p. 558, No. 2281) by Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Jazari, *Tabaqaat al-Huffaz* (p. 410) by Jalal al-Deen Suyuti, *al-Mirqaat fi Sharh al-Mishkaat* by Mulla Ali Qari, *Rijal al-Mishkat* by Shaikh Abdul Haqq al-Dehlavi, *Maqaalid al-Asaaneed* by Abu Mahdi Isa Sa'labi, *Bustan al-Muhaddiseen* by Shah Sahab (Muhaddis Dehlavi), *At'haaf al-Nubalaa*, *Abjad al-Uloom*, and *al-Taj al-Mukallal* by Maulvi Siddiq Hasan Khan and others; this is well-known and apparent. Many of these references are mentioned in the volume concerning **Hadees-e-Tair**, and some of them are mentioned in the first part of this same volume.

One of the astonishing exaggerations of the Sunnis regarding Daraqutni is that they refer to him—Allah forbid—as 'the Commander of the Faithful in Traditions' (*Amirul Momineen fi al-hadees*) and by usurping this title, they express their ultimate enmity, hostility, injustice, and rebellion against the father of the pure Imams (a.s.), as long as the night and day alternate—something that is clear to anyone who reads *Tazkirah al-Huffaz* by Zahabi and other works.

Thus, it is extremely strange that Shah Sahab, despite recognizing the authority of the Commander of the Faithful (Allah forbid) of their own school in the matter of the criticism and weakening of **Hadees-e-Iqteda**, does not give it any consideration, and by claiming its false fame and consecutiveness, stirs up rebellion and sectarianism in the ears of the people of the world!

The criticism of Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Hazm, a Zahiri, of Hadees-e-Iqteda, the five lessons derived from his statements and his biography

Seventhly: Abu Muhammad Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Hazm Zahiri, one of the prominent researchers and esteemed critics among the Ahle Tasannun, explicitly considered **Hadees-e-Iqteda** as unauthentic. With utmost clarity, he refrained from arguing with this explicit falsehood. As noted in the book **al-Milal wa al-Nihal** by Ibn Hazm in the discussion on the succession of Abu Bakr, “Indeed, it has been authentically reported that a woman asked, ‘O Messenger of Allah! What if I return and do not find you?’ It is as though she was referring to his death. He replied, ‘Go to Abu Bakr!’ This is a clear text on the succession of Abu Bakr. Furthermore, there is a reliable report that in his illness, during which he (s.a.w.a.) passed away, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said to Aisha, ‘I intended to summon your father and brother and to write a letter of instruction so that no one would say, ‘I am more deserving!’ or anyone would wish otherwise. But Allah and the believers do not accept anyone but Abu Bakr.’ Another narration states, ‘Allah and the Prophets do not accept anyone but Abu Bakr!’ This is a clear text regarding his (s.a.w.a.) appointment of Abu Bakr to the leadership of the community after him.’

Abu Muhammad (Ibn Hazm) said, ‘If we permitted ourselves to use deception—an approach that our opponents would delight in discovering or become deeply sorrowful if they missed—we could argue with the narration, ‘Follow the two who come after me, Abu Bakr and Umar.’ However, Abu Muhammad said, ‘It is not authentic,

and may Allah protect us from arguing with something that is not authentic!¹“

From this entire statement, numerous valuable learnings and profound insights become clear and apparent:

First Learning: It becomes evident that Ibn Hazm, despite his intense devotion to the caliphate of Abu Bakr and his presumption (contrary to the consensus of the majority of Ahle Tasannun) that, Allah forbid, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) appointed Abu Bakr as caliph through a clear text, resorted to certain ancient fabrications of his predecessors to substantiate this baseless claim. Yet, despite all this, he refrained from using **Hadees-e-Iqteda** as evidence. Although he mentioned it, he explicitly stated that it was not worthy of use as evidence.

Second Learning: It is explicitly established that if Ibn Hazm had considered deception permissible, he would indeed have used the **Hadees-e-Iqteda** as evidence.

From this, it is verified and proven that Ibn Hazm and other major figures among Ahle Tasannun, who have relied on the **Hadees-e-Iqteda** and take undue pride in it, have built their entire foundation on deception, manipulation, and distortion.

Third Learning: It is perfectly clear that the **Hadees-e-Iqteda** is not authentic. After Ibn Hazm’s clear statement on the lack of authenticity of this tradition, the structure of deception and misrepresentation employed by his audience and their predecessors is reduced to rubble, and their entire deceitful embellishment collapses.

Fourth Learning: It is absolutely evident that Ibn Hazm considered **Hadees-e-Iqteda** so incredulous that he sought refuge in Allah from using it as evidence, following the path of complete condemnation and denunciation. And why should it not be so, when to Ibn Hazm, using it as evidence is based on deceit, and deceit is the work of Iblis

¹ Al-Fasl fi al-Milal wa al-Nihal, vol. 4, p. 177, Discussion of Imamate after the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.)

(Satan). Allah is the Protector from his whispers and schemes.

From this, it is easy to understand that the addressee (Shah Sahab) and other figures among Ahle Tasannun, who repeatedly take pride in the **Hadees-e-Iqteda** and stake their cherished lives on this demonic deception, are indeed following in the path of Iblis and are becoming sources of actions from which protection is sought in Allah the Almighty.

It is worth mentioning that Ibn Hazm's criticism and rejection of the authenticity of **Hadees-e-Iqteda** is also evident in **Faiz al-Qadir** by Manavi, as I have previously mentioned¹. Do not neglect this point.

It is clear to those who pursue investigation and verification that Ibn Hazm was one of the great memorizers of traditions and critical scholars among the scholars of Ahle Tasannun. His achievements and contributions among these scholars are far too numerous to be fully expressed here; however, for the sake of brevity, I will focus on a few of their statements.

Abd al-Karim Ibn Muhammad Sam'ani, in his book **Al-Ansab** (The Book of Genealogies), speaks of the designation 'Yazidi' as follows, 'As for Abu Muhammad Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Saeed Andalusi, the the memorizer of traditions known as Ibn Hazm, was referred to as 'Yazidi' because his great-grandfather was among the clients of Yazid Ibn Abi Sufyan. Abu Muhammad was one of the most distinguished people of his time in Andalusia and the western regions. He authored numerous beneficial books and writings, was a memorizer of traditions, and inclined toward the school of the Zahiri adherents, as I have heard. He learned from many people in Andalusia, and his narrations and writings reached Iraq and Khorasan through Abu Abdillah Muhammad Ibn Abi Nasr Humaidi, the memorizer of traditions, who transmitted from him and conveyed them on his behalf. He passed away before the year 450 A.H., Allah willing, and

¹ Faiz al-Qadir fi Sharh Jaame' al-Saghir, vol. 2, p. 56, Explanation of H. 1318

Allah knows the best.¹

In **al-Ebar fi Khabar man Ghabar**, Zahabi, while recounting the events of the year 456 A.H., writes, “Abu Muhammad Ibn Hazm, the scholar Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Saeed Ibn Hazm Ibn Ghalib Ibn Salih Umayyad, their freed slave, originally Persian, Andalusian from Cordoba, and a follower of the Zahiri school, was a prolific author. He passed away in exile, forced from his homeland by the state, in a rural area, in a village two days before the end of Shaban, at the age of seventy-two. He narrated from Abu Amr Ibn Jasur, Yahya Ibn Masud, and many others. His first narrations date back to the year 399 A.H. He was known for his exceptional intelligence, sharp mind, extensive knowledge of the Quran, the Sunnah, various schools of thought, sects, Arabic language, literature, logic, and poetry, along with honesty, integrity, religious commitment, respect, leadership, wealth, and an extensive library. Ghazali pens, ‘I found in the names of Allah Almighty a book by Abu Muhammad Ibn Hazm, indicating his vast memory and flowing intellect.’ Saeed, in his history, noted, ‘Ibn Hazm was the most comprehensive scholar in all of Andalusia regarding Islamic sciences and had the broadest knowledge, with mastery in language, eloquence, poetry, biography, and historical accounts. His son, Fazl, informed me that his father had about four hundred volumes of his own writings in his collection, all in his own handwriting’.²”

Again Zahabi, in **Duval al-Islam**, while discussing the events of the mentioned year, pens, “In that year, the Andalusian scholar Abu Muhammad Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Saeed Ibn Hazm Qurtubi, the Zahiri jurist and prolific author, passed away at the age of seventy-two.³”

Jalal al-Deen Suyuti, in **Tabaqat al-Huffaz**, writes, “Ibn Hazm – the erudite Imam, scholar, memorizer, and jurist Abu Muhammad Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Saeed Ibn Hazm Ibn Ghalib Ibn Salih Ibn Khalaf, originally

¹ Al-Ansab, under the word ‘Yazidi’, vol. 12, p. 407

² Al-Ebar fi Khabar man Ghabar, vol. 3, p. 239

³ Duval al-Islam, vol. 1 p. 207, Incidents of the year 450 A.H.

Persian from Tirmiz, a freed slave of the Umayyads, from Cordoba, and a Zahiri scholar. He was initially a Shafi'i but then converted to the Zahiri school. He was a man of multiple disciplines, piety, and asceticism, and reached the peak of intelligence, memory, and breadth of knowledge. He was recognized as the most comprehensive scholar of Islamic sciences in all of Andalusia and the broadest in knowledge, excelling in the sciences of language, eloquence, poetry, biography, and history. Among his works are **al-Mujalla** on his own sect and independent reasoning, its commentary **al-Muhalla**, **al-Milal wa al-Nihal**, **al-Eesaal fi Fiqh al-Hadees**, etc.

The last person to narrate from him with permission was Abu al-Hasan Shareeh Ibn Muhammad. He passed away in Jumada al-Ula of the year 457 A.H.¹

Mirza Muhammad Badakhshani, in **Tarajim al-Huffaz**, chronicles, "Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Saeed Aandalusi Qurtubi, known as Abu Muhammad Ibn Hazm, was one of the prominent Imams of the Zahiri school. In lineage, he is referred to with the appellative 'al-Yazidi'. This title goes back to Yazid, a name from one of the ancestors of the attributed individual."

After mentioning several others known by this lineage, he continues, "As for Abu Muhammad Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Saeed Aandalusi, the memorizer known as Ibn Hazm, he was called 'al-Yazidi' because his distant grandfather was a freed-slave of Yazid Ibn Abi Sufyan. Abu Muhammad was among the most distinguished scholars of his time in Andalusia and the Maghreb². He authored numerous beneficial books and was a memorizer of traditions who inclined towards the Zahiri school, as I have heard. He studied with numerous figures from Andalusia, and his narrations and works reached Iraq and Khorasan through Abu Abdillah Muhammad Ibn Abi Nasr Humaidi, who transmitted and conveyed them. He died before the year 450 A.H."

¹ Tabaqaat al-Huffaz, p. 455, No. 983

² Today's North Africa comprising of Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria (to some extent Sudan - Translator).

He concludes, “However, the confirmed date of his death is after the year 450 A.H., with most opinions pointing to the year 456, while some say 457. He was born in the year 384 A.H.’ He narrated from Abu Umar Talamanki, Abu Umar Ibn Abd al-Barr, Abu Umar Ibn Jasur, Abu al-Ala Saeed Ibn Yasar al-Rab’i, Yahya Ibn Masud Ibn Wajh Hayyah, Yunus Ibn Abdillah Ibn Mughees, Muhammad Ibn Saeed Ibn Sinan, and others. His son, Fazl, and Abu Abdillah Humaidi, among many others, narrated from him. Zahabi and Ibn Nasir al-Deen (i.e. Jalal al-Deen) mentioned him in *Tabaqaat al-Huffaz*.”

Maulvi Siddiq Hasan Khan in **At’haaf al-Nubalaa** writes, “Abu Muhammad Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Saeed Ibn Hazm Ibn Ghalib Ibn Salih Ibn Khalaf Ibn Ma’dan Ibn Sufyan, the freed slave of Yazid Ibn Abi Sufyan al-Umawi. The first of his ancestors to become Muslim was Yazid, his grandfather. His origin is from Persia, and his grandfather Khalaf was the first of his ancestors to migrate to Andalusia. He was born in Cordoba in the lands of Andalusia on a Wednesday before sunrise on the last day of Ramazan in the year 384 A.H., in the eastern part of the city. He was a scholar of traditions and its jurisprudence, a memorizer who derived rulings from the Quran and Sunnah. He moved from the Shafi’i school to the Zahiri (literalist) school. He was well-versed in numerous sciences, a practitioner of his knowledge, ascetic in worldly matters despite the authority he and his father held before him in ministry and governance. He was humble, possessed many virtues, and authored numerous works in the sciences of traditions. He compiled extensive collections from various sources and made significant contributions in the field of jurisprudence of traditions (*fiqh al-hadees*).

He wrote a book titled **Eesaal ila Fahm al-Khisal al-Jaami’ah li Jumal Shara’i al-Islam fi al-Wajib wa al-Halal wa al-Haram wa al-Sunnah wa al-Ijma** in which he included the opinions of the Companions (*sahaaba*), the Followers (*tabe’een*), and those who came after them (*tab’ tabe’een*) from the Imams of the Muslims, on jurisprudential matters, clarifying the arguments for and against each group. This is a large book. He also has the book **al-Ihkam li Usul**

al-Ahkam, known for its depth and presentation of proofs, and **al-Fasl fi al-Milal wa al-Ahwaa wa al-Nihal**, as well as **Kitab fi al-Ijma wa Masa'ilihi** arranged by jurisprudential chapters, and **Kitab fi Mara'atib al-Uloom** on the ranks of sciences, how to pursue them, and their interrelationships. He also authored **Izharo Tabdil al-Yahud wa al-Nasara li al-Tawrat wa al-Injil wa Bayano Tanaqud ma Bi-Aydihim**, exposing the alteration of the Torah and Bible by the Jews and Christians, illustrating the contradictions in their scriptures beyond any possible reinterpretation, a topic not previously covered in this way.

Additionally, he wrote **Al-Taqreeb bi Hadd al-Mantiq** and its introduction using common terminology and jurisprudential examples. His method of clarifying and dispelling doubts and refuting charlatans was unique. His teacher in logic was Muhammad Ibn Hasan Mudhaji Qurtubi, known as Ibn Kinani. Ibn Hazm was a writer, poet, and physician with treatises on medicine, and he also authored works in literature. He passed away approximately four hundred years after the Hijra. Ibn Makula mentions this in his **Kitab al-Ikmal** under the entry for 'Kinani' citing Abu Ubaidillah Humaidi. Ibn Hazm had a small book called **Nuqat al-Uroos** that includes various rare and strange things, and it is very beneficial.

Ibn Bashkuwal said about him, 'Abu Muhammad was the most comprehensive scholar of the people of Andalusia in the sciences of Islam, with the widest breadth of knowledge, and the greatest mastery in linguistics, eloquence, poetry, and familiarity with historical narratives and events.' His son Abu Raafe Fazl said that he possessed four hundred volumes written in his own hand, amounting to approximately eighty thousand pages.

Humaidi writes, 'We have not seen anyone like him in the qualities he combined i.e. intelligence, quick memory, nobility of character, and piety. I have not seen anyone faster than him in composing poetry on the spot.' He then recited a verse by him:

Even if I depart with my body, my soul will forever remain

with you.

For there is a subtle meaning to vision, as Moses longed for direct sight.

And another:

There is one who blames me for being captivated by beauty,

Who lengthens his reprimand, saying:

“How can you be slain by the beauty of a face that has appeared,

When you’ve not seen anything else or known the full form?”

So I replied to him: ‘You have exaggerated in your unjust criticism,

And I have an extensive rebuttal if I choose to give it.

Do you not see that I am of the Zahirite school,

Holding firm to what is apparent until proof arises?’

Humaidi also narrated another verse of his:

We stayed together for a moment and then departed,

But the longing heart gains nothing from a brief stay.

As if there had been no meeting at all,

When separation scattered what had once united.

There were debates and exchanges between him and Abu al-Walid Sulaiman Baji, which are extensive to detail. He was often critical of the early scholars, and hardly any were spared from his criticism. As a result, hearts turned away from him, and he became a target for the jurists of his time, who disliked him and rejected his views. They agreed on declaring him misguided, criticized him harshly, warned rulers of his potential to cause discord, and discouraged the common people from approaching or learning from him. Thus, the rulers banished him from their lands until he reached the wilderness of Labla, where he passed away in the late afternoon on a Sunday in Shaban, 456 A.H. It is said that he died in the village of Mont Lishm, his own village. His birth was on a Wednesday after dawn and before

sunrise in Ramazan of 384 A.H., as mentioned by Ibn Saeed.’

Abu al-Abbas Ibn Arif said, ‘The tongue of Ibn Hazm and the sword of Hajjaj Ibn Yusuf Saqafi are like twin brothers’ referring to Ibn Hazm’s frequent criticisms of scholars. Ibn Khallikan concluded, ‘I say this was due to his strict adherence to following the faith and avoidance of innovation. He found that many of the scholars were blind imitators, clinging to their teachers like monks, rejecting sound traditions, abandoning the Book of Allah, and holding only to the secondary branches of ijtiḥād (independent reasoning). He thus freed his tongue in reproaching them. If his intentions were sincere, Allah willing, it will not harm him.’

For this reason, Shaikh al-Akbar Ibn Arabi said in the 223rd chapter of **Futuhāt al-Makkiyyah**, ‘The ultimate connection is that a thing becomes the essence of what is manifested, without knowing that it is so. I saw the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) in a dream, embracing Abu Muhammad Ibn Hazm the scholar. They united and became one such that I saw only one person, who was the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.)’ He expressed this as ‘*the union.*’ And what has been said on this matter is indeed fitting:

*A detractor imagined our meeting was at night,
And so he set out to separate us.
I embraced him until we became one in our embrace,
And when he came to us, he saw nothing but one.*

A similar Persian verse says:

*The pull of union between us is so great,
That the observer came and asked, ‘What is the sign of you and me?’*

May Allah grant us a share of this union in this world and the Hereafter!

Ibn Hazm’s father, who was a minister in the Aamiriyyah government and known for his knowledge, eloquence, and virtue, died in 402 A.H. His son Ibn Hazm said that his father recited to him during some of

his advice:

If you desire to live a wealthy life,

Then always be content with less than you seek.

Ibn Hazm had a learned son named Abu Raafe Fazl, who served Mu'tamid Ibn Abbad, ruler of Seville and other Andalusian regions. Abu Raafe died alongside his patron Mu'tamid in the Battle of Zalaca on a Friday in mid-Rajab of 479 A.H.

Labla is a town in Andalusia, while Mont Lishm is a village in the territory of Labla, where Ibn Hazm had property and frequently visited. May Allah have mercy on him!"

The criticism of Hadees-e-Iqtida by Allamah Burhan al-Deen Obaidullah Farghani, commentator of Minhaj al-Baizawi, and his biography

Eighthly: Allamah Burhan al-Deen Obaidullah Ibn Muhammad Abri Farghani, one of the distinguished and prominent scholars of the Ahle Tasannun school, explicitly declared **Hadees-e-Iqtida** as fabricated. He countered and insulted those who used it as proof and those who argued for it. He eloquently articulated his critique in **Durar al-Ghurur**. In **Sharh-o-Minhaj al-Baizawi**, an old manuscript in Arabic, which is present with me, he writes, "And it has been said: The consensus of the two Shaikhs is authoritative, as the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) said, 'Follow those who come after me: Abu Bakr and Umar.' The Messenger (s.a.w.a.) commanded us to follow them, and commands imply obligation, so opposition to them is forbidden. We mean nothing by the authority of their consensus except that. However, the response is that this narration is fabricated, as we have clarified in **Sharh al-Tawaale'**. Even if we were to accept its authenticity, it would be opposed by the saying of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), 'My companions are like the stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be rightly guided.' This implies the obligation of following each of them, yet it is unanimously agreed that it is not obligatory."

This passage clearly and explicitly conveys glad tidings that the esteemed scholar Allamah Abri, a figure of immense stature and insight, undertook great efforts to dismantle the influence of those who spread corruption and turmoil. With explicit clarity, he exposed the fabrications of this baseless and unfounded lie, decisively affirming the artificial and concocted nature of this despicable fabrication. With utmost fairness and commitment to avoiding partiality, he emphasized the rejection, disgrace, weakness, criticism, and damaged credibility of this odious slander and dreadful lie, embedding this truth firmly in the minds of those who seek understanding. May Allah reward him generously on behalf of us and all Muslims, as he cast this lie and slander to the lowest of levels!

The high status and elevated rank of Allamah Abri among scholars of Rijal (narrators) and critics are far too great to be fully detailed here. Therefore, a selection of their statements, along with clarification and explanation, will be presented here.

Shaikh Jamal al-Deen Abd al-Rahim Ibn Hasan Ibn Ali Isnawi Shafe'i stated in "**Tabaqaat al-Shafe'iyyah**", "The noble Burhan al-Deen Obaidullah Hashmi Husaini, famous as Abri was one of the prominent figures in the fields of theology (*'ilm al-kalam*) and rational sciences. He possessed a significant share of knowledge in various sciences, and authored well-known works, including a commentary on Baizawi's book (or books), al-Ghayaah al-Quswa in jurisprudence, al-Minhaj, al-Misbah, and al-Tawaale'. He lived in Sultanabad before moving to Tabriz, where he passed away on 13th Rajab in the year 743 A.H.¹"

From this passage, it is evident that Ebari was one of the distinguished figures in theology (*'ilm al-kalam*) and rational sciences, possessing an abundant share of other sciences as well. His works were well-known, and Ibn Hajar Asqalani mentioned in **Durar al-Kamina fi A'yan al-Mi'ah al-Thamina**, "Obaidullah Ibn Muhammad Hashimi Husaini Faryabi (or al-Farghani) known as Abri was knowledgeable in

¹ Tabaqaat al-Shafe'iyyah, vol. 2, p. 108, No. 855

the two fundamentals (theology and jurisprudence) and commented on the works of Qazi Nasir al-Deen Baizawi, including **al-Minhaj**, **al-Mataale'**, **al-Ghaayah al-Quswa** in jurisprudence, and **al-Misbah**. He resided in Sultanabad and later Tabriz, where he served as its judge. Isnawi mentioned him in **Tabaqat al-Shafe'iyah**, and it is said that he taught both schools of thought, initially being a Hanafi. Zahabi mentioned him in **al-Mushtabah** under Ebari, saying, 'A great scholar of our time, with widely known works.' He passed away in the month of Rajab in the year 743 A.H. I say, 'I saw in the handwriting of some Persian scholars that he passed away on the first of Zu al-Hijjah of the same year, which is more accurate.'

He was described as "the noble Sharif Murtaza, Chief Judge, esteemed by the Sultans, famous across lands, highly regarded in all fields, a refuge for the weak, and known for his humility and fairness. Toward the end of his life, he inclined toward religious sciences and taught **al-Masabeeh** in the central mosque to both private and public audiences, using eloquent, clear language accessible to all. He died in Tabriz, where famine was prevalent at the time. Famine plagued the lands of Iran in Khorasan, Iraq, Fars, Azerbaijan, and Diyarbakir, to the extent that it was beyond description. Fathers ate their sons, and sons their fathers; human flesh was openly sold in the markets. This lasted for six months, and the people of Tabriz were among the least affected by it.

From the above, it is understood that Ebari was a master in two schools of thought and provided explanations of the works of Qazi Baizawi. Due to his vast expertise, he taught the books of both the Hanafi and Shafi'i schools. Zahabi mentioned him in the book **Mushtaba al-Nisbah**, adopting a tone of veneration, respect, and reverence, thereby indicating that he was a great scholar of his time, and his works circulated widely.

It is also clear that some Persian scholars, after mentioning the date of Ebari's death, praised him with admiration and respect, describing him as noble, esteemed, Chief judge, and respected by rulers. He was

renowned across regions, pointed to in all fields, a refuge for the weak, and known for his humility and fairness. Toward the end of his life, he inclined toward religious engagement, offering interpretations of the book **Masabeeh** in the congregational mosque to a general and specific audience in eloquent, fluent expressions that were easy to understand.

In **Mirat al-Jinan**, Abu Muhammad Abdullah Ibn As'ad Yafei writes, "In the year 743 A.H., the eminent Imam and Chief Judge Obaidullah Ibn Muhammad Ebari Farghani, the brilliant Hanafi scholar and theologian, passed away. His intellect and debates were proverbial. He was an expert and multifaceted Imam from whom students graduated. He knew both the Hanafi and Shafi'i schools and taught and authored works in both. In Usul (principles) and maqulaat (rational sciences), he held a unique leadership. His compositions include **Sharh al-Ghaayah** in Shafi'i jurisprudence, **Sharh al-Tawaale'**, **Sharh al-Misbah**, and **Sharh al-Minhaj** by Baizawi, along with other works, dictations, and annotations. He held the position of judge in Tabriz and its territories until his death and was considered the teacher of teachers in his time."

From the above, it can be understood that Ebari was an eminent Imam, a distinguished scholar, a Chief Judge, and an adept disputant whose intellect and debate skills were proverbial. He was a complete guide, and scholars from the Ahle Tasannun school achieved mastery under his expert instruction. These scholars advanced from the level of students to full independence and excellence. He taught the books of both the Hanafi and Shafi'i schools, and by authoring works in both schools, he bestowed a great service upon their adherents. In the fields of Usul (principles) and maqulaat (rational sciences), he held a unique leadership and was regarded as the teacher of teachers of his time.

Taqi al-Deen Abu Bakr Ibn Ahmad Ibn Qazi Shahab Asadi, in **Tabaqat Shafi'iyyah**, writes, "Obaidullah Ibn Muhammad Sharif Burhan al-Deen Husaini Farghani, known as Ebari, was the judge of

Tabriz, a person who mastered various sciences in both the fundamental and rational sciences. He had renowned writings, resided in Sultanabad for a time and then moved to Tabriz. He wrote commentaries on Baizawi's books **al-Minhaj**, **al-Ghayah al-Quswa**, **al-Misbah**, and **al-Mataale'**. He is mentioned by Isnawi in his **Tabaqat**, though Hafiz Ibn Iraqi in **Zail al-Ebar** who said he was a Hanafi who also taught the Mazhab (school) of Abu Hanifa and Shafi'i and wrote works on both. Zahabi mentioned him in **Mushtabah al-Nisbah**, describing him as a great scholar of our time, who passed away in Tabriz in Rajab, in the year 743 A.H. The name Ebari is pronounced with a *kasrah* under the 'ain and a sukoon on the ba'; beyond this, I am unsure of what he is attributed to (in his name)."

From this text, we can understand that the scholar Ebari was well-versed in diverse sciences, skilled in multiple fields, had famous writings, and he provided commentary on al-Baydawi's books. Due to his expertise, he taught in the schools of both Abu Hanifa and Shafi'i and authored works on both schools. Zahabi, in **Mushtabih al-Nisbah**, remarked that he was a prominent scholar in his time, which is high praise.

Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Qahiri Shafi'i, known as Ibn Imam al-Kaamiliyyah, in **Sharh Minhaj**, a manuscript beautifully written in his own hand, which is present before this humble individual, pens, "The foundations of this book that I compiled and structured are based on the books of the following prominent Imams: Shaikh Jamal al-Deen Isnawi, Ebari, Halwai, and Qazi Azud al-Deen in **Sharh Mukhtasar Ibn al-Hajib**, Shaikh Sa'd al-Deen, Shaikh Saif al-Deen Abhori, and Shaikh Wali Iraqi in **Sharh Jam' al-Jawaame'**, Shaikh Badr al-Deen al-Zarkashi in **Takhreej Ahaadees al-Minhaaj wa al-Mukhtasar**, and others. May Allah be pleased with them all and us through them in this world and the hereafter. Ameen, and all praise belongs to Allah, Lord of the worlds."

This quote clearly indicates that the scholar Ebari was among the prominent Imams and scholars, alongside figures like Isnawi, Halwai,

Qazi Azud al-Deen, Shaikh Sa'd al-Deen, Shaikh Saif al-Deen Abhori, Shaikh Wali al-Deen Iraqi, and Shaikh Badr al-Deen Zarkashi. Ibn al-Imam al-Kaamiliyyah, due to his great admiration and faith, seeks Allah's favour for himself through the noble Ebari and other distinguished scholars. With this, he aspires to affirm the great dignity and high status of Ebari, who was exceptionally knowledgeable.

In **al-Badr al-Taale' bi-Mahaasene man ba'da al-Qarn al-Taase'**, Qazi Muhammad Ibn Ali Ibn Muhammad Shaukani San'ani writes, "Sayyid Obaidullah Ibn Muhammad Hashemi Husaini, known as Ebari...was mentioned by Zahabi in **al-Mushtabah**, where he described him as a great scholar of our time with widely known works. Isnawi, in **Tabaqat al-Shafi'iyyah**, stated that he was originally a Hanafi before becoming a Shafi'i, and he taught both schools. A description by someone from his region portrays him as the Chief Judge, respected by rulers, well-known across lands, regarded as a master in all fields, a protector of the weak, and known for his humility and fairness. In his later years, he devoted himself to religious studies. His works include commentaries on Baizawi's books **al-Minhaj, al-Mataale', al-Ghaayah, al-Misbah, and Sharh al-Masabeeh**. He lived in Sultaniyyah and later in Tabriz, where he held a judicial position. His expressions were eloquent and easily understood. He passed away in Tabriz in the month of Rajab, 743 A.H., during the year of extreme famine in Khorasan, Iraq, Fars, Azerbaijan, and Diyar Bakr. The famine was so severe that people resorted to cannibalism, openly selling human flesh in markets, which continued for six months, as reported in **al-Durar** by Ibn Hajar, quoting some prominent Persian scholars."

From this passage, the illustrious virtues and remarkable accomplishments of Ebari become evident, as highlighted by Ibn Hajar in **al-Durar al-Kaminah**, which is clear to those with insightful understanding.

The criticism by Hafiz Shams al-Deen Muhammad Zahabi, the author of Mizan al-Itidal, of Hadees-e-Iqteda.

Ninthly: Shams al-Deen Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Zahabi, one of the major critics and prominent scholars of Ahle Tasannun, and the author of Tuhfa (Muhaddis Dehlavi) addressed him as Imam al-Hadees and relied on his words while refuting **Hadees-e-Tair**. In **Hadees-e-Iqteda** narrated from Ibn Umar, he began to criticize and condemn it repeatedly, exposing its falsity and insignificance time and again. He writes in **Mizan al-Itidal**, “Ahmad Ibn Sulaih narrated from Zu al-Nun Misri from Maalik from Naafe’ from Ibn Umar regarding the tradition, ‘Follow those who come after me.’ **This is incorrect, and Ahmad cannot be relied upon.**¹”

Again, Zahabi chronicles in **Mizan al-Itidal**, “Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Ghalib Baaeli, known as Ghulam Khalil, narrated from Ismail Ibn Abi Owais, Shaiban, and Qurrat Ibn Habib. Ibn Kamil, Ibn Samak, and a group narrated from him. He was among the notable ascetics in Baghdad. Ibn Adi said, ‘I heard Abu Abdillah Nahaawandi say, ‘I asked Ghulam Khalil, ‘What are these emotional tales you narrate?’ He replied, ‘We created them to soften the hearts of the common folk!’ Abu Dawud remarked, ‘I fear he may be the deceiver of Baghdad!’ Daraqutni said, ‘He is abandoned (in traditions) (*matruk al-hadees*)’ and Khatib mentioned, ‘He died in Rajab, in the year 275 A.H., and was transported in a coffin to Basra, where a dome was built over him. He was known for extensive knowledge, dyed his hair with henna, and survived on a diet of plain beans.’ Ibn Adi noted, ‘His matter is evident.’”

Abu Jafar Qazi in Basra reported from him, saying, ‘Ahmad Ibn Muhammad narrated to us from Shaiban, who informed us from Rabee’ Ibn Badr from Abu Harun from Abu Saeed, that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘Whoever kisses a boy with lust, Allah curses him; if he embraces him, he will be struck with whips of fire; and if he

¹ Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 1, p. 105, No. 411

commits an immoral act with him, he will enter the Fire.’

Another one of his fabrications was saying, ‘Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Umari narrated to us from Maalik from Naafe’ from Ibn Umar that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘Follow those who come after me, Abu Bakr and Umar.’ This is falsely attributed to Maalik. Abu Bakr Naqqash commented, ‘He is weak.’ Abu Jafar Ibn Shaeri recounted, ‘When Ghulam Khalil narrated from Bakr bin Isa from Abu Awaanah, I asked him, ‘Who is this person? Ahmad Ibn Hanbal narrated from him, and he is from an earlier period that you did not see.’ He pondered over this, and I suggested, ‘Perhaps it’s another person with the same name?’ He remained silent, but the next day, he told me, ‘O Aba Jafar! I checked last night in Basra among those I met who were named Bakr bin Isa, and I found sixty men.’¹“

Yet again, Zahabi writes in **Mizan al-Itidal**, “Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Ibn Umar Ibn Qasim Ibn Abdillah Ibn Ubaidillah Ibn Aasim Ibn Umar Ibn Khattab Adawi Umari. Aqili mentioned him and said, ‘His traditions are not authentic, and he is not known for transmitting traditions.’ Ahmad Ibn Khalil narrated to us, saying, ‘Ibrahim Ibn Muhammad Halabi narrated to me from Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Ibn Umar bin Qasim, who reported from Maalik from Naafe’ from Ibn Umar with a missing link in the chain of narrators, ‘Follow those who come after me.’ This narration has no basis in the traditions of Maalik; rather, it is known from the traditions of Huzaifah Ibn Yaman.’ Daraqutni Basri said, ‘This person narrates fabrications attributed to Maalik,’ and Ibn Mandah said, ‘He has unreliable narrations.’²“

From these numerous statements, which contain insightful clarifications, it becomes evident to the discerning observer and perceptive critic that the so-called narration ‘*Follow those who come after me (Abu Bakr and Umar)*’ is entirely weak, fabricated, and among the fabrications of people with bias and enmity (towards Ahle Bait (a.s.)).

¹ Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 1, p. 141, No. 557

² Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 3, p. 610, No. 7812

It is worth mentioning that Shams al-Deen Zahabi, in his book **Talkhees al-Mustadrak**, has also criticized and discredited **Hadees-e-Iqteda**, considering its chain of transmission weak, attributing it to the people of oppression and enmity. On page 105, the narration of Ibn Masud has been severely criticized, pouring salt on the wounds of those who argue and cite it as evidence, as is mentioned in **Talkhees al-Mustadrak**, according to what has been transmitted from him.

“From Yahya Ibn Salamah Ibn Kuhail from his father from Abu al-Za’raa from Ibn Mas’ud from a missing link in the chain of narrators (*marfu*), ‘Follow those who come after me: Abu Bakr and Umar.’ ‘Be guided by the guidance of Ammar’ and ‘Adhere to the covenant of Ibn Masud.’ I say, ‘Its chain of transmission is very weak.’¹“

Allamah Manavi, in *Faiz al-Qadeer*, in his explanation of **Hadees-e-Iqteda** attributed to Ibn Masud, writes, “And it was narrated by “K” (meaning Haakim) from Ibn Masud with the aforementioned wordings. Zahabi said, ‘Its chain of transmission is very weak.’

The criticism of Hadees-e-Iqteda by Hafiz Shahab al-Deen Ahmad Ibn Hajar Asqalani

Tenthly: Shahab al-Deen Ahmad Ibn Ali Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in demonstrating the weakness and insignificance of **Hadees-e-Iqteda**, followed Allamah Zahabi. In addition to affirming and approving his words in **Mizan al-Itidal**, he frequently condemned this obviously flawed narration, exposing the unreliability of its transmitters repeatedly, strengthening and reinforcing his objective in the best expression. As he said in **Lisan al-Mizan**, “Ahmad Ibn Sulaih, from Zu al-Nun Misri from Maalik from Naafe’ from Ibn Umar with the tradition “Follow those who come after me: Abu Bakr and Umar.” This is an error, and Ahmad is not reliable.”²“

Again, Ibn Hajar Asqalani writes in **Lisan al-Mizan**, “Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Ghalib Bahili, known as Ghulam Khalil, narrated

¹ Talkhees al-Mustadrak, vol. 3 p.75

² Lisan al-Mizan, vol. 1, p. 188, No. 596

from Ismail Ibn Abi Owais, Shaiban, and Qurrah Ibn Habib from Ibn Kamil, Ibn al-Sammaak, and a group. He was among the notable ascetics in Baghdad. Ibn Adi said, 'I heard Abu Abdillah Nahawandi say, 'I asked Ghulam Khalil, 'What are these tender fables that you narrate?' He replied, 'We fabricated them to soften the hearts of the common people.' Abu Dawood said, 'I fear he was the charlatan of Baghdad.' Daraqutni said, 'He is abandoned (*matruk*).' Khatib said, 'He died in Rajab 275 A.H., was transported in a coffin to Basra, and a dome was built over him. He had a great deal of knowledge, dyed his beard with henna, and lived on pure fava beans.' Ibn Adi said, 'His case is clear.' Abu Jafar Qazi narrated to us in Basra, saying, 'Ahmad Ibn Muhammad narrated to us, saying, 'Shaiban narrated to us, saying, 'Rabee' Ibn Badr narrated to us from Abu Harun from Abu Saeed who said, 'Whoever kisses a boy with desire, Allah curses him; if he embraces him, he will be struck with whips of fire; and if he commits an indecency with him, he will enter the hell-fire.' Among his misfortunes, he said, 'Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Umari narrated to us, saying, 'Maalik narrated to us from Naafe' from Ibn Umar, who said, 'The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, 'Follow those who come after me: Abu Bakr and Umar.' This (report) is falsely attributed to Maalik.' Abu Bakr Naqqash said, 'It is very weak.' Abu Jafar Ibn Shaeri said, 'When Ghulam Khalil narrated from Bakr Ibn Isa from Abu Awaanah, I said to him, 'O Aba Abdillah! Who is this man? Ahmad Ibn Hanbal narrated from him, and he is from an earlier time that you did not meet.' He pondered over this, and then I scared him, so I said, 'Perhaps it is someone else with the same name?' He was silent, but the next day he told me, 'O Aba Jafar! I looked yesterday for everyone named Bakr Ibn Isa whom I met in Basra, and I found sixty men.' Haakim said, 'I heard Shaikh Abu Bakr Ibn Ishaq say, 'Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Ghalib is someone I do not doubt to be a liar.' Abu Ahmad Haakim said, 'His traditions are too numerous to count, and he is clearly weak.' Abu Dawood said, 'His traditions were presented to me, and I examined 400 of them; all their chains and texts were lies. He narrated fabricated traditions from trustworthy

people, as the judge Ahmad Ibn Kamil narrated to us about his piety and asceticism. We seek refuge in Allah from piety that brings its possessor to such a state.’ Ibn Hibban said, ‘He would pretend asceticism, but narration of traditions was not his field. He would narrate whatever he was asked. They brought him a copy of **Sahih Bukhari** with a chain from Ibn Abi Owais from his brother from Sulaiman Ibn Bilal, and it contained eighty traditions. He narrated all of them from Ibn Abi Owais, though he had not heard even one.’ He said, ‘I heard Ahmad Ibn Amr Ibn Jabir in Ramla say, ‘I was with Ismail Ibn Ishaq Qazi, and Ghulam Khalil entered. In the middle of their conversation, Ghulam Khalil said, ‘Do you remember, O Judge, when we were in Madina in the year 224 A.H., writing together?’ Ismail turned to us and said, ‘He lies a little; I was not there that year!’¹⁴

Yet again, Ibn Hajar Asqalani writes in **Lisan al-Mizan**, “Salim, Abu Ala, the freed-slave of Ibrahim Taai, no one narrated from him except Abd al-Samad Tanuri.’ Aqili mentioned him and said, ‘Muradi narrated from Amr Ibn Huraym from Rabee’ from Abu Abdillah, a man from the companions of Huzaifah, may Allah be pleased with him, ‘Follow those who come after me’ (till the end of the narration).’ There is a story in it, mentioned (or noted), concerning the differences regarding Rabee’ on this matter. Ibn Jarud weakened him, and Ibn Hibban mentioned him in al-Siqaat (The Trustworthy Narrators) and said, ‘He narrates from ‘Amr Ibn Haram.’”

Once again, Ibn Hajar Asqalani chronicles in **Lisan al-Mizan**, “Muhammad Ibn Abdullah Ibn Umar Ibn Qasim Ibn Abdillah Ibn Ubaidillah Ibn Asim Ibn Umar Ibn Khattab Adawi Umari—Aqili mentioned him and said, ‘His traditions are not authentic, and he is not known for transmitting traditions.’ Ahmad Ibn Khalil narrated to us, saying, ‘Ibrahim Ibn Muhammad Halabi narrated to us, saying, ‘Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Ibn Umar Ibn Qasim narrated to me, saying, ‘Maalik narrated to me from Naafe’ from Ibn Umar as a tradition with

¹ Lisan al-Mizan, vol. 1, p. 272, No. 832

a missing link (*hadees-e-marfu*) , ‘Follow those who come after me: Abu Bakr and Umar.’ This has no basis in the traditions of Maalik but is instead known from the traditions of Huzaifah Ibn Yaman.’ Daraqutni said, ‘Umari narrates falsehoods from Maalik.’ Ibn Mandah said, ‘He has strange narrations.’ Aqili, after presenting it, said, ‘This tradition is objectionable and is baseless.’ Daraqutni also reported it from the narration of Ahmad Khalili Damari, with his chain of transmission and says, ‘It is not authentic, and this Umari is weak.’ He also reported it from Abu Abbas Ibn Uqdah from Yunus Ibn Saabiq, who said, ‘Muhammad Ibn Khalid Umari narrated to us, saying, ‘Maalik narrated to us with this chain. He indicated that Muhammad Ibn Khalid Umari’s father’s name is disputed, and it might be someone else. The commentary on Yunus Ibn Saabiq, the teacher of Ibn Uqdah, will be discussed later. Daraqutni also recorded for him a narration from Abd al-Aziz Ibn Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Ibn Ubaid Ibn Aqil from him from Maalik with this chain of transmission, a tradition about going to the Eid prayers on foot and returning on horseback. When he intended to go, he would sit in the mosque until sunrise, after which he would depart, saying ‘Allahu Akbar’ and those with him would repeat it softly.’ Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Umari said, ‘This is a fabricated tradition; he narrates falsehoods from Maalik.’¹“

From these precise expressions and valuable insights, the exposure of the flaws and the unveiling of the defects of **Hadees-e-Iqteda** reach the point of certainty. To such an extent that the falsehood and deception of its narrators become fully evident and clear, leaving no need for further clarification.

The eleventh point is that Shaikh al-Islam Ahmad Ibn Yahya Ibn Muhammad Hafiz Harawi Shafei, in his book **al-Durr al-Nazid**, explicitly refuted the authenticity of **Hadees-e-Iqteda**, listing it among the fabricated narrations with utmost criticism. As stated in the mentioned book, page 108, he describes these fabrications with utter disdain, saying:

¹ Lisan al-Mizan, vol. 5, p. 237, No. 826

“Among the fabrications of Ahmad Jurjani, ‘Whoever says the Qur’an is created is a disbeliever’ ‘Faith increases and decreases,’ ‘Hearing is not like witnessing’ ‘Eggplants are a cure for every ailment’ ‘Returning a single daaniq (coin) from illicit earnings is better in the sight of Allah than seventy accepted pilgrimages’ etc. Similarly, ‘Follow after me, Abu Bakr and Umar’ is also false. ‘On the Day of Resurrection, Allah will manifest to all creation generally and will manifest to Abu Bakr specifically’ is false too!

In summary, after this luminous clarification, as clear as the midday sun, it becomes apparent that the Hadees-e-Iqtida is so utterly false, corrupt, and devoid of any value that finding anything comparable in the clear fabrications of fabricators and the disgraceful falsehoods of those who invent is nearly impossible. It is rarely matched in the tales of storytellers and the fantasies of those who are prone to lies and deceit. Why should it be any different, when leading critics and prominent critics among the Ahle Tasannun, as you know, have acknowledged its weakness and worthlessness, openly opting for the path of refutation and the method of disregarding it with the steps of justice.

It is, therefore, truly astonishing how Shah Sahab, despite all these explicit acknowledgments and sound criticisms from renowned scholars and esteemed researchers, still insists on this fabricated tradition and twisted narration, blatantly turning a blind eye to the truth. By claiming its widespread fame and consecutiveness, he seeks to outdo Musaylamah and Sajjaah! One of the most peculiar points of innovation is that Shah Sahab did not content himself with merely mentioning the Hadees-e-Iqtida in the main text of his book but went as far as to brazenly include it in the margins as well. In the margin, he writes, “The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a) said, ‘Follow after me, Abu Bakr and Umar, for they are the extended rope of Allah. Whoever holds on to them has held onto the firmest unbreakable handhold.’ Tabarani reported it from Abu Darda, and it has other chains as well.

The weakness and disreputability of the Hadees-e-Iqtida through the

chain of Abu Darda, to which Shah Sahab has held on, is well established. This chain is filled with flaws and has been severely criticized by prominent scholars of traditions. The transmission through Abu Darda is regarded as unreliable and weak, with many scholars categorizing it as fabricated (*mauzu*) due to questionable narrators in its chain.

Moreover, the narration itself is seen as inconsistent with verified sayings and events, leading notable critics among Ahle Tasannun scholars to reject its authenticity. They assert that such fabrications contradict the historical context of the Holy Prophet's (s.a.w.a.) life and teachings, where the emphasis on succession was neither vague nor left to individual interpretation. Hence, Shah Sahab's reliance on this specific narration, especially considering the consensus on its dubious nature, reflects a selective approach, disregarding the critical assessments and consensus of eminent scholars of traditions who have openly classified this narration as spurious.

Therefore, the authenticity of the narration transmitted via Abu Darda, as cited by Shah Sahab, lacks credibility and fails to meet the rigorous standards of validation of traditions.

The statement regarding the criticized and discredited nature of the Hadees-e-Iqtida through the chain of Abu Darda, which Shah Sahab has relied upon, highlights the significant weaknesses and flaws within this narration. Scholars have pointed out serious issues with the chain of transmission involving Abu Darda, labelling it as unreliable and defective. This narration has often been regarded as fabricated due to the presence of questionable narrators within its chain, and its authenticity has been widely rejected by reputable critics of traditions.

Furthermore, leading scholars of traditions have emphasized that this narration does not align with verified teachings and events associated with the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.). They argue that such narrations conflict with established historical contexts, making the claim of leadership for Abu Bakr and Umar in this manner both inconsistent

and dubious. Consequently, Shah Sahab's reliance on this tradition—despite its well-known criticisms—appears selective and overlooks the critical evaluations made by respected scholars, who have deemed this narration baseless and unauthentic.

It is entirely evident that the Hadees-e-Iqtida, in all its forms and aspects, is invalid, corrupted, and worthless, as is clear to anyone who examines the volume on the Hadees-e-Tair (the Tradition of the Bird). Recently, it has also become apparent in this context, thanks to Allah, the source of all good. However, specifically regarding the chain through Abu Darda, which Shah Sahab has considered a precious treasure and the “fruit of the West,” it is, based on Shah Sahab's own insightful evaluations, highly criticized and discredited. According to Shah Sahab's esteemed investigations, reliance on it leads to the utmost loss and disappointment, for several reasons:

First, it is unknown which chain of transmission Tabarani used to narrate this tradition. Unless a chain is found for the tradition, according to Shah Sahab, the tradition is akin to an untethered camel in the eyes of the Sunnis—no attention is paid to it. Shah Sahab states in this same book, **Tuhfa**, when addressing the second criticism against Abu Bakr regarding the curse of the Messenger (s.a.w.a.) upon those who abandoned Usama's army, “And some Persian writers who consider themselves among the scholars of traditions among the Sunnis and have mentioned this sentence in their works—this does not suffice as proof against the Sunnis. The reliability of a tradition in the eyes of the Sunnis requires finding it in the accredited works of the scholars of traditions, along with an authentication of its soundness. A tradition without a chain is like an untethered camel to them, to which they pay no attention at all.”

Thus, it becomes clear that this tradition, if its chain of transmission is not established, is like an untethered camel, and the Sunnis do not pay any attention to it at all.

Secondly, even if the chain of transmission for this tradition were to be found, Shah Sahab has clarified that the reliability of a tradition

among the Ahle Tasannun requires not only that it be in the authenticated books of traditional scholars but also that it be explicitly declared authentic. This tradition has never been authenticated, and therefore, in the eyes of discerning individuals, it lacks credibility and validity.

Thirdly, Shah Sahab, in the chapter on Imamate in **Tuhfa**, responds to **Hadees-e-Tashbeeh**, stating, “It is a well-established principle among the Sunnis that if a tradition is narrated by some prominent scholars in a book, and they have not explicitly committed to the authenticity of everything within that book—such as in the works of Bukhari, Muslim, and other authors of the **Sahih** collections—and neither the author of that book nor any other trustworthy scholar of traditions has explicitly declared that particular tradition is authentic, it cannot be used as evidence.

Although **Tabarani** included the **Hadees-e-Iqtida** through the narration of Abu Darda in his **al-Mojam al-Kabi** (as mentioned in **Kanz al-Ummal**) Tabarani did not, like Bukhari, Muslim, and other authors of the **Sahih** collections, commit to the authenticity of everything in his book. Furthermore, neither Tabarani nor any other reliable scholars of traditions have declared this tradition authentic. In fact, no scholar—reliable or otherwise—has ever made this false claim. Thus, it is definitively established, as the distinguished respondent has stated, that this tradition cannot be used as evidence in any way.

Fourthly, Shah Sahab, in **Risalah Usul al-Hadees**, in his discussion on the third category of traditions, quotes his father that the works of Tabarani are among those collections whose authors did not guarantee the authenticity of their contents. These books do not enjoy the same level of fame and acceptance as the first and second ranks, and they contain authentic, good, weak, and even fabricated narrations. Furthermore, the narrators in these works vary: some are described as reliable, some obscure, and some unknown. Most of the narrations in these collections are not acted upon by jurists, and, in fact, consensus often exists against them.

Therefore, if, according to Shah Sahab’s insights, Tabarani’s works are in this condition, how could the mere presence of Abu Darda’s narration within them be considered a reason for credibility and reliability, or a valid basis for reliance and citation among their adherents?

In any case, it is truly astonishing that this cunning respondent, despite his keen intellect and insight—qualities that are a source of pride for his followers and a basis for admiration among his devotees—has neglected his own profound conclusions and solid research, which equate the Hadees-e-Iqtida through the chain of Abu Darda with mere dust. Instead, he has chosen this specific route, one of the discredited and criticized paths of this tradition, and shamelessly and boldly highlighted it, thereby disgracing himself. By claiming, “It has other chains,” he has incited his vile associates and base followers to oppose the truth, unaware that this chain, besides being the weakest and most dubious aspect of the Hadees-e-Iqtida, reveals its fabricated nature through every phrase and word, causing any discerning observer to burst into laughter.

Do you not see that the defeated fabricator and conceited forger, in crafting this blatantly deceptive narrative, has twisted the rope of falsehood, with arrogance as its guide, diverting from the accepted truth to a hired falsehood? Like the proverb, “more deceptive than a rope-maker’s apprentice,” he has fallen into the pit of error and misguidance by his own doing. In weaving and contriving this distorted narration, he has taken his boldness to the furthest extreme, praising the two idols of Quraysh with terms like “the extended rope” and “the firmest handhold”! This clearly reveals his own affiliation with the chain of the accursed Satan and the followers of the fire of hell, a fact evident to all.

Indeed, this deluded individual has become a laughingstock among the wise for his lies and ignorance, as “no evil scheme recoils except on its perpetrator!”

Do you know what compels Shah Sahab to mention this blatantly

divisive and deceptive narrative? It is because the rejected forger and banished fabricator, in this narration, has described the two Shaikhs (Abu Bakr and Umar) as “the extended rope of Allah” and declared that holding onto them is akin to holding onto the “firmest handhold which cannot be broken.” He has, by fabricating this, raised flags of brazen audacity and shamelessness through mere fabrication and lies. Consequently, Shah Sahab, enamoured by this falsehood and deception, has willingly embraced it and included it to counter the **Hadees-e-Saqalain**. He has thus trampled upon the Holy Quran, oblivious to the fact that if critics among the people of truth see it, they will undoubtedly, with their own sound reasoning, expose this despicable fabrication and reveal the absurdity of this empty claim.

Such critics will lift the veil from the face of this flawed forger and expose the shameful of his argument, unmasking his base motives and disgraceful intent with their hands. Indeed, it is fitting to recite the following verse about our opponent, who is besotted with this nonsense and falsehood, “**They argue with falsehood to nullify the truth; so, I seized them, and how severe was My punishment!**”¹

Among the shameful and outrageous tactics of Shah Sahab is that, in his attempt to defend the **Hadees-e-Iqtida** and follow the footsteps of those who engage in injustice and aggression, he has quoted certain statements from theologians of his own school, relating them to this narration. These statements, in the most complete and obvious way, reveal not only the lack of modesty among his unfair predecessors but also Shah Sahab’s own immense brazenness. As he writes in the margins of **Hadees-e-Iqtida** quoting **Sharh al-Mawaqef**, “The Shia say, ‘This is a solitary narration (khabar-e-waahid), so it is not permissible to rely upon it in matters requiring certainty. We reply: It is no less than the Hadees-e-Tair or Hadees-e-Manzilah. They claim consecutiveness (tawaatur) for narrations that align with their beliefs, while they dismiss as solitary any narration

¹ Surah Ghaafir (40): Verse 5

that contradict them, which is mere arbitrariness. This claim, therefore, cannot be accepted.”

Since Shah Sahab has made distortions in quoting this passage from Sharh al-Mawaaqef, I will first provide the exact wording from Sharh al- Mawaaqef, and briefly and concisely refute and counter it, aiming to silence and expose the arguments of hostile and boastful opponents without extensive elaboration.

It should be noted that where the author of al-Mawaaqif and its commentator, according to their understanding, attempt to counter the explicit texts on the Imamate of Amirul Momineen Ali Ibn Abi Talib (a.s.) with texts indicating the Imamate of Abu Bakr, the following statement is recorded in Sharh al- Mawaaqef:

“**Sixth**—His (s.a.w.a.) saying, ‘Follow after me Abu Bakr and Umar.’ The lowest level of command is permissibility. The Shia say, ‘This is a solitary narration (khabar-e-waahid), so it is not permissible to rely upon it in matters that require certainty.’ We reply: ‘It is no less than the Hadees-e-Tair, upon which they rely for asserting virtue, as will be mentioned, Allah willing, nor is it less than the Hadees-e-Manzilah, which was previously mentioned. They claim consecutiveness (tawatur) for narrations that support their beliefs, and dismiss as solitary those that contradict them, which is arbitrary. Thus, such a claim cannot be accepted.”

In this response, the author of Sharh al- Mawaaqef attempts to equate the Hadees-e-Iqtida with other narrations used by the Shia to argue for the precedence and unique status of Amirul Momineen (a.s.). However, this approach merely reflects an arbitrary dismissal of the principles of traditions (usul al-hadees) and fails to acknowledge the qualitative and contextual distinctions between these narrations.

Quoting Sharh al-Mawaaqef on Hadees-e-Iqtida, and exposing the corruption and invalidity of its claim through five reasons

To any discerning and skilled observer, the corruption, invalidity, weakness, and worthlessness of this erroneous argument are clear for

numerous reasons:

First: The claim that the Shia response to the Hadees-e-Iqtida is that it is a solitary narration (khabar-e-waahid) is naught but deception and distortion. Anyone familiar with the statements of prominent Shia scholars knows with certainty that they regard this fable-like narration as fabricated, without any doubt and utmost certainty. They have consistently alerted their opponents to its flawed chain and content since ancient times, as anyone who examines **al-Shaafi** by Sayyid al-Murtada (r.a.) or **Minhaj al-Karaamah** by Allamah Hilli (r.a.) will know. And why wouldn't it be so, when the invalidity and insignificance of this fabricated narration have reached the extent that even the esteemed scholars of traditions, prominent researchers, and leading critics of the Sunni tradition themselves acknowledge it, criticizing and dismissing this fabricated tradition and throwing the dust of disgrace upon those who rely on it?

How, then, is it possible for the people of truth to remain silent about establishing its falsification and not clarify its discredit when responding to those who hold it as credible? In summary, the fundamental Shia response to the Hadees-e-Iqtida has always been its criticism and rejection. If anyone has mentioned its solitary nature as a response, it is only for the sake of argument, to silence and refute the opponent's position. This is because, even according to those who support it, this tradition does not exceed the level of a solitary narration, as will soon become evident, Allah willing.

Second: The claim that the Hadees-e-Iqtida is no less reliable than the Hadees-e-Tair is an assertion whose falsehood is as clear as the bright morning to any discerning observer. By the grace of Allah, we have provided, in the volume dedicated to the Hadees-e-Tair, numerous proofs to establish the authenticity of this noble tradition. A skilled observer, through the several arguments—certainly numbering in the hundreds—presented there, can readily see the invalidity of this flawed assertion. These arguments strike at the very core of the claims made by the author of **al-Mawaaqef** and its commentator,

piercing their hearts with utmost precision.

Anyone who has examined the ten introductory benefits in the mentioned volume with certainty knows that the reckless boldness of the author of **al-Mawaaqef** and his commentator in claiming an equivalence between the Hadees-e-Iqtida and the Hadees-e-Tair is a calamity that undermines the very foundation of their sense of justice, like a destructive flood destroying their fairness.

Third: The claim that Hadees-e-Iqtida is no less in value than the **Hadees-e-Manzilat** is even weaker, more corrupt, and more unsound than the previous claim. This is because, praise be to Allah Almighty, we have explained in the volume on **Hadees-e-Manzilat** that the traditional scholars unanimously agree on its authenticity, its multiple chains of transmission, its consecutiveness and definitive origin, as confirmed by the great and esteemed critics among the scholars of Ahle Tasannun. We have explained it in such a way that, even if the Sunni zealots were to fan the flames of jealousy and enmity a thousand times and burn with frustration for a lifetime, they could never bring forth a single accurate word against it. Their only option is to acknowledge its consecutive transmission and definitive authenticity.

Anyone who examines the aforementioned volume, with its numerous points and countless proofs, will see the falsity of this baseless claim by the author of **al-Mawaaqef** and its commentator as clearly as the noon sun. The falsehood and deception of their claim of equating Hadees-e-Iqtida with **Hadees-e-Manzilat**, becomes indisputable and evident, reaching the point of realization without any concealment.

Fourth: The claim suggesting that the people of truth (i.e. the Shias) assert consensus (*tawaatur*) in matters that align with their own beliefs and claim singularity (*aahaad*) in matters contrary to their beliefs is a false statement whose corruption and invalidity are clear and evident to all who have insight. For, by the grace of Allah the Exalted, it is apparent and proven to anyone who studies the works of

our eminent scholars in general and particularly to the reader of the writings of this humble author that any report which our respected companions (may Allah be pleased with them all) have claimed consecutiveness (*tawaatur*) – such as Hadees-e-Ghadeer, Hadees-e-Manzilāt, and others – has unquestionably been established and verified as consecutive (*mutawaatir*) based on the insights provided by the most distinguished scholars and leaders of the opponents. On the other hand, none of the narrations from the Sunnis brought forward to counter the evidence and proofs of the people of truth even reach the lowest level of credibility, let alone achieving consensus or certainty. Thus, attributing arbitrary assertions to the people of truth in this matter is, without doubt, a contradiction to self-evidence and an opposition to reality and truth.

Indeed, it has become a practice among the fanatical and argumentative Sunni scholars to label anything that aligns with their beliefs as consecutive (*tawaatur*). In an act of utter shamelessness and complete lack of modesty, they go so far as to call the definitive proofs and mass-transmitted evidence of the people of truth mere isolated reports (*aaḥaad*). Rather, due to their extreme bias and shallow mindedness, they even pursue ways to cast doubt and disparagement on these proofs. It has been established and clarified in the volumes of this book of ours, especially in this volume – namely, the volume on Hadees-e-Saqalain – that which indicates this clear matter to anyone with discerning eyes.

Fifth: The claim that the assertion of Hadees-e-Iqtida as a singular (*aaḥaad*) report is not acceptable is a clear contradiction and an obvious disputation. For, as discussed earlier, the Shia response to Hadees-e-Iqtida fundamentally lies in its critique, discreditation, and the proof of its being fabricated and concocted. Anyone among them (i.e. the Shia scholars) who has spoken of it as a singular report has done so merely as a form of concession, with the purpose of obliging and silencing the Sunni opponents. This is because the Sunni scholars themselves are divided into two groups regarding Hadees-e-Iqtida:

The first group consists of scholars whose insights reveal the weakness, disgrace, corruption, and invalidity of this baseless narration. The second group, although they do not explicitly acknowledge the fabrication of this tradition, nonetheless do not consider it outside the scope of a singular (*aaḥaad*) report. Although, after establishing the flawed nature of Hadees-e-Iqtida and exposing its complete disgrace and insignificance, according to the insights of eminent scholars and the explicit statements of critical Sunni experts, there was no real need to further emphasize its being a singular report through the words of the opponents. However, to expose the falsehoods of the author of **Mawaaqef** and its commentator, and to spitefully counter Shah Sahab, I will cite some statements from prominent Sunni scholars in which they acknowledge this weak tradition as a singular report. This should clarify for all discerning observers that even those who, out of their affection for the two Shaikhs, do not explicitly call this false tradition a lie and deceit, yet do not claim its consensus, nor do they tread the path of shamelessness and recklessness to insist on its strength and validity. Since they are aware of the reality of this false and absurd report, they, by admitting it is a singular report, cast the dust of rejection and distancing upon their biased and obstinate opponents.

This will also elucidate that if senior Sunni scholars acknowledge the singular nature of Hadees-e-Iqtida, then if a follower of the truth mentions its singular nature merely as an obligation, how could anyone reasonably say, “This claim is unacceptable”. Indeed, Allah, the Exalted and Almighty, says the truth, **“Do not follow what you have no knowledge of; indeed, the hearing, the sight, and the heart—all of these will be questioned about.”**¹

Now, one should listen to excerpts from the referenced statements and take an important lesson from the evident weakness and superficiality of Shah Sahab’s argument from **Sharh al-Mawaaqef**.

Abu al-Hasan Ali Ibn Abi Ali Aamudi, in his book **Abkaar al-**

¹ Surah Bani Israel (17): Verse 36

Afkaar, in response to criticisms against Umar, states:

“In his regard, there are texts and narrations that refute the claims of absurdities against him, and although these are singular (*aaḥaad*) reports, their collective sum approaches the level of consecutiveness (*tawaatur*). Among these is the statement of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.), ‘Indeed, in my community, there are those who receive divine inspiration, and certainly, Umar is among them’ and his statement (s.a.w.a.), ‘Follow those who come after me: Abu Bakr and Umar’.”

The eminent scholar Allamah Ibn Humam Sivasi Ḥanafi, recognized as Shaikh al-Islam among Sunnis, in his book **al-Taḥreer**, in the section on consensus (*ijma*), after mentioning Hadees-e-Iqtida and the tradition, ‘Follow my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly-guided caliphs’ states, “It is answered: [The tradition] indicates the eligibility for following, not the prohibition of independent reasoning (*ijtihad*). Thus, even if it implies obligation, it is refuted by being [a report] of singular transmission (*aaḥaad*).”

Similarly, the scholar Allamah Ibn Amir Ḥajj, in his work **al-Taqreer wa al-Taḥbeer**, in the section on consensus, after mentioning the Hadees-e-Iqtida and the tradition, ‘Follow my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly-guided caliphs’ says, “It is answered: These two traditions indicate ‘the eligibility for following,’ meaning the eligibility of the two Shaikhs [Abu Bakr and Umar] and the four caliphs for the followers to emulate them, not the prohibition of independent reasoning for other jurists. Thus, their statements would be a binding argument upon other jurists, which is the point of contention. However, it is further argued that ‘this following’ implies obligatory following, so each of them [the two Shaikhs] would imply the binding authority of their statements upon all jurists outside of themselves, which is the desired conclusion. Yet this is countered by the fact that each of these traditions is singular (*aaḥaad*), so certainty regarding the authoritative nature of their consensus or the consensus of the four cannot be established definitively, as speculation does not

lead to certainty.”

Again, Ibn Amr Ḥajj states in **al-Taqrēer wa al-Taḥbeer**, “The truth is that its implication—meaning the evidence of both the view that the consensus of the Four Caliphs and the Two Shaikhs [Abu Bakr and Umar] is binding—is only speculative (ḥanni) authority. The binding aspect relates to the decisive demand for following them, while the speculative aspect is due to it being a singular report (*khābar-e-waahid*).¹“

Mulla Nizam al-Deen Sahaalwi, in **Ṣubḥ-e-Ṣadiq fi Sharḥ-e-Manaar**, in the discussion on consensus (*ijma*), after mentioning Hadees-e-Iqtida and the tradition, “Follow my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly-guided caliphs” writes, “The answer is that both of these are from singular reports (*aaḥaad*), so definitive authority for consensus (*ijma*) cannot be established through them.”

Again, in **Ṣubḥ-e-Ṣadiq**, in response to these two traditions, he writes, “It can also be answered that both are singular reports (*aaḥaad*), while our evidence indicating the authority of consensus (*ijma*) is comprehensive and definitive, so they do not oppose it.”

Molvi Abd al-Ali, in **Fawaatih al-Raḥamoot fi Sharḥ Musallam al-Suboot**, in the discussion on consensus (*ijma*), after mentioning these two traditions, pens, “It may be answered that these two traditions are singular reports (*aaḥaad*), and thus do not lead to certainty, so their agreement cannot be considered consensus (*ijma*). This was refuted by stating that their purpose is the authority of these agreements, even if speculative, so they may be prioritized over analogy and the statements of the other two companions. However, this requires further consideration.²“

It is astonishing that when the Imam of the Sunnis, Fakhr Raazi, in **Nihaayah al-Oqool**, could not find a way to reject the traditions indicating the caliphate of Amirul Momineen Ali Ibn Abi Talib (a.s.),

¹ Al-Taqrēer wa al-Taḥbeer, vol. 3, p. 99, Fourth Chapter Concerning Consensus (*ijma*)

² Fawaatih al-Raḥamoot fi Sharḥ Musallam al-Suboot, vol. 2, p. 509

he had no choice but to admit that **Hadees-e-Iqtida** and similar narrations are singular reports (*aaḥaad*). He states, “The fifth approach for them [the Shia] is reliance on singular reports (*aaḥaad*) that they have transmitted. Among them is his statement (s.a.w.a.), ‘Greet Ali as the Commander of the Faithful.’ And his statement (s.a.w.a.), ‘Indeed, he (Ali) is the leader of the Muslims, the Imam of the God-conscious, and the guide of the radiant ones.’ He (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘This is the guardian of every believing man and woman.’ And he (s.a.w.a.) said to Ali (a.s.), ‘You are my brother, my successor, and my executor after me, and the one who will fulfil my debts.’ The objection is that all these narrations oppose what has been narrated from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) that he said: ‘Bring me ink and paper so that I may write a document for Abu Bakr that none will dispute,’ and then he said, ‘Allah and the Muslims will accept none but Abu Bakr.’ Also, he appointed him for leadership in prayer and did not remove him from it, so he was to remain the leader in prayer. Everyone who establishes someone as the leader in prayer after the Messenger also establishes his general leadership, necessitating his [Abu Bakr’s] leadership.

It has also been narrated from Anas that the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) told him, upon Abu Bakr’s approach, to give him glad tidings of Paradise and of succeeding him in leadership after him. Additionally, Jubair Ibn Muṭ’im narrated that a woman came to the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and spoke to him about a matter, and he told her to return to him. She asked, ‘O Messenger of Allah! What if I come back and do not find you?’ meaning his death. He (s.a.w.a.) replied, ‘If you do not find me, then go to Abu Bakr.’ Another narration is that he said, ‘Follow those who come after me: Abu Bakr and Umar.’

The discussion regarding the authenticity of these traditions from both sides and their indication of the intended outcome is lengthy. However, they are far from providing certainty, as they are, upon close examination, singular reports (*aaḥaad*), even though each group claims consecutiveness (*tawaatur*) for its own narrations and disputes the reliability of what the opposing side narrates.”

From these words of the Imam of the righteous and the pride of theologians (i.e. Fakhre Raazi), it becomes very clear that although the Sunni authorities, out of spite and lack of foresight, have resorted to Hadees-e-Iqtida and other fabricated reports from the unjust and oppressive authorities, using them as shields in their arguments against the people of truth (i.e. Shias) due to extreme ignorance, none of these reports are, according to his explicit statement, consecutive (*mutawaatir*). Indeed, all of them are far removed from providing certainty.

Thus, the claim of consecutive transmission of Hadees-e-Iqtida — made by Shah Sahab and also referenced in the words of the author of **al-Mawaaqef** and his commentator, upon which Shah Sahab relied— is such a baseless claim that the words of the Imam (Raazi) refute it in opposition to the people of truth, repudiating it. “**And sufficient is Allah to aid the believers in battle**¹”.

Praise be to Allah, since we have already established the consecutiveness of **Hadees-e-Saqalain** with utmost clarity and completeness, even if we hypothetically concede that this fabricated tradition (Hadees-e-Iqtida) was, in some correct manner, narrated among the Sunnis, it would still not be capable of standing as a valid opposition to **Hadees-e-Saqalain**, even by Sunni standards. Praise be to Allah for severing the rope of misguidance and exposing the deceptions of the ignorant.

Shah Sahab’s Assertion “Thus, it is necessary that all these persons should be Imams” and Its Response

I (Mir Hamid Husain) say: Since the comprehensive speech regarding fabricated and falsely attributed reports contained in the words of the addressee (Muhaddis Dehlavi) has, praise be to Allah, clarified matters in such a way as to distinguish truth from falsehood and genuine from counterfeit, it dismantles the foundation of the addressee’s fallacies

¹ Surah Ahzaab (33): Verse 25

from their very roots. Thus, the necessity of the Imamate of the aforementioned individuals has been nullified, and the faulty premise of the argument posed by the highly speculative addressee has come to nothing.

It is indeed astonishing that Shah Sahab, in opposition to **Hadees-e-Saqalain**, which is consecutively narrated (*mutawaatir*) according to both groups (Sunni and Shia) and, in its indication, is an explicit proof of the infallibility and Imamate of the Ahl-e-Bait (a.s.) generally, and a clear indication of the guardianship and succession of Amirul Momineen (a.s.) specifically, chooses to cite such fabricated reports and concocted traditions that, in terms of chain, text, language, meaning, specificity, generality, implication, understanding, application, context, collectively or individually, possess no merit worth mentioning. Yet, he presents these with the utmost enthusiasm and satisfaction, and, following this, brings forth this false conclusion, which is akin to building one falsehood upon another, further inviting criticism, rebuke, and condemnation.

He fails to understand that all the fabrications of his religious faction are unworthy of being weighed against Hadees-e-Saqalain in the scale of reason, and within the entire fabrications of his sect, there is not a single word that can compare to the standard of “*And indeed, they will not separate until they come to me at the Pond (of Kausar).*”

In summary, the assertion of the necessity of the Imamate of Humaira, Ammar, Ibn Masud, Muaz Ibn Jabal, Abu Bakr, and Umar, based on the reports that Shah Sahab has drawn from the repertoire of his predecessors, is an assertion that is entirely baseless and void, a claim that only results in loss and ruin. The proofs of their falsity, corruption, and destruction are innumerable, and what has been mentioned earlier will suffice as guidance for those with insight.

Response To The Eighth Contradictory Tradition

The author of **Tuhfa** (Isna Ashariyyah) relies on the tradition of stars: *“Indeed, my companions are like the stars in the sky.”*

Among the strange and astonishing marvels of the ages is that all of these fabricated reports and fictitious traditions of liars, which Shah Sahab has cited in his book as a response to Hadees-e-Saqalain, were not sufficient or satisfying to him. Shah Sahab could not restrain himself from including these absurdities and fabricated falsehoods crafted by the slanderous followers of misguidance. His patience did not hold, so much so that, in the margins of this book filled with misguidance, he even extended his hand to the so-called **Hadees-e-Nujoom** (Tradition of the Stars), presenting it in a bizarre and astonishing manner which is tantamount to the murder of fairness with the sword of injustice.

In the margin of **Tuhfa**, he writes, “The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘Whatever you are given from the Book of Allah, act upon it, and no one has an excuse to abandon it. If something is not found in the Book of Allah, then follow an established practice (sunnah) from me. If there is no established practice from me, then follow what my companions say. Indeed, my companions are like the stars in the sky; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided. The differences among my companions are a mercy for you.”

Baihaqi has recorded this tradition in **al-Madkhal** with his chain of narrators in from Ibn Abbas.

Proving the Falsity of Hadees-e-Nujoom from the quotes of scholars of Ahle Tasannun with sixty-nine reasons

It is not hidden and veiled from the people of intellect that the argument made by Shah Sahab and the followers of his sect, based on **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, is false and devoid of validity and soundness, for several reasons:

Criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Imam Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, the author of “Musnad”

First: Imam Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Hanbal Shaibani, who is one of the four Imams of the Sunni school of thought, considered the Hadees-e-Nujoom not only inauthentic but even fabricated (*mauzoo*). By critiquing and challenging this tradition, he opened the doors of teaching and instruction for his students. As Allamah Ibn Amir Hajj Halabi mentioned in his book **al-Taqreer wal-Tahbeer**, while discussing the critique of this tradition, he wrote, ‘And thus Ahmad said, ‘This tradition is not authentic’.¹“

Mulla Nizamuddin Sahalvi, in **Subh Sadiq - Sharh Manar**, while mentioning this tradition, writes, “Ibn Hazm stated in his **Risaalah al-Kubra**: ‘[It is] fabricated, forged, and false.’ This view was also held by Ahmad and Bazzar.”

Maulvi Abd al-Ali, known as Bahr al-Uloom, in **Fawaateh al-Rahmoot - Sharh Musallam al-Suboot**, while mentioning this tradition, said, “Ibn Hazm stated in his **Risaalah al-Kubra**, ‘[It is] fabricated, forged, and false.’ This view was also held by Ahmad and Bazaar.²“

The esteemed rank and elevated position of Ahmad Ibn Hanbal Shaibani in critiquing and verifying traditions and reports, is more evident than the sun and clearer than yesterday for the revered

¹ al-Taqreer wal-Tahbeer fi Sharh al-Tahreer, vol. 3, p. 99, Fourth Chapter Concerning Consensus

² Fawaateh al-Rahmoot - Sharh Musallam al-Suboot, vol. 2, p. 510

scholars of the Ahl-e-Tasannun. In some previous volumes, his biography has been presented in full detail from the books of the prominent Sunni authorities, establishing his status as a representative of the Prophets (a.s.) and even superior to Abu Bakr in his support of Islam, according to them. So, let this be noted by you. (Refer to Zahabi's Seyar-o-A'laam al-Nubala).

Criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Ismail Ibn Yahya Muzani, a prominent student of Imam Shafei

Indication

Second: Abu Ibrahim Ismail Ibn Yahya Muzani, a prominent student of Imam Shafei, did not consider this tradition authentic. Assuming its authenticity, he provided an interpretation that is far from correct. As Allamah Abu Umar Yusuf Ibn Abdillah Namari Qurtubi mentioned in his book **Jaame' Bayaan al-Ilm**, "Al-Muzani said regarding the statement of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.), 'My companions are like the stars'. If this narration is authentic, then its meaning pertains to what they transmitted from him and testified to on his behalf, as they are all trustworthy and reliable in what they conveyed. Nothing other than this is permissible in my view. As for what they stated based on their own opinions, if they truly believed in those opinions, they would not have contradicted one another, objected to one another, or retracted their opinions in favour of another's view. So, reflect."¹

The great merits and esteemed accomplishments of Muzani are not hidden or concealed from anyone who examines the works of the major Imams of the Ahl-e-Tasannun.

¹ Jaame' Bayaan al-Ilm, vol. 2, pp. 89-90, Chapter of Proofs Concerning Sayings of the Salaf

Biography of Ismail Ibn Yahya Muzani, a prominent student of Imam Shafei in the biographical works of Ahl-e-Tasannun

Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Barmaki Erbili, known as Ibn Khallikan, writes in **Wafayaat al-Ayaan**, “Abu Ibrahim Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Ismail Ibn Amr Ibn Ishaq Muzani, the companion of Imam Shafei was from Egypt. He was a devout, knowledgeable, diligent scholar, a debater, and one who delved deeply into subtle meanings. He was the Imam of the Shafeis and the most knowledgeable among them regarding his [Imam Shafei] methods and fatwas, as well as what he transmitted from him.

Muzani authored numerous books on the Shafei school of thought, including **al-Jaame’ al-Kabir**, **al-Jaame’ al-Saghir**, **Mukhtasar al-Mukhtasar**, **al-Mansur**, **al-Masa’il al-Mu’tabara**, **al-Targhib fi al-Ilm**, and **al-Wasaaeq**, among others. Imam Shafei said about him, ‘Muzani is the supporter of my school.’ When he completed a particular issue and included it in his **al-Mukhtasar**, he would go to the prayer niche and pray two units of prayer in gratitude to Allah, the Exalted.

Abu Abbas Ahmad Ibn Suraij writes, ‘**Al-Mukhtasar** of Muzani will leave this world as a virgin untouched!’ It is the foundational book authored in the Shafei school, upon which others have structured their works and explained and elaborated his words.

When Qazi Bakkaar Ibn Qutaibah—who will be mentioned later, Allah willing—assumed the judiciary in Egypt after coming from Baghdad, he was a follower of the Hanafi school. He wished to meet Muzani for some time, but they did not have the chance to meet until one day at a funeral prayer. Qazi Bakkaar said to one of his companions, ‘Ask Muzani something so that I may hear his speech.’ The man then said to him, ‘O Abu Ibrahim! In the traditions, there are some prohibiting nabeez (a fermented drink) and others permitting it. Why did you prioritize prohibition over permission?’ Muzani replied, ‘No scholar has claimed that nabeez was prohibited in the pre-Islamic era and

then made permissible; rather, there is consensus that it was initially permissible. This strengthens the validity of the narrations on its prohibition.’ The Qazi appreciated his response, considering it a compelling argument.

Muzani was known for his extreme piety, to the extent that he would only drink from a copper cup in all seasons. When asked the reason for the same, he replied, ‘I have heard that they use manure in the clay for making cups, and fire does not purify them.’

It is also said that if he missed a congregational prayer, he would perform twenty-five prayers individually to make up for the virtue of praying in congregation, relying on the saying of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.). ‘*The prayer in congregation is twenty-five times more virtuous than the prayer of one of you alone.*’ He practiced a severe and difficult path of abstinence and was known to have his supplications answered. None of Imam Shafei’s companions ever thought of surpassing him in any matter. Muzani was the one who undertook the task of giving Imam Shafei the ritual bath after his death, and it is said that Rabe’e was also present with him at that time.

Ibn Yunus mentioned him in his **Tarikh**, calling him ‘the companion of Shafei’ and included him under the name ‘Muslim’ instead of his grandfather ‘Ishaq’. He noted his death, as previously mentioned, and described him as a person of worship, virtue, and reliability in traditions, with no disagreement among the knowledgeable jurists. He was abstinent in worldly matters and among the best of Allah’s creations. His virtues are numerous.

He passed away on the 26th Ramazan in the year 264 A.H. in Egypt and was buried near the grave of Imam Shafei in the Lesser Qarafa cemetery at the foot of the Moqattam Hills. May Allah, Exalted be He, have mercy upon him. I have visited his grave there. Ibn Zulaq mentioned in his **Tarikh al-Saghir** that he lived for eighty-nine years, and the funeral prayer was led by Rabe’e Ibn Sulaiman Muazzin Muradi. Muzani traces his lineage back to Muzaynah bint Kalb, a well-

known large tribe.¹

Zahabi, in his book **al-Ebar** under the events of the year 264 A.H., chronicles, “In this year, Muzani, the jurist Abu Ibrahim Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Ismail Misri, the companion of Shafei, passed away in Rabee’ al-Awwal, at over ninety years of age. Shafei described him as follows, ‘Muzani is the supporter of my school.’ He was a devout ascetic and worshipper who would wash the deceased as an act of service to Allah. He authored **al-Jaame’ al-Kabir** and **al-Jaame’ al-Saghir**. Many students studied jurisprudence under him.²

Abdullah Ibn As’ad Yafei, in **Mirat al-Jinan**, under the events of the mentioned year, pens, “In this year, the jurist and Imam Abu Ibrahim Ismail Ibn Yahya Muzani Misri Shafei passed away. He was a devout ascetic, worshipper, diligent scholar, debater, and one who delved deeply into subtle meanings. Many students studied under him.

Shafei described him, saying, ‘Muzani is the supporter of my school.’ He was the Imam of the Shafeis and the most knowledgeable among them regarding the methods, edicts, and narrations of Shafei.

He authored numerous books, including **al-Jaame’ al-Kabir**, **al-Jaame’ al-Saghir**, **Mukhtasar al-Mukhtasar**, **al-Manshur**, **al-Masael al-Mu’tabara**, **al-Tarhib fi al-Ilm**, **Kitab al-Wasaaeq**, and others.

Whenever he completed a particular issue and included it in his **Mukhtasar**, he would go to the prayer niche and perform two units of prayer in gratitude to Allah, Exalted be He. Abu Abbas Ibn Suraij said, ‘Muzani’s **Mukhtasar** will leave this world as a virgin untouched!’ It is the foundational book authored in the Shafei school, upon which others structured their works and explained and elaborated its content.

When Bakkaar Ibn Qutaibah assumed the judiciary in Egypt after coming from Baghdad—he was a follower of the Hanafi school—he

¹ Wafayaat al-Ayaan, vol. 1, p. 217, No. 93

² Al-Ebar, vol. 2, p. 28

long sought to meet Muzani but could not. They finally met one day at a funeral prayer. Bakkaar said to one of his companions, 'Ask Muzani something so I may hear his speech.' The man asked him, 'O Aba Ibrahim! In the traditions, there are narrations prohibiting nabeez and others permitting it. Why did you prioritize prohibition over permission?' Muzani replied, 'No scholar has claimed that nabeez was prohibited in the pre-Islamic era and then made permissible; rather, there is consensus that it was initially permissible. This strengthens the validity of the narrations on its prohibition.' Bakkaar was impressed by his response, saying it was a decisive argument.

Muzani was extremely pious, to the point that he drank from a copper cup throughout all seasons of the year. When asked why, he said, 'I have learnt that manure is used in the clay of cups, and fire does not purify that.'

It is also said that if he missed a congregational prayer, he would perform twenty-five prayers individually to compensate for the virtue of praying in congregation, relying on the saying of the Prophet (s.a.w.a), '*The prayer in congregation is twenty-five times more virtuous than the prayer of one of you alone.*'

He practiced an extremely difficult path of abstinence and was known to have his supplications answered. None of Imam Shafei's companions ever dared to think of surpassing him in any matter. He was the one who gave the ritual bath to Imam Shafei after his death. It is said that Rabee' was also with him at that time.

His virtues are numerous. Muzani's lineage traces back to Muzainah bint Kalb. He passed away on the 26th Ramazan and was buried near the grave of Imam Shafei in the Lesser Qarafa cemetery. May Allah have mercy upon them both.¹⁴

Abd al-Wahhab Ibn Ali Subki, writes in **Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah**, "Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Ismail Ibn Amr Ibn Ishaq, the great Imam, Abu Ibrahim Muzani, the supporter of the [Shafei] school of thought and

¹ Mirat al-Jinan, vol. 2, p. 177, Incidents of the year 264 A.H.

the star of its heavens, was born in the year 175 A.H. He narrated from Shafei, Nuaim Ibn Hammad, and others. Among those who narrated from him were Ibn Khuzaimah, Tahaavi, Zakariyya Saaji, Ibn Jooṣa, Ibn Abi Hatim, and others. He was a mountain of knowledge, an expert debater and arguer. Shafei described him, saying, ‘If he debated Satan, he would defeat the latter!’

He was ascetic, devout, detached from worldly affairs, and his supplications were accepted. If he missed a prayer in congregation, he would perform it twenty-five times [as a form of compensation]. He would wash the deceased out of devotion and seeking reward, saying, ‘I do this so that my heart may soften.’ Abu Fawaaris Sindi remarked, ‘Muzani and Rabee’ were nursed by the same wet nurse.’

Abu Ishaq Shirazi said, ‘He was abstinent, learned, diligent, an expert debater, and a profound thinker, delving into subtle meanings. He authored many works, including **Al-Jaame’ al-Kabir**, **Al-Jaame’ al-Saghir**, **Al-Mukhtasar**, **Al-Manthur**, **Al-Masael al-Mu’tabara**, **Al-Tarhib fi al-Ilm**, **Kitab al-Wasaaeq**, **Kitab al-Aqaarib**, and **Nihaayat al-Ikhtisar**.’

Shafei said, ‘Muzani is the supporter of my school of thought.’ Rabee’ Ibn Sulaiman reported, ‘When we went to meet Shafei at the time of his death, I, Buwaiti, Muzani and Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Ibn Abd al-Hakam were present. Shafei gazed at us for a while and then said, ‘As for you, O Aba Yaqub [Buwayti], you will die in chains. As for you, O Muzani, you will experience hardships and tribulations in Egypt, but you will also witness a time where you are the most capable among the scholars of that period. As for you, O Muhammad, you will return to the religion of your father. And as for you, O Rabee’, you are the most beneficial to me in spreading my works. Rise, O Aba Yaqub, and take charge of the circle.’ Rabee’ said, ‘It transpired as he prophesied.’

It is mentioned that Muzani would perform two units of prayer whenever he completed a section of his **Mukhtasar**. Amr Ibn Usman Makki said, ‘Among all the worshippers I met—and they were many—I never saw anyone more diligent or consistent in worship than

Muzani. I also never saw anyone show greater reverence for knowledge and its people than him. He was the strictest in applying abstinence upon himself, while being lenient with others in this regard. He used to say, ‘I am a creation moulded by the manners of Shafei.’

Abu Asim reported, ‘Muzani neither performed ablution with water from the reservoir of Ibn Tulun nor drank from his pitchers, because it contained excrement, and fire does not purify.’ It is also said that when Bakkaar Ibn Qutaibah came to Egypt as its Hanafi judge, he met Muzani on one occasion. One of Bakkaar’s companions asked Muzani, ‘There are narrations indicating both the prohibition and permissibility of nabeez (fermented drink). Why have you prioritized prohibition over permissibility?’ Muzani replied, ‘No one claimed that nabeez was prohibited in the pre-Islamic era and later made permissible for us. There was a consensus that it was permissible, then prohibited. This supports the narrations of prohibition.’ Bakkaar was impressed by this response.

A multitude of scholars from Khorasan, Iraq, and the Levant (Syria) studied under Muzani. He passed away six days before the end of Ramazan in the year 264 A.H.¹⁴

Taqi al-Deen Abu Bakr Ibn Ahmad Asadi, in **Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah**, writes, “Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Ismail Ibn Amr Ibn Ishaq Abu Ibrahim Muzani Misri, the jurist and Imam, author of many writings, was a disciple of Shafei. He used to say, ‘I am a creation (a product) of the ethics of Shafei.’ Shaikh Abu Ishaq mentioned him among the foremost companions of Shafei and said, ‘He was ascetic, learned, diligent, and skilled in debate, a relentless arguer, and a deep diver into subtle meanings. He authored many books.’ Shafei said about him, ‘Muzani is the supporter of my school.’ He was born in the year 175 A.H. and passed away in Ramazan, though some say in Rabi’ al-Awwal, in the year 264 A.H. He was known for having his

¹ Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah, vol. 2, p. 93, No. 20

supplications answered.¹

Jalal al-Deen Suyuti, in **Husn al-Muhaazarah**, writes, “Muzani: Abu Ibrahim Ismail Ibn Yahya Ibn Ismail Ibn Amr Ibn Ishaq, the eminent Imam and supporter of the (Shafei) school of thought. Shafei said about him, ‘If he were to debate Satan, he would defeat him!’ He was an Imam, pious, ascetic, whose supplications were answered, and he had little attachment to worldly matters. Rafei said, ‘Muzani had an independent school of thought.’ Isnawi wrote, ‘He authored several books, including **Al-Mabsut**, **Al-Mukhtasar**, **Al-Manshur**, **Al-Masael al-Mu’tabarah**, **Al-Targheeb fi al-Ilm**, **Al-Wasaaeq**, and **Al-Aqaarib** (i.e. the scorpion) so named due to its difficulty. He also authored a book based on his own independent school, not following the school of Shafei.’ This was mentioned by Bandaniji in his commentary.

He used to perform Friday prayers 25 times if he missed the congregation. He would wash the deceased as an act of devotion and said, ‘I do this to soften my heart.’ He was a mountain of knowledge, skilled in debate, and a relentless arguer. He was born in the year 175 A.H. and passed away on the 24th of Ramazan in the year 264 A.H. He was buried near the grave of Shafei.²

Criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Umar Bazaar

Third: Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Umar Ibn Abd al-Khaliq Basri, known as Bazaar—whose esteemed status and high rank among the Sunni scholars is well recognized—has critically evaluated **Hadees-e-Nujoom** (Tradition of the Stars) with meticulous scrutiny, both in terms of its chain of transmitters (*isnad*) and its content (*matn*), exposing its flaws and weaknesses. He outpaced other critics in this regard. As Allamah Abu Amr Yusuf Ibn Abdillah Qurtubi, known as Ibn Abd al-Barr, stated in **Jaame’ Bayaan al-Ilm**, ‘Muhammad Ibn

¹ Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah, vol. 1, p. 58, No. 3

² Husn al-Muhaazarah, vol. 1, p. 237, No. 49, Mention of the Egyptian Imams Jurists

Ayyub Raqqi said, ‘Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Amr Ibn Abd al-Khaliq Bazaar told us, ‘I asked about what is narrated from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), which the general public often relates, that the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) supposedly said, *‘The example of my companions is like the stars. Whichever of them you follow, you will be guided.’* He responded, ‘This statement is not authentic from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.).’ It was narrated by Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi from his father from Saeed Ibn Musayyab from Ibn Umar from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.). Sometimes, Abd al-Rahim would narrate it from his father directly from Ibn Umar. The weakness of this tradition lies in Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid, for the scholars of traditions refrained from narrating from him, and the statement is also considered objectionable as coming from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.).

Furthermore, it has been authentically reported from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) with a sound chain of narration, *‘Hold fast to my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly-guided caliphs after me. Cling to it with your molars.’* This statement contradicts the narration of Abd al-Rahim, even if it were authentic—how much more so when it is not. The Prophet (s.a.w.a.) does not permit disagreement among his companions after him. And Allah knows best.¹“ This is the end of al-Bazzar’s statement.

It is clear and evident to those who examine the statement of Bazaar that he has critiqued and discredited **Hadees-e-Nujoom** on multiple grounds. The details and enumeration of these critiques were previously discussed in the second part of the volume on **Hadees-e-Madinah al-Ilm** (*The Tradition of the City of Knowledge*) of Abaqāt al-Anwār. Refer to it if you wish to gain further knowledge, with the help and support of Allah.

The critique of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** by Bazaar is also evident and apparent in the following works:

- ♦ **Ibtaal al-Rayy wa al-Qiyas** by Ibn Hazm,

¹ Jaame’ Bayaan al-Ilm, vol. 2, p. 90 Chapter of Proof Concerning the Sayings of the Salaf

- ♦ **Minhaj al-Sunnah** by Ibn Taymiyyah,
- ♦ **Tafseer al-Bahr al-Muheet** by Abu Hayyan,
- ♦ **Tafseer al-Nahr al-Maadd** by Abu Hayyan,
- ♦ **Tafseer Durr Laqeet** by Taj al-Deen Ahmad Qaysi, known as Ibn Maktum,
- ♦ **A'lam al-Muwaqqe'in** by Ibn Qayyim,
- ♦ **Takhreej Ahaadees al-Minhaaj** by Abu al-Fazl Iraqi,
- ♦ **Talkhees al-Khabeer** and **Takhreej Ahadees Mukhtasar Ibn Haajib** by Ibn Hajar Asqalani,
- ♦ **al-Taqreer wa al-Tahbeer** by Ibn Amir Haaj Halabi,

Sharh of Ali al-Qari on **Shifa** by Qazi Ayaz,

- ♦ **Faiz al-Qadeer** by Abd al-Rauf Manavi,
- ♦ **Subh Sadiq** by Mulla Nizam al-Deen Sahaalwi, and
- ♦ **Fawaateh al-Rahmoot** by Maulvi Abd al-Ali.

These sources further clarify and substantiate the critique and rejection of **Hadees-e-Nujum**.

Criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Ibn Qattan Abdullah Ibn Adi Jurjani

Indicator

Fourth: Abu Ahmad Abdullah Ibn Muhammad Jurjani, known as Ibn Adi, included this tradition in his book **Al-Kaamil**, a work dedicated to mentioning weak and criticized narrators as well as exposing fabrications and falsehoods attributed to them. He cited this tradition in the biography of Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid Hashimi Qazi and in the biography of Hamza Ibn Abi Hamza Jazari Nasibi, using these instances as a basis for critiquing and discrediting the tradition. As will be clarified further, God willing, through the statements of Hafiz al-'Iraqi in what follows.

The noble virtues and praiseworthy achievements of Ibn Adi, as claimed by Sunni scholars, are numerous and well-known. However,

in this context, it is appropriate to briefly highlight some of them:

The biography of Hafiz Ibn Qattan, as narrated from the reliable biographical works of Ahl-e-Tasannun

Sam'ani, in his book **al-Ansab**, mentions the lineage and biography of Ibn Adi Jurjani as follows, "Abu Ahmad Abdullah Ibn Adi Ibn Abdillah Ibn Muhammad Jurjani, known as Ibn Qattan Hafiz, was a native of Jurjan and the master of traditions (*hafiz*) of his era. He travelled extensively between Alexandria and Samarqand, visiting various regions and meeting numerous scholars. He studied under figures such as Abu Abd al-Rahman Ahmad Ibn Shuaib Nasai, Ali Ibn Sa'd Raazi, Qasim Ibn Abdillah Akhimi, Qasim Ibn Zakariyya Taraz, and many others whose names would take too long to list.

He was a teacher of prominent scholars like Haakim Abu Abdillah Hafiz, Abu al-Qasim Hamza Ibn Yusuf Sahmi, Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Hasan Hairi, and others. He began his journey in writing of traditions in Jurjan in the year 290 A.H., studying under Ahmad Ibn Hafs and others. In 297 A.H., he travelled to Iraq, Syria, and Egypt.

Ibn Adi authored a book on the identification of weak narrators called **al-Kaamil**, comprising approximately sixty volumes. He also compiled the traditions of Maalik Ibn Anas, Awza'i, Sufyan Sauri, Sho'bah, Ismail Ibn Abi Khalid, and several other lesser-known narrators. He also wrote a commentary on Muzani's work, titled **al-Intisar**. He was a meticulous and unparalleled scholar of traditions in his time, narrating unique traditions. He transmitted these traditions to his sons Adi, Abu Zur'ah, and Mansur, who exclusively narrated these traditions from their father. His son Adi resided in Sajistan (now called as Sistan), where he shared his father's narrations.

Hamza Ibn Yusuf Sahmi stated, 'I once asked Daraqutni to write a book on weak narrators. He replied, 'Don't you have Ibn Adi's book?' I said, 'Yes!' He remarked, 'It is sufficient; nothing more is needed.'"

Ibn Adi was born on a Saturday, the 1st Zu al-Qa'dah in the year 277 A.H.—the same year that Abu Hatim (Muhammad Ibn Idris) Raazi

passed away. He died on the 1st Jumada al-Akhirah in the year 365 A.H. in Jurjan. Abu Bakr Ismaili led his funeral prayer. He was buried beside the mosque of Karz Ibn Wabarah, to the right of the Qibla. I visited his grave.¹⁴

Zahabi, in **Tazkerah al-Huffaaz**, chronicles, “Ibn Adi, the great Imam and memorizer of traditions (*hafiz*), Abu Ahmad Abdullah Ibn Adi Ibn Abdillah Ibn Muhammad Ibn Mubarak Jurjani, also known as Ibn Qattan, was the author of the book **al-Kaamil fi al-Jarh wa al-Ta’deel**. He was one of the eminent figures of his time. He was born in the year 277 A.H., began studying traditions in the year 290 A.H., and undertook his first journey in 297 A.H. He studied under figures such as Bohlool Ibn Ishaq Anbari, Muhammad Ibn Usman Ibn Abi Suwaid, Muhammad Ibn Yahya Marwazi, Abd al-Rahman Ibn Qasim Abu Ruwas Dimishqi, Anas Ibn Salam, Abu Khalifa Jumahi, Hasan Ibn Sufyan, Abu Abd al-Rahman Nasai, Imran Ibn Mujaasheh, Abdan Ahwazi, Abu Ya’la Mosuli, Hasan Ibn Muhammad Madani (a companion of Yahya Ibn Bukair), Hasan Ibn Faraj Ghazi, and many others.

Among those who narrated from him were Abu Abbas Ibn Undah (his teacher), Abu Saeed Malini, Hasan Ibn Raamin, Muhammad Ibn Abdillah Ibn Abdukuwayh, Hamza Ibn Yusuf Sahmi, Abu Husain Ahmad Ibn Ali, and others. Ibn Adi was an author known for his expertise in the evaluation of narrators (*rijal*) and recognition of defects (*‘ilal*) in traditions.

Abu al-Qasim Ibn Asaakir wrote, ‘He was reliable, though he had a slight inclination in his tone.’ Sahmi pens, ‘I once asked Daraqutni to author a book on weak narrators. He replied, ‘Don’t you already have the book of Ibn Adi?’ I said, ‘Yes!’ He said, ‘It is sufficient; nothing more is needed’.”

Zahabi adds, “Ibn Adi also authored a book organized by the chapters of **Mukhtasar al-Muzani**, which he titled **al-Intisar**. Sahmi writes,

¹ Al-Ansab – under Jurjani – vol. 3, p. 221

‘He was a meticulous and unmatched master of traditions in his time. He narrated unique traditions, some of which he passed on to his two sons, Adi and Abu Zur’ah, who were the only ones to narrate them from him.’”

Khalili pens, ‘He was unparalleled in memory and stature. I once asked Abdullah Ibn Muhammad Hafiz, ‘Who had a better memory, Ibn Adi or Ibn Qaani?’ He replied, ‘The button of Ibn Adi’s shirt had a better memory than Abd al-Baqi Ibn Qaani!’”

Khalili also noted, ‘I heard Ahmad Ibn Abi Muslim Hafiz say, ‘I have not seen anyone like Abu Ahmad Ibn Adi, nor anyone superior to him in memory.’ Ahmad had met Tabarani and Abu Ahmad Haakim, and he told me, ‘The memory of those individuals was acquired with effort, while Ibn Adi’s memory was natural.’ Ibn Adi’s **Mu’jam** included narrations from over a thousand teachers.¹⁴”

Zahabi continues, “Abu al-Walid Baaji said, ‘Ibn Adi was a reliable memorizer of traditions (*hafiz*) with no issues in his credibility.”

Hamza Ibn Yusuf wrote, ‘Abu Ahmad (Ibn Adi) passed away in Jumada al-Akhirah of the year 365 A.H., and his funeral prayer was led by Imam Abu Bakr Ismaili.”

Zahabi, in his book **al-Ebar**, under the events of the year 365 A.H., chronicles, “In this year, Ibn Adi, the great memorizer, Abu Ahmad Abdullah Ibn Adi Ibn Abdullah Ibn Muhammad Qattan Jurjani, passed away. He was the author of **al-Kaamil fi al-Jarh wa al-Ta’del** and lived for 88 years. He began writing extensively in the year 290 A.H. and travelled in the year 297 A.H. He studied under Abu Khalifa, Abd al-Rahman Ibn Ruwas, Bohlool Ibn Ishaq, and their contemporaries.

Ibn Asaakir writes, ‘He was reliable, though he had a slight inclination in his tone.’ Hamza Sahmi says, ‘He was a meticulous memorizer of traditions with no equal in his time.’ He passed away in Jumada al-Akhirah.²⁴”

¹ Tazkerah al-Huffaaz, vol. 3, p. 904

² Al-Ebar, vol. 6, p. 337

Yafei, in **Mirat al-Jinan**, under the events of the mentioned year (365 A.H.), writes, “In this year, the great memorizer of traditions (*hafiz*) Abu Ahmad Abdullah Ibn Muhammad, known as Ibn Qattan Jurjani, the author of **al-Kaamil fi al-Jarh wa al-Ta’deel**, passed away.¹⁴”

Suyuti writes in **Tabaqaat al-Huffaz**, “Ibn Adi: The great Imam and memorizer of traditions (*hafiz*) Abu Ahmad Abdullah Ibn Adi Ibn Abdillah Ibn Mubarak Jurjani, also known as Ibn Qattan, was the author of **al-Kaamil fi al-Jarh wa al-Ta’deel** and one of the prominent figures of his time. He was born in the year 277 A.H. and began studying traditions in 290 A.H.

He narrated from Muhammad Ibn Usman, Nasai, and Abu Ya’la. Among those who narrated from him were Ibn Uqdah (his teacher) and Hamza Sahmi. He was skilled in recognizing defects (*ilal*) in traditions and balanced in his assessment of narrators (*rijal*). There was no one like him in his era.”

Khalili says, ‘He was unparalleled in memory and stature.’ He passed away in Jumada al-Akhirah in the year 365 A.H.”

Criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Abu al-Hasan Ali Ibn Umar Daraqutni

Fifth: Abu al-Hasan Ali Ibn Umar Daraqutni, who is among the eminent memorizers of traditions and reports and their distinguished critic, and about whom we have recently pointed out his stature and greatness among Sunni scholars, has criticized **Hadees-e-Nujoom** in his book **Gharaeab Maalik**. He has meticulously followed the path of investigation in discrediting and censuring its narrators. As the renowned scholar Ibn Hajar Asqalani mentioned in **Lisan al-Mizan**, “Jameel Ibn Yazid narrated from Maalik from Jafar Ibn Muhammad from his father from Jabir from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), ‘Whatever you find in the Book of Allah, act upon it, and it is not permissible for you to leave it for something else.’ The tradition continues: ‘My companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be

¹ Mirat al-Jinan, vol. 2, p. 381

guided.’ It was narrated by Daraqutni in **Gharaaeb Maalik** and by Khatib in **Al-Ruwaat an Maalik** through the following chain: Hasan Ibn Mahdi from Abdoh Marwazi from Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Sakooni from Bakr Ibn Isa Marwazi from Abu Yahya from Jameel.”

Daraqutni said, “It is not authentic from Maalik, and its narrators are unknown.”¹

Praise be to Allah, criticism by Daraqutni of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** in the book **Gharaaeb Maalik** also becomes evident from the study of the book **Takhreej Ahaadees al-Kashshaaf** by Ibn Hajar Asqalani, as will be explained later, God willing.

Criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Ibn Hazm Zaaheri in his treatise “Ibtaal al-Rayy wa al-Qiyas”

Sixth: Abu Muhammad Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Hazm Aandalusi Zahiri, a prominent and esteemed scholar of Sunni Islam, as you have learned earlier, has explicitly and clearly demonstrated in his treatise **Ibtaal al-Rayy wa al-Qiyas wa al-Istihsaan wa al-Ta’leel wa al-Taqleed** that the **Hadees-e-Nujoom** is fabricated, false, invalid, and unauthentic. He exposed its flaws and defects as required. Similarly, Abu Hayyan Gharnaati in his Quranic exegesis **Al-Bahr al-Muheet** regarding **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, writes, ‘The memorizer Abu Muhammad Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Hazm said in his treatise **Ibtaal al-Rayy wa al-Qiyas wa al-Istihsaan wa al-Ta’leel wa al-Taqleed**, verbatim, “This is a fabricated, false, and invalid report that has never been authenticated’.²

Abu Hayyan Gharnaati, in his other exegesis **al-Nahr al-Madd min al-Bahr**, writes regarding the **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, “The minister and memorizer (of traditions) Abu Muhammad Ali Ibn Hazm said in his treatise **Ibtaal al-Rayy wa al-Qiyas wa al-Istihsaan wa al-Ta’leel wa al-Taqleed**, verbatim, “This is a fabricated, false, and invalid

¹ Lisan al-Mizan, vol. 2, p. 137, No. 594

² Al-Bahr al-Muheet, vol. 5, p. 511 under the exegesis of verses 84-89 of Surah Nahl (16)

report that has never been authenticated.”

Taj al-Deen Abu Muhammad Ahmad Ibn Abd al-Qadir Ibn Ahmad Ibn Maktum Qaisi Hanafi, in his commentary **al-Durr al-Laqaet**, while mentioning **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, writes, “Hafiz Abu Muhammad Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Hazm, in his treatise **Ibtaal al-Rayy wa al-Qiyas wa al-Istihsaan wa al-Ta’leel wa al-Taqleed**, states, ‘It is a fabricated, falsely attributed, invalid report that has never been authenticated’.”

The critique and evaluation (*jarh wa ta’dil*) of Ibn Hazm regarding Hadees-e-Nujoom are also evident and clear from the following works:

- ♦ **Takhreej-o-Ahaadees-e-Minhaj** by Hafiz Zain al-Deen Iraqi
- ♦ **Talkhees al-Khabeer** by Hafiz Ibn Hajar Asqalani
- ♦ **al-Taqreer wa al-Tahbeer** by Ibn Amir Haaj Halabi
- ♦ **Mirqat** by Mulla Ali Qari
- ♦ **Nasim al-Riyaz** by Shahab al-Deen Khafaji
- ♦ **Subh Sadiq** by Mulla Nizam al-Deen Sahaalawi
- ♦ **Fawaateh al-Rahmoot** by Maulvi Abd al-Ali Lakhnawi

as you will soon come to know, God willing, with further details and elaboration.

The discrediting of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Bazaar as transmitted by Ibn Hazm in his treatise Ibtal al-Rayy wa al-Qiyas

Seventh: Ibn Hazm Zahiri, in his treatise **Ibtal al-Rayy wa al-Qiyas** also transmitted the words of Hafiz Bazaar concerning the critique of Hadees-e-Nujoom. He entrusted the reinforcement and affirmation of his own research to the authoritative insights of this great critic and distinguished expert.

As you will soon come to know, God willing, from the forthcoming details drawn from:

- ♦ **Al-Bahr al-Muheet** by Abu Hayyan Gharnaati
- ♦ **Al-Nahr al-Madd min al-Bahr** by the same author

- ♦ **Al-Durr al-Laqeet** by Ibn Maktum Qaisi.

The critique and evaluation of Jawab Ibn Ubaidillah Taimi where Ibn Hajar has refrained from condemning him

Eighth: Hafiz Ibn Hazm Andalusi, in his book **al-Ahkam**, as transmitted from him, has provided an appropriate critique and evaluation of **Hadees-e-Nujoom**. He opened the doors of profound knowledge and guidance to his students and seekers of truth, presenting his analysis with clarity.

It is evident that after such a critique and evaluation by a distinguished scholar like this esteemed *hafiz* and insightful critic, relying on **Hadees-e-Nujoom** is extremely objectionable and blameworthy. Anyone who uses this tradition as evidence, in the eyes of rational and discerning individuals, will be utterly dismissed and criticized.

Indeed, Allah the High is the Protector from the manipulations of ignorant and oppressive adversaries.

The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Husain al-Baihaqi

Ninth: Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Husain Ibn Ali Baihaqi, who is among the elite of the foremost scholars of traditions and one of the prominent Sunni authorities, whose eminence and distinction are as evident as the sun and clearer than yesterday's light to these esteemed figures, is himself praised in **Bustan al-Muhaddeseen** for his illustrious achievements and outstanding merits. In his book **al-Madkhal**, he narrates **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, critiquing and evaluating it in detail, thereby dispelling the doubts from the hearts of those endowed with insight.

As Hafiz Zain al-Deen al-Iraqi in his **Takhreej-o-Ahaadees-e-Minhaj** of Baizawi, in reference to Hadees-e-Nujoom writes, "Baihaqi narrated it in al-Madkhal from the tradition of Amr, quoting from the tradition of Ibn Abbas in a similar manner, and through another chain

as a disconnected (*mursal*) narration. He says, ‘Its text is well-known, but its chains of transmission are weak, and no chain of transmission for it has been authenticated’.”

From this passage, it is evident that Baihaqi, in his book **al-Madkhal**, narrated Hadees-e-Nujoom from the narration of Amr, attributed to Ibn Abbas, and also through another chain as a disconnected (*mursal*) narration. He then clarified that its text is well-known, but its chains of transmission are weak, and no chain of this tradition has been authenticated.

This statement, when examined closely, clearly indicates the invalidity of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** through its various chains of transmission, reinforcing its weakness and insignificance in a manner evident to any insightful and informed observer.

It becomes as clear as the sun from here that Shah Sahab’s mention of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** from Baihaqi’s **al-Madkhal**, narrating it through Ibn Abbas, while omitting Baihaqi’s critique of the tradition, is an explicit display of shamelessness and audacity. By committing outright deceit in transmission, he openly flaunts his brazenness and irreverence. Glory be to Allah! The poor Baihaqi, out of utmost fairness, openly admitted that the chains of transmission for Hadees-e-Nujoom are weak and that no chain has been authenticated. Yet, Shah Sahab entirely disregards his statement and merely clings to his narration of the tradition attributed to Ibn Abbas. In doing so, he surpasses even the audacity of the heretic who argued with the verse, **‘Do not approach prayer.’**

Thanks be to Allah, the critique and evaluation by Baihaqi regarding Hadees-e-Nujoom and his regarding all its chains of transmission as weak are also evident and clear from the book **Takhreej-o-Ahadees al-Kashshaaf** by Ibn Hajar Asqalani, as you will come to know later with Allah’s assistance.

The critique and evaluation of Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi, about whom Ibn Hajar has taken a general approach, indicates that he is regarded as unreliable in transmitting traditions.

Tenth: Hafiz Baihaqi, in his book **al-Itiqad**, also made it clear and evident that **Hadees-e-Nujoom** is flawed and weak, raising the banner of critique and research with diligence and precision. As you will soon learn, with the help of Allah, from Hafiz Ibn Hajar Asqalani's **Talkhees al-Khabeer**, Baihaqi in **al-Itiqad** described the chain of transmission of Hadees-e-Nujoom, narrated through Abd al-Rahim Ammi, as "**not strong**" (*ghair qawiyy*), and referred to the version narrated through Zahhak Ibn Muzaahim as "**a disconnected tradition**" (*hadees-e-munqati*).

This critique and evaluation, attributed to Baihaqi in **al-Itiqad**, has also been quoted by Allamah Ibn Amir Haaj Halabi in his book **al-Taqreer wa al-Tahbeer**, as you will come to know later, Allah willing.

When it becomes evident that Baihaqi did not suffice with critiquing and evaluating Hadees-e-Nujoom in **al-Madkhal**, but, out of further fairness, also clarified its weak chain of transmission and its disconnection and invalidity in **al-Itiqad**, it becomes clear and manifest that the argument of the opponent, based solely on Baihaqi's narration of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** in **al-Madkhal** while concealing Baihaqi's repeated critique of this tradition both in **al-Madkhal** and **al-Itiqad**, is astonishing and peculiar. Such an act, reaching the extremes of disgrace and repugnance, demonstrates a behaviour so reprehensible that it warrants maximum reprimand and blame from those endowed with reason and understanding.

The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Yusuf Ibn Abd al-Birr Qurtubi in his book Jaame' Bayaan al-Ilm

Eleventh: The scholar of traditions of the West, Abu Umar Yusuf Ibn Abdillah, known as Ibn Abd al-Barr Namari Qurtubi, in his book

Jaame' Bayaan al-Ilm criticised and discredited **Hadees-e-Nujoom** as was appropriate. His statements are adorned with clear evidence and decisive proofs, as he says in the mentioned book, "Muzani said regarding the statement of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). 'My companions are like stars' that if this narration is authentic, its meaning pertains to what they transmitted from him and testified about on his behalf. Thus, all of them are trustworthy and reliable regarding what came from him. For me, it cannot mean otherwise. However, regarding what they expressed as their own opinion, if they considered it binding, they would not have refuted one another, nor would they have criticized one another, nor would any of them have returned to the opinion of their companion. So, reflect on this.

It is also narrated from Muhammad Ibn Ayyub Raqqi who said, 'Abu Bakr Ahmad Ibn Amr Ibn Abd al-Khaliq Bazzaar said to us, 'I asked them (or you asked, depending on the manuscript) about what is narrated from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) among the general populace that they relate from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), saying, 'The example of my companions is like stars' or 'My companions are like the stars, so whichever of them you follow, you will be rightly guided.' They replied (or he said), 'This statement is not authentic from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.). It was narrated by Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi from his father from Saeed Ibn Musayyib, from Ibn Umar from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.). Sometimes, it is narrated that Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi narrated it from his father from Ibn Umar. The weakness of this tradition comes from Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid because the scholars of traditions have refrained from narrating his traditions. Additionally, the content of this statement is also objectionable as coming from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.).

A sound chain of narration is reported from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), 'Adhere to my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly guided caliphs after me. Hold on to it with your molar teeth.' This statement would contradict the tradition of Abd al-Rahim if it were authentic—but it is not. Moreover, the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) would not permit disagreement among his companions after him. Allah knows best.' This is the end of

al-Bazaar's statement¹.

Abu Umar says, "Abu Shahaab al-Hannaat narrated from Hamza Jazari from Naafe' from Ibn Umar, who said, 'The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, 'Indeed, my companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided.' However, this chain of transmission is not authentic, and no one who is relied upon for narrating from Naafe' transmits it. Moreover, Bazaar's statement is not correct in any case because emulating the companions of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) individually is only for those who are ignorant of what they are asked about. For such individuals, following (*taqlid*) is necessary for them. He (the Prophet) did not command his companions to emulate each other when they interpreted something with a permissible, reasonable, and possible interpretation in the principles (of religion). Rather, each of them is a star, and it is permissible for an ignorant layperson to follow them in what they need for their religion. The same applies to other scholars among the public. Allah knows best.

It has also been narrated in a different chain regarding this tradition, other than what Bazaar mentioned from Salam Ibn Sulaim, who said, 'Haaris Ibn Ghusain narrated to us from Amash from Abu Sufyan from Jabir, who said, 'The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, 'My companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided'."

Abu Umar said, 'This chain of narration does not constitute evidence, as Haaris Ibn Ghusain is unknown'.²

The significant benefits and useful returns of this statement, along with Ibn Abd al-Barr's inclusion and the critique of some of his statements, are mentioned in detail in the second part of the volume of **Hadees-e-Madinah al-Ilm**. You should refer to it so that you may

¹ Jaame' Bayaan al-Ilm, vol. 2, pp. 90-91, Chapter of Mentioning the Proof in the Sayings of the Salaf

² Jaame' Bayaan al-Ilm, vol. 2, p. 91, Chapter of Mentioning the Proof in the Sayings of the Salaf

fully grasp the extent of the weakness of this tradition through its study.

The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Abu al-Qasim Ali Ibn Asaakir Dimishqi and the reference of his biography

Indicator

Twelfth: Abu al-Qasim Ali Ibn Hasan Ibn Hibatullah Dimashqi, known as Ibn Asaakir, who is among the great Sunni jurists and renowned memorizers (of tradition), has criticized **Hadees-e-Nujoom** and explicitly pursued the path of weakening its narrators, as you will come to know, God willing, later from the statement of al-Manavi in **Faiz al-Qadeer**.

The critique and disparagement of this great preserver and insightful critic regarding the **Hadees-e-Nujoom** are sufficient and comprehensive for invalidating its credibility and reducing it from the rank of reliability. The traces of this report are thus erased by the erasing winds of neglect and obliteration.

References for Ibn Asaakir's biography

The sources for the biography of Hafiz Ibn Asaakir al-Dimashqi and his abundant and numerous praises, as well as his manifest virtues, according to Sunni reports, are detailed in the following works:

1. Mojam al-Udaba by Yaqut al-Hammui (vol. 4, pp. 73-78)
2. Wafayaat al-A'yaan by Ibn Khallikan (vol. 3, p. 309, No. 441)
3. Tazkerah al-Huffaaz by Zahabi (vol. 4, p. 328, No. 11094)
4. Duval al-Islam by Zahabi (vol. 2, p. 78, Incidents of year 571 A.H.)
5. Mirat al-Jinan by Abdullah Ibn As'ad Yafei (vol. 3, p. 393, Incidents of year 571 A.H.)
6. Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah by Taj al-Deen Subki (vol. 4, p. 273, About those who died in the sixth century)

7. Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah by Abd al-Rahim Isnawi (vol. 2, p. 95, No. 838)
8. Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah by Taqi al-Deen Asadi
9. Tabaqaat al-Huffaz by Jalal al-Deen Suyuti (p. 498, No. 1061)
10. Al-Mukhtasar fi Tarikh al-Bashar by Abu al-Fida Ayyubi (vol. 3, p. 59, Incidents of year 571 A.H.)
11. Tatimmah al-Mukhtasar by Ibn Wardi
12. Tarikh Khamees by Diyarbakri
13. Jaame' Masaaneed-e-Abi Hanifah by Abu Muayyad Muhammad Ibn Mahmud Khaarazmi
14. Madinah al-Uloom by Azniqi
15. Abjad al-Uloom
16. Taj al-Mukallal (p.75, No. 61) and At'haaf al-Nubalaa by Maulvi Siddiq Hasan Khan, a contemporary.

These sources provide detailed accounts of Ibn Asaakir's contributions and qualities.

The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Abu al-Faraj Ibn Jauzi in his book "al-Elal al-Mutanaahiyah"

Thirteenth: Abu al-Faraj Abd al-Rahman Ibn Ali Ibn Muhammad Bakri Baghdadi, known as Ibn Jauzi, explicitly criticized the **Hadees-e-Nujoom** by affirming its lack of authenticity. He denounced one of its narrators as unreliable and labelled another as a liar, raising the banner of disapproval and condemnation. He writes in his book **al-Elal al-Mutanaahiyah**, "Nuaim Ibn Hammad narrates, 'Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi reported from his father from Saeed Ibn Musayyib from Umar Ibn Khattab, who said, 'The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, 'I asked my Lord about the disagreements among my companions after me, and He revealed to me, 'O Muhammad! Indeed, your companions are to Me like the stars in the sky; some are brighter than others. Whoever takes anything from what they hold in their disagreements is upon guidance'."

The author (Ibn Jauzi) commented, “This is not authentic. Nuaim is unreliable, and Yahya Ibn Maeen said, ‘Abd al-Rahim is a liar’.”¹⁴

The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Umar Ibn Hasan Ibn Dahiyah Kalbi Aandalusi, and the references of his biography

Fourteenth: The esteemed Hafiz Abu al-Khattab Umar Ibn Hasan Ibn Ali Kalbi Aandalusi, known as Ibn Dahiyah, who was a distinguished critic and prominent memorizer (of traditions) among the Sunnis, began his critique and disparagement of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** by explicitly rejecting its authenticity with fairness and without bias. Hafiz Zain al-Deen Iraqi stated in Taleeq-o-Takhreej-e-Ahadees-e-Minhaj al-Baizawi, “Ibn Dahiyah, while mentioning the tradition ‘My companions are like stars,’ said, ‘This tradition is not authentic.’”

The remarkable praises and illustrious commendations of Ibn Dahiyah by Sunni scholars have been mentioned and recorded in detail in the following works concerning **Hadees-e-Wilayah**:

1. Wafayaat al-A’yaan by Ibn Khallikan (vol. 3, pp. 448-450, No. 497)
2. Bughyah al-Wuaat by Suyuti (vol. 2, p. 218, No. 1832)
3. Husn al-Muhaazarah by Suyuti (vol. 1, p. 273, No. 71)
4. Husn al-Maqsad by Suyuti
5. Nafh al-Tib by the scholar al-Muqri (vol. 2, pp. 301-307, Chapter 5)
6. Sharh al-Mawahib al-Ladunniyyah, by Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Baaqi Zarqani (vol. 1, p. 80)

After reviewing these sources, the completeness of arguments compelling the opponents and the thorough refutation of malicious adversaries leave no room for doubt or ambiguity.

¹ Al-Elal al-Mutanaahiyah fi al-Ahaadees al-Waahiyah, vol. 1, p. 283

The criticism and discrediting of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Ibn Taimiyyah Hanbali

Fifteenth: Indeed, Ahmad Ibn Abd al-Halim Hanbali, known as Ibn Taimiyyah, whose obstinacy and fanaticism is more than what can be adequately described, found himself incapable when confronting the people of truth. He was therefore compelled to resort to criticizing and rejecting the authenticity **Hadees-e-Nujoom**. As mentioned in Minhaj, in the section where Allamah Hilli (may Allah have mercy upon him) cites Hadees-e-Nujoom, Ibn Taimiyyah says, ‘As for his statement, ‘My companions are like the stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided’ this tradition is weak, and the scholars of traditions have declared it weak. Bazzaar said, ‘This tradition is not authentic from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.), and is not found in the reliable books of traditions.’”

From this statement of Ibn Taimiyyah, several aspects that reflect the weakness and insignificance of Hadees-e-Nujoom have been elaborately explained in the volume (of Abaqat) on Hadees-e-Madinah al-Ilm. Refer to it if you wish. And Allah is the Guide.

The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Abu Hayyan Muhammad Ibn Yusuf Gharnaati in Tafseer al-Bahr al-Muheet

Sixteenth: Abu Hayyan Muhammad Ibn Yusuf Aandalusi Gharnaati, one of the eminent and highly regarded interpreters of the Holy Quran and distinguished scholars of traditions among the Ahle Tasannun, made extensive efforts to criticize and invalidate Hadees-e-Nujoom. With determination and thoroughness, he endeavoured to refute, nullify, and obliterate it. As mentioned in his commentary **al-Bahr al-Muheet**, he writes, [Al-Zamakhshari said] ‘If you ask, how is the Quran an explanation of everything? I say: Its meaning is that it clarifies everything related to matters of religion, either through explicit text on some issues or through referral to the Sunnah, as it commands adherence to and obedience to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) and says, **He does not speak from desire.**’ It also

encourages consensus (*ijma*) in the verse, "And follows a path other than that of the believers." The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) was pleased for his Ummah to follow his companions and emulate their actions, as he (s.a.w.a.) said, 'My companions are like the stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided.' They exercised independent reasoning (*ijtihad*), applied analogical deduction (*qiyas*), and paved the way for using these methods, so the Sunnah, consensus, analogical reasoning, and independent judgment are all rooted in the explanation provided by the Quran. This is how it serves as an explanation for everything.'

As for the statement, 'The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) was pleased, up to 'you will be guided,' this was not said by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). It is a fabricated tradition that is not authentic in any way from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). Hafiz Abu Muhammad Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Hazm in his treatise **Ibtaal al-Rayy wa al-Qiyas wa al-Istihsaan wa al-Ta'leel wa al-Taqleed** writes the following, 'This is a fabricated, false report that was never authenticated.' He mentioned its chain of transmission as recorded by Bazaar, the author of **al-Musnad**, who said, 'You asked about what is reported from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and commonly circulated among the masses, who narrate it from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.), saying, 'The likeness of my companions is like the stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided.' This statement is not authentic from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.). It was narrated by Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zayd Ammi from his father from Saeed Ibn Musayyib from Ibn Umar from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.). The weakness of this tradition stems from Abd al-Rahim, as the scholars of traditions refrained from narrating his reports. Furthermore, this statement is also anomalous and unproven from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), who would not permit discord among his companions after him.¹

This is the exact wording of Bazaar. Ibn Maeen said, 'Abd al-Rahim

¹ Al-Bahr al-Muheet, vol. 5, p. 511 under the exegesis of Surah Nahl (16): Verses 84-89

Ibn Zaid is a liar and is of no significance.’ Bukhari says, ‘He is abandoned (in narration of traditions).’ It was also narrated by Hamza Jazari, and Hamza is also unreliable and abandoned.’

This statement, coupled with the eloquence of Allamah Abu Hayyan, demonstrates the flawed and criticized nature of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** in several ways:

1. First, Allamah Abu Hayyan explicitly stated, after quoting Zamakhshari’s words that included Hadees-e-Nujoom, that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) never said these words.
2. Second, he explicitly mentioned that this tradition is fabricated.
3. Third, he clarified in detail that this tradition is not authentic in any way from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.).
4. Fourth, he cited the text of Hafiz Ibn Hazm in his treatise **Ibtal al-Rayy wa al-Qiyas** (Refutation of Opinion and Analogical Reasoning), wherein he stated that this tradition is fabricated.
5. Fifth, he quoted Ibn Hazm as saying that this tradition is fabricated.
6. Sixth, he quoted Ibn Hazm as stating that this tradition is false.
7. Seventh, he quoted Ibn Hazm as affirming that this tradition was never authenticated.
8. Eighth, through Ibn Hazm, he quoted Bazaar, who said that this tradition is commonly narrated by the masses.
9. Ninth, he cited Bazaar, who stated that this tradition is not authentic from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.).
10. Tenth, he quoted Bazaar, who explained that the weakness of this tradition comes from Abd al-Rahim, meaning that the tradition is weak due to its narration by Abd al-Rahim.
11. Eleventh, he cited Bazaar, who said that scholars abandoned narrating the traditions of Abd al-Rahim.
12. Twelfth, he quoted Bazaar, who stated that this saying — ‘My companions are like the stars; whichever of them you follow,

you will be guided' — is anomalous (*munkar*) from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.).

13. Thirteenth, he cited Bazzaar, who affirmed that this statement is not established.
14. Fourteenth, he quoted Bazzaar, who explained that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) would not permit his companions to disagree after him. This serves as rational evidence for the fabrication of **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, as explained earlier in the volume on Hadees-e-Madinah al-Ilm when discussing the benefits of Ibn Abd al-Barr's commentary in **Jaame' Bayan al-Ilm**. Refer to it, for it is highly beneficial.
15. Fifteenth, regarding Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid, the narrator of this tradition, he quoted Ibn Maeen as saying that he is a liar.
16. Sixteenth, he quoted Ibn Maeen, who described Abd al-Rahim as wicked.
17. Seventeenth, he cited Ibn Maeen, who said that Abd al-Rahim is of no significance.
18. Eighteenth, he quoted Bukhari regarding Abd al-Rahim, stating that he is abandoned (*matruk*).
19. Nineteenth, through thorough investigation, he explained that this tradition was also narrated by Hamza Jazari, and Hamza is unreliable.
20. Twentieth, regarding Hamza, after describing him as unreliable, he also explicitly stated that Hamza is abandoned.

These twenty points, each on its own, humiliate the defiant arrogant one, uproot the obstinate denier, and reveal that those who fabricated lies have been deluded in their religion by their fabrications!

The criticism of Abu Hayyan of this tradition (Hadees-e-Nujoom) in another commentary written by him called "Al-Nahr al-Maadd"

Seventeenth: Allamah Abu Hayyan Andalusi Gharnaati, in his commentary **al-Nahr al-Maadd min al-Bahr al-Muheet**, also

subjected **Hadees-e-Nujoom** to disparagement and criticism, exposing its weakness and insignificance as thoroughly as required. As he mentioned in the aforementioned commentary, “[Zamakhshari said], ‘If you ask, how is the Quran an explanation of everything?’ I say, ‘Its meaning is that it clarifies everything related to matters of religion, either through explicit text on some issues or referral to the Sunnah, as it commands adherence to and obedience to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) and states, **’He does not speak from desire.’** It also encourages consensus (*ijma*) in the verse, **’And follows a path other than that of the believers.’** The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) was pleased for his nation (*ummah*) to follow his companions and emulate their actions, as he said, ‘My companions are like the stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided.’ They exercised independent reasoning (*ijtihad*), applied analogical deduction (*qiyas*), and paved the way for using these methods. Thus, the Sunnah, consensus, analogical reasoning, and independent judgment are all rooted in the explanation provided by the Quran. This is how it serves as an explanation for everything.’

[Abu Hayyan commented]: As for the statement, ‘The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) was pleased,’ up to the phrase ‘you will be guided,’ this was not said by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.), and it is a fabricated tradition that is not authentic in any way from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.).

Hafiz Abu Muhammad Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Hazm, in his treatise **Ibtaal al-Rayy wa al-Qiyas wa al-Istihsaan wa al-Ta’leel wa al-Taqleed**, explicitly states, ‘This is a fabricated, false report that was never authenticated.’ He mentioned its chain of transmission as recorded by Bazzar, the author of **al-Musnad**, who said, ‘You asked about what is reported from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and commonly circulated among the masses, who narrate it from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), saying, ‘The likeness of my companions is like the stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided.’ This statement is not authentic from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.). It was narrated by Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi from his father from Saeed Ibn Musayyib from

Ibn Umar from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.). However, it is not established, and the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) would not permit discord among his companions after him.’

This is the exact wording of Bazzaar. Ibn Maeen said, ‘Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid is a liar, wicked, and of no significance.’ Bukhari said, ‘He is abandoned (*matruk*).’ It was also narrated by Hamza Jazari, and Hamza is also unreliable and abandoned.”

This statement by Abu Hayyan also serves as evidence for the aforementioned numerous points indicating the weakness, insignificance, corruption, and falsity of Hadees-e-Nujoom. Take note of this, and Allah is the Guide to the most upright paths.

The supreme status and the utmost exalted position of Allamah Abu Hayyan among the prominent and distinguished scholars of the Sunni community need no elaboration.

Biography of Abu Hayyan Aandalusi

Allamah Zahabi writes in **Mojam Mukhtass**, “Muhammad Ibn Yusuf Ibn Ali Ibn Hayyan, the Imam, the scholar of diverse disciplines, the authority on Arabic, Abu Hayyan Aandalusi Jayyani, then Gharnaati Shafei, was a renowned scholar of the Egyptian lands and the author of remarkable works. He was born in the year 654 AH. He studied under the scholars of Aandalus (modern day Spain), the Maghreb, and Egypt, and recited the Quran in the seven canonical readings under Maleehi, the student of Abu Jaud, among others. He also studied with Izz Harraani and his contemporaries. He wrote to me about his narrations and had significant contributions in this field and was deeply committed to learning.

Later in life, his eyesight weakened, and he assumed the role of overseeing the Mansuriyah Dome. He passed away on the evening of Saturday, 28th Safar, in the year 745 A.H.”

Salah al-Deen Khalil Ibn Aibak Safadi writes in **al-Waafi bi al-Wafayaat**, “**Muhammad Ibn Yusuf Ibn Ali Ibn Yusuf Ibn Hayyan**, the Shaikh, the Imam, the Hafiz, the distinguished scholar,

the unique figure of his era, the Shaikh of his time, and the leader of grammarians, Asir al-Deen Abu Hayyan Gharnaati, recited the Quran with multiple readings. He studied traditions in the lands of Aandalus, Africa, Alexandria, Egypt, and Hijaz. He obtained certifications (*ijaazah*) from Syria, Iraq, and other regions. He strove, sought knowledge, compiled, and recorded extensively.

I have not seen among my teachers anyone more engaged in study than him; he was either listening, teaching, or writing, and I never observed him in any other state. He was greatly welcoming to intelligent students and held them in high regard. He excelled in both prose and poetry and composed exquisite *al-muwashshahat al-badee'ah* (a type of Andalusian poetry). He was precise in what he transmitted, accurate in his speech, knowledgeable in language, and meticulous in vocabulary. As for grammar and morphology, he was the foremost authority in the world; no one in the Arabic-speaking lands was mentioned alongside him in these disciplines.

He had a great mastery of Qur'anic exegesis (*tafseer*), traditions (*hadees*), legal documents, jurisprudential branches, and biographies of people, their classes, and their histories, especially regarding the Maghribis (North Africans). He recorded their names with great attention to their pronunciation, whether with vowel shifts (*imla*), truncation, softening, or emphatic articulation, as they neighbored Frankish lands and their names and titles were distinctive. All of this he documented, refined, and meticulously detailed. Shaikh Shams al-Deen Zahabi had posed to him several questions related to the Maghribis, and he answered them.

His authored works spread widely, gained immense popularity, and were studied, copied, and taught. They overshadowed earlier works and preoccupied both local scholars and visitors to his region. Students who studied under him became themselves Imams and Shaikhs during his lifetime. He was the one who encouraged people to engage with the writings of Shaikh Jamal al-Deen Ibn Maalik, inspired them to study his works, and clarified their complexities for

them. He guided students through the depths of Ibn Maalik's works, unlocking their intricacies.

Regarding **Muqaddamah Ibn al-Haajib** (a famous grammatical work), he would say, 'This is the grammar of the jurists!' He would only teach works like **Kitab Sibawayh, al-Tas'heel** by Ibn Maalik, or his own compositions. When he arrived in the region, he closely studied with Shaikh Baha al-Deen Ibn Nahhas, from whom he learned many literary texts. Abu Hayyan was described as having a pleasant demeanour, a handsome face, and a fair complexion tinged with redness. His beard was luminous and thick, and his hair, though not dense, flowed naturally. His Andalusian accent was prominent, and he pronounced the letter *qaaf* close to *kaaf*, except when reciting the Quran, where he pronounced it eloquently. I once heard him say, 'No one in this region pronounces the letter *qaaf* correctly.'

He had a close relationship with Prince Saif al-Deen Arghun, the scribe (*dawadaar*) of Sultan Nasir, who was the deputy ruler of the Islamic domains. Abu Hayyan had access to him and sometimes stayed at his residence. When his daughter Nadar passed away, he sought permission from Sultan Nasir to bury her in her home within Cairo, and the Sultan granted it. Further details about this incident will come later, God willing.

Initially, Abu Hayyan adhered to the Zahiri school of thought but later adopted the Shafei school. He was appointed to teach Quranic exegesis at the Mansuriyah Dome and to teach at the Aqmar Mosque. I read **al-Asfaar al-Sittah** and **al-Maqamaat al-Hariri** under him, and many distinguished scholars from the Egyptian lands attended these sessions. He had a reliable manuscript with him, while the attendees had about twelve copies, one of which was in the handwriting of Hariri himself. During these readings, numerous benefits and discussions arose from both him and the attendees.

He remarked, 'After Ibn Daqeeq al-Eid, I have not heard anyone more eloquent in their recitation.' When we reached the **Maqaamah** in which Hariri mentioned riddles, Abu Hayyan said, 'I do not

understand the concept of riddles as defined by literary scholars.’ I attempted to explain and give examples, but he said, ‘Do not trouble yourself with me! I have laboured extensively on this topic, and I have gained no insight.’ This statement reflected his great fairness and honesty, as he admitted it in front of a gathering who all heard him.

I also read to him **Saqt al-Zand** by Abu Ala, some of **al-Hamaasah** by Abu Tamaam al-Taai, **Maqsurah** of **Ibn Duraid**, and other works. I listened to his reading of **Talkhees al-Ibaaraat bi Latif al-Ishaaraat** in the seven modes of Quranic recitation by Ibn Salima. I also heard him teach **al-Fasih** by Sa’lab, which was read by Qazi Shahab al-Deen Ibn Fazaalallah in Cairo. Additionally, I heard from him the introduction to his book titled **Irtishaf al-Zarb min Lisan al-Arab**, as well as selected passages from his **Majaani al-Hasr** and other works.”

Safadi, after mentioning some of Abu Hayyan’s poetry, pens, “I wrote to him requesting his authorization (*ijaazah*) in the following words, ‘The request is made to the grace of our master, the Shaikh, the Imam, the scholar, the practitioner, the distinguished luminary, the eloquent orator, the interpreter of literature, the gatherer of virtues, the pillar of the inquirer’s means, the proof for imitators, the adornment of adherents, the axis of the inclined, the leader of the qualified, the best of the latter generations, the inheritor of the sciences of the former generations, the one who possesses the highest rank in every constrained domain, the author of works that captivate hearts, making every person of intellect yearn for them, and the one who conducts research that illuminates decisive evidence from the hidden recesses of their sources and captures elusive concepts from the depths of their origins. He is the solver of the riddles of the ancients, who surpasses lofty aspirations unreachable by others and the one to whom belongs glory. He ascends the heights of eloquence, unveiling its hidden treasures, as if it were resting in his sanctuary. He seizes the crowns of eloquence in fulfilling its most challenging demands, surpassing all competitors. His words have revealed the gardens of excellence, leaving those who come after him hesitant to enter their

gates. He presents proofs as radiant as untouched beauties, which no human or jinn has approached. He has created gardens of prose and poetry so exquisite that no hand, even of a jinn, can reach their branches. He is Asir al-Deen Abu Hayyan.”

Knowledge continues to thrive and revive, and this is no surprise when it comes to Abu Hayyan,

Until the sciences achieve their ultimate goals and place their seekers in the abode of security and fulfilment.

The request of the author of these words is for authorization for what he—may Allah extend his life—has transmitted from the collections of Musnads, compilations, Sunan, collections of traditions, literary compositions in prose and poetry, and other branches of knowledge in their varied forms, categories, and types. These were received in the lands of Aandalus, Africa, Alexandria, Egypt, Hijaz, and elsewhere, either through reading, listening, correspondence, or general or specific authorization. Furthermore, it is requested that he be authorized for the great works in exegesis of the Noble Quran, sciences of traditions (*uloom al-ahaadees*), literary compositions, and his poetry and prose. This includes a specific authorization to authenticate the books he authored up to this date, as well as a general authorization for any future works according to the view of those who deem it permissible. May this request be met with favour and grace, Allah willing.

The Shaikh replied, ‘May Allah honour you! You assumed good about me and showed immense generosity in your kindness, to which I cannot object. You described someone who is but a cloud of dust that might be mistaken for the sky or a mirage that a thirsty one might think is water. O son of the nobles! —and you are wiser than anyone who discerns—would you graze the dry twigs while lush gardens surround you? Have your virtues and knowledge not sufficed you from seeking a mere sip from a waterless well or a handful of barren soil? Indeed, the manuscripts shine with the light of your pages, and the world is fragrant with the aroma of your words. You are more

knowledgeable about whom to turn to for expertise and more decisive in whom to trust for narration. Yet you have sought to adorn me with your kindness and elevate me by your request, to bring forth the obscure into prominence, to rescue one stumbling in understanding, to establish a mention for him, and to raise his rank. It is not possible for me to refuse you in what you have requested or to decline your invitation to the path you have pointed to.

Thus, I grant you—may Allah strengthen you—authorization for everything I have transmitted from my teachers in the lands of Aandalus, Africa, Egypt, Hijaz, and elsewhere through reading, listening, correspondence, specific or general authorization, either orally or in writing. This includes everything I was authorized to transmit in Syria, Iraq, and beyond, as well as all that I have authored, compiled, and composed in prose and poetry, along with everything mentioned in this request. Among what I have transmitted are:

- ◆ The Noble Quran, which I recited in the seven canonical readings under several teachers, the most prominent being the venerable, long-lived Shaikh Fakhr al-Deen Abu al-Zaahir Ismail Ibn Hibatillah Ibn Ali Ibn Hibatillah Misri Maleehi, the last to transmit the Quran through recitation from Abu Jaud.
- ◆ The “Six Books” (*al-Kutub al-Sittah*),
- ◆ Al-Muwattaa,
- ◆ Musnad of Abd,
- ◆ Musnad Darimi,
- ◆ Musnad Shafei,
- ◆ Musnad Tayaalisi,
- ◆ Al-Mojam al-Kabir of Tabarani,
- ◆ Al-Mojam al-Saghir of Tabarani,
- ◆ Sunan al-Daraqutni, and more.

As for individual treatises, they are too numerous to list. Among the books on grammar and literature, I transmit through reading:

- ◆ Kitab Sibawayh,

- ◆ Al-Idah,
- ◆ Al-Takmila,
- ◆ Al-Mufasssal,
- ◆ Jumal al-Zajjaji, and others.

I also transmit works such as:

- ◆ The Six Books (al-Asfaar al-Sitta),
- ◆ Al-Hamaasah,
- ◆ Diwan Habib,
- ◆ Diwan Mutanabbi,
- ◆ Diwan Ma'arri.

My teachers, from whom I received authorization through listening or reading, are many, but I will now mention a selection of their senior authorities.

Abu Hayyan mentioned, after listing a great number of his teachers, "The total number of those from whom I heard (directly) is approximately 450 individuals. As for those who granted me authorization (*ijaazah*), they include a great many scholars from Granada, Malaga, Ceuta, the lands of Africa, Egypt, Hijaz, Iraq, and the Levant (Syria).

As for the works I have authored, they include:

1. Al-Bahr al-Muheet – a commentary on the Noble Quran.
2. Ithaf al-Arib bi ma fi al-Quran min al-Gharib – concerning rare and unique words in the Quran.
3. Al-Asfaar al-Mukhtasar min Kitab al-Saffar – a commentary on Kitab Sibawayh.
4. Al-Tajrid li-Ahkam Sibawayh.
5. Al-Tazyeel wa al-Takmeel fi Sharh al-Tas'heel.
6. Al-Tankhil al-Mukhtasar min Sharh al-Tas'heel.
7. Al-Tazkirah.
8. Al-Mubdi' – on morphology (sarf).

9. Al-Mawfur.
10. Al-Taqreer.
11. Al-Tadreeb.
12. Ghaayat al-Ihsan.
13. Al-Nukat al-Hisaan.
14. Al-Shazaa fi Mas'alah Kaza.
15. Al-Fadl fi Ahkam al-Fasl.
16. Al-Lamha.
17. Al-Shadhra.
18. Al-Irtiza fi al-Farq bain al-Dad wa al-Za'.
19. Iqd al-La'ali.
20. Nukat al-Amali.
21. Al-Naafe' fi Qira'at-e-Naafe'.
22. Al-Asir fi Qira'at Ibn Kasir.
23. Al-Mawrid al-Ghamr fi Qira'at Ibn Amr.
24. Al-Rauz al-Basim fi Qira'at Aasim.
25. Al-Muzn al-Hamir fi Qira'at Ibn Amir.
26. Al-Ramzah fi Qira'at Hamzah.
27. Taqreeb al-Naa'i fi Qira'at al-Kisaai.
28. Ghaayah al-Matlub fi Qira'at Ya'qub.
29. Al-Matlub fi Qira'at Ya'qub.
30. The poem Al-Nayyir al-Jali fi Qira'at Zaid Ibn Ali.
31. Al-Wahhaaj fi Ikhtisar al-Minhaaj.
32. Al-Anwar al-Ajla fi Ikhtisar al-Mahalla.
33. Al-Hulal al-Haaliyah fi Asaaneed al-Quran al-Aaliyah.
34. Al-A'laam bi Arkan al-Islam.
35. Nasr al-Zahr wa Nazm al-Zahr.
36. Qatr al-Habi fi Jawab As'ilah al-Zahabi.
37. My catalogue of narrations (*fihrist masmuaati*).

38. Nawaafis al-Sihr fi Damaais al-Shi'r.
39. Tuhfat al-Nadus fi Nuhat al-Aandalus.
40. Al-Abyaat al-Waafiyah fi Ilm al-Qaafiyah.
41. A treatise on traditions (*juz' fi al-hadees*).
42. Mashyakhat Ibn Abi al-Mansur.
43. Al-Idrak li-Lisan al-Atraak.
44. Zahr al-Mulk fi Nahw al-Turk.
45. Nafhah al-Misk fi Sirat al-Turk.
46. Al-Af'aal fi Lisan al-Turk.
47. Mantiq al-Khurus fi Lisan al-Fars.

Among the works I did not complete:

1. Maslak al-Rushd fi Tahreer Masaael Ibn Rushd.
2. Manhaj al-Saalik fi al-Kalam ala Alfiyyat Ibn Maalik.
3. Nihayat al-Aeraab fi Ilmay al-Tasreef wa al-Aeraab.
4. A poem titled Majani al-Husr fi Adab wa Tawarik Ahl al-'Asr.
5. Khulaasah al-Tibyaan fi Ilmay al-Badee' wa al-Bayan.
6. A poem Nur al-Ghabash fi Lisan al-Habash.
7. Al-Mahbur fi Lisan al-Yahmur.

These were said and recorded by Abu Hayyan Muhammad Ibn Yusuf Ibn Ali Ibn Yusuf Ibn Hayyan. My birthplace was Granada, at the end of Shawwal in the year 654 A.H.¹

Muhammad Ibn Shakir Ibn Ahmad Kutubi writes in **Fawaat al-Wafayaat**, "Muhammad Ibn Yusuf, known as Ali Ibn Yusuf Ibn Hayyan, the Shaikh, Imam, memorizer (of traditions), scholar, unparalleled in his era, leader of his time, and master of grammarians, Asir al-Deen Abu Hayyan Gharnaati. He recited the Qur'an with its variant readings and studied traditions in the lands of Aandalus, the Island of Ifriqiya, the coastal city of Alexandria, Egypt, and Hijaz. He also obtained licenses (*ijaazaat*) from Syria, Iraq, and other regions.

¹ Al-Waafi bi al-Wafayaat, vol. 5, p. 175, No. 2347

He strove, sought knowledge, acquired it, and authored works. He had a keen interest in intelligent students and held them in high regard. He was skilled in both poetry and prose, known for his unique *al-muwashahaat al-badeeah* (a form of Arabic poetry). He was meticulous in his transmissions, precise in his speech, well-versed in Arabic language, and proficient in its expressions.

In grammar and morphology, he was the world's leading authority. He also had expertise in Quranic exegesis (*tafseer*), traditions, legal conditions (*shurut*), branches of jurisprudence (*furu'*), biographies, classes of narrators, histories, their events, and recording their names—especially focusing on the pronunciation styles of the North Africans (*maghrebis*), including their tendencies towards *imlaa*, abbreviation, softening, and emphasis. He encouraged people to engage with the works of Jamal al-Deen Ibn Maalik, motivating them to study these texts. He elucidated their ambiguities, navigated their complexities, unlocked their difficulties, and committed to teaching only what was found in *Kitab Sibawayh*, *Tas'heel* by Ibn Maalik, or his own authored works.

Upon returning from his travels, he closely followed Shaikh Baha al-Deen Ibn Nahhaas and studied literary works with him. He was of pleasant demeanour, handsome, fair-skinned with a slight reddish hue, and his greying hair appeared luminous.

He was born in Granada in the months of the year 654 A.H. and passed away in Egypt in the early days of 745 A.H. May Allah have mercy on him!"

Kutubi continues, after mentioning some of his poetry, "He was praised by Muhyiddeen Ibn Abd al-Zahir, who said, 'When I heard discussions about the Divine Essence explained by the most eminent of scholars, I was told, 'This is Abu Hayyan.' I said, 'You have spoken the truth and done justice; he is indeed a true monotheist.'"

As for the works he authored, they include:

1. Al-Bahr al-Muheet – A comprehensive commentary on the Noble Quran.

2. Ithaf al-Arib bi ma fi al-Quran min al-Gharib – A book on rare and unusual words in the Quran.
3. Kitab al-Asfaar al-Mukhtasar min Kitab al-Saffaar.
4. Sharh Kitab Sibawayh – A commentary on Sibawayh's foundational work on Arabic grammar.
5. Kitab al-Tajrid li-Ahkam Sibawayh.
6. Kitab al-Taz'heel wa al-Takmeel fi Sharh al-Tas'heel.
7. Kitab al-Tasjeel (or al-Tankheel) min Sharh al-Tas'heel.
8. Kitab al-Tazkerah.
9. Kitab al-Mubdi – On morphology (*sarf*).
10. Kitab al-Mawfur.
11. Kitab al-Taqreeb.
12. Kitab al-Tadreeb.
13. Kitab Ghaayah al-Ihsan.
14. Kitab al-Nukat al-Hisan.
15. Kitab al-Shifa (or al-Shadha) fi Mas'alah Kaza.
16. Kitab al-Fazl fi Ahkam al-Fasl.
17. Kitab al-Lamha.
18. Kitab al-Shuzur.
19. Kitab al-Irtiza fi al-Farq bain al-Zaad wa al-Zaa
20. Kitab Aqd al-La'ali.
21. Kitab Nukat al-Amaali.
22. Kitab al-Naafe' fi Qiraat-e-Naafe'.
23. Al-Athir fi Qiraat-e-Ibn Kasir.
24. Al-Wird al-Ghamr (or al-Mawrid al-Ghamr) fi Qiraat Abi Amr.
25. Al-Rauz al-Basim fi Qiraat-e-Aasim.
26. Al-Muzn al-Ghamir (or al-Hamir) fi Qira'at Abi 'Amir.
27. Al-Ramza fi Qiraat-e-Hamza.
28. Al-Naai (or Taqreeb al-Naai) fi Qiraat al-Kisaai.

29. Al-Nasr (or al-Nayyir) al-Jali fi Qiraat-e-Zaid Ibn Ali.
30. Al-Wahhaaj fi Ikhtisar al-Minhaaj.
31. Al-Nur al-Ajla fi Ikhtisar al-Muhalla.
32. Al-Hulal al-Haaliya fi Asaaneed al-Quran al-Aaliya.
33. Al-E'laam bi-Arkan al-Islam.
34. Nasr al-Durar wa Nazm al-Zahr.
35. Qatr al-Habi fi Jawab As'ilah al-Zahabi.
36. Nawaafis al-Sehr fi Damaaes al-She'r.
37. Tuhfah al-Nadas fi Nuhat al-Aandalus.
38. Al-Abyaat al-Waafiyah fi Ilm al-Qaafiyah.
39. Masheekha Ibn Abi al-Mansur.
40. Al-Idraak li-Lisan al-Atraak.
41. Zahw al-Mulk fi Nahw al-Turk.
42. Nafhah al-Misk fi Seerah al-Turk.
43. Al-Af'aal fi Lisan al-Turk.
44. Mantiq al-Khoros fi Lisan al-Fars.

Among his incomplete works:

1. Maslak al-Rushd fi Tajreed Masaael Nihaayah Ibn Rushd.
2. Manhaj al-Saalik fi al-Kalam 'ala Alfiiyat Ibn Maalik.
3. Nihayat al-E'raab fi Ilm al-Tasreef wa al-E'raab.
4. Rajz: Majani al-Qasr (or al-Husr) fi Shuara al-Asr.
5. Al-Mahbur fi Lisan al-Yahmur.

May Allah have mercy on him.”

Taj al-Deen Abd al-Wahhab Ibn Ali Subki, in **Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah**, pens, “Muhammad Ibn Yusuf Ibn Ali Ibn Yusuf Ibn Hayyan Nafari Aandalusi, originally from Jayyan, born and raised in Granada, and later a resident of Egypt, our shaikh and teacher, Abu Hayyan. He was the master of grammarians, a singular scholar, and an ocean that knew no ebb but only flow. He was the Sibawayh of his time and the Mubarrad when debates among his peers intensified. He

was the Imam of grammar, offering to its seekers whatever they desired, the tongue of the Arabs to whom every ear was inclined in attention.

He was a Kaaba of knowledge, visited by seekers from every corner, a destination for caravans from far and wide. Scholars flocked to him like rivers converging upon the sea. His knowledge was a sweet, flowing spring, quick to quench the thirst of its seekers. People travelled to him day and night, and his praises echoed like the perfume of the night and the musk of the day.

His soul was gentler than the breeze, and his charm sweeter than the finest wine. The sun of his scholarship rose from the west, and he settled in Egypt, which became the ultimate destination of his brilliance. He sat there in grandeur, unmatched in reputation, attracting both fledglings and eagles of knowledge. Egypt revelled in him, and the Nile celebrated him, while he inspired awe in every soul he touched.

He was born in *Matkhasharash*—a walled city in the region of Granada—toward the end of Shawwal in the year 654 A.H. He grew up in Granada, where he studied Quranic readings, grammar, and language. He travelled across the Maghreb and arrived in Egypt before 680 A.H.

He heard traditions and studied under many scholars: in Granada, he learned from Abu Jafar Ibn Zubair, Abu Bashir, Abu Jafar Ibn Tabba', Abu Ali Ibn Abi Ahwas, and others; in Malaga, from Abu Abdillah Muhammad Ibn Abbas Qurtubi; in Bijaya, from Abu Abdillah Muhammad Ibn Salih Kinani; in Tunis, from Abu Muhammad Abdullah Ibn Harun and others; in Alexandria, from Abd al-Wahhab Ibn Hasan Ibn Furat; in Mecca, from Abu al-Hasan Ali Ibn Salih Husaini; and in Egypt, from Abd al-Aziz al-Harrani, Ibn Khatib Mazah, Ghazi Hallawi, and many others.

He accompanied the master of traditions Abu Muhammad Dimyati, studied with several of his teachers, and contributed significantly to the fields of grammar and Quranic readings. Many prominent scholars

studied under him, including my father, the Imam and scholar. My father's works are filled with references to Abu Hayyan.

When we travelled from Damascus to Cairo in the year 742 A.H, the Sultan later ordered us to return to Syria after completing our mission. My father requested a few days' delay for my sake, so I could complete my studies with Abu Hayyan. He said to me, 'My son, this is a rare opportunity, and you may not find it again in another journey.' And so, it was.

Shaikh Abu Hayyan was an influential Imam, acknowledged by the scholars of his time as a leader and exemplar. His works were preserved and studied by generations—his concise summaries by children and his comprehensive works by their fathers. His name became proverbial for precision, thoroughness, and reliability. He made significant contributions to jurisprudence, summarizing *Minhaaj al-Nawawi*, and authored widely circulated works, including *Al-Bahr al-Muheet fi al-Tafsir*, *Sharh al-Tas'heel*, *al-Irtishaf*, *Tajreed Ahkam Sibawayh*, *al-Tazkerah*, *al-Ghaayah*, *al-Taqreeb*, *al-Mubdi'*, *al-Lamha*, and more.

In Quranic readings, he authored *Eqd al-La'ali*. He also composed a great deal of poetry, with his *al-muwashahat al-badee'ah* (strophic poems) surpassing his other verses in quality.

He passed away on the evening of Saturday, the 28th of Safar, 745 A.H, at his home on the outskirts of Cairo and was buried in the Sufi cemetery¹."

Jamal al-Deen Isnawi writes in **Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah**, "Our Shaikh, Asir al-Deen Abu Hayyan Muhammad Ibn Yusuf Ali Ibn Hayyan Andalusi was the leading scholar of his time in the science of grammar, renowned for his famous works in the fields of grammar and Quranic exegesis (*tafseer*) both in the East and the West. He had numerous students spread across different regions. He was also an Imam in the Arabic language, well-versed in the seven modes of

¹ Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah, vol. 6, p. 31

Quranic recitation, and a distinguished scholar of traditions. Additionally, he was an excellent poet, eloquent in speech, meticulous in his work, and diligent in both learning and teaching until his last moments. He possessed extensive knowledge and maintained a deep focus on his endeavours. While he engaged only slightly in the study of Islamic jurisprudence (*fiqh*), he abridged the book **al-Minhaaj** by Nawawi. However, he leaned toward the Zahiri school of thought and occasionally expressed this inclination openly.

He was born in Granada at the beginning of Shawwal in the year 654 A.H. He studied in Granada and Egypt under many notable figures. He learned grammar from Abu Jafar Ibn Zubair, the last of the great Arab grammarians, and also from a few of Abu Jafar's teachers who were students of Abu Ali Shalubayn. He later travelled to Egypt, where he studied Kitab Sibawayh under Shaikh Baha al-Deen Ibn Nahhaas Halabi. He also learned from numerous other scholars and dedicated himself to teaching, writing, and leading academic circles.

He taught at the Jaame' al-Aqmar Mosque and was appointed to teach tafseer at the Jaame' Tulun Mosque and the Mansuriya Dome. He became blind shortly before his death and passed away on the evening of Saturday, the 27th of Safar in the year 745 A.H, at his home outside Bab al-Bahr. He was buried the following day outside Bab al-Nasr in the Sufi cemetery. I often visit his grave as it is near the graves of my mother and her brother, may Allah have mercy on them, as well as my father's grave. I studied many of his works with him and discussed **al-Tas'heel** under his supervision. He once wrote for me, 'Discuss this matter with Shaikh so-and-so...' to the end of his words. He also said to me, 'I have never designated anyone as a shaikh at your age.'

Among his poetry, he recited to us:

'My enemies have a favor and grace upon me,

So may the Most Merciful not remove my enemies from me.

They sought out my faults, so I avoided them,

*And they competed with me, so I attained the lofty heights’.*¹

Shams al-Deen Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Jazari in **Tabaqaat al-Qurra’** writes, “Muhammad Ibn Yusuf Ibn Ali Ibn Hayyan, Asir al-Deen Abu Hayyan Aandalusi Gharnaati was an Imam, a memorizer (*hafiz*) of traditions, a distinguished scholar, a master of Arabic language and literature, and a scholar of Quranic recitations (*qira’at*). He was known for his integrity and reliability (*adaalah* and *siqah*).

Jazari continues, “Zahabi said, ‘Despite his complete mastery of Arabic, he also had extensive expertise in jurisprudence (*fiqh*), traditions (*asar*), Quranic recitations (*qira’at*), and linguistics (*lughat*). He authored works in the sciences of Quranic recitation and textual verification (*tahqeeq*). He was the pride of the scholars of Egypt in our time, and many prominent figures graduated under his tutelage.

Jazari adds, “He composed a poem in *Lamiyyah* form encompassing the seven Quranic readings, free of symbols, and supplemented it with valuable annotations. He also composed a similar poem for the recitation of Yaqub and provided an excellent commentary. Among his other works is **Irtishaf al-Darb min Lisan al-Arab**, a comprehensive text on the Arabic language. He also wrote a commentary on about half of **Alfiyyat Ibn Maalik** in two volumes.

His most notable work is his exegesis, which surpassed all previous endeavours in its field, titled **al-Bahr al-Muheet** in ten large volumes. He later abridged it into three volumes under the title **al-Nahr**, and he also composed a poetic rendition of it with extraordinary eloquence.

He was characterized by piety, righteousness, trustworthiness, and integrity. He passed away in the year 745 A.H. in Cairo and was buried in the Sufi cemetery.

He was born in the last ten days of Shawwal in the year 654 A.H. in Granada. He began his studies in Quranic recitation in the year 670

¹ Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah, vol. 1, p. 218, No. 414

A.H.¹

Taqi al-Deen Abu Bakr Asadi in **Tabaqaat al-Shafeiyyah** chronicles, “Muhammad Ibn Yusuf Ibn Ali Ibn Hayyan Ibn Yusuf, the renowned Shaikh, Imam, scholar, memorizer of traditions, exegete (*mufasssir*), grammarian (*nahwi*), and linguist, was a unique figure of his era, the master of grammarians in his time, and the top exegete of his age. His famous works spread widely across the East and West. Known as Asir al-Deen Abu Hayyan Aandalusi Jayyani Gharnaati, and later Misri, he was born in Granada. Some say his birth year was 652 A.H, while others state it was Shawwal 654 A.H. He began seeking knowledge in the year 657 A.H.

He studied Arabic in his homeland under several teachers, the most notable being Abu Jafar Ibn Zubair, from whom he also learned traditions in the Maghreb (North Africa). He studied various narrations under him and others. He received some knowledge from the teachers of his Shaikh, Abu Jafar, who had studied under Abu Ali Shalubain. He travelled to Cairo in 679 A.H and encountered Abu Tahir Ismail Ibn Hibatillah Milli, the last person to have studied under Abu al-Jaud. He studied with him and learned Arabic under the two scholars viz. Razi al-Deen Qustantini and Baha al-Deen Ibn Nahhaas, under whom he studied Kitab Sibawayh.

He studied principles of jurisprudence (*usul al-fiqh*) under Isfahani, traditions under Dimyaati, and other subjects with numerous scholars. He narrated from about 400 Shaikhs and granted authorization (*ijaazah*) to over 1,500 individuals. He mentioned this in a book he authored titled **al-Tibyaan fi Man Rawa anhu Abu Hayyan**. Initially adhering to the Zahiri school of thought, he later associated himself with the Shafei school, abridging **Minhaaj Nawawi**. After the death of Ibn Nahhaas in 698 A.H, he became the leading grammarian of his time and continued teaching until his death.

¹ Tabaqaat al-Qurra', vol. 2, p. 285, No. 3555

Generations of students learned from him, and he authored numerous well-known works, with some reports suggesting over fifty titles. Among them are:

1. Al-Bahr al-Muheet (a tafsir).
2. Al-Nahr min al-Bahr (an abridgment of his tafsir).
3. Sharh al-Tas'heel (in six volumes).
4. Irtishaf al-Darb (in grammar, unmatched, in three volumes).
5. Al-Tazkerah (in grammar, in three volumes).
6. Ghaayah al-Ihsan (a foundational work in grammar).
7. Al-Nukat al-Hasan Sharh Ghaayah al-Ihsan (a commentary).
8. A Diwan (collection of poetry).

He taught, narrated, and was heard by leading Imams, scholars, and memorizers of traditions. He became blind shortly before his death, and his biography is extensive and widely known.”

Salah Safadi writes, “He is the one who encouraged people to read the works of Ibn Maalik, motivated them towards them, and explained their obscurities. He used to say about Ibn Haajib’s introduction, ‘This is the grammar of the jurists.’ He passed away in Cairo in Safar of the year 745 A.H. and was buried in the cemetery of the Sufis. His companion, Kamaal Adfawi, mentioned him in his book **al-Badr al-Saafir**, providing a lengthy biography spanning about a booklet. He listed a group of his teachers, mentioned the number of his authored works, and stated that he studied jurisprudence according to the Shafei school under Shaikh Alam al-Deen Ibn Bint Iraqi. He reviewed **al-Muharrar** by Rafei and its abridgment, **al-Minhaaj** by Nawawi, under his guidance, and memorized most of **al-Minhaaj**. Among his works, he listed **al-Wahhaaj**, an abridgment of **al-Minhaaj** in jurisprudence. He tended visibly toward the school of the Zahiris (literalists) and was known for harbouring distrust of all people.”

Ibn Hajar Asqalani pens in **al-Durar al-Kaaminah**, “Muhammad Ibn Yusuf Ibn Ali Ibn Yusuf Ibn Hayyan Gharnaati, Asir al-Deen Abu Hayyan Andalusi Jayyani, was born at the end of Shawwal in the

year 654 A.H. He studied the Quran with the preacher Abd al-Haqq Ibn Ali, individually and collectively, and then with the preacher Abu Jafar Ibn Tabbaa', and later with the Hafiz Abu Ali Ibn Abi Ahwas in Maaleqah. He heard (traditions) extensively in the lands of Andalus and Ifriqiya (North Africa). Then he came to Alexandria, where he studied Quranic readings with Abd al-Basir Ibn Ali Maryuti, and in Egypt with Abu Tahir Ismail Ibn Hibatillah Maleehi, the last of Abu al-Jaud's students. There, he adhered to Shaikh Baha al-Deen Ibn al-Nahhaas, listening to him recite many works of literature and transmitting narrations from his teachers, as written in his own hand.

Among his teachers were Abu Ali Ibn Abi al-Ahwas, Muhammad Ibn Yahya Ibn Abd al-Rahman Ibn Rabee', Wajeeh Ibn Dahhaan, Qutb Qastalani, Ibn Anmaati, Izza Harraani, Abu Muhammad Ibn Harun, Muhammad Ibn Abdullah Ibn Nazw, Ibn Khatib Mizzah, Ghazi Hallawi, Munisa bint Aadil, and Shaamiya bint Bakri. He said that the number of people he learned from reached 450 individuals, while those who authorized him (*ijaazah*) were too numerous to count. He also heard from Abd al-Wahhab Ibn Ghuramaat and Abdullah Ibn Ahmad Ibn Faaris.

Safadi said, 'I never saw him except that he was either listening, engaging, writing, or reading a book; I never saw him doing otherwise. He was attentive to bright students, esteemed them greatly, and highlighted their abilities. He composed a great deal of poetry, including odes and *muwashshahat badeeah*. He was reliable in what he transmitted and well-versed in language. As for grammar and morphology, he was the unrivalled master, devoting most of his life to this field until no one in the world was mentioned in connection to it other than him. He had extensive expertise in exegesis, traditions, biographies, and knowledge of people's ranks, especially the Maghrebis. His works became widely known across the world during his lifetime. He taught both the young and old, and his students became leaders and teachers even during his life.'

He was the one who encouraged people to read the works of Ibn

Maalik, made them interested in these books, explained their ambiguities, and used to say about Ibn Haajib's introduction, 'This is the grammar of the jurists.' He was committed to teaching only from Kitab Sibawayh, al-Tas'heel by Ibn Maalik, or his own writings.

Ibn al-Khatib said, 'The reason for his departure from Granada was that his youthful enthusiasm led him to confront his teacher Abu Jafar Ibn Tabbaa'. There was also a fallout between him and his teacher Abu Jafar Ibn Zubair, which escalated. He criticized him, wrote refutations of him, and accused him of fabrications. This was reported to the Sultan of Granada, who took Abu Jafar's side, ordered his capture and punishment, leading Abu Hayyan to go into hiding. He then crossed the sea in secret and travelled eastwards, eventually settling in Egypt.'

He added, 'Abu Hayyan composed a large body of poetry, some of which demonstrated great skill, while other parts lacked refinement. He arrived in 679 A.H., meeting Abu Tahir Maleehi, the last person to study with Abu Jaud. He also attended the gatherings of Shaikh Shams al-Deen Isfahani. He was initially a Zahiri (literalist) but later affiliated with the Shafei school, even abridging **Minhaaj**. However, Abu Baqaa' would say that he never truly abandoned his Zahiri tendencies. I heard Abu Hayyan himself say, 'It is impossible for one who has embraced the Zahiri school of thought to abandon it, for it becomes deeply ingrained in the mind'.'

He listed his authored works, as recorded in his own handwriting:

- ♦ Al-Bahr al-Muheet (The Vast Ocean) – The exegesis of the Holy Quran
- ♦ Gharib al-Quran (The Uncommon Words of the Quran), a single volume
- ♦ Al-Asfaar al-Mukhtasar min Kitab al-Saffar (The Summary of the Journeys from Saffar's Book)
- ♦ Sharh al-Tas'heel (Commentary on al-Tas'heel)
- ♦ Al-Tazkerah (The Reminder)

- ◆ Al-Mawfur (The Abundant)
- ◆ Al-Tazkeer (The Recollection)
- ◆ Al-Mubdi' (The Innovator)
- ◆ Al-Taqreeb (The Approximation)
- ◆ Al-Tadreeb (The Training)
- ◆ Ghayaah al-Ihsan (The Ultimate Excellence)
- ◆ Al-Nukat al-Hisaan (The Fine Points)
- ◆ Al-Shadha fi Mas'alah Kazaa (The Scent about the pronoun 'thus')
- ◆ Al-Lamha (The Glance)
- ◆ Al-Shadhra (The Fragment)
- ◆ Al-Irtiza (The Acceptance)
- ◆ Aqd al-La'ali – Nukat al-Amaali (The Necklace of Pearls – Subtleties of Aspirations)
- ◆ Al-Naafe' (The Beneficial)
- ◆ Al-Maurid al-Ghamr (The Submerged Source)
- ◆ Al-Rauz al-Baasim (The Smiling Garden)
- ◆ Al-Muzn al-Haamir (The Pouring Clouds)
- ◆ Taqreeb al-Naai (Bringing the Distant Closer)
- ◆ Ghayaah al-Matlub (The Ultimate Goal)
- ◆ Al-Nayyir al-Jali (The Clear Light)
- ◆ Al-Wahhaaj fi Ikhtisar al-Minhaaj (The Glowing Lamp: Abridgment of Al-Minhaj)
- ◆ Al-Nur al-Ajla fi Ikhtisar al-Muhalla (The Radiant Light: Abridgment of Al-Muhalla)
- ◆ Al-Hulal al-Haaliyah (The Beautiful Adornments)
- ◆ Al-A'lam (The Flags)
- ◆ Nasr al-Zahr wa Nazm al-Zahr (Scattering Flowers and Stringing Flowers)

- ◆ Qatr al-Habi (The Rain of Pearls)
- ◆ Al-Fihrist (The Index)
- ◆ Nawaafis al-Sihr (The Windows of Magic)
- ◆ Majaani al-Husur (The Free Gatherings)
- ◆ Tuhfah al-Nads fi Nuhat al-Aandalus (The Rare Gift in the Grammarians of al-Andalus)
- ◆ Al-Abyaat al-Waafiya fi al-Qaafiya (The Perfect Verses on Rhyme)
- ◆ Al-Idrak li-Lisan al-Atraak (Comprehension of the Turkish Tongue)
- ◆ Zahv al-Mulk fi Nahv al-Turk (The King's Pride in Turkish Grammar)
- ◆ Al-Af'aal fi Lisan al-Turk (The Verbs in the Turkish Tongue)
- ◆ Mantiq al-Khoros bi-Lisan al-Fars (The Language of the Mute in Persian)
- ◆ Nur al-Ghabash fi Lisan al-Habash (The Light of Dawn in the Abyssinian Tongue)
- ◆ Al-Mahbur fi Lisan al-Yahmur (The Colored Language of the Red One)
- ◆ Maslak al-Rushd (The Path of Guidance)
- ◆ Manhaj al-Saalik (The Method of the Traveler)
- ◆ Nihayaah al-E'raab (The Ultimate in Parsing)
- ◆ Khulaasah al-Bayan (The Summary of Elucidation)

Some of these works remained unfinished.

Ibn Hajar continued, after mentioning a selection of his poetry, "Al-Kamaal said in his biography, 'He was the great scholar of his era, the reviver of the first art [grammar and linguistics] after its traces had faded, and the master of the Arabic language, unmatched and unrivalled. He accompanied him from the year 718 A.H. until his death and mentioned a great number of his teachers. He studied **al-Muharrar** by Rafei under Alim Iraqi and memorized **al-Minhaaj**,

abridging it, as well as abridging **al-Muhalla** by Ibn Hazm. He listed his writings and noted that he was truthful, trustworthy, and free from philosophical innovations, Mutazilite views, and anthropomorphism. He inclined toward literary pursuits, admiring the beauty of youth, and adhered to the Zahiri school. He also had a deep love for Ali Ibn Abi Talib (a.s.) and disassociated himself from (those who fought him). He interpreted the saying, *'No one loves you except a believer, and no one hates you except a hypocrite,'* according to this view. He was deeply humble, often weeping when reading the Quran or even when hearing poetic verses of love.'

He added, 'He was praised by many prominent figures, including Ibn Abd Zahir, Shaafe', Sadr Ibn Wakil, Ashraf Ibn Wahid, Najm Tunī, Abu Husain Jazzar, Shahab Farazi, Ishaq Ibn Manni Turki, Muhir Qoosi, and Ibn al-Khaimi.'

Ibn Hajar continued, 'I came across a book of his titled **al-Nazar fi al-Mala'ah an Nidar** (The Insight into Adornment and Lustre), written in his own hand in a large volume. In it, he mentioned his beginnings, the start of his scholarly journey, his travels, the biographies of many of his teachers, and his personal experiences. He digressed into numerous topics covering diverse fields, which he summarized in **al-Tazkerah**.'

Among his writings in this book, he mentioned the origins of the Nafza tribe, saying, 'It is attributed to Nafza, a Berber tribe. The Berbers, as they claim, descend from Barbar Ibn Qais Ibn Aylan Ibn Muzar. Their tribes include Riyaasah, Hawaarah, Manjah, Nafza, Kadama, Lawama, Sarama, Sama, and Harama. They were all in Palestine with Goliath, but after his death, they dispersed, with most of them heading to the mountains in Sous and elsewhere.'

He said, 'Granada, the capital of Aandalus, is comparable to Damascus in its abundance of fruits and is Islamic. My father was from Jayyan (Jaén), so Abu Hayyan was called 'Jayyani'.'

He added, 'It is said that he fell ill once, and a group, including Ibn Daniyal, came to visit him. He recited a long poem, and when he

finished, Ibn Daniyal said to the group, ‘Rejoice, for the Shaikh has recovered and will soon visit the bathhouse.’ When asked why, he replied, ‘Because he has expelled every remaining trace of illness through his words!’

Safadi said, ‘He was a tall Shaikh, handsome, fair complexion with a hint of redness, illuminated with a radiant beard. His beard was full but not thick, and his hair was long and loose. He spoke fluently in the Andalusian dialect, pronouncing the letter qaf close to kaf, but in the Quran, he pronounced it precisely and correctly. He was praised by a group of eloquent literati, and prominent scholars studied under him, some of whom passed away in his lifetime or shortly after, as he lived a long life.’

He continued, ‘He was particularly close to Aragon, the deputy ruler, and would often stay overnight at the citadel with him. When his daughter Nidar passed away, he requested permission from Sultan Nasir to bury her in a domed structure in the Eastern Cemetery, and permission was granted.’

‘He followed the Zahiri school of thought, but when he came to Cairo and saw that the Zahiri school was abandoned, he adopted the Shafei school. He studied **al-Muharrar** and **al-Minhaaj** under Aleem Iraqi and memorized most of **al-Minhaaj** except for a small portion.’

Ibn Hajar continues, ‘I said, ‘A copy of his work, written in his own hand, was seen by me. He later abridged it and studied some principles of jurisprudence (*usul al-fiqh*) with Abu Jafar Ibn Zubair using **al-Ishaarah** by Baji and parts of **al-Mustasfa**. He also studied theology (*usul al-din*) under Ibn Zubair and some logic with Badr al-Deen Muhammad Ibn Sultan. He read with him from **al-Irshad** by Abeedi on matters of disagreement. He excelled in grammar to the extent that he became exclusively known for it.

He was free from philosophy, innocent of Mutazilite theology and anthropomorphism, and adhered to the way of the early predecessors (*salaf*). He greatly revered Ibn Taymiyyah and even praised him in a poem, but later turned against him, mentioning him negatively in his

exegesis and accusing him of anthropomorphism. It was said that this change occurred because they had a debate about the Arabic language, during which Ibn Taymiyyah insulted Sibawayh, which offended Abu Hayyan and caused his estrangement from him. Others said that he discovered Ibn Taymiyyah's book **al-Arsh** (The Throne) and became convinced that he was an anthropomorphist.

Abu Hayyan was a prolific learner of traditions, with his teachers numbering 400. Many granted him certifications (*ijaazah*), and he compiled them in his book **al-Bayan min Shuyukh Abi Hayyan**, where their number reached 1,500. His works exceed fifty in number.

Jafar Adfawi writes, "He followed the path of many prominent grammarians in his love for Ali. On one occasion, he said to Badr al-Deen Ibn Jama'ah, 'The statement, *'No one loves you except a believer, and no one hates you except a hypocrite'* — is it authentic?' Ibn Jama'ah replied, 'Yes.' Abu Hayyan then asked, 'Those who fought against him and drew their swords against him — did they love him or hate him?'

Al-Adfawi also reports, 'The Shaikh was generally distrustful of people, though Safadi countered this by saying that he never heard him speak ill of anyone, whether alive or deceased. I did, however, hear that he criticized Ibn Daqeeq Eid, but I personally did not hear him say anything specific about him. What I did hear was his disdain for those labelled as 'pious', to the extent that I once asked him, 'O my master! What do you think of Shaikh Abu Madin?' He replied, 'A righteous Muslim man. Otherwise, he would neither fly in the air nor pray all five prayers in Mecca as some ignorant people claim about him.'

He had a profound humility, crying when he heard the Quran and weeping when listening to love poetry. He would say, 'The poetry that moves me most is either romantic or heroic; poetry about generosity does not affect me.'

He was proud of his frugality, much as others boast of their generosity, and would say, 'I advise you to preserve your wealth and let them call you "stingy" rather than needing anything from the

lowly!’ He also criticized my habit of spending money on buying books, saying, ‘If you want a book, borrow it from the endowments, fulfil your need, and return it. If you need a dirham, will you find someone to lend it to you?’ He also said, ‘A poor person in Cairo can suffice with just four fils daily: a loaf for morning, another for evening, oil for one fils, and water for one fils.’

Zahabi said in **al-Mojam al-Mukhtas**, ‘Abu Hayyan was a master of many disciplines, an authority in the Arabic language, and a leading scholar in Egypt. He was highly skilled and tireless in his pursuit of knowledge.’

Isnawi said, ‘He was the leading scholar of his era in grammar, a master of the Arabic language, knowledgeable in Quran and traditions, an excellent poet, truthful in speech, precise in his work, and with a great command of memorization. Although he was Shafei, he inclined toward the Zahiri school and would sometimes openly express this tendency.’

Toward the end of his life, he suffered a decline in health. A group of our teachers narrated from him, including his grandson Abu Hayyan Muhammad Ibn Hayyan Ibn Abi Hayyan Shaikh Abu Ishaq Tanukhi and Shaikh al-Islam Siraj al-Deen Balqini.’

He passed away in his home outside Bab al-Bahr on the 18th of Safar in the year 745 A.H.¹

Jalal al-Deen Suyuti writes in **Bughyah al-Wu’aat**, ‘Muhammad Ibn Yusuf Ibn Ali Ibn Yusuf Ibn Hayyan, the Imam Asir al-Deen Abu Hayyan Aandalusi Gharnaati Nafzi – attributed to Nafza, a Berber tribe – was the grammarian, linguist, Quranic exegete, scholar of traditions, reciter, historian, and litterateur of his time. He was born in Matkhsharsh, a city in Granada, at the end of Shawwal in the year 654 A.H. He studied Quranic recitations with Abu Jafar Ibn Ṭabba’ and Arabic with Abu al-Hasan Aabazi, Abu Jafar Ibn Zubair, Ibn Abi al-Ahwaas, Ibn al-Saaegh, and Abu Jafar Labli. In Egypt, he studied

¹ Al-Durar al-Kaaminah, vol. 5, p. 70, No. 4693

under Baha Ibn Nahhaas and others.

He excelled in grammar and taught during the lifetimes of his teachers in the Maghreb. He heard traditions in Aandalus, Africa, Alexandria, Egypt, and Hijaz from approximately 450 scholars, including Abu al-Husain Ibn Rabee', Ibn Abi al-Ahwas, Razi Shaatibi, Qutb Qastallaani, and Izz Harrani. He received authorizations (*ijaazaas*) from numerous scholars in both the Maghreb and the Mashriq, including Sharq Dumyaati, Taqi Ibn Daqeeq, Eid, Taqi Ibn Razeen, and Abu al-Yaman Ibn Asaakir. He dedicated himself to the study and transmission of traditions, excelling in it, as well as in Quranic exegesis (*tafsir*), Arabic, Quranic recitations, literature, and history. His name became renowned, and his fame spread widely. The notable scholars of his time learned from him and advanced during his lifetime, including Shaikh Taqi al-Deen Subki and his sons, Jamal Isnawi, Ibn Qasim, Ibn Aqil, Samin, Nazir al-Jaysh, Safaqisi, Ibn Maktum, and many others.

Safadi said, 'I never saw him except that he was listening, studying, writing, or reading a book. He was precise in what he transmitted and knowledgeable in language. As for grammar and morphology, he was the undisputed imam in those fields. He devoted most of his life to these disciplines until no one in the world could match him in them. He also had great expertise in exegesis, traditions, biographies of people, and knowledge of their ranks, particularly those of the Maghreb. He taught many people, both young and old, producing students who became leaders and teachers during his lifetime. He committed himself to teaching only from Kitab Sibawayh, al-Tas'heel, or his own compositions.

The reason for his departure from Granada was that, in the fervour of youth, he clashed with his teacher Abu Jafar Ibn Ṭabba'. He also had a confrontation with his teacher Abu Jafar Ibn Zubair, criticizing him and authoring a refutation of his narrations. This matter was brought to the Sultan, who ordered his apprehension and punishment. Abu Hayyan went into hiding, then fled by sea to the Mashriq.

In his book **al-Nazaar**, in which he documented his beginnings, studies, teachers, and travels, he mentioned that one reason he decided to leave Granada was that a scholar of logic, philosophy, mathematics, and natural sciences said to the Sultan, ‘I am aging, and I fear I may die. I suggest that you appoint students for me so I can teach them this knowledge, which will benefit the Sultan in the future.’ Abu Hayyan said, ‘It was suggested that I be one of those students, with a generous salary and fine clothing, but I refused and departed, fearing that I would be compelled to do so.’

Safadi continues, ‘He studied under Alam Iraqi and attended the sessions of Isfahani. He followed the Shafei school, but Abu al-Baqaa said he always adhered to the Zahiri school.’ Ibn Ḥajar writes, ‘Abu Hayyan used to say, ‘It is impossible for someone to abandon the Zahiri school once it has entered their mind.’ Adfawi mentioned that Abu Hayyan boasted about his frugality as others boasted about generosity. He was trustworthy, truthful, and an authority, free from philosophical innovations, Mutazilite beliefs, or anthropomorphism. He inclined towards the Zahiri school and had a deep love for Ali Ibn Abi Talib. He was highly devout and wept frequently while reciting the Quran.

Abu Hayyan was a tall man, handsome, with a fair complexion tinged with redness. His beard was large, and his hair flowed naturally. He initially revered Ibn Taymiyyah but later had a disagreement with him. When Abu Hayyan cited something from Kitab Sibawayh, Ibn Taymiyyah remarked, ‘Sibawayh, the builder of grammar, made thirty errors in his book.’ This offended Abu Hayyan, who then criticized Ibn Taymiyyah severely in his exegesis, **al-Nahr**.¹

Safadi said, “He had great enthusiasm for intelligent students and showed them immense respect. He was the one who encouraged people to engage with the works of Ibn Maalik, urging them to read and study them. He clarified the obscure aspects of these works and navigated their complexities with his students. He used to say about

¹ Bughyah al-Wu’aat, p. 121

the Muqaddimah of Ibn al-Hajib: ‘This is the grammar of jurists.’ He held the position of teaching exegesis at the Mansuriyyah Dome and Quranic recitation at the Jaame’ al-Aqmar. His speech was eloquent, though when not reciting the Quran, he pronounced the *qāf* almost like a *kāf*.

Among his authored works are:

1. **Al-Bahr al-Muheet** in Quranic exegesis.
2. **Al-Nahr**, a summary of the above, also titled **Ithaaf al-Areeb bi ma fi al-Quran min al-Gharib** (A Gift to the Eloquent Regarding Rare Words in the Quran).
3. **Al-Tazyeel wa al-Takmeel** – a detailed commentary on al-Tas’heel, extensive in scope.
4. **Al-Irtishaaf** and its abridged version in two volumes. These two works are unmatched in Arabic grammar for their comprehensiveness and wealth of opinions and disputes, upon which I relied in my own book *Jawaame’ al-Jawaame’*. May Allah make them beneficial.
5. **Al-Tankheel**, a summarized commentary on al-Tas’heel by the author and his son, Badr al-Deen.
6. **Al-Asfaar**, an abridged commentary on *Kitab Sibawayh* by al-Saffar.
7. **Al-Tajreed**, a work focused on the rulings derived from *Kitab Sibawayh*.
8. **Al-Tazkerah** in Arabic grammar, a four-volume work, large in size. I have studied it and selected much from it.
9. **Al-Taqreeb**, a summary of **al-Maghrīb**.
10. **Al-Tadreeb**, its commentary.
11. **Al-Mubdi’** in morphology.
12. **Ghaayah al-Ihsaan** in grammar.
13. Commentary on **al-Shadhaa** in specific grammatical issues.
14. **Al-Lamhah al-Shadhrah** and **al-Irtiza** on the differences

between the alphabets *zaad* and *zaa*.

15. **Aqd al-La'ali** on Quranic recitations, following the rhyme and style of al-Shaatibiyyah.
16. **Al-Hullal al-Haaliyyah** on high Quranic chains of transmission (*isnad*).
17. **Nuhaat al-Aandalus** (Grammarians of Spain).
18. **Al-Abyaat al-Waafiyyah** on the science of rhymes (*ilm al-qaafiyyah*).
19. **Mantiq al-Khoros fi Lisan al-Furs** (The Logic of the Mute in the Language of the Persians).
20. **Al-Idraak li-Lisan al-Atraak** (Comprehension of the Language of the Turks).
21. **Zahw al-Mulk fi Nahv al-Turk** (The Pride of the King in the Grammar of the Turks).
22. **Al-Wahhaaj**, a summary of al-Minhaaj by Nawawi, and many others.

Among his unfinished works:

1. **Sharh al-Alfiyyah** – A commentary on Alfiyyah.
2. **Nihaayah al-E'raab fi al-Tasreef wa al-E'raab** – A comprehensive work on morphology and syntax.
3. **Urjuzah Khulaasah al-Tibyan fi al-Ma'ani wa al-Bayan** – A didactic poem summarizing meanings and rhetoric.
4. **Urjuzah Nur al-Ghubash fi Lisan al-Habash** – A didactic poem on the Ethiopian language.
5. **Majani al-Hasr fi Tawaarikh Ahl al-Asr** – A collection on the histories of contemporary figures.

Excerpts from his poetry:

◆ On adversity and virtue:

My enemies have a favour and blessing upon me,

So may the Merciful never take my foes from me.

*They sought to find my faults, and I avoided them,
They competed with me, so I gained greatness.*

◆ **On separation and sorrow:**

*Tears raced ahead of the mounts at the thought of the journey,
As the one I love prepared to depart from me.
The lines etched upon my cheeks were as beautiful as his script,
And yet he could not match, even as the son of Muqla.*

◆ **The Tamer of Love”**

*The tamer of love has appeared in its cheek,
How beautiful is the face of this tamer.
Some thought my heart had healed,
But the truth is, a fleeting presence is of no weight.*

He passed away on the 28th of Şafar, in the year 745 A.H. and was eulogized by Safadi with the following:

*The death of Asir al-Deen, the guide of humanity,
Brought tears from the lightning and the rainclouds alike.
Even the gentle morning breeze became faint,
Ill at dawn when the news spread.
The birds in their groves, in their mournful cries,
Eulogized him with rhymed prose, echoing on the letter Ra.
O eyes! Pour forth tears,
To soak the soil that now holds him.
Let blood flow, for the calamity of his loss,
Demands more than what has already been shed.
The Imam of knowledge has departed,
A leader among leaders, while the world followed behind.
The night now calls to him, isolated,
As the grave encloses what you see.*

How sorrowful it is, that his manifest guidance,
 Has now become concealed in the dust.
 He had gathered virtue in his era,
 And when he passed, that virtue fractured.
 For a time, virtue was recognized through him,
 But now that he has gone, it has been forgotten.
 He was beyond the rules of syntax and morphology,
 Unshaken by calamities that befell others.
 He embodied the superlative, unparalleled,
 And no one matched him in excellence.
 His piety was his constant source of action,
 With deeds as their undeniable proof.
 He entered the grave, but only after
 Loosening the firm bonds of patience.
 Zaid and Amr wept for him,
 From the grammar books and all who studied under him.
 How difficult al-Tas'heel has become after him,
 How often did he make the difficult easy.
 He encouraged others to delve into it,
 For he had mastered grammar profoundly.
 After him, clarity has faded,
 And his fortune has reversed.
 Those who equalled him in his art are few,
 Yet he had arts in which he stood unmatched.
 The scholars now wipe their tears upon him,
 As they wash away remnants of sleep.
 Syntax has been led astray after him,
 And morphology has been altered.
 The pure Arabic language, after his time,

*Has been misunderstood by those attempting to explain it.
 His al-Bahr al-Muheet in exegesis,
 Guides its seekers to the essence of pearls.
 Its benefits are abundant,
 And they bind one's little finger in awe.
 He was precise in his transmission, an authority,
 As clear as the light of dawn when it breaks.
 His travels in the era of the Prophet's (s.a.w.a.) sunnah,
 Are more truthful than any report you may hear.
 His chains of transmission were lofty,
 Dwarfed only by the highest peaks.
 Through them, he equated grandchildren with their forebears,
 Marvel at what others missed.
 As a poet, he was eloquent in his verses,
 How often did he refine words and embellish them.
 His meanings, whenever he inscribed them,
 Outshone whatever was written in Tustar.
 May I be held his ransom, who has passed into mortality's grip,
 Yet now embraces his Lord's generosity.
 He did not close his white eyes,
 Except to awaken in green silk.
 The Houris shake his hand,
 Grateful for the toil of all he had written.
 Though he has died, his memory remains eternal,
 Reviving hearts long before it spreads.
 The soil that veils him is graced by rain,
 That showers it with sustenance at dawn.
 May his Lord bestow upon him mercy,
 And lead him to Kawthar on the Day of Gathering.*

Muhammad Ibn Ali Shaukani, in **al-Badr al-Taale'**, writes, "Muhammad Ibn Yusuf Ibn Ali Ibn Yusuf Gharnaati, Asir al-Deen Abu Hayyan al-Aandalusi, the great Imam in Arabic language and exegesis, was born at the end of Shawwal in the year 654 A.H. He recited the Quran in individual and combined readings with the scholars of Aandalus, and he heard extensively there and in Africa. Then, he travelled to Alexandria and Egypt, where he studied under Ibn Nahhas. Among his teachers were Wajih Ibn Burhan, Qutb Qastalani, Ibn al-Anmati, and others, until he himself stated that he learned from around 450 individuals. As for those who gave him authorizations (*ijaazahs*), they were very numerous.

He excelled in linguistics, Arabic studies, and Quranic exegesis, surpassing his peers and becoming uniquely distinguished in these fields across the entire world. No one of his era equalled him. Safadi said, 'I never saw him except engaged in listening, teaching, writing, or studying a book. I never saw him otherwise. He showed great regard for intelligent students, honouring them and acknowledging their worth.' He was prolific in poetry, precise in his transmissions, and highly knowledgeable in language. In grammar and morphology, he was the absolute authority, dedicating most of his life to these fields until no one else in the world was mentioned in comparison to him.

He had outstanding expertise in exegesis, traditions, biographies of individuals, and the study of their ranks, particularly regarding the people of the Maghreb (North Africa). He authored works that travelled across the horizons of the earth and gained fame during his lifetime. Generations of students learned from him, and his disciples became Imams and scholars while he was still alive. He was the one who encouraged people to study the books of Ibn Maalik, clarifying their obscurities. He used to say, 'The Muqaddimah of Ibn Haajib is the grammar of the jurists.' He committed himself to teaching only from Kitab Sibawayh, al-Tas'heel, or his own writings, maintaining this practice until the end of his life.

Among his works are:

- ◆ Al-Bahr al-Muheet in exegesis
- ◆ Gharib al-Quran in one volume
- ◆ Al-Asfaar, abridged from the book of al-Saffar
- ◆ A commentary on al-Tas'heel
- ◆ Al-Tazkerah
- ◆ Al-Mawfur
- ◆ Al-Tazkeer
- ◆ Al-Mubdi'
- ◆ Al-Taqreeb wa al-Tadreeb
- ◆ Ghayaah al-Ihsan bi al-Nukat al-Hisan
- ◆ Al-Shadha fi Mas'alah Kaza
- ◆ Al-Lamhah
- ◆ Al-Shadhrah
- ◆ Al-Irtiza
- ◆ Aqd al-La'ali
- ◆ Nukat al-Amani
- ◆ Al-Naafe'
- ◆ Al-Mawrid al-Ghamr
- ◆ Al-Rawz al-Basim
- ◆ Al-Muzn al-Hamir
- ◆ Al-Ramzah
- ◆ Ghaayah al-Matlub
- ◆ Al-Nayyir al-Jali
- ◆ Al-Wahhaaj, a summary of al-Minhaaj
- ◆ Al-Nur al-Ajla in abridging al-Muhalla
- ◆ Al-E'laam
- ◆ Nawaafis al-Sihr
- ◆ Tuhfah al-Naddas fi Nuhat al-Aandalus

- ◆ Idrak li-Lisan al-Atraak
- ◆ Mantiq al-Khoros bi-Lisan al-Furs
- ◆ Nur al-Ghabash fi Lisan al-Habash
- ◆ Maslak al-Rushd
- ◆ Manhaj al-Saalik
- ◆ Nihaayah al-E'raab
- ◆ Khulaasah al-Bayan

And other works mentioned by Ibn Hajar in **al-Durar**, which were taken from the handwriting of Abu Hayyan himself. Among the works not mentioned is **Al-Nahr al-Madd** in exegesis, an abridgment of **Al-Bahr al-Muheet**, as previously noted.” Ibn al-Khatib said, “The reason for his departure from Granada was that, driven by the impulsiveness of youth, he engaged in disputes with his teacher Abu Jafar Ibn Tabba’. A rift also occurred between him and his other teacher, Abu Jafar Ibn Zubair, leading to hostility. He criticized his teacher and even began writing to refute him. The matter was escalated to the Sultan of Granada, who sided with Abu Jafar and ordered Abu Hayyan to be summoned and punished. Fearing for his safety, he went into hiding and later left for the East. There, he attended the lectures of Shaikh Shams al-Deen Isfahani, who adhered to the Zahiri school. Later, Abu Hayyan is said to have aligned with the Shafei school, though Abu al-Baqa’ maintained that he always remained a Zahiri.

Ibn Hajar said, ‘Abu Hayyan used to say, ‘It is impossible for one whose mind has embraced the Zahiri school to abandon it.’ This statement is accurate, for the Zahiri school is the essence of reason and the culmination of action for one who has been granted fairness and whose natural disposition has not been altered by influences that deviate it from its original state. The Zahiri school is not exclusive to Dawud Zahiri and his followers but represents the approach of the greatest scholars who adhered strictly to the texts of the Shariah, from the time of the Companions until today. Dawud was merely one of

them, although he became known for his rigid stance in certain issues where adhering to the apparent meaning was unwarranted. He also neglected certain types of analogy that fairness demands should not be ignored.

In essence, the Zahiri school involves adhering to the apparent meaning of the Quran and Sunnah in all their indications while rejecting reliance on personal opinion that has no foundation in textual evidence. If you carefully examine the opinions of the great independent jurists who focus on evidence, you will find that their views align with the Zahiri school. Moreover, if you are blessed with fairness, possess a sound understanding of jurisprudential sciences, and thoroughly study the sciences of the Quran and Sunnah, you will inevitably align with the Zahiri approach—that is, acting upon the apparent meanings of the Shariah—not ascribed to Dawud Zahiri specifically but to the evident nature of the Zahiri methodology. Your connection to this methodology would match his in terms of adherence to the apparent meanings of the texts, which is equivalent to being linked to faith and Islam itself, as well as to the final Messenger (s.a.w.a.). To this meaning of the Zahiri school, as we have clarified, Ibn Hazm referred when he said, ‘And as for me, I am nothing but a Zahiri, and I remain so until evidence arises to prove otherwise.’

The works of the subject of this biography exceed fifty in number. Among them is a didactic poem on Quranic readings (*qira’at*) written in the meter of al-Shatibiyyah but without cryptic symbols, and it contains many benefits. However, it did not gain the renown of al-Shatibiyyah. He was devoid of any inclination toward philosophy, Mutazilism, or astrology, adhering to the way of the pious predecessors (*al-salaf al-salih*). He was known for his deep humility, frequent recitation of the Quran, and devotion to worship.

He leaned toward the love of Amir al-Momineen Ali Ibn Abi Talib (a.s.), distancing himself from those who opposed Ali, as was the habit of many grammarians. Adfawi mentioned that he followed the path of

many of the leading grammarians in their love for Ali, to the point that he once said to Badr al-Deen Ibn Jama'ah, 'It is reported from Ali (a.s.) that he said, *'The Prophet (s.a.w.a.) entrusted to me, 'No one loves me except a believer, and no one hates me except a hypocrite.'* Is this narration authentic?' Ibn Jama'ah replied, 'Yes!' Then he said, 'And those who fought him and unsheathed their swords against him—did they love him or hate him?'

He adhered to the mannerisms of refined literary culture, exhibiting a bias toward the virtues of youth. He was also famously known for his stinginess, which he would boast about as others boast about generosity. He became ill shortly before his death and passed away on the 8th of Safar in the year 745 A.H.¹⁴

Maulvi Siddiq Hasan Khan (1248 - 1307 A.H.), a contemporary scholar (of Mir Hamid Husain), writes in "**al-Taj al-Mukallal**", "Muhammad ibn Yusuf Gharnaati, known as Asir al-Deen Abu Hayyan Andalusi, was an Imam of Arabic and Quranic exegesis. Muqri provided a lengthy and excellent biography of him. Ibn Marzuq described him as 'the master of grammarians in Egypt and the master of scholars of traditions in the Mansuriya school. I attended his lectures, read before him, and he narrated to me Sunan Abi Dawood, Sunan Nasai, and Mawatta of Maalik through a group of renowned scholars.' He said, 'One day, I complained to him about the harm a stranger faces from enemies, and he recited for me verses he had composed himself,

My enemies have a favour and a grace over me; may God not take them away from me.

They sought out my faults, so I avoided them, and they competed with me, so I achieved excellence.

Safadi mentioned his biography, praised him greatly, and said, 'He served this field for nearly eighty years, delving into its subtleties and complexities with a unique and diverse approach. He remained in this state until he 'entered the news of 'was', i.e. he passed away. His

¹ Al-Badr al-Taale', vol. 2, pp. 154-156, No. 534

movements turned into stillness. He died in 745 A.H., and the absentee funeral prayer was offered for him in Damascus.

He was born in 652 A.H. and had unparalleled expertise in exegesis, traditions, biographical evaluations, and classifications of individuals. His works spread far and wide, gaining popularity without losing their value. They were read, studied, copied, and preserved, overshadowing earlier works. People studied with him and became Imams and teachers during his lifetime. He was handsome, with a noticeable complexion imbued with redness, illuminated grey hair, and a full beard. His hair was long and flowing. He was a person of humility, often weeping when he heard the Quran and shedding tears upon listening to romantic poetry. Adfawi mentioned, 'He (Abu Hayyan) said to me, 'When I read poems of love, I am inclined toward them.' Initially, he adhered to the Zahiri (literalist) ideology, but later followed the Shafei school. At first, he also held Shaikh Ibn Taymiyyah in high regard and praised him in a poem, but then distanced himself from him after encountering his book **al-Arsh**.' I say, this is not the case. In **al-Badr Al-Taale'**, it is written, 'He was a Zahiri and later aligned himself with the Shafei school. However, Abu al-Baqa used to assert that he remained a Zahiri. Ibn Hajar said, 'Abu Hayyan would say, 'How could someone who has embraced the Zahiri school ever turn away from it once it has taken root in their mind?' This is accurate in its essence, as the Zahiri school represents the starting point of thought and the ultimate approach to action when fairness prevails, and one's nature remains unaltered. Among its followers, the Zahiri approach is not just the method of Dawud Zahiri and his adherents but rather a methodology upheld by major scholars committed to the texts of the Shariah, from the era of the Companions until now. Dawud is merely one of these scholars, although he became known for a rigid adherence in specific issues where a literal interpretation was applied where it may not have been necessary, neglecting types of analogy that a fair-minded person would not dismiss.

In summary, the Zahiri school entails adhering to the apparent

meanings of the Quran and Sunnah with all their indications, rejecting reliance on mere opinion that cannot be directly traced back to them through any form of evidence. If you examine the views of prominent jurists deeply engaged in textual evidence, you will find them aligned with the Zahiri approach in essence. Indeed, if you are endowed with fairness, have a proper understanding of the sciences of jurisprudence (*ijtihad*), and study the sciences of Quran and Sunnah with due diligence, you will find yourself a Zahiri—meaning, someone who acts based on the apparent meanings of the Shariah—attributed not to Dawud Zahiri but to the Zahiri methodology itself. Your attribution to it and Dawud’s attribution are identical. This affiliation is equivalent to being affiliated with faith and Islam and to the Seal of the Messengers (s.a.w.a.). It aligns with the Zahiri methodology in the sense that Ibn Hazm referred to when he said, ‘And I am nothing but a Zahiri, remaining steadfast upon it until clear evidence arises.’ Thus, the matter concluded.

Salah Kutbi pens, ‘The Shaikh, Imam, Hafiz, and scholar par excellence, the unique of his era, the master of his time, and the leader of grammarians, Asir al-Deen Abu Hayyan, recited the Quran in various modes of recitation. He studied and listened in the lands of Aandalus, the island of Africa, the city of Alexandria, the lands of Egypt and Hijaz, and obtained authorizations (*ijaazaat*) from the Levant (Syria) and other regions. He sought knowledge, acquired it, wrote extensively, and exerted great effort. He was a poet of refined verse, composing exquisite and remarkable poetry. A selection of his poetry is included in **al-Fawaat**, and Muqri also mentioned him in **Nafh al-Tib**, citing some of his elegant poems. Many poets, prominent figures, and scholars praised him in their verses, which are documented in his eulogies.

He was described as, ‘The distinguished Imam, the eloquent tongue of the Arabs, the interpreter of literature, the collector of virtues, the foremost resource for those seeking knowledge, the proof for imitators, the adornment of the diligent, the best of the latter

generations, and the inheritor of the knowledge of the earlier ones.¹

He (Shaukani) also writes in **At'haaf al-Nubala**, "Muhammad Ibn Yusuf, Ali Ibn Yusuf Ibn Hayyan, the Shaikh, Imam, memorizer (of traditions), scholar, unique of his time, and the teacher of his era, the master of linguists, Asir al-Deen Abu Hayyan Gharnaati, recited the Quran according to its variant readings. He learnt traditions in Aandalus, the island of Africa, the Alexandria border region, the lands of Egypt and Hijaz. He obtained authorizations from the Levant (Greater Syria), Iraq, and other regions, striving diligently in pursuit of knowledge. He wrote extensively and focused on training intelligent students, holding them in high regard and honouring them. He was skilled in both prose and poetry, with numerous *muwashshahat badeeah* (a type of Aandalusian poem). In his narrations, he was precise, and in his statements, meticulous. He was knowledgeable in language and precise in his use of terms. As for morphology and syntax, he was an unparalleled authority in his time. In the sciences of Quranic exegesis (*tafsir*) and traditions, he had a distinguished mastery. Additionally, he excelled in laws, branches of knowledge, biographies, historical accounts, events, and the recording of people's names, especially among the Maghrebis, preserving their pronunciation with attention to diction (*imla*), abbreviation, softening, and emphasis.

He had a handsome and pleasant countenance, a fair complexion tinged with redness, and bright grey hair. He was born in Granada during the months of the year 654 A.H. His teachers included Abu al-Hasan Aamudi, Ibn Saaegh, and many others. In Egypt, he studied with figures like Bahaa Ibn Nahhaas, and in grammar, he became the foremost scholar of his time, surpassing his teachers. His fame spread to distant lands, and the great figures of his era learned from him. He authored numerous renowned works. He passed away in Safar 745 A.H. in Egypt. Salah Safadi eulogized him, as follows:

¹ Al-Taj al-Mukallal, p. 353, No. 370

Asir al-Deen, the Shaikh of the world, has passed, and so the lightning wept and lamented.

The gentle breeze, so beautiful, softened in mourning and grew weak in the dawn as it passed.

The chirping birds in their songs mourned him in melodious elegies, ending on the letter ra.

O eyes! Pour forth tears that can moisten the earth that now encloses him.

Flow with blood, for the calamity of his loss demands more than tears have yet provided.

The Imam who, in his knowledge, was seen as a guide, while all others followed him,

Is now summoned to solitude, his body enclosed in a grave as you see.

Oh, what grief! He was a beacon of guidance manifest, now hidden beneath the soil.

He gathered the virtues of his age—this is true—but when he departed, they shattered apart.

Continuing his eulogy, the poet says:

Even if he has died, his memory remains eternal,

Bringing life to others before they rise again.

The soil that covers him was graced with rain,Moistening it by night and early at dawn.

His Lord has distinguished him with mercy,

That will lead him to Kausar on the Day of Gathering.

Suyuti mentions this elegy in full in **Husn al-Muhaazarah**.

This elegy is a profound lamentation for Asir al-Deen Abu Hayyan Gharnaati, extolling his virtues and mourning his loss as a monumental figure of knowledge and guidance.”

The critique and evaluation of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Zahabi in his book Mizan al-Itidal.

Eighteenth: Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Zahabi, one of the prominent critics and renowned scholars among the traditionalists of Ahle Tasannun, in **Mizan al-Itidal** repeatedly criticized and discredited the **Hadees-e-Nujoom**. He has meticulously condemned and exposed the narrators and transmitters of this tradition as they deserve, using the tools of critique and censure. He writes, ‘Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid Hashimi Qazi. Daraqutni said, ‘He fabricates traditions.’ Abu Zur’ah said, ‘He narrates traditions that have no basis.’ Ibn Adi remarked, ‘He steals traditions and narrates rejected (*munkar*) narrations from reliable sources.’ Among what he narrated is, ‘From Muhammad Ibn Abi Maalik al-Maazeni from Hasan Ibn Abi Jafar from Ayyub from Naafe’ from Ibn Umar as a narration with a missing link (*marfu*), ‘Two people never accompany each other, whether for good or evil, except that they will be resurrected upon it.’ Then he recited, ‘**When the souls are paired**’¹. This is false.’

Then Ibn Adi followed this with other narrations from him and said, ‘All of them are fabrications, and some are stolen from others.’ He (Jafar) had sworn an oath not to narrate and not to say narrated to us so and so (*haddasana fulaan*). Instead, he used to say, so-and-so told us (*qala lana fulaan*).’

Ibn Tullab narrated to us from Ibn Jamee’ Ghassaani from Umar Ibn Musa Ibn Harun in Massisa from Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid said, ‘Safwan Ibn Habira and Muhammad Ibn Bakr Barsani narrated to us from Ibn Jurayj from Ata’ from Ibn Abbas, ‘The Prophet (s.a.w.a.) was born circumcised and with his umbilical cord cut.’ This narration’s fault lies with Jafar.

Khatib said, ‘Al-Mustaeen (billah)(the Abbasi king) dismissed him (Jafar ibn Abdul Wahid) from his position as a judge and exiled him to Basra due to a matter that reached him. He died in the year 258 A.H.’ Abu Hatim said, ‘Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid Ibn Jafar Ibn Sulaiman Ibn

¹ Surah Takveer (81): Verse 7

Ali connected a tradition to Qa'nabi and added 'from Anas' to it. Qa'nabi invoked a curse against him, and he was disgraced.' Abu Zur'ah said, 'I fear that the curse of the righteous shaikh (Qa'nabi) caught up with him.' Among his calamities is, 'From Wahb Ibn Jarir from his father from A'mash, from Abu Salih from Abu Hurairah from the Prophet (s.a.w.a), *My companions are like the stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided.*'

Additionally, Zahabi stated in **Mizan al-Itidal**, 'Hamza Ibn Abi Hamza Jazari Nasibi narrated from Ibn Abi Mulaykah, Mak'hool, and a group of others. Narrators such as Ali Ibn Saabit and Shababah reported from him. Ibn Maeen said, 'He is not worth a penny.' Khatib said, 'He is a denier of traditions.' Daraqutni said, 'He is abandoned (*matruk*).' Ibn Adi said, 'Most of what he narrates is fabricated.' I (Zahabi) say, 'There is a narration of him in **Jaame' al-Tirmizi** that surpasses (in fabrication) the rest of his narrations.'

Ali Ibn Saabit narrated from Abu Hamza (likely Hamza Naseebi) from Abu Zubair from Jabir as a marfu' narration, 'Whoever forgets to mention the name of Allah when eating should recite after finishing: 'Say: He is Allah, the One' (Surah Al-Ikhlās).'

Ibn Hibban: Al-Hasan Ibn Sufyan narrated to us from Suwayd from Hafs Ibn Masirah from Hamza Ibn Abi Hamza from Ata' from Ibn Umar that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) prayed at a cemetery. It was said to him, 'O Messenger of Allah! Which cemetery is this?' He (s.a.w.a.) replied, 'A cemetery in the land of Al-Ad, which is called 'Asqalan'. People from my nation will conquer it, and Allah will raise seventy thousand martyrs from it. Each one of them will intercede for people equal to the tribes of Rabeeah and Muzar. Asqalan is the bride of Paradise.'

So'ban (or possibly Usman) narrated from Hamza from Naafe' from Ibn Umar the traditions, 'My companions are like stars; whichever one you follow, you will be rightly guided.' This was narrated by Abd Ibn Humaid in his **Musnad**.

Usman Ibn Abd al-Rahman narrated from Hamza from Naafe' from

Ibn Umar, ‘The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) forbade killing bats and hoopoes because they extinguished the fire at the Sacred House in Jerusalem when it caught fire.’ His extreme wickedness is evident. Bukhari mentioned him in **Al-Zu’afaa** (The Weak Narrators).¹⁴

Zahabi in **Mizan al-Itidal** writes, “Zaid Ibn Hawari Ammi, Abu Hawari Basri, the judge of Herat, narrated from Anas, Saeed Ibn Musayyab, and others. Among those who narrated from him were his two sons, Abd al-Rahim and Abd al-Rahman, as well as Sho’bah and Hushaim. Ibn Maeen said, ‘He is acceptable.’ On another occasion, he said, ‘He is nothing.’ And on yet another occasion, he said, ‘He is weak, but his traditions can be written down.’ Daraqutni said, ‘He is acceptable’ while Nasai considered him weak. Abu Hatim said, ‘He is weak, but his traditions can be written down.’ Ibn Adi said, ‘Perhaps Sho’bah did not narrate from anyone weaker than him.’ Sa’di said, ‘Can be abstained from (*mutamaasik*).’

Among his odd (unacceptable) narrations:

Qais Ibn Rabee’ from Habib Ibn Sabit from Ayyub Ibn Musa from Zaid Ibn Hawari from Anas (*marfu*), ‘Paralysis will soon spread among people to such an extent that they will wish for the plague instead.’

Salam al-Tawil, ‘From Zaid Ammi from Qatadah from Anas (*marfu*), ‘It is abominable for the muezzin to be the Imam.’ This, perhaps, is corrupted by Salam.”

Salam narrated from Zaid Ammi from Muawiya Ibn Qurra from Ma’qil Ibn Yasar (*marfu*), ‘Whoever performs cupping (*hajaamah*) on a Tuesday, the 17th of the month, it will be a cure for the entire year.’

Nuaim Ibn Hammad narrated, ‘Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi narrated from his father from Saeed Ibn Musayyab from Umar (*marfu*), ‘I asked my Lord about the differences among my companions after me, and Allah revealed to me, ‘O Muhammad! Your companions are to Me like the stars; some are brighter than others. Whoever adheres to anything from what they are upon in their differences is considered

¹ Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 1, p. 413, No. 1511

guided by Me.”‘ This is false. Abd al-Rahim was abandoned (*matruk*), and Nuaim is known for unknown (*manaakeer*) narrations.¹“

Zahabi in **Mizan al-Itidal** chronicles, “Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ibn Hawari Ammi narrated from his father and others. Bukhari said, ‘He was abandoned.’ Yahya said, ‘He is a liar.’ On another occasion, he said, ‘He is nothing.’ Jawzjani said, ‘He is not trustworthy.’ Abu Hatim said, ‘His traditions are to be abandoned.’ Abu Zur’ah said, ‘He is weak.’ Abu Dawud said, ‘He is weak.’

Abu Ammar Husain Ibn Haaris narrated, ‘Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi narrated to us, ‘My father narrated to me from Anas (*marfu*), ‘It is sufficient for a person’s good-fortune to be trusted in matters related to Allah.’

Bukhari mentioned him in **al-Zu’afaa** (*The Weak Narrators*) in a tradition from Muhammad Ibn Ya’la Harawi, ‘Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi narrated to us, ‘My father narrated to me from Anas (*marfu*), ‘The easiest reward for a believer is that he has ten dirhams in his hand. He counts them and finds them to be nine, which makes him sad. Then he counts again and finds them to be ten, and his sadness is recorded as a good deed greater than what the earth can contain.’ He died in the year 184 A.H.²“

The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Taj al-Deen Ahmad Ibn Abd al-Qadir Qaysi in his book Al-Durr al-Laquet Min al-Bahr al-Muheet

Nineteenth: Taj al-Deen Abu Muhammad Ahmad Ibn Abd al-Qadir Ibn Ahmad Ibn Maktum Qaysi Hanafi, in his book **Al-Durr al-Laquet min al-Bahr al-Muheet**, critiqued and discredited **Hadees-e-Nujoom**. He worked to refute and suppress it, citing the detailed research of his critical teacher, Abu Hayyan, who pursued a path of denial and rejection. As mentioned in the book, he said, ‘If you ask, ‘How is the Quran a clarification (*tibyaan*) of everything?’ I reply,

¹ Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 2, p.102, No. 3003

² Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 2, p.605, No. 5030

‘The meaning is that it clarifies all matters of religion, whether explicitly stated or referred to the Sunnah, as it commands adherence to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) and obedience to him.’

It has been said, “**He does not speak of (his own) desire**”¹, and an encouragement towards consensus is found in the verse: “**And follows other than the way of the believers**”². Moreover, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) approved for his nation the following of the companions and adherence to their practices in his statement, ‘My companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided.’ They exerted independent reasoning (*ijtihad*), made analogies (*qiyas*), and paved the way for reasoning and independent judgment, so that the Sunnah, consensus, analogy, and independent reasoning were all based on the explanation of the Book (the Quran). Hence, the Quran became an explanation for all things.

As for the statement, ‘And the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) approved...you will be guided’, it was not said by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). This is a fabricated narration that cannot authentically be attributed to him (s.a.w.a.). The master of traditions, Abu Muhammad Ali Ibn Ahmad Ibn Hazm, mentioned in his treatise **Ibtaal al-Rayy wa al-Qiyas wa al-Istihsaan wa al-Ta’leel wa al-Taqleed**, ‘This is a fabricated, false narration that has never been authentically transmitted.’ He cited its chain of transmission to Bazaar, the author of **al-Musnad**, who said, ‘You asked about what has been narrated on the authority of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and is widespread among the public, where it is reported that the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘Indeed, my companions are like the stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided.’ This is a statement that has not been authentically reported from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.). It was narrated by Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi from his father from Saeed Ibn Musayyab from Ibn Umar on the authority of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), but it is not established. The Prophet (s.a.w.a.) does not

¹ Surah Najm (53): Verse 3

² Surah Najm (4): Verse 115

permit disagreement among his companions after him.’ This is the verbatim text of Bazzar’s statement. Ibn Maeen said, ‘Abd al- Rahim Ibn Zaid is a liar, corrupt, and worthless.’ Bukhari said, ‘He is abandoned.’ It was also narrated by Hamza Jazari, and Hamza himself is unreliable and abandoned.

The grandeur of rank and the greatness of the status of Ibn Maktum among the perspectives of eminent scholars of Ahle Tasannun is clear and undisputed. Previously, in the second volume of the book **Hadees-e-Ghadeer**, you have heard about his lofty merits and eminent virtues as recorded in works such as **al-Waafi bi al-Wafayaat** (vol. 7, p. 48, No. 669) by Salah al-Deen Khalil Ayyub Safadi, **Tabaqaat al-Qurra** (vol. 1, p. 70, No. 306) by Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Jazari, **Husn al-Muhaazara fi Tarikh-e-Misr wa Qaahirah** (vol. 1, p. 362, No. 37 Discussion of Hanafi Scholars in Egypt) and **Bughyah al-Wuaat** (vol. 1, pp. 326-329, No. 622), both by Suyuti. Hereunder, we will suffice with some passages revealing his noble characteristics and remarkable qualities mentioned in the book *Lisan al-Mizan* of Ibn Hajar Asqalani,

Biography of Ahmad Ibn Maktum Hanafi: Taj al-Deen Abu Muhammad Ahmad Ibn Abd al-Qadir Ibn Ahmad Ibn Maktum Muhammad Ibn Salim Ibn Muhammad Qaisi Hanafi Nahvi was born in 682 A.H. He acquired knowledge from Baha al-Deen Ibn Nahhas and Mayaati. He took precedence over others in jurisprudence, syntax and lexicons. He also taught law. Among his books are ‘**al-Jam’ bain al-Abaab wa al-Muhkam**’, ‘**al-Jam’ al-Muntanaahi fi Akhbaar al-Nuhaat**’, ‘**al-Durr al-Laquet min al-Bahr al-Muheet**’, etc.¹“

The criticism and discrediting of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Muhammad Ibn Abi Bakr Ibn Qayyim Jauziyyah Hanbali

Twentieth: Muhammad Ibn Abi Bakr Ibn Qayyim Jauziyyah Hanbali Dimashqi, one of the prominent scholars of traditions and critics

¹ Al-Durar al-Kaaminah, vol. 1, p. 186, No. 451

esteemed among the Ahle Tasannun, criticized and rejected **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, exposing its flaws and tearing away its veil with a fair and just approach. In his book **E'laam al-Muwaqqein**, while refuting the followers of blind imitation (*taqleed*) and invalidating their arguments, he writes,

“The forty-fifth point: Their claim that the well-known tradition ‘My Companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided’ is sufficient for the validity of taqlid.’

“The response is as follows: First, this tradition has been narrated through various chains, including: through A'mash from Abu Sufyan from Jabir; from Saeed Ibn Musayyab from Ibn Umar; and from Hamzah Jazari from Naafe' from Ibn Umar. However, none of these chains are authentic.

‘Ibn Abd al-Barr said, ‘Muhammad Ibn Ibrahim Ibn Saeed narrated to us that Abu Abdillah Ibn Mufarraj narrated to them, saying, ‘Muhammad Ibn Ayyub Samut told us that Bazzar said, ‘As for the narration attributed to the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.), ‘My Companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided’, this statement is not authentically established as being from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.).’

From this statement, it becomes evident that Ibn Qayyim, in response to those who hold onto the **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, clarified that this tradition is narrated through the chain of al-A'mash from Abu Sufyan from Jabir, through the narration of Saeed Ibn Musayyab from Ibn Umar, and through the chain of Hamzah Jazari from Naafe' from Ibn Umar. However, none of these three chains are established as authentic.¹

Furthermore, to strengthen and confirm his assertion, Ibn Qayyim cited the statement of the scholar of traditions, Bazzar, who explicitly rejected the authenticity of this tradition as being from the noble Messenger (s.a.w.a.).

¹ E'laam al-Muwaqqein, vol. 2, p. 223

Through this critical analysis and the meticulous examination of this noble and insightful scholar, the fabric of this tradition has been completely unravelled. This serves to refute every ignorant adherent who clings to it and to humble every misguided claimant who persists in relying upon it.

The criticism and discrediting of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Najm al-Deen Iraqi in his book “Takhreej-o-Ahaadees-e-Minhaj”

Twenty-First: Hafiz Zain al-Deen Abd al-Rahim Ibn Husain Iraqi, who is among the well-known memorizers of traditions (*huffaaz al-ahaadees*) and prominent critics among the Ahle Tasannun, exerted his utmost efforts in critiquing and discrediting ‘**Hadees-e-Nujoom**’ highlighting its weaknesses, flaws, corruption, and invalidity. As he states in his book **Takhreej-o-Ahaadees-e-Minhaj al-Baizawi**, “The tradition ‘My companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided’ was narrated by Daraqutni in **al-Fazaael** and Ibn Abd al-Barr in **al-Ilm** through his chain from Jabir. However, he said, ‘This chain of transmitters (*isnaad*) does not meet the standard of evidence because Haaris Ibn Ghusain is unknown.’ It was also narrated by Abd Ibn Humaid in his **Musnad** through Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi from his father from Ibn al-Musayyab from Ibn Umar. Bazzar commented, ‘It is rejected (*munkar*) and not authentic.’ Furthermore, it was narrated by Ibn Adi in **al-Kaamil** from Hamza ibn Abi Hamza Baihaqi (al-Naṣeebi, according to another version) from Naafe’ from Ibn Umar with the wording, ‘Whichever of their statements you adopt (instead of “whichever of them you follow”).’ However, its chain is weak due to Hamza, who was accused of fabricating.

It was also narrated by Baihaqi in **al-Madkhal** from Amr in the tradition of Ibn Abbas in a similar manner, and from another chain as with a missing link (*mursal*). Baihaqi said, ‘Its text is widely cited, but its chains are weak, and none of its chains of transmitters are authentic.’ Ibn Hazm called it fabricated, false, and invalid. Baihaqi

also remarked that some of its meanings are conveyed in the tradition of Abu Musa, ‘The stars are a source of security for the inhabitants of the heavens’ which includes the statement, ‘My companions are a source of security for my nation.’ This tradition was narrated by Muslim.”

From this statement by Hafiz Iraqi, several aspects of his critique of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** become clear:

1. First, he cited it as narrated from Jabir, followed by quoting the critique and rejection of it by the *Hafiz* of the West, Ibn Abd al-Barr, with complete clarity.
2. Second, he mentioned it as narrated from Ibn Umar and then quoted *Hafiz* Bazzar, who stated that this tradition is rejected (*munkar*) and not authentic.
3. Third, he explained that Ibn Adi narrated this tradition in *al-Kaamil* through the narration of Hamza Ibn Abi Hamza al-Naseebi, and its chain is weak due to Hamza. It has been definitively established that he was accused of fabricating traditions.
4. Fourth, he quoted from Baihaqi, who in his book *al-Madkhal* stated regarding **Hadees-e-Nujoom** that its text is widely cited, but its chains are weak, and no chain of this tradition is authentic.
5. Fifth, he cited Hafiz Ibn Hazm, who declared this tradition to be fabricated, false, and invalid.

These points, some of which include multiple layers of critique, serve as powerful arguments to refute, silence, and confound those who use **Hadees-e-Nujoom** as evidence. They act like “shooting stars” (*shuhub al-rujoom*), opening the doors of criticism and reproach against the proponents of this tradition in the most striking manner.

The criticism and appraisal of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Iraqi in the margins of the book Takhreej

Twentieth: Hafiz Zain al-Deen Iraqi, in his book “Ta’leeq-o-Kitab

Takhreej Ahaadees Minhaj”, also critiqued and discredited **Hadees-e-Nujoom** following the methodology of his eminent predecessors in censuring and rejecting this tradition. As stated in his annotation, “Ibn Dihyah said, ‘The tradition ‘My companions are like stars’ is not authentic. This tradition was narrated by Quzaaee, who said, ‘Abu al-Fath Mansur Ibn Ali Anmati informed us, who narrated from Abu Muhammad Hasan Ibn Waasiq (or Raasiq, as noted), who narrated from Muhammad Ibn Jafar Ibn Muhammad, who narrated from Jafar –implying Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid – who narrated from Wahb Ibn Jarir Ibn Hazm, from his father, from A’mash, from Abu Salih, from Abu Hurairah, from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), who said, ‘My companions are like the stars; whoever follows any of them will be guided.’”

Al-Iraqi continues, ‘Daraqutni said, ‘Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid fabricated traditions. Abu Ahmad Ibn Adi also said, ‘He was accused of fabricating traditions, and his narrations are not authentic.’”

This statement by Hafiz Iraqi also serves as evidence for the discrediting (*Maqduhiyyah*) of the “Hadith of Stars” (*Hadith al-Nujum*) for several reasons:

1. **First:** Hafiz Iraqi explicitly cites Hafiz Ibn Dihyah, who stated that **Hadees-e-Nujoom** is not authentic.
2. **Second:** Hafiz Iraqi narrates **Hadees-e-Nujoom** from Quzaaee through a chain of transmitters that ends with Abu Hurairah. He then references Daraqutni’s criticism of Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid, who appears in this chain, quoting that Jafar was known to fabricate traditions.
3. **Third:** Hafiz Iraqi further cites Ibn Adi, who accused Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid of fabricating traditions.
4. **Fourth:** Hafiz Iraqi also transmits from Ibn Adi that **Hadees-e-Nujoom** is not authentic.

In these benefits and aspects are those that blacken faces and those that whiten faces.

The criticism and disparagement of Hadees-e-Nujoom by the aforementioned Hafiz from another aspect and mention of the sources of his biography

Twenty-Third: Hafiz Iraqi, in addition to his previously mentioned statements, has made another contribution that clearly and evidently highlights the weakness and unreliability of **Hadees-e-Nujoom**. To elaborate on this summary: Hafiz Iraqi criticized Qazi Ayaz, the author of **al-Shifa**, for including Hadees-e-Nujoom in his work. He argued that the author of **al-Shifa** should not have cited this tradition with definitive certainty.

Hafiz Iraqi's intention was to point out that, since the status of this tradition is well-known among scholars of the field, and they have considered it condemned (*maqduh*) and unreliable (*majruh*), it would have been more appropriate for Qazi Ayaz not to attribute this tradition definitively and unequivocally to Prophet Muhammad (s.a.w.a.). This statement of Hafiz Iraqi has been cited by Shahaab al-Deen Khafaji in **Nasim al-Riyaz**, as will become evident in due course, God willing.

The esteemed status and elevated rank of Hafiz Iraqi are evident and manifest to anyone familiar with works like **Tabaqaat al-Qurra** by Ibn Jazari, **al-Zau' al-Laame'** by Sakhaawi, **al-Badr al-Taale'** by Shaukani, and others.

The criticism and discrediting of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Hafiz Ibn Hajar Asqalani in Talkhees al-Khabeer

Twenty-Fourth: Ahmad Ibn Ali Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, a prominent scholar of Ahle Tasannun and meticulous critic of narrations, has extensively and thoroughly critiqued and invalidated **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, providing a detailed explanation to enlighten those with knowledge and certainty, as is fitting. In his book **Talkhees al-Khabeer fi Takhreej Ahaadees al-Raafei al-Kabir**, he writes, 'The tradition 'My companions are like the stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided.'

It was narrated by Abd Ibn Humaid in his **Musnad** through the chain of Hamza Naseebi from Naafe' from Ibn Umar. However, Hamza is extremely weak (*zaeef jiddan*).

It was also narrated by Daraqutni in **Gharaaeb-e-Maalik** through the chain of Jamil Ibn Yazid (likely Zaid) from Maalik from Jafar Ibn Muhammad from his father from Jabir. Jamil is unknown (*la yu'raf*), and there is no basis for this narration in the works of Maalik or those above him.

Bazzar mentioned it through the narration of Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zayd Ammi from his father from Saeed Ibn Musayyab from Amr. Abd al-Rahim is an excessive liar (*kazzaab*).

It was also narrated from Anas, but its chain is weak (*waahin*). Additionally, it was narrated by Quzaaee in his **Musnad al-Shahaab** from A'mash from Abu Salih from Abu Huraira. However, in its chain is Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid Hashimi, who is an excessive liar (*kazzaab*).

Abuzar Harawi narrated in **Kitab al-Sunnah** the tradition of Mandil from Juwaybir from Zahhak Ibn Muzaahim, which is disconnected (*munqate'*) and extremely weak (*fi ghaayah al-za'f*). Abu Bakr Bazzar said, 'This statement is not authentic from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.)' Ibn Hazm remarked, 'This is a fabricated, false, and baseless narration.'

Baihaqi, in **al-E'teqaad**, following the tradition of Abu Musa al-Ash'ari recorded by Muslim with the wording, 'The stars are a source of security for the inhabitants of the heavens; when the stars vanish, what is promised to the inhabitants of the heavens will come to pass' and 'My companions are a source of security for my nation; when my companions are gone, what is promised to my nation will come to pass.'

Baihaqi commented, 'It has been transmitted in a connected tradition with an unreliable chain (referring to the tradition of Abd al-Rahim Ammi) and in a disconnected tradition (referring to the tradition of Zahhak Ibn Muzaahim), *'The example of my companions is like the example of stars in the sky; whoever takes guidance from any of them will be guided.'*

He added, ‘Here, we narrate what is correct from sound traditions that convey part of this meaning.’¹

Ibn Hajar comments, ‘Baihaqi was correct; it affirms the validity of likening the companions to stars in general. However, regarding the idea of following any one of them specifically, this is not evident in Abu Musa’s tradition. Nonetheless, it can be inferred indirectly from the notion of seeking guidance by the stars. The apparent meaning of the tradition refers to the turmoil that arises after the era of the companions, such as the erasure of prophetic traditions, the emergence of innovations, and the spread of immorality across the earth. And Allah is the One whose help is sought.’”

From this statement, it becomes evident to discerning individuals that Ibn Hajar placed great emphasis on criticizing and evaluating this tradition in several ways:

Firstly, he transmitted the narration as being reported from Ibn Umar through Hamza Naseebi and then clarified that Hamza is extremely weak.

Secondly, he indicated that the narration was transmitted from Jabir through Jamil and subsequently stated explicitly that Jamil is not well-known.

Thirdly, he clarified that this tradition has no original basis from Maalik or from those above Maalik.

Fourthly, he clarified that this tradition was reported by Bazzar through the narration of Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid from his father from Saeed Ibn Musayyab from Umar and Abd al-Rahim is a liar.

Fifthly, he explained that although this narration is also reported from Anas, its chain of transmitters is weak.

Sixthly, he highlighted that this tradition was narrated from Abu Hurairah and clarified that the chain of transmitters includes Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid Hashimi, who is a liar.

¹ Talkhees al-Khabeer fi Takhreej Ahaadees al-Raafei al-Kabir, vol. 4 pp. 190-191, H. 2098

Seventhly, he noted that this narration was transmitted from Mandil from Juwaybir from Zahhak Ibn Muzaahim in a disconnected manner and remarked that this narration is extremely weak.

Eighthly, he cited Hafiz Bazzar, who stated that this statement, i.e., the Hadees-e-Nujoom, has not been authentically transmitted from the Noble Prophet (s.a.w.a.).

Ninthly, he quoted Ibn Hazm, who declared this report to be fabricated, false, and baseless.

Tenthly, from the book **al-E'teqad** by Baihaqi, he transmitted that Hadees-e-Nujoom was criticized and deemed weak both in the narration of Abd al-Rahim and in the narration of Zahhak Ibn Muzaahim.

And these are ten complete points that have brought disgrace upon the **faces of the toiling, labouring ones**¹.

The critique and evaluation of the mentioned tradition (i.e. Hadees-e-Nujoom) by the esteemed Hafiz Ibn Hajar in Takhreej Ahaadees al-Kashshaaf
Twenty-Fifth: Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in the book **Takhreej Ahaadees al-Kashshaaf**, has explicitly and comprehensively demonstrated the flaws and weaknesses of **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, providing sufficient and clear statements that surpass his peers in exposing its defects and shortcomings. As mentioned in the book, 'The tradition, 'My companions are like the stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be rightly guided,' was reported by Daraqutni in **al-Mutalif** through the narration of Salam Ibn Sulaim from Haaris Ibn Ghusain from A'mash from Abu Sufyan from Jabir as a *marfu'* report. Salam is weak².

It was also narrated in **Gharaaeb Maalik** through the chain of Jamil Ibn Yazid from Maalik from Jafar Ibn Muhammad from his father

¹ Referring to Surah Ghaashiyah (88): Verse 3

² Al-Kaaf al-Shaaf fi Takhreej Ahaadees al-Kashshaaf, printed on the margins of Kashshaaf, vol. 2, p. 628

from Jabir in the middle of a tradition. In it, the phrase is, ‘Whichever statement of my companions you take, you will be guided. My companions are like the stars; whoever follows a star among them will be guided.’ He said, ‘This narration cannot be established from Maalik, and its narrators other than Maalik are unknown.’

It was also narrated by Abd Ibn Humaid and Daraqutni in **al-Fazaael** through the narration of Hamza Jazari from Naafe’ from Ibn Umar. Hamza was accused of fabrication.

Quzaaee narrated it in **Musnad al-Shahaab** from Abu Hurairah, and in its chain is Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid Hashimi, who was declared a liar.

Ibn Tahir narrated it from the chain of Bishr Ibn Husain from Zubair Ibn Adi from Anas and Bishr was also accused.

Baihaqi recorded it in **al-Madkhal** from the narration of Juwaybir from Zakhak from Ibn Abbas, and Juwaybir is abandoned.

It was also narrated by Juwaybir from Jawab Ibn Abdillah as a *marfu’* report, but it is *mursal*.

Baihaqi said, ‘This text is famous, but all its chains of transmitters are weak.’ It is also narrated in **al-Madkhal** from Umar, ‘I asked my Lord regarding the differences that will occur among my companions after me, and it was revealed to me, ‘O Muhammad! Your companions are to Me like the stars in the sky; some are brighter than others. Whoever adheres to any of the matters they are upon in their differences, they are, in My view, upon guidance.’

In its chain of transmission is Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi, and he is considered abandoned (*matruk*).”

Eight insights of Hafiz Ibn Hajar in his views

Indication

This statement, filled with glad tidings from Ibn Hajar, contains numerous insights and sound investigations, each of which serves as a decisive blow to refute the arguments of the falsifiers. It further

elucidates the weakness, insignificance, corruption, and invalidity of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** to the utmost degree.

First: Ibn Hajar clearly states in this passage that this tradition was mentioned by Daraqutni in his book **al-Mutalif**, narrated by Salam Ibn Salim from Haaris Ibn Ghusain from Abu Sufyan from Jabir. However, Salam is weak (*zaeef*).

Second: Ibn Hajar states in this passage that Daraqutni included **Hadees-e-Nujoom** in his book **Gharaaeb Maalik** through the narration of Jamil Ibn Yazid. He further cites Daraqutni himself, who stated that this narration is not authentically attributed to Maalik and that all the narrators linked to Maalik in this chain are unknown.

Third: Ibn Hajar explicitly mentions that Hadees-e-Nujoom was narrated by Abd Ibn Humaid and Daraqutni in the book **al-Fazaael** from the narration of Hamza Jazari from Naafe' from Ibn Umar. However, the scholars of traditions have accused Hamza of fabricating traditions.

Fourth: Ibn Hajar states that **Hadees-e-Nujoom** was narrated by Quzaaee in **Musnad al-Shahaab** through the narration of Abu Hurairah. However, in its chain of transmitters is Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid Hashimi, and the scholars of traditions have declared him a liar.

Fifth: Ibn Hajar mentions that **Hadees-e-Nujoom** was narrated by Ibn Tahir through Bishr Ibn Husain from Zubair Ibn Udayy from Anas. However, Bishr has been accused of fabrication.

Sixth: Ibn Hajar explicitly states in this passage that Baihaqi included **Hadees-e-Nujoom** in his book **al-Madkhal**, narrating it via Juwaybir from Zakhak from Ibn Abbas. However, Juwaybir is deemed unreliable (*matruk*). Furthermore, Baihaqi also narrated it in **al-Madkhal** via Juwaybir from Jabir Ibn Abdillah in a *marfu'* form, but this chain is *mursal*.

Seventh: Ibn Hajar clearly mentions in this passage that, despite narrating the **Hadees-e-Nujoom** in **al-Madkhal**, Baihaqi admitted that all its chains of transmitters are weak.

Eighth: Ibn Hajar states in this passage that Baihaqi also narrated **Hadees-e-Nujoom** in **al-Madkhal** from Umar but the chain of transmitters includes Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi, who is deemed unreliable and abandoned (in traditions) (*matruk*).

These eight observations from Ibn Hajar, though each one individually suffices to refute an intelligent opponent, make the sixth and seventh points particularly significant, as they completely undermine the argument built on Hadees-e-Nujoom. This is because the basis of reliance on this tradition is its narration from Ibn Abbas, which Baihaqi included in **al-Madkhal**. However, its weakness, falsity, and invalidity are so evident that even Baihaqi could not conceal them. Instead, he boldly and explicitly criticized and condemned it, raising the banner of academic rigor. Moreover, he went further by admitting the weakness of all its chains, thus treading the path of utmost disparagement and disapproval.

Therefore, it is incumbent upon Shah Sahab's supporters to abandon reliance on **Hadees-e-Nujoom**. They should avoid following the misguided path of deception and confusion set by the opponent (viz. Muhaddis Dehlavi). If they have any sense of fairness, they should recognize that using this narration—particularly through Baihaqi's chain—is a reprehensible and disgraceful error. They should strive to refrain from it, desisting from ever mentioning it again.

It is worth mentioning that Ibn Hajar's statements in **Takhreej-o-Ahaadees al-Kashshaaf** regarding the criticism and discrediting of Hadees-e-Nujoom, while sufficient and comprehensive, warrant further attention to certain matters to complete the benefit and clarification.

1) **Criticism and Disparagement of Salam Ibn Sulaim, the narrator of Hadees-e-Nujoom**

Firstly, Ibn Hajar, in his criticism and evaluation of Salam, has sufficed with a general weakening, whereas Salam is considered by prominent scholars to be deeply flawed due to severe defects and significant criticisms. Previously, regarding the discrediting of the

tradition about the superior knowledge of Muaz in matters of the permissible (halal) and the prohibited (haram), it was noted that Bukhari in his book *al-Zuafaa* stated that the scholars abandoned Salam. Nasai, in his book *al-Zuafaa*, declared that Salam's narrations are abandoned (*matruk al-hadees*). Abu Nuaim Isfahani in *Hilyah al-Auliya* explicitly mentioned that Salam is unanimously considered abandoned. Ibn Jawzi, in his book *al-Mauzooaat*, while discussing the virtue of the callers of prayers (*muezzins*), reported that Yahya Ibn Maeen said regarding Salam that 'he is nothing, and his traditions should not be written.' Ibn Jawzi also quoted Bukhari, Nasai, and Daraqutni describing Salam as abandoned. Furthermore, he cited Ibn Hibban, who stated that Salam, despite being considered trustworthy, narrated fabricated traditions as if he himself intentionally fabricated them.

Secondly, Ibn Jawzi, in *al-Mauzooaat*, while criticizing the traditions on Zakat al-Fitr, transmitted the criticism of Salam from Yahya Ibn Maeen, Nasai, and Ibn Hibban. Zahabi, in *Mizan al-Itidal*, quoted criticism of Salam from Bukhari, Yahya Ibn Maeen, Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, Nasai, Abu Zur'ah, and Ibn Adi. He also mentioned in *al-Mughni* that Salam is abandoned, and Abu Zur'a considered him weak. Zahabi further conveyed in *al-Kashif* that Bukhari described Salam as abandoned. Sibṭ Ibn Ajami, in his book *al-Kashf al-Hatheeth am-man Rumiya Be Waz' al-Hadees*, explicitly stated that a group of scholars discredited Salam and cited Ibn Jawzi and Ibn Hibban, noting that Salam narrated fabricated traditions, despite being considered trustworthy.

Even Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in *Taqreeb al-Tazeeb*, explicitly described Salam as abandoned. Additionally, in *Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb*, he elaborated in detail on the criticisms against Salam. The summary is as follows, 'Ahmad Ibn Hanbal stated that Salam narrated denounced (*munkar*) traditions; Yahya Ibn Maeen noted that Salam had denounced traditions; and Ibn Maeen also remarked that Salam 'is nothing.' Similarly, Ibn Madini said that Salam is weak. Ibn Ammar said that Salam is not reliable, and Juzjaani stated that he is not

trustworthy. Bukhari mentioned that the scholars abandoned Salam, and on another occasion, he noted that scholars criticize Salam. Abu Hatim declared that Salam is weak in traditions and that scholars abandoned him. Abu Zur'ah said that Salam is weak. Nasai remarked that Salam is abandoned (*matruk*), and on another occasion, he stated that Salam is not trustworthy and his narrations are not to be written. Ibn Khirash called him a liar and described him as abandoned. Abu al-Qasim Baghawi stated that Salam is very weak in traditions.

Ibn Adi transmitted several of Salam's narrations and remarked that none of them are corroborated. Additionally, Ibn Adi criticized Salam in the tradition of postpartum bleeding (*nifas*) and the tradition about the *muezzin*, both of which Salam narrated. Ibn Hibban said that Salam, despite being considered trustworthy, narrated fabricated traditions, seemingly as if he deliberately fabricated them. Afterward, Ibn Hibban specifically criticized Salam's narration of the tradition on postpartum bleeding (*nifas*). Ijli stated that Salam is weak. Saji remarked that Salam has denounced narrations. Haakim said that Salam narrated fabricated traditions. Abu Nuaim concluded that Salam is unanimously considered abandoned by the scholars.

2) **Criticism and evaluation (qadh wa jarh) of Haaris Ibn Ghaseen, one of the narrators of Hadees-e-Nujoom, whom Ibn Hajar did not address in his criticisms**

Ibn Hajar, in his critique of the chain of transmission (*isnad*) of *Mu'talif* by Daraqutni, limited himself to a general criticism of Salam while neglecting to criticize Haaris Ibn Ghaseen, even though he too is criticized and discredited. Previously, it was noted that the scholar of traditions of the Maghreb, Ibn Abd al-Barr Qurtubi, in his book *Jaame' Bayan al-Ilm*, while criticizing the chains of transmission for *Hadees-e-Nujum* stated, 'And there has been a chain of transmitters for this tradition other than the one mentioned by al-Bazzar, reported from Salam Ibn Sulaim. He said, 'Haaris Ibn Ghaseen narrated to us from A'mash from Abu Sufyan from Jabir, who said that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, **'My companions are like stars;**

whichever of them you follow, you will be guided.' Abu Umar (Ibn Abd al-Barr) said, '*This chain of transmitters (isnad) cannot be used as evidence because Haaris Ibn Ghaseen is unknown (majhul).*'

This statement underscores that Haaris Ibn Ghaseen, as a narrator, is deemed unreliable due to his unknown status, rendering the chain of transmission weak and inadmissible as evidence.

This statement of Ibn Abd al-Barr has also been summarized by the scholar of traditions Hafiz Zain al-Deen Iraqi in his book **Takhreej-o-Ahaadees-e-Minhaj**, as you previously heard.

3) **Criticism and evaluation (*qadh wa jarh*) of Hamzah Ibn Abi Hamzah Jazari Naseebi, another narrator whose flaws Ibn Hajar overlooked**

Ibn Hajar, in his criticism of Hamzah Jazari, sufficed with the brief statement 'They accused him of fabricating traditions'. However, it should be noted that he has been severely criticized and discredited by many prominent scholars.

Bukhari writes in **al-Zu'afaa**, 'Hamzah Ibn Abi Hamzah Naseebi is a denier of traditions.'¹

Nasai pens in **al-Zu'afaa**, 'Hamzah Naseebi is abandoned in traditions' (*matruk al-hadees*).²

Ibn al-Jawzi in **al-Mauzooaat**, while criticizing the tradition 'Hair in the nose protects from leprosy' reported from Jabir, writes, 'In its second chain, there is Hamzah Naseebi. Yahya (Ibn Maeen) said, 'He is nothing.' Ibn Adi says, 'He fabricates traditions.'

Additionally, in **al-Mauzooaat**, while criticising the tradition about the virtues of Asqalan transmitted from Ibn Umar, he mentioned, 'In the second chain, there is Hamzah Ibn Abi Hamzah. Ahmad Ibn Hanbal said, 'His traditions are discarded.' Yahya said, 'He is nothing, not worth a penny.' Nasai and Daraqutni said, 'He is abandoned in

¹ Al-Zu'afaa of Bukhari, p. 36, No. 88

² Al-Zu'afaa of Nasai, p. 32, No. 139

traditions.¹ Ibn Adi stated, ‘He fabricates traditions.’ Ibn Hibban said, ‘He narrates fabrications from trustworthy narrators; it is impermissible to report from him.’

Ibn Jawzi, in **al-Mauzooat**, while critiquing the tradition ‘Whoever forgets to say ‘In the Name of Allah’ (*Bismillah*) over his food, let him recite Surah Tauheed after finishing,’ remarked, ‘This is a fabricated narration, and the one accused of fabricating it is Hamzah, meaning Hamzah Ibn Abi Hamzah Jofi Naseebi. Ahmad said, ‘His traditions are discarded.’ Yahya said, ‘He is nothing, not worth a penny.’ Ibn Adi said, ‘He fabricates traditions.’ Ibn Hibban said, ‘It is impermissible to narrate from him.’ Daraqutni said, ‘He is abandoned.’

Abu Hayyan Gharnaati, in his exegesis **al-Bahr al-Muhit**, while critiquing **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, writes, ‘And it was also narrated by Hamzah Jazari, and this Hamzah is worthless (*saaqit*), abandoned (*matruk*).’

Zahabi, in **Mizan al-Itidal**, in the entry for Hamzah Jazari, pens, ‘Ibn Maeen said, ‘He is not worth a penny.’ Bukhari said, ‘He is a denier of traditions (*munkir al-hadees*).’ Daraqutni said, ‘He is abandoned (*matruk*).’ Ibn Adi said, ‘The majority of his narrations are fabricated.’²

Additionally, Zahabi, in **al-Kashif**, says, ‘Hamzah Ibn Abi Hamzah Maymun Jazari Naseebi, who narrated from Ibn Abi Mulayka and Mak’hul, and from him Bakar Ibn Muzar and Shabaabah. He was abandoned.’

Furthermore, Zahabi, in **al-Mughni fi al-Zu’afaa**, writes, ‘Hamzah Ibn Abi Hamzah narrated from Ata and is accused and weak.’

Zahabi also writes in **Talkhees al-Mustadrak**, after citing a tradition transmitted by Hamzah Jazari, ‘Hamzah is Naseebi. Ibn Adi said, ‘He fabricates traditions.’

¹ Al-Mauzooat, vol. 3, p. 34, Chapter regarding What one should do if he forgets to recite Bismillah on his food

² Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 1, p. 606, No. 2299

Burhan al-Deen Sibṭ Ibn Ajami Halabi in his book **al-Kashf al-Hasess am-man Ruwiya be Waz' al-Ḥadees** writes, 'Hamza Ibn Abi Hamza Jazari Naseebi was mentioned by Zahabi in **Mizan (al-Itidal)**, and he did not explicitly label him as a fabricator. However, he quoted Ibn Adi thus, 'Most of what he narrates is fabricated.' Zahabi explicitly stated this in **Talkhees al-Mustadrak** under the chapter on legal punishments, in the narration of 'Whoever mutilates his slave is free.' He then said, 'It includes Hamza Naseebi.' Ibn Adi said, 'He fabricates traditions.' Similarly, Ibn Jawzi also quoted Ibn Adi.

Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in **Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb**, chronicles, "Hamza Ibn Abi Hamza Maymun Jo'fi Jazari Naseebi narrated from Amr Ibn Dinar, Abu Zubair, Ibn Abi Mulaykah, Zaid Ibn Rafi', Mak'hul, and others. Among those who narrated from him are Hamza Zayyaat, Bakr Ibn Muzar, Shabaabah Sawaar, Yahya Ibn Ayyub Misri, Abu Shabab Hannaat, Muhammad Ibn Fazl Ibn Atiyyah, and others. Muhammad Ibn Auf reported from Ahmad, 'His narrations are rejected.' Ibn Abi Khaisamah narrated from Ibn Maeen, 'His narration is worthless.' Duri quoted Yahya, 'He is not worth a coin.' Bukhari and Abu Hatim labelled him as 'denier of traditions.' Tirmizi said, 'Weak in traditions.' Nasai and Daraqutni declared, 'His tradition is abandoned.' Ibn Adi said, 'The majority of what he narrates is odd and fabricated, and the fault lies with him.' Ibn Hibban said, 'He narrates fabricated reports from trustworthy narrators as if he deliberately intended to do so, and it is impermissible to narrate from him.'

He has a single tradition in Tirmizi's collection on 'dusting books,' but he is unnamed there. Tirmizi commented afterward, 'Hamza here is Hamza Ibn Amr Naseebi.' Mizzi remarked, 'We do not know of anyone calling him Hamza Ibn Amr except Tirmizi, and it seems he confused him with Hammad Ibn Amr Naseebi.' Uqayli listed him as 'Hamza Ibn Abi Hamza Naseebi, also known as Hamza Ibn Maymun'

and cited the tradition that Tirmizi attributed to him.¹

I [Ibn Hajar] say, ‘Abu Hatim and Abu Zur‘ah also considered him weak in traditions. Abu Hatim further said, ‘He is weaker than Hamza Ibn Najeeh.’ Ajiri narrated from Abu Dawud. ‘He is nothing.’ Haakim said, ‘He narrates fabricated traditions.’ Ibn Adi also said, ‘He fabricates traditions.’

Bukhari and Ibn Hibban included among his fabricated narrations the traditions, ‘Asqalan is one of the two brides’, ‘Whoever eats food should recite Surah Tauheed after finishing’ and ‘Do not use reeds to clean your teeth, as it causes tooth decay’ among others.

Ibn Hajar, in **Talkhees al-Khabeer**, while criticising the tradition, ‘The blood of the white sheep is purer to Allah than the blood of the two black ones’ records, ‘It contains Hamza Naseebi, and it is said that he used to fabricate traditions.’

Mulla Ali Muttaqi, in **Kanz al-Ummaal**, after mentioning the tradition, ‘Be kind to goats’ writes, ‘Ibn Adi said, ‘It (the chain of transmitters) has Hamza Naseebi, who is a liar.’

Safi al-Deen al-Khazraji in **Mukhtasar al-Tazheeb**, pens, ‘Hamza Ibn Abi Hamza Maymun Jo’fi Jazari Naseebi narrated from Naafe’, and Bakr Ibn Muzar narrated from him. Bukhari said, ‘He is a denier of traditions’, and he has a solitary tradition recorded by him (likely by Tirmizi).’

Muhammad Ibn Tahir Fattani, in **Qanun al-Mauzooaat**, pens, ‘Hamza Ibn Abi Hamza Jo’fi fabricated traditions. Hamza Naseebi fabricated traditions, and once he said, ‘His tradition is fabricated.’ I say, ‘Tirmizi narrated from him.’

Shaukani, in **Nayl al-Awtar**, while mentioning the tradition forbidding the killing of swallows, said, ‘Baihaqi said, ‘He narrated a connected tradition on this matter, but it contains Hamza Naseebi, and was accused of fabrication.’

Abd al-Wahhab Madrasi, in **Kashf al-Aḥwaal fi Naqd al-Rijal**,

¹ Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb, vol. 3, p. 29

stated, ‘Hamza Ibn Abi Hamza Jo’fi Naseebi was a fabricator. Tirmizi narrated from him. He heard from Abu Zubair and Ata, and Ali Ibn Sabit and Hafs Ibn Misrah narrated from him in al-Muqtada, Manaaqeb al-Buldaan, and al-At’emah.’

4) **Ibn Hajar, in his critique of Ja’far ibn Abd al-Wahid, has also taken a concise approach.**

Ibn Hajar, in his criticism of Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid, has also taken a concise/liberal approach, whereas eminent scholars have made extensive efforts in panning and disparaging him. Ibn Jawzi, in his book *al-Mauzooaat*, in the chapter on ‘Humility in Prayer’, after mentioning a tradition narrated by Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid, states, ‘This is a fabricated narration. Ibn Hibban said, ‘This narration has no basis. He also said. ‘Jafar used to steal traditions and alter reports in such a way that there would be no doubt he fabricated them. Abu Ahmad Ibn Adi said, ‘Jafar was accused of fabricating traditions.’¹

Again, Ibn Jawzi, in his book *al-Mauzooaat*, in the chapter on ‘The Acceptance of Supplication Against One Who Does Not Show Gratitude to Creatures for Favours’, after recording two traditions, writes, ‘This tradition is not authentic from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). As for the first chain, it contains Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid. Daraqutni said, ‘He is a liar who fabricates traditions.’²

Previously, you heard that Zahabi, in **Mizan al-Itidal**, quotes Daraqutni that Jafar fabricated traditions, and from Abu Zur’ah that Jafar narrated traditions that have no basis. Zahabi also quotes Ibn Adi, who said that Jafar used to steal traditions and narrated anomalous reports from trustworthy narrators. Additionally, Ibn Adi mentioned that he refuted Jafar’s tradition on the interpretation of the verse, ‘**And when the souls are paired**’³, and noted that he narrated numerous fabricated traditions, some of which were stolen from

¹ Al-Mauzooaat, vol. 2, p. 96, Chapter of Humility in Prayer

² Al-Mauzooaat, vol. 3, p. 172 Chapter on ‘The Acceptance of Supplication Against One Who Does Not Show Gratitude to the Creatures for Favours’

³ Surah Takveer (81): Verse 7

others.

Moreover, Ibn Adi narrates that Jafar fabricated a tradition about the birth of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.), stating that Jafar was the flaw in that tradition, meaning he was the one who fabricated and constructed it. Khatib mentioned that al-Mustaeen – the Abbaside king – dismissed Jafar from his judicial position and exiled him to Basra due to a matter that had reached him about Jafar.

Abu Hatim narrates that Jafar made an addition to a tradition he narrated from Qanabi, which led Qanabi to complain against him. Consequently, Jafar was disgraced. Abu Zur'ah adds, 'I fear that the supplication of the righteous elder, Qanabi, might have reached him.' At the end of Zahabi's commentary, he mentions **Hadees-e-Nujoom** as narrated by Jafar, exposing further of Jafar's calamities without needing to elaborate. That alone suffices as a mark of disgrace, loss, destruction, and ruin.

Zahabi writes in **Mughni**, 'Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid Hashimi Qazi is abandoned (*matruk*).'

Sibt Ibn Ajami Halabi, in his book **al-Kashf al-Hasess am-man Rumiya bi Waz' al-Hadees**, pens, 'Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid Hashimi Qazi: Daraqutni said he fabricated traditions. Ibn Adi cited his traditions and said all of them are false, and some of them were stolen from others. Ibn Jawzi also quoted Ibn Adi saying he was accused of fabricating traditions, mentioning this in several places in **al-Mauzooat**."

Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, in **Lisan al-Mizan**, while discussing the biography of Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid, after quoting Zahabi, chronicles, 'Saeed Ibn Amr Barazae said, 'I mentioned to Abu Zur'ah some traditions I heard from Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid, and he rejected them, saying they have no basis. Regarding some of them, he said they are false. Then he paused and said, 'I used to see him and wished to speak with him because of his calm demeanour. He was an Abbasid, suitable for the caliphate, possessing memory and jurisprudence. Yet he produced such fabrications from which we seek protection and safety

from Allah.’

Suyuti, in **al-La’ali al-Masnu’ah**, after quoting a tradition narrated by Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid, writes, ‘Ibn Hibban said, ‘There is no basis for it, and Jafar is accused of fabricating traditions.’

Muhammad Ibn Tahir Fattani, in **Qanun al-Mauzooaat**, writes, ‘Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid is a liar who fabricates traditions. In *Kh* and *Dh*, it is mentioned, ‘Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid Hashimi steals traditions and narrates odd and objectionable reports from trustworthy narrators. Daraqutni said, ‘He used to fabricate traditions.’

Abd al-Wahhab Madrasi, in **Kashf al-Ahwaal**, writes, ‘Jafar Ibn Abd al-Wahid Hashimi Qazi is a liar who fabricates traditions. He heard from Saeed Ibn Aslam, Muhammad Ibn Maslamah, Abu Etaab Dallaal, and others. From him narrated Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Sulaiman, Ibn Hibban, Ahmad Ibn Harun, Ibn Adi, and others, in topics such as the virtues of various companions, prayer, zikr, and in **al-Zayl** regarding resurrection.’

5) **The criticism and disparagement of scholars of traditions regarding the highly flawed character of Bishr Ibn Husain Isfahani, who was also critiqued by Ibn Hajar lightly**

Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in his critique of **Bishr Ibn Husain**, is guilty of adopting a very brief and light approach, while the scholars of **rijal** took a more detailed and expansive approach in highlighting his highly flawed character, leaving no room for negligence or leniency in their evaluation.

Zahabi, in *Mizan al-Itidal*, stated, ‘**Bishr Ibn Husain Isfahani, a companion of Zubair Ibn Adi, was described as questionable by Khatib. Daraqutni said he is abandoned (matruk). Ibn Adi remarked that most of his traditions are not memorized. Abu Hatim accused him of lying about Zubair. Hajjaj Ibn Yusuf Ibn Qutaibah narrated, ‘Bishr told me, ‘Zubair Ibn Adi narrated to me from Anas, attributing it to the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), ‘Whoever moves his ring, turban, or hangs a thread to remind himself**

has associated gods with Allah; indeed, Allah is the One who reminds of needs.’ Then he narrated one hundred traditions with this chain, none of which are authentic. Amir Ibn Ibrahim narrated from Bishr Ibn Husain from Zubair from Anas that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘The best of deeds is *al-hall wa al-rehlah*. It was asked, ‘What is *al-hall wa al-rehlah*? He said, ‘Beginning the Quran and completing it.’¹

Ibrahim narrated, ‘Bishr narrated from Zubair from Anas that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) used to praise Allah between every two morsels.’ Ibn Adi commented, ‘Zubair is reliable, but Bishr is weak, except for the narrations found in the version transmitted by Hajjaj from him, which are straightforward.’

Ibn Adi added, ‘In the version transmitted by Hajjaj, there is a tradition, ‘No one has a greater right to dignity than the bearer of the Quran, due to the honour of the Quran within him.’

Also included in this version are the narrations, ‘Woe to the merchant who swears by day and holds himself accountable by night’ and ‘Woe to the jeweller today and tomorrow.’

Ibn Abi Dawud narrated, ‘Muhammad Ibn Amir Ibn Ibrahim from his father from Bishr from Zubair from Anas’ and mentioned the tradition regarding the dignity of the bearer of the Quran.

Abu al-Husain Yunini and Ali Ibn Usman reported, ‘Ahmad Ibn Muhammad narrated to us from Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Hafiz from Qasim Ibn Fazl from Usman Ibn Ahmad Barji from Muhammad Ibn Umar Ibn Hafs from Hajjaj Ibn Yusuf from Bishr Ibn Husain from Zubair Ibn Adi from Anas that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘If it were not for the beggars who lie, no one who refuses them would succeed.’ Ibn Hibban remarked, ‘Bishr Ibn Husain narrates from Zubair a fabricated collection of approximately one hundred and fifty traditions.’

Again, Zahabi in **al-Mughni** writes, ‘Bishr Ibn Hasan (or possibly

¹ Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 1, p. 315, No. 1192

Husain) Isfahani is the narrator of the collection attributed to Zubair Ibn Adi. Daraqutni said, 'He is abandoned (*matruk*).' Abu Hatim said, 'He lies about Zubair.'¹

Zain al-Deen Iraqi, in **Takhreej-o-Ihya al-Uloom**, while critiquing the narration, 'Indeed, humility only increases a servant in elevation', pens, 'It includes Bishr Ibn Hasan, and he is extremely weak.'

Ali Ibn Abi Bakr Ibn Sulaiman Haisami, in **Majma' al-Zawaed**, in the chapter on the qualities of faith, after mentioning a tradition narrated from Anas, chronicles, 'It includes Bishr Ibn Husain, and he is an excessive liar.'

Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in **Lisan al-Mizan**, in Bishr's biography, after quoting the statement from **Mizan al-Itidal**, writes, 'Ibn Hibban, in **al-Siqaat**, in the biography of Zubair Ibn Adi, said, 'Bishr Ibn Husain is as if the earth brought forth its innermost core for his traditions! Nothing narrated from Zubair should be considered except as a source of bewilderment!' Abu Nuaim said, 'He came to Abu Dawud Tayaalisi and said, 'Zubair Ibn Adi narrated to me.' Abu Dawud rejected him, saying, 'We know of only one tradition of Zubair Ibn Adi from Anas. Abu Nuaim further commented, 'He transmitted narrations after the year 200 A.H.'²

Abu Hatim, when told that there were people in Baghdad narrating about 20 traditions from Muhammad Ibn Ziyad from Bishr Ibn Husain from Zubair Ibn Adi from Anas, who said, 'These are fabricated traditions. Zubair only narrated four traditions from Anas.'

Uqaili writes, 'Hajjaj Ibn Yusuf narrated from him (Bishr) from Zubair from Anas and mentioned the tradition on dignity, the tradition, 'If it were not for beggars,' and the tradition, 'Woe to the merchant.' He also narrated other similar objectionable (*munkar*) reports.'

Daraqutni writes, 'He narrates falsehoods (*bawaatil*) from Zubair, who is trustworthy, but the manuscript (*nuskah*) is fabricated.' Abu

¹ Al-Mughni, p. 105, No. 898

² Lisan al-Mizan, vol. 2, p. 21, No. 74

Ahmad Haakim said, ‘His traditions are not reliable.’ Ibn Jarud said, ‘He is weak.’

Muhammad Ibn Tahir Fattani writes in **Qaanoon al-Mauzooaat**, ‘Bishr Ibn Husain Isfahani is abandoned (*matruk*). He narrates falsehoods (*bawaatil*) from Zubair Ibn Adi. Ibn Hibban said, ‘He narrated a fabricated collection of approximately one hundred and fifty traditions from Zubair.’

Shaykh Rahmatullah Sindhi in **Mukhtasar-o-Tanzih al-Shari’ah**, ‘Bishr Ibn Husayn Isfahani possesses a fabricated collection of around one hundred and fifty narrations attributed to Anas.’

Abd al-Wahhab Madrasi in **Kashf al-Ahwaal** chronicles, ‘Bishr Ibn Husain Isfahani Hilali: Bukhari remarked about him, ‘There is some issue with him’ and in another place, ‘He is abandoned.’ He narrates falsehoods from Zubair. Abu Hatim said, ‘Bishr Ibn Husain fabricates lies about Zubair.’ Ibn Hibban said, ‘Bishr narrates a fabricated collection from Zubair containing about a hundred and fifty traditions.’ Abu Nuaim said, ‘A man came to Abu Dawood Tayaalisi and said, ‘Narrate to me from Zubair Ibn Adi from Anas.’ Abu Dawood rejected him and said, ‘We do not know of Zubair Ibn Adi narrating from Anas except for one tradition.’ Daraqutni stated, ‘Bishr narrates falsehoods from Zubair, while Zubair is trustworthy. And the copy is attributed to hearing from Zubair Ibn Adi; it was narrated by Hajjaj Ibn Yusuf Ibn Qutaibah regarding charity, marriage, and etiquette, as well as in the supplement on the virtues of the Quran and transactions.’

6) **Ibn Hajar chose the path of brevity in criticizing Juwaibir too**

Ibn Hajar Asqalani has chosen a mild and brief approach in critiquing Juwaibir, whereas the esteemed critics and great scholars of traditions of Ahle Tasannun have adopted a detailed and extensive method in their criticism of Juwaibir, elaborating on the complete weakness and insignificance of his narrations, as you will soon come to know, with the help of Allah, the All-Hearing, the Answerer (of prayers).

7) **Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani has remained silent regarding the criticism of Zahhak mentioned in the primary narration of Juwaibir**

Ibn Hajar Asqalani has remained silent regarding the criticism of Zahhak, who appears in the primary narration of Juwaibir even though Zahhak is also discredited and disparaged by prominent scholars of Ahle Tasannun, as will soon become evident, with Allah's help, from the analyses and investigations of those well-versed in scrutiny and research. Moreover, Ibn Hajar himself has mentioned a portion of this criticism in his book **Tahzeeb**.

8) **The criticism and discrediting of Jawwaab Ibn Ubaidillah Taimi, about whom also Ibn Hajar has remained silent despite the critique against him.**

Ibn Hajar Asqalani has also remained silent regarding the criticism and discrediting of Jawwaab Ibn Ubaidillah Taimi, who appears in another narration of Juwaibir. This is despite the fact that some scholars well-versed in the study of narrators and critics have deemed him extremely weak, exposing his flaws by highlighting his corrupt beliefs and misguided creed.

Zahabi writes in **Mizan al-Itidal**, "Jawwaab Ibn Ubaidillah Taimi narrated from Haaris Ibn Suwaid. Ibn Maeen deemed him reliable (*siqah*), while Ibn Numair considered him weak (*zaeef*). Abu Khalid Ahmar said, 'I saw him; he used to give sermons and was inclined towards *Irja'* (postponing judgment).' Namri mentioned, 'I passed through Jurjaan, where Jawwaab Taimi resided, but I did not engage with him, due to his inclination towards *Irja'*.' Khalaf Ibn Hushab narrated, 'When Jawwaab Taimi heard remembrance (*zikr*), he would tremble. I mentioned this to Ibrahim, who replied, 'If he is capable of controlling it, then it is nothing; but if he cannot control it, he has been overtaken by those before him.' Ibn Adi remarked, 'Jawwaab has only a few *musnad* (connected) narrations, and he has some incomplete ones in asceticism (*zuhd*) and other areas. May Allah have

mercy on him.¹

Additionally, in **al-Mughni**, Zahabi writes, ‘Jawwaab Ibn Ubaidillah Taimi was weakened by Ibn Numayr, while Ibn Maeen regarded him as reliable. He narrated from Haaris Ibn Suwaid.’

Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in **Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb**, writes regarding Jawwaab Ibn Ubaidillah Taimi, ‘Ibn Numayr said, ‘He is weak (*zaeef*) in tradiitions. Sauri saw him but did not narrate from him.’ Abu Khalid Ahmar said, ‘He used to give sermons and followed the doctrine of *Irja*.’ Abu Nuaim quoted Sauri as saying, ‘I passed through Jurjaan, where Jawwaab Taimi resided, but I did not engage with him.’ Sufyan explained this as ‘because of his inclination towards *Irja*’.²

Additionally, Safi al-Deen Khazraji in **Khulaasah al-Tahzeeb** pens, ‘Jawwaab Ibn Ubaidillah Tamimi (or Taimi), a Kufi, narrated from Ma’rur Ibn Suwaid, and Abu Ishaq Shaibani and Abu Hanifa narrated from him. Abu Khalid Ahmar remarked, ‘He inclined towards the doctrine of *Irja*.’ Ibn Numair considered him weak.³

9) **Ibn Hajar did not mention the name of the person who narrated this report from Juwaibir**

Ibn Hajar did not mention the name of the person who narrated this report from Juwaibir. However, as you will learn later, with Allah’s help, from the insights of Hafiz Sakhaawi, the narrator of this report from Juwaibir is Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima. You will also come to know that Sulaiman is discredited by prominent figures and regarded as weak by distinguished authorities. Moreover, Ibn Hajar himself has detailed his flaws and deficiencies in **Lisan al-Mizan**.

10) **The disparagement and discrediting of Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi, about whom Ibn Hajar has adopted a general and brief (casual) approach.**

¹ Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 1, p. 426

² Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb, vol. 2, p. 112

³ Khulaasah al-Tahzeeb, p. 66

Ibn Hajar adopted a general, brief and causal approach regarding the criticism of Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi. However, a detailed explanation and clarification of the statements made by his critics, as well as the explicit remarks concerning him, are worthy of mention and elaboration. Bukhari, in his book *al-Zuafaa*, writes, ‘Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi, Abu Zaid Basri, narrated from his father. They abandoned him.’ Nasai, in his book *al-Zuafaa wa al-Matrukeen*, remarks, ‘Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi is abandoned (*matruk*), Abu Zaid Basri.

Abd al-Rahman Ibn Abi Hatim Raazi, in his book **al-Elal**, after mentioning a tradition about the virtue of performing ablution three times, quotes his father as saying, ‘Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid is abandoned in traditions (*matruk al-hadees*).’

Similarly, in **al-Elal**, after citing a tradition about the virtue of the month of Ramazan, he pens, ‘My father said, ‘This tradition is denounced (*munkar*), and Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid is abandoned in traditions (*matruk al-hadees*).’

Ahmad Ibn Hasan Baihaqi, in his book **al-Sunan al-Kubra**, after narrating a tradition on the virtue of performing ablution three times, comments, ‘This is how Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi narrated it from his father, but others have narrated it differently, and they are not strong in narration.’

Previously, it was noted that Hafiz of the Maghreb, Ibn Abd al-Barr Qurtubi, in **Jaame’ Bayaan al-Ilm**, quotes Hafiz Abu Bakr Bazzar. After transmitting **Hadees-e-Nujoom** from Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi, Bazzar criticizes this tradition by saying, ‘The weakness of this tradition stems from Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid, as the scholars have refrained from narrating his traditions.’

Ibn Jawzi, in his book **al-Mauzooaat**, under the section on marriage, after mentioning the tradition, ‘If it were not for women, Allah would have been truly worshipped’ (لو لا النساء لعبد الله حقا حقا), pens, ‘This tradition is baseless, and among its narrators is Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi. Yahya (Ibn Maeen) said, ‘He and his father are worthless’. On

another occasion, he said, ‘Abd al-Rahim is a liar and vile.’ Nasai said, ‘He is abandoned in traditions (*matruk al-hadees*).’ Ibn Adi remarked, ‘This tradition is denounced (*munkar*); I do not know it except through this chain. All of Abd al-Rahim’s narrations are such that reliable narrators do not follow him.’

Additionally, Ibn Jawzi, in **al-Elal al-Mutanaahiya**, after citing **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, comments on the criticism and disparagement of its narrators, ‘Yahya Ibn Maeen said, ‘Abd al-Rahim is a liar.’

Abu Hayyan al-Gharnaati, in his exegesis **al-Bahr al-Muhit**, after quoting Hafiz Bazzar’s critique of **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, says, ‘Ibn Maeen said, ‘Abd al-Rahim bin Zayd is a liar, vile and worthless.’ Bukhari said, ‘He is abandoned (*matruk*).’

Zahabi, in **Mizan al-Itidal**, under the biography of Zaid Ammi, after narrating **Hadees-e-Nujoom** through a chain that includes Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi, writes, ‘This is false (*batil*), and Abd al-Rahim has been abandoned.’

Again, in **Mizan al-Itidal**, under the biography of Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi, he chronicles, ‘Bukhari said, ‘They abandoned him.’ Yahya (Ibn Maeen) said, ‘He is an excessive liar.’ In another place, he commented, ‘He is worthless.’ Jawzajaani remarked, ‘He is not reliable.’ Abu Hatim said, ‘His tradition is abandoned.’ Abu Zur’ah said, ‘He is frail (*waahin*).’ Abu Dawud said, ‘He is weak (*zaeef*).’

In the same book, Zahabi also cites **Hadees-e-Nujoom** as narrated by Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi and clarifies for people of intellect that this tradition is among his fabrications (*mauzooaat*).’

Furthermore, in **al-Mughni**, Zahabi says, ‘Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ibn Hawari Ammi, narrating from his father. Bukhari said, ‘They abandoned him.’¹

In **al-Kashif**, he (Zahabi) chronicles, ‘Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi narrated from his father, and Suwaid and Hasan Ib Qaz’ah narrated from him. He was abandoned. He died in the year 184 A.H.’

¹ Al-Mughni, p. 391, No. 3675

Ibn Maktum Qaisi Hanafi, in his book **Durr Laqeet**, quotes Abu Hayyan Gharnaati, who, while criticizing and discrediting **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, writes, ‘Ibn Maeen said, ‘Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid is a liar, vile and worthless. Bukhari said, ‘He is abandoned (*matruk*).’

Ibn Hajar himself, in **Tahzeeb** in the biography of Abd al-Rahim Ammi, writes, “Duri reported from Ibn Maeen, ‘He is nothing.’ Jawzjaani said, ‘Not trustworthy.’ Abu Zur’ah said, ‘Feeble, weak in traditions.’ Abu Hatim said, ‘His tradition is abandoned; he narrates unacceptable traditions and corrupts his father’s narration with absurdities.’ Bukhari said, ‘They abandoned him.’ Abu Dawud said, ‘Weak.’ Nasai said, ‘Abandoned in traditions’, and in another place, he said, ‘Not trustworthy, not reliable, and his traditions should not be written.’ Ibn Adi said, ‘He narrates from his father from Shaqeeq from Abdullah strange narrations, and he has reported traditions that trustworthy narrators do not corroborate.’ Abu Bakr Ibn Abi Aasim said, ‘He died in the year 184 A.H.’ I (Ibn Hajar) say, ‘And Aqili said, ‘Ibn Maeen called him a liar and wicked.’ Abdullah Ibn Ali Ibn Madini quoted his father as saying, ‘Weak.’ Saaji said, ‘He has objectionable narrations.’”

Again, Ibn Hajar writes in **Taqreeb al-Tahzeeb**, “Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ibn Hawari Ammi Basri, Abu Zaid. Ibn Maeen called him a liar. He belongs to the eighth generation (of narrators) and died in the year 184 A.H.”

Ibn Hajar also writes in **Talkhees al-Khabeer**, criticized **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, saying, “Bazaar mentioned it as narrated by Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi from his father from Saeed Ibn Musayyib from Amr. Abd al-Rahim is a liar.”

He continues in **Talkhees al-Khabeer**, after mentioning a tradition from (Abdullah) Ibn Umar concerning ablution, “Its chain revolves around Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi, narrating from his father. There is disagreement regarding him, and he is abandoned, while his father is weak.”

Mulla Ali Muttaqi Hindi, in **Kanz al-Ummaal**, in the Book of Virtues,

after mentioning the tradition, “*Whoever endures the heat of Mecca, etc.*” said, “And in it is Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi, who is abandoned and narrates from his father, and he is not strong.”

Also, in **Kanz al-Ummaal**, in the Book of Virtues, after mentioning a tradition about passing the month of Ramazan in Makkah, he said, “Reported by Ibn Abbas, and he said, ‘Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi is unique in narrating it, and he is not strong.’”

Safi al-Deen Khazraji writes in **Mukhtasar al-Tahzeeb**, “Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi narrated from his father and Attar narrated from him. Bukhari said, ‘They abandoned him.’¹”

Chief Justice Muhammad Ibn Ali Shaukani, in **Fawaaed Majmooh fi al-Ahadees al-Mawzooah**, regarding the tradition, ‘Whoever walks to fulfil the need of his Muslim brother...’ said, ‘In its chain is Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi, narrating from his father, and he is nothing.’”

Abd al-Wahhab Madrasi, in **Kashf al-Ahwaal**, chronicles, “Abd al-Rahim Ibn Zaid Ibn Hawari Ammi Basri is nothing. And in another place, he writes, ‘(He was) a liar.’ He heard from his father and Muhammad Ibn Yahya Basri, Abdullah Ibn Imran, Isa Ibn Ziyad and Bishr Ibn Amaarah narrated from him in topics related to charity, pilgrimage, and marriage.”

Twenty-Sixth Reason: The criticism by Hafiz Ibn Hajar Asqalani in his book Takhreej-o-Ahaadees-e-Mukhtasar Ibn al-Hajib regarding Hadees-e-Nujoom
Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, in his book **Takhreej-o-Ahaadees-e-Mukhtasar Ibn al-Hajib**, criticized and challenged the authenticity of Hadees-e-Nujoom, citing Bazzar’s statement about its lack of soundness and highlighting its weakness and insignificance. This will become clearer later, God willing, through the explanation of the phrase from **Faiz al-Qadeer** by Manavi.

¹ Mukhtasar al-Tahzeeb, p. 337

Twenty-Seventh Reason: The criticism and disparagement of the Hafiz (Ibn Hajar) in the stated tradition are found in the book Lisan al-Mizan

Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in **Lisan al-Mizan**, in the entry for Jamil Ibn Yazid, has transmitted that **Hadees-e-Nujoom** is criticized (deemed unreliable) by Daraqutni. The statement from **Lisan al-Mizan** has already been quoted, so do not be heedless of this matter.

Twenty-Eighth Reason: The criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Allamah Ibn Humam, Kamaal al-Deen Muhammad Sivasi, is mentioned in his book Tahreer

Allamah Kamal al-Deen Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Wahid Sivasi Hanafi, famously known as Ibn Humam, who is among the prominent scholars of the Hanafi school, has stated regarding **Hadees-e-Nujoom** that this tradition is not recognized as authentic. As he explains in his book *Tahreer*, which is one of the well-known works on the principles of jurisprudence (*usul-e-fiqh*), in the discussion on consensus (*ijma*), while responding to the tradition, ‘Follow those who come after me: Abu Bakr and Umar’ and ‘Adhere to my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly guided caliphs’, he states, ‘The response is: These indicate the permissibility of following them but do not prohibit independent reasoning (*ijtihad*). Even if it is assumed that following them is obligatory, this can still be dismissed by noting that it is a solitary narration (*khabar-e-waahid*), and it is opposed by the narration, ‘My companions are like stars; whoever you follow, you will be guided’ and ‘Take half of your religion from Humaira (Aisha).’ However, the former (My companions are like stars) is unknown (and hence not authentic).¹

¹ Al-Tahreer ba Sharh Ibn Amir al-Haaj, vol. 3, p. 99, Chapter Four Concerning Consensus

Twenty-Ninth Reason: The criticism and discrediting of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Allamah Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Amir al-Haaj Halabi is mentioned in the book al-Taqrer wa al-Tahbeer

Indication

Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Halabi Hanafi, known as Ibn Amir Haaj, in **al-Taqrer wa al-Tahbeer fi Sharh al-Tahreer**, critically examines and discredits **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, emphasizing its extreme weakness and lack of authenticity. In the discussion on consensus (*ijma*), while responding to the tradition, ‘Follow those who come after me’ and ‘Adhere to my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly guided caliphs’, he states, ‘In opposition to this, it is also responded to by mentioning, ‘My companions are like stars; whoever you follow among them, you will be guided’ and ‘Take half of your religion from Humaira (Aisha).’ However, the former (‘My companions are like stars’) is unknown (and hence not authentic).’

He further references Ibn Hazm in his **Risaalah al-Kubra**, who described the tradition as forged, fabricated, and invalid. Despite there being multiple chains of transmission narrated by Umar, his son, Jabir, Ibn Abbas, and Anas with various wordings, none are authentic. Among these, the closest to the mentioned wording is the one reported by Ibn Adi in **al-Kaamil** and Ibn Abd al-Barr in **Bayan al-Ilm**, which states, ‘The example of my companions is like the stars; they guide you, so whoever among them you take their words, you will be guided.’

Additionally, Daraqutni and Ibn Abd al-Barr narrated from Jabir, ‘The example of my companions in my nation is like the stars; whoever you follow among them, you will be guided.’ However, he concludes, ‘None of these narrations are authentic.’ Hence, Ahmad Ibn Hanbal said, ‘This hadith is not authentic.’ And al-Bazaar states, ‘This statement cannot be authentically attributed to the Prophet (s.a.w.a.).’ Baihaqi, in **al-Itiqad**, comments, ‘We have narrated it in a connected

chain with a weak chain of narrators, and in another narration that is disconnected. A sound tradition conveys a similar meaning, which is the tradition of Abu Musa narrated in Muslim thus, ‘The stars are a safety for the sky; when the stars are gone, what has been promised to the sky will come. I am a safety for my companions; when I am gone, what has been promised to my companions will come. My companions are a safety for my nation; when my companions are gone, what has been promised to my nation will come.’¹

From this passage, the utmost diligence of Ibn Amir Haaj in criticizing and refuting this tradition is clear and evident.

Firstly, regarding **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, he quotes Ibn Hazm, who stated that this tradition is fabricated, baseless, and false.

Secondly, after mentioning that this tradition has been transmitted through multiple chains, he indicates that none of these chains is authentic.

Thirdly, he cites Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, who explicitly stated that this tradition is not authentic.

Fourthly, he quotes Hafiz Bazzaar, who said that this statement, meaning **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, has not been authentically reported from the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.).

Fifthly, he references Baihaqi, who, in his book **al-Itiqad**, stated that **Hadees-e-Nujoom** is narrated in one instance with a weak connected chain and in another instance as a disconnected report.

In these five points is sufficient proof to silence the opponent and his whispers, hasten the burial and obliteration of falsehood, and constrain the heretic in his efforts and arguments.

Ibn Amir Haaj is one of the great and esteemed scholars of prominence and significance among the Ahle Tasannun.

¹ Al-Taqreer wa al-Tahbeer fi Sharh al-Tahreer, vol. 3, p. 99, Chapter Four Concerning Consensus

Biography of Allamah Ibn Amir Haaj Halabi

Sakhaawi writes in **al-Zau al-Laame'**, "Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Hasan Ibn Ali Ibn Sulaiman Ibn Umar Ibn Muhammad Shams Halabi Hanafi, whose father and grandfather have passed away, is known as Ibn Amir Haaj and Ibn Muwaqqit. He was born on the 18th of Rabi' al-Awwal in the year 825 A.H. in Aleppo (*Halab*) and grew up there. He memorized the Quran under Ibrahim al-Kafirnawi and others, as well as Arbaeen of Nawawi, al-Mukhtar, Muqaddamaat of Abi Lays, Tasrif of Izzi, al-Jarjaniyya, and parts of Akhshikati. He studied under Ibn Khatib Nasiriya, Burhan Hafiz, Shihab ibn Rassam, and others from his hometown.

He pursued jurisprudence under A'laa Malti and studied grammar, morphology, rhetoric, and logic with Zain Abd al-Razzaq, one of the students of A'laa Bukhari. He travelled to Hama, where he studied with Ibn Asqar, and then to Cairo, where he studied under our teacher through my recitation and that of others. He learned extensively from him, including portions of Sharh Alfiyyaat Iraqi and other works. He also closely studied with Ibn Humam in jurisprudence, Usul al-Fiqh, and other fields, excelling in these disciplines.

Ibn Humam and others authorized him to teach, and he took up teaching, benefiting many students. He issued legal verdicts and wrote commentaries on **Munyah al-Musalli**, **Tahrir** by his teacher Ibn Humam, and **al-Awaamil**. He authored a treatise on Hajj rituals titled Daaee Manaar al-Bayan le-Jaame' al-Taskeen bi al-Quran and a commentary on Surah Asr titled **Zakheerah al-Qasr fi Tafseer Surah al-Asr**, among other works.

I have heard his discussions and insights, and he has read some portions of **al-Qaul al-Badee'** from me and taken it from me. He was a virtuous scholar, accomplished in various fields, pious, strong-willed, and inclined toward leadership and pride."

Sakhaawi also writes in **al-Zau al-Laame'**, "He performed Hajj more than once, including during the pilgrimage season of the year 877 A.H. He then stayed in Makkah during the following year, where he

taught briefly and issued legal verdicts. He subsequently travelled from there to Jerusalem, where he resided for about two months. However, he did not remain free from opponents in either place, such that he abandoned his earlier intention to settle in one of them. He realized that his interests were better served in his hometown, so he returned there.

He did not live long after that, passing away on the night of Friday, the 29th of Rajab in the year 879 A.H, after an illness that lasted more than fifty days. His wife, the mother of his children, had passed away forty days earlier. His funeral was well-attended. May Allah have mercy on him and us!”

Thirtieth Reason: The criticism and disparagement of Shaikh Muwaffaq al-Deen Abuzar Ahmad Ibn Ibrahim Halabi, the author of Sharh al-Shifa, regarding Hadees-e-Nujoom and his biography

Indicator

Abuzar Ahmad Ibn Ibrahim Halabi, in **Sharh al-Shifa**—as has been transmitted from him—clearly and explicitly criticized and invalidated **Hadees-e-Nujoom**. Following this, he reproached the author of **al-Shifa**, Qazi Ayaz, stating, “It would have been appropriate for Qazi not to mention it in a definitive form, given what is known about this tradition among experts in the field, and he has done similar things on multiple occasions before.”

This means that it was unsuitable for Qazi Ayaz to cite the tradition with definitive phrasing because its condition is well-known among experts in the discipline. Moreover, it is noted that Qazi Ayaz has, on various occasions, mentioned weak traditions in a definitive manner.

Abuzar Halabi is considered one of the eminent scholars of prominence and one of the distinguished and accomplished figures among the Ahle Tasannun.

Biography of Shaikh Mufawwaq al-Deen Abuzar Halabi

Shams al-Deen Sakhaawi, in **al-Zau al-Laame'**, writes, "Ahmad Ibn Ibrahim Ibn Muhammad Ibn Khalil, Shaikh Muwaffaq al-Deen Abuzar, the son of scholar of traditions Burhan Abu al-Wafa of Tripoli (Libya) origin, then Halabi by birth and residence, was a Shafie scholar and the father of Abu Bakr Ani, although he is more widely known by his own agnomen. He was born on the night of Friday, the 9th of Safar in the year 818 A.H. in Aleppo (Halab) and grew up there. He memorized the Quran and perfected its recitation under his father, as well as memorized **al-Minhajain** (both in jurisprudence and principles of jurisprudence), **Alfiyyatai al-Hadees wa Nahv**. He studied under A'laa Ibn Khatib Nasiriya and others among his father's students.

He pursued jurisprudence under A'laa mentioned above, Ibn Maktum Rajabi, and Salaami, benefiting greatly from him in jurisprudence and Arabic language studies, as well as under others. He also studied Arabic under Ibn A'zaari, Shams Malti, and Zain Kharazi, and prosody under Sadaqah. He learned traditions from his father and our teacher, and he heard from them and other scholars of his hometown and visiting scholars.

He travelled to the Levant (Syria) during his pilgrimage journey, where he studied under Ibn Nasir al-Deen, Ibn al-Tahhaan, Ibn Fakhr Misri, and Aisha bint Ibn Shuraihi. However, his hearing from others was not extensive; most of his knowledge came from his father. A group of scholars, at the request of our companion Ibn Fahd, granted him authorization (*ijaza*). He began focusing on the literary arts early on and excelled in them and he compiled in them compositions in both poetry and prose, but as he informed me, he eventually discarded all of them. Among his works were: **Urus al-Afrah fi ma Yuqaal fi al-Rah** (The Bride of Joys in What Is Said about Wine), **Eqd al-Durar wa al-La'al fi ma Yuqaal li al-Salsaal wa Sitr al-Haal fi ma Qeel fi al-Khaal wa al-Hilaal** (The Necklace of Pearls and Gems in What Is Said about the Series, and Concealment of the State in

What Is Said about the Mole and the Crescent), **al-Mustaneer fi al-Izaar al-Mustadeer** (The Enlightened One on the Circular Cheek), and **al-Badr Iza Istetaar fi ma Qeel fi al-Izaar** (The Full Moon When Hidden, in What Is Said about the Cheek).

He also focused on legal conditions and excelled in them, to the point that he wrote official documents at the office of Ibn Khatib Nasiriya. However, he later abandoned this as well and dedicated himself to the study of traditions and jurisprudence. He authored works on the ambiguities of Bukhari and its grammar, compiling a brief commentary that he summarized from the works of Kirmani, Barmavi, and our teacher, as well as an even shorter version. Among his works are **al-Tauzeeh le al-Awhaam al-Waqeah fi al-Sahih** (Clarification of Errors in al-Sahih), **Mubhamaat-o-Muslim** (Ambiguities in Muslim), **Qurrah al-Ain fi Fazl al-Shaikhain wa al-Sihrain wa al-Sibtain** (The Delight of the Eye in the Virtues of the Two Shaykhs, the Two Sons-in-Law, and the Two Grandsons), and **Sharh al-Shifa wa al-Masaabih** (A Commentary on al-Shifa and al-Masaabih), although he did not complete it. He also wrote a supplement to the history of Ibn Khatib Nasiriya and other works.

He was dedicated to reading **al-Sahihain** (the two Sahihis) and **al-Shifa**, especially after the death of his father. He became highly skilled in the vocabulary, ambiguities, and biographies of the narrators, missing almost nothing except rarely. When our teacher was in Aleppo (Halab), he was close to him and admired him for his intelligence and lively spirit. So much so that our teacher even wrote about him from his poetry:

*You possess enchanting, wide, and captivating eyes,
A delicate elegance with a sway that mesmerizes.
Your saliva is the water of modesty, oh fragrant breath,
Your verdant cheek, oh my beauty, you are Elias!*

My teacher introduced his writing about him with the following statement, “He had a passion for composing *mawaliya* poetry and was described as ‘Imam Muwaffaq al-Deen’ and at times as ‘the virtuous,

brilliant, original, and extraordinary scholar of traditions, whose agnomen reflects his truthful speech, the skilled master who engaged with his namesake and sacrificed his life for him, the latter who surpassed the former in insight, elegance, and charm. May Allah prolong his life for the benefit of Muslims!

He was granted permission to teach and impart knowledge of traditions during his father's lifetime and was formally addressed with this permission after his father's death. The teacher wrote to him, 'May Allah preserve and extend his life, and continue to bless others through him as He did through his father! May He grant him the goodness of this world and the Hereafter, fulfilling what he aspires for—permission to teach the Prophetic traditions. His desire has been fulfilled, his request has been granted, and I authorize him to teach the sciences of traditions, including what he has learned and practiced, such as **Sharh al-Alfiyya** by our teacher, the great master of traditions Abu al-Fazl, as well as the benefits he acquired from his father, the scholar of traditions Burhan al-Deen, and other knowledge he has gained through study and review.

I also authorize him to teach and explain meanings of traditions from any book that has been read to him or from which he has taught, provided he is knowledgeable in that field. I ask him to remember me in his righteous prayers during his gatherings of Prophetic traditions." Till the end of his statement.

I met him in Aleppo; he listened to my recitation, and I listened to his. I even wrote down some of his compositions beyond what has already been mentioned, which I recorded elsewhere. His admiration for me increased, and he greatly praised me both in speech and writing. After that, his letters continued to reach me, always expressing affection, and in some of them, he referred to me as "our sheikh."

He was virtuous, courageous, and highly respected in his community. He lived a secluded life, detached from worldly pursuits, content with little, and inclined towards solitude. He was extremely humble, friendly to strangers, and generous in his hospitality. He avoided

pretentiousness and possessed complete virtue, exceptional intelligence, and strong recall, especially of his memorized material. He was keen on preserving his father's books, rarely allowing anyone access to them, and even prohibited it entirely to prevent any favouritism among the people of his town. On rare occasions, he would show them to someone he trusted, but only in his presence.

He endured additional harm from some of his father's students, who said inappropriate things about him and did not respect his father's status. However, this did not affect his dignity. (Burhan al-Deen) al-Baqai said, "He had an extraordinary memory, a talent for crafting eloquent and pleasing speech, sharp intellect, quick responses, and the ability to articulate his thoughts effectively. He discussed many obscure and unique matters of traditions. He said, 'There was a strong bond of affection and friendship between us.'"

He became deeply engaged in composing works on various subjects until he excelled in *mawaliya* poetry, often reciting his verses to me, and I recorded some of them. In another place, he was described as an accomplished and multifaceted scholar. He devoted himself to teaching and recitation, benefiting many people from his town and visitors alike. He even collaborated with the older scholars in drafting petitions during his father's lifetime—and so on.

Ibn Fahd and others among our companions have documented his biography, as did Ibn Abi Ghadeebah, who described his father as "the eminent scholar" and mentioned some of his works. He passed away on Thursday, the 11th of Dhu al-Qa'dah in the year 884 A.H., after experiencing a brief period of mental decline and seclusion from people. He was buried next to his father. (Burhan al-Deen) al-Baqai said, 'He fell ill in the final part of the year 882 A.H. but recovered from the illness. However, he experienced mental ailment and lost his eyesight, which persisted until midway through the year 884 A.H. Then, he was cured of that condition, and his eyesight returned to him. After that, he passed away.' I say, 'He left behind no one like him, may Allah have mercy on him and us.'"

Thirty-First Reason: The criticism and disparagement by Hafiz Shams al-Deen Muhammad Sakhaawi regarding Hadees-e-Nujoom

Shams al-Deen Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Sakhaawi, one of the well-known figures among scholars of Ahle Tasannun and prominent memorizers of traditions, writes in **al-Maqaasid al-Hasanah**, “The tradition ‘The disagreement of my community is a mercy’ is reported by Baihaqi in **al-Madkhal** from the narration of Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima from Juwaibir, from Zahhak from Ibn Abbas, who reports, ‘The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘Whatever you are given from the Book of Allah, act upon it, and no one has an excuse to abandon it. If it is not found in the Book of Allah, then follow my sunnah. If there is no sunnah of mine, then follow what my companions say. My companions are like stars in the sky; whichever of them you follow, you will be rightly guided. And the disagreement of my companions is a mercy for you.’

From this chain, it is also narrated by Tabarani and Dailami in his **Musnad** with the same wording. However, Juwaibir is weak, and the chain of Zahhak from Ibn Abbas is disconnected¹.

From this passage, it is evident and clear that Baihaqi included **Hadees-e-Nujoom** in his book **al-Madkhal** in the chain of narration attributed to Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima from Juwaibir from Zahhak from Ibn Abbas. Similarly, it has been transmitted through this chain by Tabarani and Daylami.

The scholar al-Sakhaawi, after mentioning this narration, engages in discrediting the reliability of its chain of transmitters. Acknowledging the plain truth and honest counsel, he clarifies the flawed nature of this narration, affirming that Juwaibir is weak and that the narration of Zahhak from Ibn Abbas is disconnected.

Thus, it becomes established and confirmed that citing **Hadees-e-Nujoom** and referencing it from Baihaqi’s **al-Madkhal** serves no

¹ Al-Maqaasid al-Hasanah, p. 49, H. 39

beneficial purpose for the claimant. Rather, it entirely exposes his ignorance or feigned ignorance before experts in critique, authentication, and scrutiny. By Allah! How astonishing! What kind of fairness and integrity is this, when the claimant firstly disregards Baihaqi's criticism of all the chains of this tradition in his book **al-Madkhal**—as cited from him by the scholar of traditions Zain al-Deen Iraqi in **Takhreej-o-Ahaadees al-Minhaj**, as mentioned earlier? Secondly, he overlooks Baihaqi's criticism in **al-Itiqad** of the narration of Abd al-Rahim Ammi and the narration of Zahhak Ibn Muzaahim—both of which are related to this tradition, as you have learned from **Talkhees al-Khabeer** by the scholar of traditions Ibn Hajar Asqalani. Thirdly, he fails to pay attention to the critical remarks of the eminent scholar Sakhaawi regarding the narration from Ibn Abbas specifically. Instead, he mentions it with great enthusiasm to counter those who follow the truth, relying solely on the fact that Baihaqi narrated this tradition in **al-Madkhal**. He aims to deceive the ignorant and common folk, oblivious to the fact that, if the readers of books and researchers of the teachings of notable scholars discover the true state of this narration, they will undoubtedly hasten to condemn, criticize, and reproach the source of this deception and misguidance. And they will never stop pursuing Shah Sahab (the author of Tuhfa), except through constant tracking and examination. They will strive to uncover the secrets and tear away the veils of this glaringly evident and disgracefully notorious falsehood, using the explicit texts of prominent researchers and the insights of critical scholars, the foremost authorities in verification and meticulous scrutiny.

Although what Allama al-Sakhaawi has briefly mentioned in the criticism and discrediting of the narrators of this fabricated and baseless narration is sufficient and comprehensive for skilled researchers, it is appropriate to elaborate with some of the statements of the esteemed and eminent Ahle Tasannun scholars concerning the narrators of this weak tradition, in detailed clarity.

All the narrators mentioned in Baihaqi's chain of narration are

criticized and deemed unreliable.

Regarding Sulayman ibn Abi Karima: He is highly criticized and unreliable.

- ♦ **Ibn Abi Hatim Raazi** in his book **al-Elal** mentioned the narration, ‘The most blessed women of my nation are those with the fairest faces and the smallest dowries.’ He then said, ‘My father said, ‘This is a false tradition, and Ibn Abi Karima is weak in traditions.’
- ♦ **Ibn Jauzi** in **al-Mauzooat** (The Fabricated Narrations), after listing the narrations criticizing the *Murjiah*, pens, ‘These narrations are fabrications attributed to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). As for the first, it includes Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima and Ahmad Ibn Ibrahim. Ibn Adi said, ‘They both narrate objectionable reports.’¹“
- ♦ **Zahabi** in **Mizan al-Itidal** stated, ‘Sulayman Ibn Abi Karima Shaami narrated from Hisham Ibn Urwah, Hisham Ibn Hassan, Abu Qurrah, and Khalid ibn Maimun. His narrations were transmitted by Sadaqah ibn Abd Allah, Amr ibn Hashim al-Beiruti, and Muhammad ibn Makhlad al-Raini. Abu Hatim considered him weak, and Ibn Adi chronicled, ‘Most of his narrations are objectionable, and I have not found any positive remarks about him from early scholars.’²“

Amr ibn Hashim narrated, ‘Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima told us from Hisham Ibn Hasan from Hasan from his mother from (the mother of believers) Umm Salamah, who reports, I said, ‘O Messenger of Allah! Inform me about His saying, ‘Hoor al-Een’ (fair and wide-eyed fairies).’ He (s.a.w.a.) replied, ‘They are fair and have large eyes.’ This narration is known only through this chain.

Amr Ibn Hashim narrated, ‘Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima told us, ‘Khalid

¹ Al-Mauzooat, vol. 1, p. 277, Chapter Regarding What is to be done in case of disagreements, Section of Traditions Condemning the Murjeah

² Mizan al-Itidal, vol. 2, p. 221, No. 3502

Ibn Maimun Khorasani told me from Zahhak from Ibn Abbas that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘Every community has its Jews, and the Jews of my community are the Murjeah.’

Zahabi also writes in **al-Mughni fi al-Zuafaa**, ‘Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima, who narrated from Hisham Ibn Urwah, is weak and a narrator of objectionable reports.’¹

Ibn Hajar Asqalani pens in **Lisan al-Mizan**, “Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima Shaami narrated from Hisham Ibn Urwah, Hisham Ibn Hasan, Abu Qurrah, and Khalid Ibn Maimun, and his narrations were transmitted by Sadaqah Ibn Abdillah, Amr Ibn Hashim Beiruti, and Muhammad Ibn Makhlad Raini. Abu Hatim declared him weak. Ibn Adi said, ‘Most of his narrations are objectionable, and I have not found any positive remarks about him from earlier scholars.’

Amr Ibn Hashim narrated, ‘Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima narrated to us from Khalid Ibn Maimun Khorasani from Zahhak from Ibn Abbas that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘Every community has its Jews, and the Jews of my community are the Murjeah.’

He (Ibn Hajar) continues in **Lisan al-Mizan**, “Bakr Ibn Abd al-Aziz Ibn Ismail Ibn Abdillah Ibn Abi Muhajir narrated from his uncle Abd al-Ghaffar Ibn Ismail and Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima. His narrations were transmitted by Abd al-Rahman Ibn Yahya Ibn Ismail Ibn Abi Muhajir and Abbas Ibn Abd al-Rahman Ibn Walid Ibn Najih Dimashqi from Sulaiman from Hibban the freed slave of Abu Darda from Abu Darda, a disconnected narration, ‘If you take pride, then take pride in Quraysh,’ (till the end of the tradition). Bazzar narrated it in his **Musnad** and Abbas said, ‘There is no harm in it, but Bakr is not known for transmission, although he is recognized by lineage.’ Likewise, Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima is mentioned as having narrated this. He (Bazzar) said, ‘We do not have it preserved except through this chain, so we included it and clarified its defect.’²“

¹ Al-Mughni fi al-Zuafaa, p. 282, No. 2616

² Lisan al-Mizan, vol. 3, p. 102, No. 339 under the alphabet ى

Suyuti, in **Jam' al-Jawaame'**, has considered Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima as weak, and Mulla Ali Muttaqi in **Kanz al-Ummaal** and its selection also mentions Suyuti's statement regarding his weakening without objection or refutation, as you will soon hear, God willing. Muhammad Ibn Tahir Ibn Ali Fattani in **Qaanoon al-Mauzooaat** said, 'Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima is weak.'¹

Abd al-Wahhab Ibn Muhammad Ghaus Madrasi, a contemporary scholar, said in **Kashf al-Ahwaal fi Naqd al-Rijal**, "Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima Shaami is weak. Ibn Adi said, 'Most of his traditions are objectionable. He heard [traditions] from Khalid Ibn Maimun and Ibn Jurayj, and Amr Ibn Hashim Beirutu narrated from him concerning [matters of] the Sunnah and resurrection."

As for Juwaibir Ibn Saeed, he is heavily criticized and disparaged with severe discreditation and injury. Bukhari, in his book **al-Zuafaa**, said, "Juwaibir Ibn Saeed Balkhi, who narrated from Zahhak, was commented on by Ali (Ibn Madini) regarding Yahya (Ibn Maeen), 'I used to recognize Juwaibir for two traditions, but then he started narrating these additional traditions, and thus he was deemed weak.'²

Bukhari also writes in his **Tarikh al-Saghir**, "Ali narrated to me, saying that Yahya (Ibn Maeen) said, 'I used to recognize Juwaibir for two traditions, but then he started narrating these additional traditions, and consequently, he was deemed weak.' He is Juwaibir Ibn Saeed Balkhi."

Nasai chronicles in his book **al-Zuafaa**, "Juwaibir Ibn Saeed Khorasani is abandoned in traditions (*matruk al-hadees*)."³

Ibn Jauzi, in his book **al-Mauzooaat**, in the chapter "Warning for Those Who Reach Forty" pens, "As for Juwaibir, they unanimously agreed to abandon his narrations. Ahmad said, 'Do not occupy yourself with his traditions.'"

¹ Qaanoon al-Mauzooaat, p. 261 under the alphabet س

² Al-Zuafaa of Bukhari, p. 27, No. 58

³ Al-Zuafaa of Nasai, p. 28, No. 104

Moreover, Ibn Jauzi, in **al-Mauzooaat**, after mentioning the narration about applying kohl on the Day of Ashura, continues, “Haakim said, ‘I disassociate myself before Allah from the responsibility of Juwaibir.’ He also said, ‘There is no narration reported from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) regarding applying kohl on the Day of Ashura. It is an innovation introduced by the killers of Husain (a.s.)’ Ahmad said, ‘Do not occupy yourself with the traditions of Juwaibir.’ Yahya said, ‘He is nothing.’ Nasai and Daraqutni said, ‘He is abandoned.’

Ibn Jauzi, in **al-Mauzooaat**, also criticized Juwaibir in other contexts, as you will soon know, God willing, from what we mention regarding the criticism of Zahhak.

Zahabi writes in **Mizan al-Itidal**, “Juwaibir Ibn Saeed Abu al-Qasim Azdi Balkhi, the commentator and companion of Zahhak, was said by Ibn Maeen, ‘He is nothing.’ Jawzjani said, ‘Do not occupy yourself with him.’ Nasai, Daraqutni, and others said, ‘His tradition is abandoned.’ I (Zahabi) say, ‘He narrated something from Anas, and Hammad Ibn Zaid, Ibn Mubarak, Yazid Ibn Harun, and a group narrated from him.’

Abu Malik from Juwaibir from Zahhak from Ibn Abbas from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), ‘It becomes obligatory for a boy to pray when he understands and to fast when he can endure it.’

It is also narrated from Juwaibir from Zahhak from Ibn Abbas, ‘Whoever applies kohl on the Day of Ashura will never suffer from eye disease.’

Abu Qudamah Sarakhsi said, ‘Yahya Qattan said, ‘They were lenient in learning exegesis from people they did not trust in traditions.’ Then, he mentioned Lais Ibn Abi Sulaim, Juwaibir, Zahhak, and Muhammad Ibn Saeed, and said, ‘Their traditions are not praiseworthy, but exegesis can be written from them.’”

Zahabi chronicles in **al-Mughni**, “Juwaibir Ibn Saeed Balkhi, the commentator; Daraqutni and others said, ‘He is abandoned.’”

Zahabi also writes in **al-Kashif**, “Juwaibir Ibn Saeed Balkhi narrated from Anas and Zahhak, and Ibn Mubarak and Yazid Ibn Harun

narrated from him. They (the scholars) abandoned him.”

Ibn Hajar Asqalani chronicles in **Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb**, in the biography of Juwaibir, “Amr Ibn Ali said, ‘Neither Yahya nor Abd al-Rahman narrated from him’ and the same was stated by Abu Musa. Abu Talib, quoting Ahmad, said, ‘What is from Zahhak is easier, but what he attributes to the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) is rejected.’ Abdullah Ibn Ahmad quoted his father as saying, ‘Whenever Wakee’ encountered a tradition from Juwaibir, he would say, ‘Sufyan from ‘*a man*’ without naming him, due to his weakness.’ Duri and others, quoting Ibn Maeen, said, ‘He is nothing.’ Duri added, ‘He is weak and not far removed from Jabir (Ibn Yazid) Jo’fi and Ubaydah Zabbi.’

Abdullah Ibn Ali Ibn Madini said, ‘I asked him (his father) about Juwaibir, and he severely weakened him.’ He added, ‘I heard my father say, ‘Juwaibir narrated excessively from Zahhak and reported strange things.’ Yaqub Ibn Sufyan mentioned him in the chapter of those whose narrations should be avoided. Aajurri, quoting Abu Dawud, said, ‘Juwaibir, despite his weakness...’ Nasai, Ali Ibn Junaid, and Daraqutni said, ‘He is abandoned.’ Nasai also said in another place, ‘He is not reliable.’

Ibn ‘Adi said, ‘The weakness in his traditions and narrations is evident.’ I (Ibn Hajar) say, ‘Abu Qudamah Sarakhsi quoted Yahya Qattan as saying, ‘They were lenient in taking exegesis from people they did not trust in traditions’, then mentioned Zahhak, Juwaibir, and Muhammad Ibn Saaeb, and said, ‘Their traditions are not upheld, but exegesis can be written from them.’ Ahmad Ibn Sayyar Marwazi said, ‘Juwaibir Ibn Saeed was from the people of Balkh. He was a companion of Zahhak and had narrations and knowledge of historical events. His state in exegesis is good, but he is weak in transmission of narrations.’

Ibn Hibban said, ‘He narrates reversed things from Zahhak.’ Haakim Abu Ahmad said, ‘His narration is worthless.’ Haakim Abu Abdillah said, ‘I disassociate myself before Allah from his responsibility.’ Bukhari mentioned him in **al-Tarikh al-Awsat** in the chapter of

those who died between 140 and 150 A.H.¹

Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in **Talkhees al-Khabeer**, in his criticism of the tradition ‘There is no divorce except after marriage’ after mentioning some of its narrations, writes, “Baihaqi pens in **al-Khilafiyaat**, ‘Bukhari said, ‘The most authentic and well-known narrations in this regard are: the traditions of Amr Ibn Shoaib, the narration of Zuhri from Urwah from Aisha, and the tradition from Ali. Its chain revolves around Juwaibir from Zahhak from Nazzal Ibn Sabrah from Ali, and Juwaibir is abandoned.’

The fact that Juwaibir is abandoned is also mentioned in the context of this tradition’s criticism in **Subul al-Salaam** by Muhammad Ibn Ismail Amir San’ani and **Nayl al-Awtaar** by Qazi al-Quzaat (Chief Justice) Muhammad Ibn Ali Shaukani.

Safi al-Deen Khazraji writes in **Mukhtasar al-Taz’heeb**, “Juwaibir Ibn Saeed al-Azdi, Abu al-Qasim Balkhi; it is said his name was Jabir, narrated from Anas and Abu Şabiḥ, and from him [narrated] al-Saurī and Ḥammaad Ibn Zaid. Ibn Maeen said, “Weak (narrator); he died after the year 140 A.H.”

Suyūṭi in **Jam’ al-Jawaame’**, after mentioning the tradition ‘Ten traits of the people of Lot’ (as transmitted about him), stated, ‘Dailami transmitted it vide the chain of Ibrahim Ṭayyaan from Husain Ibn Qasim Zahid from Ismail Ibn Abi Ziyad Shashi from Juwaibir from Zahhak from Ibn Abbas.

And Tayyan and the three [narrators] above him are liars.

The *same* statement is also mentioned in **Kanz al-Ummaal** by Mulla Ali Muttaqi. Both Suyūṭi in **Jam’ al-Jawaame’** and Ali Muttaqi in **Kanz al-Ummaal** and **Mukhtasar Kanz al-Ummaal** clearly highlight Juwaibir’s weakness and explicitly criticize the authenticity of **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, as will soon become evident, God willing.

Muhammad Ibn Tahir Fattani pens in **Qaanoon al-Mauzooaat**, stated, ‘Juwaibir is weak.’ ‘He is a liar.’ At another time, he said, ‘He is

¹ Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb, vol. 2, p. 1033 under the alphabet ج

completely abandoned and narrates from someone like Zahhak.’ Another time, he said, ‘He is ruined.’

Chief Justice Muhammad Ibn Ali Shaukani, in **Nayl al-Awtaar**, in the chapter on following a person in a state of dry ablution (*tayammum*) while in a state of ablution (*wuzu*), mentioned regarding a narration from al-Baraa, ‘In its chain is Juwaibir Ibn Saeed, and he is abandoned (*matruk*).’”

Abd al-Wahhab Ibn Muhammad Ghaus al-Madrasi, a contemporary scholar, writes in **Kashf al-Ahwal**, ‘Juwaibir Ibn Saeed Abu al-Qasim Azdi Khorasani is utterly abandoned. In **Kitab al-Mubtada**, he is described as ‘perished.’ In another context, it is mentioned that he claimed to have heard from Zahhak. Narrators such as Muhammad Ibn Abdullah Filistini, Sufyan, Salam Ibn Yazid, Amr Ibn Jamee’, Bahr Saqaa, Muhammad Ibn Sult, Ismail Ibn Abi Ziyad, and others narrated from him on topics like faith, beginnings, the virtues of the Quran, fasting, holy war, marriage, and in **al-Zayl** on knowledge and comprehensive matters.’

As for Zahhak, the criticism and discrediting by the pioneers of the science of Rijal (evaluating narrators) are clear. Moreover, it is confirmed and well-known among knowledgeable individuals that he did not hear from Ibn Abbas.

Ibn Jauzi in his book **al-Mauzooaat** in the chapter on ‘Warnings for Those Who Reach Forty’ chronicles, “As for Zahhak, Shu’bah said, ‘He does not narrate from him, and it is denied that he met Ibn Abbas.’ Yahya Ibn Saeed said, ‘He is considered weak by us.’

Ibn Jauzi, in his book **al-Mauzooaat** in the chapter on ‘The Supplication for the Captive’, after mentioning a tradition, pens, ‘This is a fabricated tradition. Zahhak is weak and did not hear from Ibn Abbas. Juwaibir is nothing, and we have mentioned from Ahmad that he said, ‘One should not occupy oneself with the traditions of Juwaibir.’”

Again, Ibn Jauzi, in his book **al-Mauzooaat** in the chapter on ‘The Dislike of Divorce’, after mentioning a tradition, writes, ‘This is an

invalid tradition, and has defects: Zahhak is discredited, and Juwaibir is nothing. Nasai and Daraqtuni said, 'Juwaibir and Amr Ibn Jamee' are abandoned.'

Zahabi, in **Mizan al-Itidal**, in his entry on him, writes, 'Yahya al-Qattan said, 'Shu'bah denied that Zahhak had ever met Ibn Abbas.' al-Tayalisi said, 'Shu'bah narrated to us, 'I heard Abd al-Malik Ibn Mayasrah say, 'Zahhak did not meet Ibn Abbas; rather, he met Saeed Ibn Jubair in Rayy and learnt Quranic exegesis from him.' Salam ibn Qutaybah said, 'Shu'bah narrated to us, 'I asked Mashash, 'Did Zahhak hear from Ibn Abbas? He said, 'He never saw him!' Yahya ibn Saeed said, 'Zahhak is weak according to us.'

Zahabi also said in **Mizan al-Itidal** in his entry on him, 'Ibn Adi said, 'Zahhak Ibn Muzahim is only known for exegesis, but as for his narrations from Ibn Abbas, Abu Hurairah, and everyone he narrates from, all of that is subject to scrutiny.'

Zahabi in **al-Mughni fi al-Zuafaa** in his entry on Zahhak, writes, 'Yahya Qattan considered him weak, and so did Shu'bah.'¹

Zahabi in **al-Kashif** in his entry on Zahhak chronicles, 'Shu'bah said, 'He was considered weak by us.'²

Alaa al-Deen Ali Ibn Usman Mardini, known as Ibn Turkmani, in his book **al-Jawhar al-Naqi** in the chapter 'The One Who Dies in Ihram', said, 'Zahhak is Ibn Muzahim; he did not meet Ibn Abbas. In Ibn Jauzi's book, it is mentioned: 'Shu'bah did not narrate from him and denied that he met Ibn Abbas. Yahya Ibn Saeed said, 'He is weak according to us.'"

Again, Ibn Turkmani, in his book **al-Jawhar al-Naqi** in the chapter 'The Term for the Impotent', writes, 'Zahhak is Ibn Muzahim, and he is criticised.'

Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in **Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb**, in his entry on Zahhak, pens, 'Abu Qutaibah narrated from Shu'bah, 'I asked Mashash, 'Did

¹ Al-Mughni fi al-Zuafaa, p. 312, No. 2912

² Al-Kashif, vol. 2, p. 330, No. 2460

Zahhak hear from Ibn Abbas?’ He replied, ‘He never saw him.’ Salam Ibn Qutaibah narrated from Abu Dawud from Shu’bah, ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Misrah said, ‘Zahhak did not meet Ibn Abbas; rather, he met Saeed Ibn Jubair in Rayy and learnt (Quranic) exegesis from him.’ Abu Usamah narrated from Mu’alla from Shu’bah from Abd al-Malik, ‘I asked Zahhak, ‘Did you hear from Ibn Abbas?’ He said, ‘No.’ I asked, ‘Then from whom did you take what you narrate?’ He replied, ‘From this one and that one.’ Ibn Madini narrated from Yahya Ibn Saeed, ‘Shu’bah would not narrate from Zahhak Ibn Muzahim and denied that he had ever met Ibn Abbas.’

Ali narrated from Yahya Ibn Saeed, ‘Zahhak was considered weak by us.’

Bukhari said, ‘Abu Nuaim narrated to us, ‘Sufyan narrated from Haakim Ibn Daylam from Zahhak – meaning Ibn Muzahim – who said, ‘I heard Ibn Umar say, ‘No hand adorned with an iron ring has ever appeared.’ Bukhari also commented, ‘I do not know of anyone else who claimed to have heard from Ibn Umar except Abu Nuaim.’

Abu Janab Kalbi narrated from Zahhak, ‘I stayed as a neighbour to Ibn Abbas for seven years.’ Ibn Hibban mentioned him in **al-Siqaat** and said, ‘He met a group of Taabeein but did not directly narrate from any of the Companions. Whoever claims he met Ibn Abbas has erred. He was a teacher of children in an elementary school, and his narrations of Abu Ishaq from Zahhak saying, ‘I narrated from Ibn Abbas’ are a mistake from Shareek.

Ibn Adi said, ‘He was known for exegesis, but as for his narrations from Ibn Abbas, Abu Hurairah, and all those he narrates from, all of that is questionable. He became famous only for exegesis.’¹⁴

Suyuti, in **Al-La’ali al-Masnooah**, after mentioning a tradition narrated by Zahhak from Ibn Abbas regarding the reason for the revelation of the verse ‘**And whoever fears Allah, He will make**

¹ Tahzeeb al-Tahzeeb, vol. 4, p. 81, No. 3058 under the alphabet ض

for him a way out¹, quoted from Ibn Jauzi, ‘Zahhak is weak and did not hear from Ibn Abbas.’

Muhammad Ibn Tahir Fattani, in **Qanoon al-Mauzooaat**, writes, ‘The narration of Zahhak from Ibn Abbas is weak, discredited, and he did not hear from Ibn Abbas.’

Abd al-Wahhab Ibn Muhammad Ghaus Madrasi, a contemporary scholar, in **Kashf al-Ahwaal fi Naqd al-Rijal**, pens, ‘Zahhak Ibn Muzahim is weak. Shu’bah would not narrate from him and denied that he ever met Ibn Abbas.’

Briefly, from this clear and illuminating explanation, it becomes evident that **Hadees-e-Nujoom** attributed to Ibn Abbas, which Baihaqi narrated in his **al-Madkhal** with his chain of transmission and which Shah Sahab (author of Tuhfa) uses as an argument against **Hadees-e-Saqalain**, is, in addition to being regarded by Baihaqi himself as weak and unestablished, also exposed and discredited by the scholar Sakhaawi, who unveiled its flaws and demonstrated its utter falsehood and worthlessness.

This narration, despite its disconnection, deserves to be labelled as a chain of falsehood. Avoiding and abstaining from relying on it is obligatory, not that Shah Sahab and his supporters consider it proof and use it as a response to **Hadees-e-Saqalain** to counter the people of truth (i.e. the Shias). However, *‘If you are shameless, do as you wish!’*

It is worth mentioning that the context of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** attributed to Ibn Abbas, which Baihaqi narrated in his **al-Madkhal** with the aforementioned discredited chain of transmitters, also includes the phrase, *اختلاف اصحابي لكم رحمة* ‘*The disagreements among my companions are a mercy for you.*’

Therefore, in addition to Hafiz Sakhaawi, other prominent scholars and esteemed researchers of Ahle Tasannun have also criticized and discredited the chain of transmitters of Baihaqi’s narration regarding

¹ Surah Talaq (65): Verse 2

the tradition ‘*The disagreements among my companions are a mercy for you*’. By revealing the truth about its problematic nature, they have further demonstrated its collapse and invalidity.

A discerning observer and an insightful scholar, with minimal attention and reflection on their words, can readily perceive the extreme weakness, disconnection, and deficiencies in Baihaqi’s chain of transmitters regarding **Hadees-e-Nujoom**.

Such a person would not be swayed by the reproaches and objections of a devoted supporter of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** who, being enamoured by Baihaqi’s inclusion of it, deliberately and blatantly overlooks the flaws and criticisms of its chain of transmitters. Such negligence is wholly indefensible.

Allamah Zain al-Deen Iraqi writes in **Takhreej-o-Ahaadees al-Minhaj**, ‘The tradition ‘*The disagreements among my companions are a mercy for you*’ was narrated by Baihaqi in **al-Madkhal** from Ibn Abbas with the wording ‘*My companions*’ (instead of ‘*My Ummah*’). Adam Ibn Abi Iyas narrated it in **Kitab al-Ilm wa al-Hilm** with the wordings, ‘*The disagreement of my companions for my Ummah is a mercy.*’ However, it is a weak disconnected (*mursal*) narration. Baihaqi mentioned it in his treatise **al-Ash’ariyyah** with this wording but without a chain of transmitters.

Iraqi, in his book **al-Mughni ‘an Haml al-Asfaar al-Kibaar fi al-Asfaar**, pens, ‘The tradition ‘*The disagreement of my companions for my Ummah is a mercy*’ was mentioned by Baihaqi in his treatise **al-Ash’ariyyah** as a suspended narration and was narrated with a chain of transmitters in **al-Madkhal** from Ibn Abbas with the wording ‘*The disagreement of my companions is a mercy for you.*’ Its chain of transmitters is weak.¹

Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Rahman Shafei, known as Ibn Imam, in **al-Kaamiliyyah** (Commentary on **Minhaj**), writes, “The

¹ Al-Mughni ‘an Haml al-Asfaar al-Kibaar fi al-Asfaar, vol. 1, p. 34 (Printed on the margins of Ihya al-Uloom of Ghazzali)

fifth argument they present is that using analogy (*qiyas*) leads to disagreement and disputes among *mujtahids* due to its reliance on indicators (*amaraat*), which vary. Thus, how can it be permissible to act upon it, while Allah, the Exalted, has said: **‘And do not dispute, lest you lose courage and your strength depart.’**¹ ‘Consequently, it should be prohibited.’

We respond: ‘The verse is only referring to disagreements in opinions and wars, as indicated by the phrase, **‘lest you lose courage and your strength depart.’** As for disagreements regarding rulings (*ahkam*), they are permissible, as indicated by the statement of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), *‘Disagreement in my Ummah is a mercy.’* Khattabi and Baihaqi said, ‘It has been narrated from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), which suggests it has a basis.’

Shaykh Zain al-Deen Iraqi said, ‘It was narrated with a chain in **al-Madkhal** from Ibn Abbas with the wording, *‘The disagreement of my companions is a mercy for you,’* but its chain is weak.’

Muhammad Ibn Tahir Fattani, in **Tazkerah al-Mauzooaat**, writes, ‘In **al-Maqasid**, ‘The tradition *‘Disagreement in my Ummah is a mercy’* was narrated by Baihaqi from Zahhak from Ibn Abbas, disconnected (*marfu*) in a lengthy tradition with the wording, *‘And the disagreement of my companions is a mercy for you.’* Similarly, it was narrated by Tabarani and Dailami. The narration of Zahhak from Ibn Abbas is disjointed (*munqate*). Iraqi said, ‘It is a weak and disconnected (*mursal*).’²

Allama Manavi in **Faiz al-Qadeer - Sharh Jaami’ al-Saghir** in his commentary on the tradition, *‘The differences among my ummah are a mercy,’* writes, ‘Baihaqi has attributed it in **al-Madkhal**, and likewise Dailami in **Musnad al-Firdaus**, both narrating it as an elevated (*marfu*) tradition from Ibn Abbas with the wording, ‘The differences of my companions are a mercy, and the differences of the companions

¹ Surah Anfaal (8): Verse 46

² Tazkerah al-Mauzooaat, pp. 90-91, Chapter of the Merit of his (s.a.w.a.) Ummah and their consensus

are in the same ruling as the differences of the ummah' as previously mentioned. However, this tradition, as Hafiz Iraqi has stated, has a weak chain of transmitters.¹

Ali Azizi in **al-Siraj al-Munir - Sharh Jaame' al-Saghir** in his commentary on the tradition '*The differences among my ummah are a mercy*' while explaining Suyuti's statement '*and perhaps it was recorded in some of the books of scholars of traditions that have not reached us*' states, 'And this is indeed the case, as Baihaqi attributed it in **al-Madkhal**, and likewise Dailami in **al-Firdaus**, narrating it as a tradition from Ibn Abbas but with the wording '*The differences of my companions are a mercy.*' The Shaykh remarked, 'This is a weak narration.'²

From this, it becomes clear and evident for you that the chain of transmitters presented by Baihaqi in his book **al-Madkhal** regarding **Hadees-e-Nujoom** is not only deemed weak and unreliable by Baihaqi himself, but its weakness and flaws have also been highlighted by many prominent critics and experts in the evaluation of traditions and narrations. These include figures such as Hafiz Zain al-Deen Iraqi, Allama Sakhaawi, Muhammad Ibn Tahir Fattani, Allama Manavi, Shaikh Muhammad Hijazi Sha'raani and Shaikh Ali Azizi in particular. They have demonstrated the shortcomings and deficiencies of this narration, thereby enhancing the intellectual humility of an astute and noble audience with their insightful contributions beyond measure.

¹ Faiz al-Qadeer - Sharh Jaami' al-Saghir, vol. 1, p. 212, Explanation of Hadees 288

² Al-Siraj al-Munir - Sharh Jaame' al-Saghir, vol.1, p. 70, alphabet الف

Thirty-Second Reason: The Criticism and Disparagement by Kamal al-Deen Muhammad Ibn Abi Sharif Qudsi Regarding Hadees-e-Nujoom and His Biography

Indicator

Kamal al-Deen Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Abi Bakr Ibn Ali Ibn Masud Ibn Rizvan Qudsi Shafei, known as Ibn Abi Sharif, reported the criticism of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** from his teacher, Ibn Hajar, highlighting its inconsistencies. In doing so, he added to the demonstration of its profound weakness, as noted by that insightful critic. This will, God willing, be further elaborated upon later in the discussion of the statement from **Faiz al-Qadeer** by Manavi.

The Biography of Ibn Abi Sharif Qudsi

Allama Ibn Abi Sharif is recognized among scholars of Ahle Tasannun for his noble virtues and esteemed contributions. Allama Shams al-Deen Sakhaawi, who was a contemporary of Ibn Abi Sharif, provided his extensive biography in **al-Zau al-Laame' le Ahl al-Qarn al-Taase'**. A brief excerpt from this biography, selectively highlighted here, states, 'One should note that Sakhaawi in **al-Zau al-Laame'** writes, 'Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Abi Bakr Ibn Ali Ibn Masud Ibn Rizvan al-Kamal, Abu al-Hana, Ibn Nasir al-Deen Murri Qudsi Shafei, the brother of Ibrahim and the grandson of the renowned judge of the Maaliki school in Jerusalem. Shihab Ahmad Ibn Awjan, also known as Ibn Abi Sharif, was born on the night of Saturday, the 5th of Zu al-Hijjah in the year 822 A.H. in Jerusalem. He was raised there under the care of his father and was among the notable and wise figures of Jerusalem.

Sakhaawi, in **al-Zau al-Laame'**, writes, 'He travelled to Cairo multiple times, including in the year 839 A.H. During some of these visits, he studied under Ibn Humam, al-Izz Abd al-Salaam Baghdadi, al-Alaa Qalqashandi, Qaayaani, and our teacher. Among the works he studied were portions of **Mukhtasar Ibn al-Hajib al-Asli** from the

first two scholars, the beginning of **Sharh Alfiyyat al-Iraqi** up to the section on **al-Mu'allal** from the third scholar, and a portion from the beginning of **Sharh al-Minhaj** al-Far'ee. From the fourth scholar, he studied the principles of jurisprudence (*usul*) and jurisprudence, among other subjects, and praised him in a fine poem. From the fifth scholar, he studied **Sharh al-Nukhbah** and other works in the sciences of traditions. He maintained close association with him, studying narrations and explanations both orally and by reading during their time together in Cairo and in his homeland.'

He acquired knowledge from several scholars until he excelled and most, if not all, of his teachers granted him permission to teach. They held him in high esteem. Among these scholars were Ibn Humam, Abd al-Salaam, and our teacher, who remarked that he engaged in discussions indicating his preparedness and capability to issue legal edicts (*fatwa*) based on his understanding and verification of the Shafei school for those who sought his guidance. He was also recognized for his expertise in the sciences of traditions, extracting benefits from both text and chain of transmitters (*isnaad*), and for his competence in navigating the intricacies of these fields.'

Sakhaawi continues in **al-Zau al-Laame**', 'He performed Hajj and stayed in Makkah in the year 853 A.H., where he studied with al-Sharaf Abu al-Fath Maraaghi, al-Naqi Ibn Fahd, al-Burhan al-Zafri, and Abu al-Baqaa Ibn al-Zia. In Madina, he studied with Muhib Matari and Abu Muhammad Abdullah Ibn Muhammad Shushtari, from whom he heard portions of **al-Shifa** and received permission (*ijaazah*) to narrate from them at his own request and that of others. Several scholars, including Biqaai, wrote his biography.

Biqaai described him as possessing sharp intellect, reliable memory, keen insight, sound judgment, upright reasoning, quick comprehension, remarkable eloquence, and impeccable conduct. He was noted for his ample wisdom, evident refinement, amiable personality, and noble demeanour, which shone through his appearance. He was highly reserved and distant from people, except

for his close companions. Biqaai said, ‘He is now my friend, and there is a bond of friendship between us that words cannot adequately describe.’

Sakhaawi continues in **al-Zau al-Laame’**, ‘I accompanied him in the past and heard his recitation from **Asbaab al-Nuzul** and other works to our teacher. He also listened to my recitations before the same teacher and others, such as Kamal Ibn Barzi, on various subjects. Our meetings were repeated, particularly in his homeland, where he and I attended lessons together on certain topics, some of which he documented for me in his own handwriting. He praised my contributions extensively, even attending some of my teaching sessions. He once remarked to me, ‘It would be more fitting for you to sit in larger venues, such as the Haakim Mosque or similar places’ indicating the large crowds of the location and the number of attendees.

He also wrote an introduction for one of my brother’s works, and I transcribed some of his poetry while in his homeland. He visited us in Cairo several times, both before and after, with his last visit being in the year 876 A.H. During that visit, he taught students works such as **Sharh-o-Jam’ al-Jawaame’** by Mahalli and others.

However, several individuals opposed him, to the extent that he nearly ceased teaching altogether due to their misrepresentation of his explanations and their inability to comprehend his intended meanings.’

Again, Sakhaawi states in **al-Zau al-Laame’**, ‘He taught, issued legal opinions, narrated traditions, composed poetry and prose, and authored works. Among his writings was a *Haashiyah (commentary on margins)* on **Sharh-o-Jam’ al-Jawaame** by Mahalli, in which he relied on the commentary by Shihab Kurani and often followed his strict interpretations. He also began another work on **Tafsir al-Baizaawi**, but it remained incomplete, as did his commentaries on **al-Irshad** by Ibn Muqri, **Fusul Ibn al-Haaem**, **al-Zubd** by Ibn Raslan, **Mukhtasar al-Tanbeeh** by Ibn al-Naqeeb, and **al-Shifa** by Qadi

Ayaz.

I did not approve of his writing on the issue of Ghazali in defence of Biqaai. Not long after, the Sultan ordered him to return to his homeland and appointed him as the head of its school following the death of Shihab Amiri. This caused him much distress, as it did for many others. He withdrew significantly from public life and minimized his involvement in affairs.

Despite this, he was not free from envy or antagonism from some people who disliked him. In summary, he was a distinguished scholar, with profound investigative skills and sound reasoning in the matters he studied. His written works were stronger than his spoken explanations, and his deliberate reflection surpassed his impromptu remarks. He was known for his clarity, patience, precision, and limited speech, as well as his avoidance of speaking about others.¹

Jarullah Ibn Fahd Makki, in **Zayl Zau al-Laame'**, which he inscribed in the margins of the present manuscript of **Zau al-Laame'** in his own handwriting, pens, 'I say: He [Ibn Abi Sharif] lived for four years after our teacher, the author [Sakhaawi]. He was mentioned by the historian of Damascus, our teacher Muhyi al-Deen Naeemi, in **al-Unwaan**, where he wrote, 'Shaikh al-Islam Kamal al-Deen Muhammad Ibn Abi Sharif Murri Qudsi Shafei. He was born on Saturday, the 5th of Zu al-Hijjah in the year 822 A.H, and passed away in Jerusalem on Thursday, the 25th of Jumada al-Ula in the year 906 A.H. He left behind two brothers, one of whom was the distinguished scholar Burhan al-Deen, who held a notable position in Egypt, and the other was Jalal al-Deen, who was with him in Jerusalem. He left behind considerable wealth.

He acquired knowledge from many scholars, among them the renowned Ibn Haaem (Imam, perhaps in error). He authored several works, including a **Sharh** (commentary) on **al-Irshad** by Ibn Muqri Yamani. May Allah have mercy on him!'

¹ Al-Zau al-Laame', vol. 9, pp. 64-67, No. 168

Qazi Mujir al-Deen Abu Yaman Abd al-Rahman ‘Alimi Hanbali, a student of Ibn Abi Sharif, provided an extensive biography of him in his book **al-Uns al-Jalil bi-Tarikh al-Quds wa al-Khalil**. A portion of this biography is as follows, ‘He is Shaikh al-Islam, the King of the illustrious scholars, the memorizer (of traditions) of the age and era, the blessing of the ummah, the extensively learned of the Imams, Kamal al-Deen, Abu Ma’ali Muhammad, son of Amir Nasir al-Deen Muhammad Ibn Abi Bakr Ibn Ali Ibn Abi Sharif Maqdisi Shafei, our teacher, the eminent Imam, the unparalleled scholar, the model for travellers and seekers, the diligent authority, the grandson of the Chief Justice Shihab al-Deen Abu al-Abbas Ahmad Umari Maaliki, famously known as Ibn Awjan.

He was born on a night that ushered in the morning of Saturday, the 5th of Zu al-Hijjah in the year 822 A.H in the city of Jerusalem. He grew up there in chastity, piety, and religiousness, with no record of youthful recklessness or engagement in forbidden acts. He memorized the Noble Quran, **al-Shatibiyyah**, and **al-Minhaj** by Nawawi, and studied them under Chief Justice Shaikh al-Islam Muhibb al-Deen Ibn Nasrallah Jubaili, Chief Justice Sa’d al-Deen Dari Hanafi, and Shaikh al-Islam Izz al-Deen Maqdisi in the year 839 A.H.

Later, he memorized **Alfiyyah Ibn Maalik** and **Alfiyyah al-Hadees** and studied the Quran with its various recitations under Shaikh Abu al-Qasim Nuwairi from whom he also heard lessons. He studied Arabic, the principles of jurisprudence (*usul al-fiqh*), logic, terminology of traditions (*mustalah al-hadees*), morphology (*tasrif*), prosody (*‘aroz*), and rhyme (*qaafiyah*), and he was granted permission to teach these disciplines in the year 844 A.H. He studied jurisprudence under Shaikh Zain al-Deen Mahir and Shaikh Imad al-Deen Ibn Sharaf, attended lessons with Shaikh Shihab al-Deen Ibn Arslan and Shaikh Izz al-Deen Maqdisi, and engaged deeply in the pursuit of knowledge.

In the year 844 A.H., he travelled to Cairo, where he studied under prominent Islamic scholars, including Shaikh al-Islam Ibn Hajar. Ibn

Hajar wrote him a teaching authorization (*ijazah*), praising him as an excellent, accomplished, and unparalleled scholar. Ibn Hajar said, ‘He participated in scholarly discussions, demonstrating his readiness and qualification to issue edicts based on his knowledge and verification of the Shafei school of thought for those who sought his guidance. He also contributed to the sciences of traditions by deriving benefits from its texts and chains of transmitters. His ability to navigate the intricacies of these fields affirmed his competence in this regard.’

He also studied under several other scholars, including Shaikh Kamal al-Deen Ibn Humam, Chief Justice Shams al-Deen Qaayaati, and Muqri Baghdadi, among others. He applied himself diligently to his studies and teaching, excelling and distinguishing himself. During the lifetime of his teacher, Zain al-Deen Maahir, he was already a recognized authority, with Maahir referring students and seekers of edicts to him when he himself retired from teaching.

He began teaching and issuing legal opinions in 846 A.H. He composed poetry, authored works, and heard traditions from notable scholars such as Shaikh al-Islam Ibn Hajar, Shaikh Zain al-Deen Zarkashi Hanbali, Shaikh Izz al-Deen Ibn Furat, and others among the prominent scholars. He travelled to Cairo several times and performed Hajj in 853 A.H, accompanying Qazi Abd al-Basit, the head of the Mamluk state. While in Madina, he studied traditions with Muhibb Tabari and others, and in Makkah, with Abu al-Fath Maraaghi and others.

His status and knowledge continued to grow, and he became a rarity of his time and a wonder of his era. He excelled as an Imam in various sciences, thoroughly verifying the knowledge he transmitted. He became a leading figure in Jerusalem, a central figure at the Salaahiyyah school, and one of its most distinguished scholars and instructors.¹⁴

Likewise, Mujir al-Deen Hanbali in **al-Uns al-Jalil** chronicles, “Then,

¹ Al-Uns al-Jalil bi-Tarikh al-Quds wa al-Khalil, vol. 2, p. 288

in the year eighty-one [i.e., 881 A.H.], Shaikh al-Islam travelled to the protected city of Cairo and settled there. Students and scholars frequently visited him, engaged in learning from him, and benefited from his knowledge. His awe and prestige grew significantly, and his influence increased among the Sultan and the pillars of the state. In Shawwal of the year eighty-eight [888 AH], he visited the noble city of Jerusalem and returned to Cairo in Jumada al-Aakhir of the year eighty-nine [889 AH], as previously mentioned.

When the earlier-mentioned demolition of the old Ashrafiyyah school occurred and the construction of the new school attributed to the king of the era, our master Sultan al-Malik al-Ashraf, was completed, and Allah, the Exalted, decreed the death of Shaikh Shihab al-Deen Amiri before the school's affairs were finalized and its functions organized, as previously mentioned, the Sultan issued an order to appoint Shaikh al-Islam Kamal to the school. He was summoned to the Sultan's presence, who personally offered him the position and requested his acceptance. Shaikh al-Islam agreed, was honoured with the robe of Kamaliyyah made of sable, and arrived in noble Jerusalem with members of the distinguished state. He assumed the school's administration, as mentioned regarding the events of the year ninety [890 AH].

With his arrival, the aforementioned school, the sacred land, and indeed the entire Islamic kingdom were adorned with beauty, awe, and dignity. The affairs of jurists and judges of the purified Sharia were well-organized under his presence, and the blessings of his knowledge and dissemination of learning were evident. He enjoined good, forbade evil, and his stature grew immensely. His word was exalted, and his commands were obeyed by the Sultan and those beneath him. Royal decrees were frequently issued to him concerning new events and the supervision of the subjects' conditions. He was granted the esteemed title of Shaikh al-Islam, achieving a status that none of the scholars or prominent figures before him had attained. He remained at the forefront of assemblies and a distinguished figure in gatherings, with his word being the ultimate reference and the

foundation for decisions in all matters. Scholars from all schools of thought entrusted him, and his legal rulings were accepted both according to his school and others. Edicts were sent to him from Egypt, Syria, Aleppo, and other regions. His reputation spread far and wide, and his works were disseminated across all lands. He became a definitive authority among people in all the territories of Islam.

Mujir al-Deen Hanbali in **al-Uns al-Jalil** continues, ‘As for his demeanour and awe, they were among the marvels in grandeur and radiance. Seeing him reminded one of the righteous predecessors, and whoever looked at him could recognize, merely by his appearance, that he was among the scholars who acted upon their knowledge, even if they did not know him personally. As for his handwriting and phrasing in issuing legal rulings, they were of the utmost excellence. In summary, his virtues are too numerous to be confined and too well-known to be listed. He is far greater than someone like me to adequately describe his merit, and if I were to give him his due in this biography, it would require an extensive chapter. Indeed, his virtues and the mention of his teachers deserve a dedicated book, but brevity is intended here.

Among his writings are *Al-Is’aad bi Sharh al-Irshad* in jurisprudence, *Al-Durar al-Lawaame’ bi Tahreer Jam’ al-Jawaame’* in the principles of Islamic jurisprudence, *al-Faraaed fi Hall Sharh al-Aqaaed*, *al-Musamara bi Sharh al-Musayara*, a partial commentary on *Tafsir al-Baizawi*, another partial commentary on *Sharh al-Minhaj*, and a partial commentary on *Safwah al-Zubad* by Shaikh Shihab al-Deen Ibn Arslan, among other works.

During the lifetime of my father, I presented to him a portion of the book **al-Muqni’** on the jurisprudence of Imam Ahmad. I later presented to him again what I had memorized after the first presentation, and he granted me authorization in the months of the year 873 A.H. I attended some of his lessons and dictations at the Salaahiyyah School and frequently attended his sessions at the noble al-Aqsa Mosque, both before his journey to the protected city of Cairo

and after his return to Jerusalem. I received his authorization on multiple occasions, both privately and publicly. Among the verses he recited in Jerusalem after being away for a long time were:

I greet the lands of Jerusalem whenever the morning breeze blows,

For they are the abodes of joy in the times of youth.

And I remain, out of longing for them, persistent,

Sending my greetings to those sanctuaries and meadows.’

I heard these verses directly from him on the noble road of Jerusalem upon his return from protected Gaza in the month of Zu al-Qa’dah in the year 900 A.H. He authorized me to narrate them on his behalf. May Allah honour the religion through him and prolong his life for the Muslims!¹

Shaukani in **al-Badr al-Taale’** chronicles, “Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Abi Bakr Ibn Ali Ibn Masud Ibn Rizvan Kamal Murri Qudsi Shafei, known as Ibn Abi Sharif, was born on the night of Friday, the 5th of Zu al-Hijjah in the year 822 A.H in Jerusalem. He grew up under the care of his father, memorized several concise texts, and recited the seven Qirat (except for Hamzah and Kisai) under Naviri. He learned the sciences of principles (of jurisprudence), traditions, grammar, prosody, rhyme, logic, and other disciplines from him.

He studied logic, rhetoric, and eloquence under Siraj Rumi and Shihab Ibn Arslan. He travelled to Cairo, where he studied under Ibn Humam and Ibn Hajar. He excelled in the sciences and became known for his intelligence, sharp mind, precise understanding, and quick comprehension. He engaged in teaching and gathered students to study **Sharh Jam’ al-Jawaame’** by Mahalli. However, some of them opposed him due to their inability to grasp the depth of his precision, analysis, and exposition.

Among his works are a **Haashiya** (commentary) on **Jam’ al-**

¹ Al-Uns al-Jalil bi Tarikh al-Quds wa al-Khalil, vol. 2, p. 288

Jawaame’ by Mahalli, drawing on **Sharh Jam’ al-Jawaame’** by Shihab Kurani. He also authored another **Hashiya** on **Tafsir al-Bayzawi** (which remained incomplete), a commentary on **Irshad** by Ibn Muqri, a commentary on **Fusul** by Ibn Humam, a commentary on **Zubad** by Ibn Arslan, a commentary on **Mukhtasar al-Tanbih** by Ibn Naqib, and a commentary on **al-Shifa** by Qadi Ayaz.

He achieved widespread renown and passed away in Jerusalem on Thursday, the 25th of Jumada al-Ula in the year 906 A.H.¹

Thirty-Third Reason: Suyuti explicitly states in his book Itmam al-Dirayah li-Qurra’ al-Niqaayah the weakness of Hadees-e-Nujoom

Jalal al-Deen Abd al-Rahman Ibn Abi Bakr Suyuti, in his book **Itmam al-Dirayah li-Qurra’ al-Niqaayah**, has clearly elaborated on the weakness of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** and mentioned it in the context of negating the authority of a companion’s statement over others. He has made a commendable effort to clarify its frailty, as he pens, ‘The statement of a companion is not a binding proof for others, according to both the old and the new opinions. Yes, the Hadith ‘My companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided’ was cited, but it has been responded to by highlighting its weakness.’

Thirty-Fourth Reason: Suyuti has mentioned Hadees-e-Nujoom in “Jaame’ Saghir” and annotated it with the letter “ض” in the margin, which signifies that it is weak (ضعيف)

Jalal al-Deen Suyuti, in his **Jaame’ Saghir**, mentioned Hadees-e-Nujoom and marked it with the letter “ض” in the margin, which indicates that this tradition is weak (ضعيف), as noted in the said book.

ض (ضعيف) - I asked my Lord about the differences among my companions after me, and it was revealed to me: O Muhammad! Your

¹ Al-Badr al-Taale’, vol. 2, p. 124, No. 500

companions are, in My view, like stars in the sky; some are brighter than others. Whoever adheres to anything of what they are upon, despite their differences, is on guidance in My sight. (Reported by) al-Sajzi in al-Ibaanah and Ibn Asaakir, on the authority of Umar¹.

This conclusion is based on a version printed in Egypt in the year 1286 A.H.

Thirty-Fifth Reason: Suyuti's criticism and disparagement in Jam' al-Jawaame'

Jalal al-Deen Suyuti, in **Jam' al-Jawaame'**, extensively criticised and disparaged **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, weakening its chain of transmitters and elaborating on its falsity and insignificance in a complete manner. As reported, he stated in the afore-mentioned book, "Whatever you have been given from the Book of Allah, act upon it; no one has an excuse to abandon it. If it is not found in the Book of Allah, then with an established Sunnah of mine. If it is not in my Sunnah, then by what my companions have said, for my companions are like stars in the sky. Whichever one you follow, you will be guided, and the differences among my companions are a mercy for you."

This was cited by Qazi in **al-Madkhal**, Abu Nasr Sijzi in **al-Ibaanah**, and others, and it was said to be rare. Khatib, Ibn Asaakir, and Dailami narrated it through a chain from Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima from Juwaibir from Zahhak from Ibn Abbas. However, Sulaiman is weak, and so is Juwaibir.

It is clear and evident to an insightful and enlightened observer that the style of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** is precisely the same style that Shah Sahab has selected for argumentation and reference, distinct from other styles. However, out of complete prudence and discretion, they have refrained from disclosing the flaws and criticisms of its chain of transmitters.

¹ Faiz al-Qadeer fi Sharh Jaame' Saghir, vol. 4, p. 76, Explanation of H. 4603

Thirty-Sixth Reason: Mulla Ali Muttaqi reported Hadees-e-Nujoom in “Kanz al-Ummaal” along with the criticism and discrediting of Suyuti

Mulla Ali Muttaqi, in **Kanz al-Ummaal**, has included **Hadees-e-Nujoom** in the same style that Shah Sahab has mentioned, along with the criticisms and analysis of Suyuti regarding it. By presenting Suyuti’s eloquent and comprehensive elaboration on the flaws and denunciation of its chain of transmitters, he has removed all doubts from the hearts of sceptics. As stated in the afore-mentioned book, in the second chapter of the first book under the alphabet **alif**: “Whatever you have been given from the Book of Allah, act upon it; no one has an excuse to abandon it. If it is not found in the Book of Allah, then with an established Sunnah of mine. If it is not in my Sunnah, then by what my companions have said, for my companions are like stars in the sky. Whichever one you follow, you will be guided, and the differences among my companions are a mercy for you.”

“This was cited by Qazi in **al-Madkhal**, Abu Nasr Sijzi in **al-Ibaanah**, and others. It was said to be rare. Khatib, Ibn Asaakir, and Dailami narrated it through a chain from Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima from Juwaibir from Zahhak from Ibn Abbas. However, Sulaiman is weak and so is Juwaibir.¹“

Thirty-Seventh Reason: Mulla Ali Muttaqi has also mentioned Hadees-e-Nujoom in “Muntakhab Kanz al-Ummaal”

Mulla Ali Muttaqi, in **Mukhtasar Kanz al-Ummaal**, has also included **Hadees-e-Nujoom** in the same style that Shah Sahab has mentioned, while citing Suyuti’s critique and evaluation of its narrators, thereby adopting an attitude of submission toward its flaws. As stated in the mentioned book, in *Kitab al-Iman wa al-Islam*, under the chapter on adherence to the Book and the Sunnah,

¹ Kanz al-Ummaal, vol. 6, p. 133

“Whatever you have been given from the Book of Allah, act upon it; no one has an excuse to abandon it. If it is not found in the Book of Allah, then with an established Sunnah of mine. If it is not in my Sunnah, then by what my companions have said, for my companions are like stars in the sky. Whichever one you follow, you will be guided, and the differences among my companions are a mercy for you.”

“This was cited by Baihaqi in **al-Madkhal**, Abu Nasr Sijzi in **al-Ibaanah**, and others. It was said to be rare. Khatib, Ibn Asaakir, and Dailami narrated it through a chain from Sulaiman Ibn Abi Karima from Juwaibir from Zahhak from Ibn Abbas. However, Sulaiman is weak and so is Juwaybir.”

Thirty-Eighth Reason: Mulla Ali Qari, in Mirqaat al-Mafatih (the commentary on Mishkat al-Masaabih) declared Hadees-e-Nujoom to be flawed and criticized

Mulla Ali Qari, in **Mirqaat al-Mafatih (the commentary on Mishkat al-Masabih)**, critically examined and openly declared **Hadees-e-Nujoom** to be flawed and weak. He adopted an explicit approach in exposing its defects and denouncing its credibility. In the mentioned book, he pens, “Ibn Rabee’ said, ‘Know that the tradition *‘My companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided’* is attributed to **Ibn Majah**, as mentioned by Jalal al-Deen Suyuti in **Takhreej Ahaadees al-Shifa**. However, after searching for it, I did not find it in Sunan Ibn Majah. Ibn Hajar Asqalani mentioned it in **Takhreej Ahaadees al-Raafe’i**, in the chapter on the etiquette of judges. He elaborated on it and declared it weak, even feeble (*waahin*). Moreover, he quoted Ibn Hazm, who stated that it is fabricated (*mawzu’*) and false. However, he also mentioned that Baihaqi remarked that the tradition of Muslim conveys some of its meaning, specifically the statement of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.), *‘The stars are the security of the heavens,’* and so on. Ibn Hajar said, ‘Baihaqi is correct in asserting that this tradition conveys the validity of the

analogy of the Companions with the stars. However, regarding following them (*iqtida*), this is not apparent. Yes, one may infer this from the idea of guidance (*ihtida*) through the stars.’ I said, ‘Apparently, guidance (*ihtida*) is a derivative of following (*iqtida*).’

He added, ‘The apparent meaning of the tradition indicates the tribulations that would occur after the passing of the Companions, such as the erasure of the Sunnah, the emergence of innovations, and the spread of injustice across the lands.’ He concluded.

Ibn Subki also discussed this tradition in his **Sharh Ibn al-Haajib al-Asli** while speaking about the justice (*adaalah*) of the Companions. He did not attribute it to Ibn Majah but mentioned it in **Jaame’ al-Usul** with the wording, ‘From Ibn Musayyib from Umar Ibn Khattab in a marfu’ form, ‘I asked my Lord...,’ up to the statement ‘you will be guided.’

It is among the traditions mentioned by Razeen in **Tajreed al-Usul**, which Ibn Asir did not find in the cited sources. The author of **Mishkat al-Masaabih** mentioned it, stating, ‘Razeen narrated it.’¹

From this statement, numerous benefits and sound conclusions become clear to those endowed with expertise and insight:

1. It becomes evident that Jalal al-Deen Suyuti attributed the narration of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** to **Sunan Ibn Majah**. However, this narration, despite thorough investigation, is not found in **Sunan Ibn Majah**.
2. It is established that Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, in *Takhreej Ahaadees al-Raafei*, provided an extensive commentary on this tradition and stated that it is weak (*zaif*) and feeble (*waahin*).
3. It is further verified that Ibn Hajar Asqalani, in the same work, quoted Ibn Hazm, who declared this tradition to be fabricated (*mawzu*) and false (*baatil*).
4. It becomes clear that Ibn Subki, in his *Sharh Mukhtasar Ibn al-*

¹ Mirqaat al-Mafatih (the commentary on Mishkat al-Masabih), vol. 11, p. 163, Explanation of H. 6018

Haajib, discussed this tradition and did not attribute it to Ibn Majah.

5. It appears that Ibn Asir Jazari mentioned this tradition in *Jaame' al-Usul*, narrating it from Saeed Ibn Musayyib on the authority of Umar Ibn Khattab. Afterward, he only wrote the term "he narrated it" (**akhrajahu**) without naming the source. Thus, this tradition is among those that Razeen mentioned in *Tajrid al-Usul*, but Ibn Asir did not find it in the cited sources. Consequently, the author of *Mishkat al-Masabih* transmitted it but was unable to attribute it to any of the six canonical collections (**al-sihah al-sittah**). Therefore, he had to suffice with attributing its narration to Razeen."

Thirty-Ninth Reason: Criticism of Mulla Ali Qari in "Sharh al-Shifa"

Mulla Ali Qari, in **Sharh al-Shifa**, unveiled the reasons for the criticism and weakness of this tradition, emphasizing its discreditation and weakness as acknowledged by Ahle Tasannun scholars and critics. In the mentioned book, while commenting on Qazi Ayaz's statement, "*And he said: My companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided,*" he writes, "Know that his statement, '*And he said: My companions...*,' refers to a different tradition. Daraqutni narrated it in **Fazaael**, and Ibn Abd al-Barr cited it through him from the narration of Jabir, saying, 'This chain of transmitters does not provide valid evidence.' Abd Ibn Humaid narrated it in his **Musnad** from Ibn Umar. Bazzar said, 'It is rejected (munkar) and not authentic.' Ibn Adi mentioned it in **al-Kaamil**, narrating it with his chain from Naafe' on the authority of Ibn Umar with the wording, '*Whichever of them you take his statement,*' instead of '*you follow,*' and its chain is weak.

Baihaqi narrated it in **al-Madkhal** from the narrations of Umar and Ibn Abbas with a similar wording, and from another source in a mursal form. He said, 'Its text is well-known, but its chains are weak.' Halabi commented, 'It would have been better for Qazi Ayaz not to

mention it with certainty, given what is known among the experts in the field. Similar instances from him have occurred repeatedly.’

I say: It is possible that he considered it established through a chain he knew or that he took the multitude of chains as elevating it from weak (*zaif*) to acceptable (*hasan*), relying on his good opinion. Additionally, weak traditions can be acted upon in matters of virtuous deeds. Allah knows best the reality of the situations.”

From this statement, several benefits and insights become evident to those with expertise and mastery:

1. It is established that the chain of transmitters for **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, narrated from Jabir, is so flawed that Hafiz Ibn Abd al-Barr explicitly stated that no valid evidence can be derived from it.
2. It becomes clear that **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, narrated from Ibn Umar, has been explicitly declared by Hafiz Bazzar to be rejected (*munkar*) and not authentic (*sahih*).
3. It is confirmed that Ibn Adi, in **al-Kaamil**, narrated **Hadees-e-Nujoom** from Ibn Umar and stated that its chain is weak (*zaif*).
4. It appears that Baihaqi, in his book **al-Madkhal**, narrated **Hadees-e-Nujoom** from Umar and from Ibn Abbas through another chain and later remarked that while the text of the tradition is well-known, its chains are weak.
5. It becomes apparent that Halabi, the commentator of **al-Shifa**, criticized Qazi Ayaz for mentioning this tradition with certainty. He stated that it would have been more appropriate for Qazi Ayaz not to mention it in a definitive form, as the status of this tradition is well-known among the experts in the field; meaning it is considered flawed and weak by the scholars of traditions. Halabi also noted that Qazi Ayaz had done this multiple times, repeatedly mentioning weak traditions with certainty.

As for what Mulla Ali Qari attempted in order to absolve Qadi Ayaz from Halabi's criticism and objection, claiming that it is possible that this tradition was established for Qadi Ayaz through a chain of transmitters, or that he considered the multitude of its chains as elevating it from weak (*zaiif*) to acceptable (*hasan*), based on his goodwill, and that weak traditions can be acted upon in matters of virtuous deeds (*fazaael al-amal*), this explanation by Ali Qari is entirely deceptive, false, and invalid for the following reasons:

First, if the senior scholars of traditions, both early and later authorities of Ahle Tasannun, despite thorough investigation and examination, did not find any reliable chain of transmitters for this tradition, the possibility of such a chain being available to Qazi Ayaz is highly improbable and entirely unreasonable. How could anyone accept such a possibility, especially when, had Qazi Ayaz possessed such a chain, he would undoubtedly have mentioned it here with pride and used it to elevate his own standing? He would not have hidden it away in secrecy, thereby exposing himself to criticism, denunciation, and censure by expert critics for quoting this tradition with certainty.

Second, as detailed earlier, it is well established that Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, one of the four pillars of jurisprudence (of Ahle Tasannun) whose eminent status and lofty position among the Ahle Tasannun require no explanation, declared **Hadees-e-Nujoom** to be not authentic but fabricated (*mauzu*). Muzani, the distinguished student of Shafei, also did not consider this tradition to be authentic. Hafiz Abu Bakr Bazzar exerted commendable effort in criticizing the chain and text of this tradition; Hafiz Ibn Adi also criticized it and deemed it unauthentic, and Hafiz Daraqtuni discredited it as well. Hafiz Ibn Hazm called it fabricated, false, and invalid, stating that it has never been authenticated. Hafiz Abu Bakr Baihaqi remarked that its chains are weak and no reliable chain for it has been established. Hafiz of the Maghrib, Allama Ibn Abd al-Barr, transmitted the criticisms of Muzani and Hafiz Abu Bakr Bazzar and also mentioned some of its chains, declaring it flawed and discredited.

All these eminent scholars of traditions and prominent critics preceded Qazi Ayaz. Even if Qazi Ayaz was not fully aware of the contributions of all of them, it is inevitable that he would have known about the research of at least some of them. Upon gaining such knowledge, if he had discovered a reliable chain for **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, it would have been necessary for him to mention it to benefit his audience and to refute the criticisms of detractors by citing that chain. Instead, he refrained from mentioning it altogether and relied on quoting the text of the tradition without a chain, and that too with certainty; thereby undermining the principles of caution and scholarly rigour.

Third, if this tradition had a reliable chain of transmitters, and for any reason Qazi Ayaz failed to mention it, then certainly the commentators of the book **al-Shifa** and the scholars who analysed and authenticated its traditions—who are prominent and highly esteemed among the scholars of Ahle Tasannun and preceded Ali Qari—would have mentioned it. They would have considered it a significant contribution to Qazi Ayaz’s work, freeing him from the criticisms and censure of expert critics. However, none of them were able to do so. On the contrary, the opposite occurred, as leading scholars such as Hafiz Zain al-Deen Iraqi and Abuzar Halabi criticized Qazi Ayaz in this matter, and this critique is well-established.

Moreover, from the earlier citation in Ali Qari’s **Mirqat**, it is evident that Suyuti, in his **Takhreej Ahaadees al-Shifa**, carelessly (without due diligence) attributed this tradition to Ibn Majah, despite there being no trace of it in **Sunan Ibn Majah**. This stands as the most definitive proof of the failure of efforts in this regard, as is clear to those of intellect and understanding.

Fourth, the claim of the multitude of chains for **Hadees-e-Nujoom** that Ali Qari has put forward is exceedingly weak. It is evident to anyone who has examined the contributions of the great critics and eminent scholars of traditions previously mentioned that this tradition never possessed a multitude of chains. The few chains

through which it has been transmitted have been subjected to rigorous criticism and disparagement by these experts, who have, to the best of their ability, criticized and discredited every single chain. They have clearly and explicitly highlighted the flaws and defects of its narrators. None of them have considered the chains of this tradition sufficient to elevate it to the status of **hasan**.

How, then, could it be permissible for Qazi Ayaz, after seeing their evaluations and understanding their criticisms, to maintain a good opinion of this tradition, thereby further substantiating its weakness and tarnishing his own scholarly credibility? Is this not but a corrupt assumption and a baseless illusion?!

Fifth, Ali Qari's claim that weak traditions can be acted upon in matters of virtuous deeds is an assertion that, even if accepted, does not support his case, for the following reasons:

1. **Not Merely Weak but Fabricated:** This tradition is not merely weak (*zaif*); rather, it is fabricated (*mauzu*), false (*baatil*), and entirely discredited. Fabricated traditions are not acceptable under any circumstances, not even in matters of virtuous deeds.
2. **No Mention of a Virtuous Deed:** This tradition does not mention any specific virtuous deed or act of goodness to warrant its application in such a context. Instead, its implication is the guidance of the entire community through following any individual companion, a matter of immense significance and grave implications. Such a lofty purpose cannot rely on a weak and dubious narration, let alone one that is fabricated.
3. **Certainty in Attribution:** Even if we were to disregard all of this and hypothetically assume that Qazi Ayaz's use of this tradition was permissible in praising the Companions based on the principle of acting upon weak traditions in virtues, the fundamental objection remains valid. The criticism against Qazi Ayaz pertains to his use of the tradition with certainty

(*sighah al-jazm*), which remains problematic. This deceptive reasoning and manipulative justification by Ali Qari do not absolve Qazi Ayaz of the blame and censure directed at him.

In the future, if Allah the Almighty wills, further evidence will emerge from the words of Khafaji in **Nasim al-Riyaz** and Shaukani in **Irshad al-Fuhood**, demonstrating the additional falsity, utter disgrace, and ultimate humiliation of this deceit, misguidance, embellishment, and pretence by Ali Qari. So, remain among those who are watchful and vigilant, and seek refuge in Allah from the schemes of deceptive plotters.

Fortieth Reason: The criticism and disparagement Hadees-e-Nujoom by Abdul Rauf Ibn Taj al-Aarifeen Manavi

Allama Abd al-Rauf Ibn Taj al-Aarifeen Manavi, in **al-Taysir fi Sharh Jaame' Saghir**, has transmitted the criticism of Hadees-e-Nujoom from prominent critics, removing layers of ambiguity and confusion from the thoughts of readers with the lens of thorough investigation. He states in the mentioned book, "*I asked my Lord about the disputes among my companions*"—meaning, regarding their rulings—"after me," i.e., *after my death.*" It was revealed to me, '*O Muhammad! Indeed, your companions, in My sight, are like stars in the sky; some of them are brighter than others. Whoever follows anything from what they are upon in their disagreements is, in My sight, upon guidance.*' This is because they are like a single soul in their belief in monotheism and their support for the religion. Their differences arose from their ijtehad (independent reasoning), and there are explanations for their actions. Hence, their disagreements are considered a mercy, as is mentioned in the narrated by Sajzi in **al-Ibaanah** regarding the principles of faith and by Ibn Asaakir on the authority of Umar. Ibn Jauzi remarked, "It is not authentic" and Zahabi judged, "It is false."¹

¹ Al-Taysir fi Sharh al-Jaame' al-Saghir, vol. 2, p. 48 under alphabet ٤

Forty-First Reason: The criticism of Abd al-Rauf Ibn Taj al-Aarifeen Manavi

Allama Abd al-Rauf Ibn Taj al-Aarifeen Manavi, in **Faiz al-Qadeer - Sharh Jaame' Saghir**, made a praiseworthy effort to uncover the flaws and expose the defects of **Hadees-e-Nujoom**. He highlighted the statements of earlier scholars concerning the criticism of this fabricated narration, addressing its refutation in the best possible manner. In **Faiz al-Qadeer - Sharh Jaame' Saghir**, while explaining the tradition, *"I asked my Lord about the disputes among my companions after me, and He revealed to me, 'O Muhammad! Indeed, your companions, in My sight, are like stars,"* etc., as narrated, he writes, 'Sajzi mentioned it in his book **al-Ibaanah** regarding the principles of religion, and Ibn Asaakir mentioned it in his history book on the authority of Umar Ibn Khattab. Ibn al-Jauzi remarked in al-Elal, 'This is not authentic. Naeem is discredited, and Abd al-Rahim, according to Ibn Maeen, is a liar. In al-Mizan, it is mentioned that this hadith is false.' Ibn Hajar, in **Takhreej al-Mukhtasar**, writes, "This is a strange tradition. When he was asked about Bazzar, he said, "This statement cannot be authentically attributed to the Prophet (s.a.w.a.)." Kamaal Ibn Abi Sharif commented, "Our teacher, viz. Ibn Hajar, implied that it is inconsistent." Ibn Asaakir states, "It was narrated by Abu Hawari from Saeed Zaid Ammi, who was weak in traditions." Ibn Adi remarked, "The majority of what he narrates and the narrators he transmits from are weak."¹

Forty-Second Reason: The criticism and discrediting of Hadees-e-Nujoom by Shihab al-Deen Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Umar Khafaji Misri Hanafi

Shihab al-Deen Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Umar Khafaji Misri Hanafi, in **Nasim al-Riyaz - Sharh Shifa of Qazi Ayaz**, unveiled the criticism and disparagement of **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, providing a declaration of evidence for those of understanding and intellect. In the mentioned book, a manuscript of which in Arabic script is currently

¹ Faiz al-Qadeer fi Sharh al-Jaame' al-Saghir, vol. 4, p. 76, Explanation of H. 4603

before us, he stated, “The Prophet (s.a.w.a.) said in another tradition narrated by Daraqutni and Ibn Abd al-Barr in **al-Ilm** through chains of transmitters, all of which are weak, to the extent that Ibn Hazm affirmed it is fabricated. Hafiz Iraqi commented, ‘It would have been better for the author not to present it with certainty.’

What is said—that it is acceptable because the author cited it in the context of the virtues of the companions and because it is established that weak traditions can be acted upon in virtuous deeds, let alone in the virtues of men—has no basis. This is because ‘*My companions are like the stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided,*’ pertains to acting upon what they did and said in matters of rulings (*ahkam*). This is not among the virtues for which acting upon weak hadiths is permissible.’ Hence, the tradition does not fall under the category of virtues where the use of weak reports might be acceptable.

From this passage, it becomes clear and evident that Allamah Khafaji, in highlighting the weakness, insignificance, corruption, and falsity of **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, paid attention to several aspects, some of which are as follows:

First, he demonstrated that the chains of transmitters (*asaaneed*) of all the routes for this tradition are weak.

Second, he explicitly stated that Ibn Hazm firmly concluded that this tradition is fabricated (*mauzoo*).

Third, he quoted Hafiz Iraqi, who stated that the author of **al-Shifa** should not have included this tradition in a definitive (*jazm*) manner.

Fourth, he refuted the statement of some individuals that sought to dismiss Hafiz Iraqi’s critique of the author of **al-Shifa**. He clarified that the dismissal of Hafiz Iraqi’s criticism on the basis that the author of **al-Shifa** mentioned **Hadees-e-Nujoom** in the context of the virtues of the companions, and that scholars have established the permissibility of acting upon weak traditions in the context of virtuous deeds, let alone the virtues of individuals, holds no weight.

This is because **Hadees-e-Nujoom** involves the ruling of acting upon

the actions and statements of the companions, and this does not fall under the category of virtues where acting upon weak traditions is permissible.

The strength and precision of this argument by Khafaji is evident to those with insight. After reflecting upon it, the validity of Hafiz Iraqi's reproach becomes clear and manifest to all.

However, it is surprising that Khafaji himself, after this, made a desperate attempt to absolve Qazi Ayaz from the criticism and scrutiny of Hafiz Iraqi's objection, trying to rescue him from this perilous predicament and bring him to safety. He states, "If it were said that the meaning of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** aligns with the preceding tradition, namely the tradition about following the two Shaikhs, which is an authentic tradition acted upon, and for this reason, Qazi Ayaz mentioned it (Hadees-e-Nujoom) after that tradition as if in continuity with it, and therefore expressed certainty about it, this statement in defence of Qazi Ayad would have been stronger and better." It is quite evident that this entire argument, fabricated by Khafaji to support and defend Qazi Ayaz, is weaker than a spider's web and more fragile than a mulberry leaf. This is because any rational, perceptive, and thoughtful individual clearly knows that: Firstly, **Hadees-e-Iqtida** (following the two Shaikhs) is a different tradition, and **Hadees-e-Nujoom** is a separate one. The former was specifically fabricated for the two Shaikhs (Abu Bakr and Umar), while the latter was concocted regarding all the companions collectively.

This distinction is why many scholars of Ahle Tasannun principles of jurisprudence (*usul-e-fiqh*) consider **Hadees-e-Nujoom** to conflict with **Hadees-e-Iqtida**. This is evident to anyone who has studied works such as:

- ◆ **Ihkam al-Ahkam** by Aamudi,
- ◆ **Mukhtasar al-Usul** by Ibn Haajib and its commentary by Azud al-Deen Eiji,
- ◆ **Haashiyah al-Taftazaani** on this commentary,

- ♦ **Sharh al-Minhaj** by Obaidullah Ibn Muhammad Farghani, known as Abri,
- ♦ **Meraj al-Wusul** by Allama Majd al-Deen al-Aiki,
- ♦ **Al-Tahrir** by Ibn al-Humaam al-Sivasi,
- ♦ **Al-Taqreer wa al-Tahbeer** by Ibn Amir Haaj Halabi,
- ♦ **Al-Tayseer** by Muhammad Amin, known as Amir Badshah Bukhari,
- ♦ **Musallam al-Suboot** by Muhibullah Bihari,
- ♦ **Al-Subh al-Sadiq** by Mulla Nizam al-Deen al-Sahaalawi,
- ♦ **Fawaateh al-Rahmoot** by Abd al-Ali Lakhnawi, and
- ♦ **Sharh al-Musallam** by Molavi Waliullah Lakhnawi.

This divergence and the contradiction between these two traditions are well-documented and cannot be overlooked by those who have examined these foundational texts.

Thus, portraying a tradition that contradicts another tradition as having the same meaning is explicitly an attempt to reconcile two opposites, which is inherently contradictory and untenable.

Secondly, the claim that **Hadees-e-Iqtida** is an authentic and widely accepted tradition is incorrect. Praise be to Allah, the Exalted, in the volume concerning **Hadees-e-Tair**, and in this volume too, it has been thoroughly explained and proven in detail that this tradition is fabricated and spurious. Its complete corruption and falsehood, according to the admissions of prominent scholars of Ahle Tasannun and distinguished researchers, have been established beyond doubt. After examining it, no rational person would attempt to authenticate it.

Thirdly, the claim that Qazi Ayaz mentioned **Hadees-e-Nujoom** after **Hadees-e-Iqtida** as a form of corroboration is utterly baseless. It is clear to those familiar with the insights of scholars in the science of traditions, such as Allamah Ibn Salaah, Allama Nawawi, Zain al-Deen Iraqi, and others, that corroboration (*mutaba'ah*) in a single tradition is established through multiple narrators, and it serves as evidence for

the first tradition if it conveys the same meaning.

It is evident that **Hadees-e-Iqtida** and **Hadees-e-Nujoom** are not the same tradition. Furthermore, **Hadees-e-Nujoom** does not share the same meaning as **Hadees-e-Iqtida**; rather, it contradicts it. Therefore, in this context, neither corroboration is established, nor does the appearance of evidence emerge. Given this, how can Khafaji's statement, "*and therefore, he mentioned it after it as if it were a corroboration,*" hold any validity?

Fourthly, it is also evident and clear to those familiar with the insights of scholars in the science of traditions that fabrications and falsehoods by forgers and liars cannot be used for corroboration (*mutaba'ah*) or supporting evidence (*shawaahid*). At most, some weak narrations by specific individuals in this context may be mentioned. However, as has been repeatedly clarified earlier, **Hadees-e-Nujoom** is fabricated, false, and invalid. Khafaji himself has transmitted from Ibn Hazm the acknowledgment of its fabricated nature. Moreover, as previously established, the narrators of this tradition are among the forgers and corrupt fabricators. Thus, considering this tradition as part of corroborative evidence is a complete error and oversight, exposing one's own negligence and obliviousness to those endowed with knowledge and intellect.

Fifthly, even if it were assumed that **Hadees-e-Nujoom** shares the same meaning as **Hadees-e-Iqtida** and the authenticity of **Hadees-e-Iqtida** were hypothetically accepted (despite it being impossible), and Qazi Ayaz's wording were considered to suggest corroboration, still, Qazi Ayaz's assertion regarding **Hadees-e-Nujoom** would not hold true. Even after traversing all these stages, Khafaji would fail to achieve his intended goal.

This is because, in such a case, Qazi Ayaz would have been required to narrate **Hadees-e-Iqtida** in a definitive manner and present **Hadees-e-Nujoom** with indications of its weakness. According to Khafaji's invalid claim, **Hadees-e-Iqtida** is authentic, while **Hadees-e-Nujoom** is certainly not authentic. However, Qazi Ayaz did not

proceed in this manner. Instead, he narrated **Hadees-e-Iqtida** with its chain of transmitters and mentioned **Hadees-e-Nujoom** definitively, without citing its chain of transmitters.

It is abundantly clear that to narrate an authentic tradition without definitiveness and to mention a non-authentic tradition with definitiveness and certainty is an extremely reprehensible and egregious action, utterly devoid of any justification or permissibility.

Briefly, it is truly astonishing why Qazi Ayaz did not present **Hadees-e-Iqtida** which Khafaji considers authentic, with definitive language. Instead, he narrated it with his own chain of transmitters, even though that chain is flawed and criticized. Meanwhile, Qazi Ayaz presented **Hadees-e-Nujoom** which is never considered authentic by Khafaji. In fact, based on Khafaji's own admission, all its chains of transmitters are weak, and Ibn Hazm explicitly declared it fabricated. Yet, Qazi Ayaz inverted the truth and, contrary to proper practice, presented it with definitive and assertive language, thereby exacerbating his lack of discernment and insight in the eyes of those endowed with understanding, to the furthest extent possible.

From this, it is clearly established that Khafaji's attempt to defend Qazi Ayaz's position is as fragile as a spider's web—never stronger or better, but rather the weakest and feeblest. Its frailty and worthlessness are evident and manifest to those with vision and intellect, casting the dust of humiliation and disgrace upon both follower and leader alike. Therefore, do not be among the heedless in this matter, for we have refuted Khafaji's statement and cast it to the lowest depths.

Forty-Third Reason: Allamah Muhammad Moeen Ibn Muhammad Amin Sindi has declared Hadees-e-Nujoom to be fabricated (*mauzoo'*) with certainty and conviction.

The esteemed scholar Muhammad Moeen Ibn Muhammad Amin Sindi, whose high rank and elevated status in the science of traditions you have already come to know in the volume on **Hadees-e-**

Madinah al-Ilm, has decisively and with certainty declared **Hadees-e-Nujoom** to be fabricated (*mauzoo*). As stated in **Diraasah al-Labib**, after mentioning **Hadees-e-Saqalain** and using it as evidence for the infallibility (*ismah*) of the Ahl-e-Bait (a.s.), he pens, “If it is said, ‘Indeed, the following has been narrated, ‘My companions are like the stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be rightly guided’ and it has been narrated, ‘Follow those who come after me; Abu Bakr and Umar’ and it has been narrated, ‘Adhere to my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly guided caliphs’, it is proved that people are encouraged to follow others and the guidance of those who emulate them.’

We say: The first tradition is fabricated; otherwise, the statement ‘you will be rightly guided’ within it would specifically indicate their infallibility and the absence of error in them.¹

From this passage, it is evident that Allama Muhammad Moeen Sindi explicitly declares **Hadees-e-Nujoom** to be fabricated and rejects it in comparison to **Hadees-e-Saqalain**. He takes the path of fairness. If the status of this tradition is such that even fair-minded scholars of Ahle Tasannun themselves reject it in comparison to **Hadees-e-Saqalain**, decisively declaring it fabricated and increasing their efforts to expose its falsehood, then no one among fair-minded individuals would deem it permissible for our interlocutor (i.e. the author of Tuhfa) to argue with this fabricated tradition and spurious report, particularly in opposition to **Hadees-e-Saqalain**. Furthermore, using it in opposition to the people of truth is akin to “darkness, one layer over another” (ظُلُمَاتٌ بَعْضُهَا فَوْقَ بَعْضٍ) and not at all acceptable. No one would excuse them for clinging to such a blatant lie and disgraceful falsehood.

¹ Diraasah al-Labib fi Uswah bi al-Habib, p. 240

Forty-fourth Reason: Qazi Mohibullah Bihari, in his book *Musallam al-Suboot*, has weakened the authenticity of Hadees-e-Nujoom

Qazi Mohibullah Bihari, in his book **Musallam al-Suboot**, explicitly weakens **Hadees-e-Nujoom** and concisely yet clearly demonstrates the failure and loss of those who use it as evidence for their claims. In the mentioned book, while rejecting the authority of the consensus of the two Shaikhs (*Abu Bakr and Umar*) and the consensus of the four caliphs, he states, ‘They said, ‘Follow those who come after me: Abu Bakr and Umar,’ and ‘Adhere to my Sunnah,’ [referring to the tradition].’

We reply: This is addressed to the followers (*muqallidun*), explaining their eligibility to be followed, because the *mujtahids* would often disagree with them, and the followers might follow others. As for the opposition [to this argument] by citing ‘My companions are like the stars’ and ‘Take half of your religion from Humaira’ as mentioned in **al-Mukhtasar**, it is dismissed because both are weak (*zaiif*).¹

It is worth mentioning that Qazi Mohibullah Bihari is among the distinguished scholars and eminent figures highly respected by the Ahle Tasannun. Ghulam Ali Azad Bilgrami, in his book **Sabbah al-Marjaan**, provides the following account of him, “Qazi Mohibullah Bihari is attributed to Bihar—a great city whose name is derived from ‘Sooba’ in ancient times, later referred to as ‘Patna.’ These two towns are adjacent, and the birthplace of Qazi Mohibullah is Kara, a village belonging to the district of Muhibb Alipore, which itself is one of the populated suburbs of Bihar.

His tribe is known by the title ‘Malik.’ Qazi Mohibullah was an ocean of knowledge and a radiant star among luminaries. In the prime of his youth, he travelled across various regions of the subcontinent, diligently pursuing knowledge and studying foundational texts from diverse sources. He eventually settled entirely within the scholarly circle of Maulvi Qutb al-Deen Shamsabadi, who guided him along the

¹ Musallam al-Suboot ba Sharh Abd al-Ali, vol. 2, p. 510

path of intellectual excellence.

After mastering the sciences and surpassing his peers, he travelled to the southern regions of India, known as the Deccan, where he became associated with Sultan Aurangzeb Alamgir. The Sultan appointed him as the Qazi of Lucknow in the northern regions of India. After several years, he was dismissed from this position and returned to the Deccan. There, Aurangzeb once again appointed him as the Qazi of Hyderabad, which was the capital of the eastern regions of the Deccan. However, the Sultan later became displeased with him for a certain reason and removed him from this position.

Following some time, Aurangzeb pardoned him through the intercession of mediators and entrusted him with the education of the Sultan's grandson, Sultan Rafi al-Qadr, the son of Sultan Muhammad Moazzam, who was in turn the son of Aurangzeb Alamgir. Toward the end of his life, Aurangzeb entrusted the governance of Kabul to his son Muhammad Moazzam, also known as Shah Alam.

Accompanying Shah Alam and his grandson Rafi al-Qadr, Qazi Mohibullah travelled to Kabul. After residing there for a short while, Sultan Aurangzeb passed away in the Deccan in the year 1118 AH. Shah Alam then returned from Kabul to the Indian territories, appointing Qazi Mohibullah to a high-ranking position and granting him the title 'Faazil Khan'. He was made the chief minister (*Sadr-e-Mamaalik*) of all the Indian territories in the year 1119 A.H.

In this same year, the destroyer of pleasures (i.e. death) attacked him, causing him to taste the bitterness of grief and the sourness of regrets. Among his works are: **Sullam al-Ulum**: A treatise on logic; **Musallam al-Suboot**: A foundational text on the principles of jurisprudence (*usul al-fiqh*), a widely studied and significant work in Islamic legal theory; and **al-Jawhar al-Fard**: A treatise addressing the issue of the indivisible particle (*al-juz' allazi la yatajazza*). These three works are well-received and widely used in the schools of scholars.¹⁴

¹ Sabhah al-Marjaan be Zikr Aasaar-e-Hindustan, p. 77

Maulvi Siddiq Hasan Khan, a contemporary scholar, writes in **Abjad al-Uloom**, “Qazi Mohibullah Bihari, attributed to Bihar—a great city in eastern Purab, previously known as ‘Sooba’ and later referred to as ‘Patna’ with both towns being adjacent. The Qazi was born in Karaa, a village in the district of Muhibb Alipore, which is part of the suburbs of Bihar. His tribe is known as ‘Malik.’

The Qazi travelled across the regions of Purab, acquiring the foundational texts of various disciplines from multiple sources before dedicating himself entirely to the scholarly circle of Qutb Shamsabadi. He became an ocean of knowledge and a radiant star among scholars. He then travelled to the Deccan, where he associated himself with Sultan Aurangzeb Alamgir. The Sultan appointed him as the Qazi of Lucknow, and later as the Qazi of Hyderabad, the capital of the eastern regions of the Deccan.

After some time, he was dismissed but was later entrusted with the education of Sultan Aurangzeb’s grandson, Rafi al-Qadr, son of Muhammad Moazzam. Toward the end of his life, Aurangzeb entrusted the governance of Kabul to his son Muhammad Moazzam, known as Shah Alam. The Qazi accompanied Shah Alam and his son Rafi al-Qadr from the Deccan to Kabul.

When Aurangzeb passed away in the Deccan in 1118 A.H, Shah Alam moved from Kabul back to the Indian territories. He granted Qazi Muhibullah a high-ranking position, appointing him as the chief minister (*Sadr-e-Mamaalik*) of all Indian territories and granting him the title ‘Faazil Khan’ in 1119 AH, the year of his passing. Among his works are: **Sullam al-Uloom**: A treatise on logic; **Musallam al-Suboot**: A foundational text on the principles of jurisprudence (*usul al-fiqh*); and **al-Jawhar al-Fard**: A treatise on the issue of the indivisible particle (*al-juz’ allazi la yatajazza*). These three works are widely accepted and frequently studied in the schools of scholars.”

Forty-Fifth Reason: Mulla Nizam al-Deen Sahaalvi has explicitly and clearly stated that Hadees-e-Nujoom is fabricated

Mulla Nizam al-Deen Sahaalvi, one of the distinguished scholars of this region and a prominent figure among its eminent scholars, has explicitly and comprehensively declared **Hadees-e-Nujoom** to be fabricated in his work **al-Subh al-Sadiq fi Sharh al-Manar**. In demonstrating the weakness, insignificance, corruption, and falsity of this tradition, he has outperformed his contemporaries.

In the book, in the discussion on consensus (*ijma*), while refuting those who argue using the tradition of ‘Follow those who come after me’ and ‘Adhere to my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly guided caliphs’, he writes, ‘It is also countered by the statement of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.), ‘My companions are like the stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be rightly guided’ and his statement, ‘Take half of your religion from this Humaira.’ Thus, the argument weakens.

I reply: The first tradition, though narrated in some sources considered reliable, is not recognized. Ibn Hazm stated in his *Risaalah al-Kubra*: It is a lie (*makzub*), fabricated (*mauzoo*), and invalid (*baatil*). This view is also shared by Ahmad and Bazzar. As for the second tradition, it is also not recognized, as noted by Mizzi, Zahabi, and others. Zahabi remarked, ‘It is among the baseless (*waahin*) traditions that have no known chain of transmitters.’ Subki and Hafiz Abu Hajjaj said, ‘Every tradition containing the term ‘Humaira’ is baseless except for one narration related to women (as per Nasai).’ This is mentioned in some commentaries on **al-Tahrir**.”

Forty-Sixth Reason: Maulvi Abdul Ali Lucknawi has criticised and invalidated Hadees-e-Nujoom

Maulvi Abdul Ali Lakhnawi, who is highly regarded among the Ahle Tasannun in these regions and cities (i.e. the Indian subcontinent) for his many virtues and is famously known among both their commoners and elites as *Bahr al-Uloom* (The Ocean of Knowledge)

has explicitly criticized and refuted **Hadees-e-Nujoom** with clear and detailed reasoning, demonstrating its utter weakness, insignificance, corruption, and invalidity, as per the statements of the prominent figures and foundations of his school of thought.

In his book **Fawaateh al-Rahmoot - Sharh Musallam al-Suboot**, he discusses this in the section on the consensus of the two Shaikhs and the four Caliphs, stating, “As for the opposition based on the tradition, ‘My companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided’, narrated by Ibn Adi and Ibn Abd al-Barr, and the tradition, ‘Take half of your religion from Humaira,’ referring to Umm al-Momineen Aisha al-Siddiqah, as mentioned in **al-Mukhtasar**, these are rejected because both are weak and unfit for practice, let alone for opposing authentic narrations. As for the first tradition, it is not recognized. Ibn Hazm said in his Risaalah al-Kubra, ‘It is fabricated, forged, and false.’ Ahmad and Bazzar held the same view. Regarding the second tradition, Zahabi said, ‘It is among the weak narrations with no known chain of transmitters.’ Subki and Hafiz Abu Hajjaj stated, ‘Every tradition bearing the term ‘Humaira’ is baseless except for one narration in Nasai.’ This is also mentioned in al-Taysir.¹“

It is worth mentioning that this statement by the Ahle Tasannun scholar known as Bahr al-Uloom (the Ocean of Knowledge), which criticizes and refutes **Hadees-e-Nujoom** nullifies and erases his earlier remarks in some parts of his book where he supported this tradition. This casts the dust of humiliation and disgrace upon those who use this fabricated tradition as a basis for argument in a manner most contemptible. So, beware and do not be deceived by what could lead you to peril.

¹ Fawaateh al-Rahmoot - Sharh Musallam al-Suboot, vol. 2, p. 510

Forty-Seventh Reason: The Imam, memorizer, and jurist of Ahle Tasannun Qazi Muhammad Ibn Ali bin Muhammad Shaukani has deemed Hadees-e-Nujoom as condemned and invalid

The Imam, memorizer, and jurist of Ahle Tasannun Qazi Muhammad Ibn Ali bin Muhammad Shaukani, in his book **Irshad al-Fuhoool ilaa Tahqeeq al-Haqq min Ilm al-Usul**, has extensively criticized and invalidated **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, explaining in detail its flaws and weaknesses. As he states in the section on consensus in the aforementioned book, “Similarly, the narration ‘My companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided’ implies the authority of the statements of each of them. However, it has notorious flaw, as one of its narrators is Abd al-Rahim Ammi, narrating from his father, both of whom are extremely weak. In fact, Ibn Maeen stated that Abd al-Rahim is a liar. Bukhari said he is abandoned (*matruk*), as did Abu Hatim. Another chain of narration includes Hamza Naseebi, who is also very weak. Bukhari described him as a fabricator of narrations (*munkar al-hadith*), and Ibn Maeen said his worth is less than a penny. Ibn Adi said that most of his narrations are fabricated. It has also been narrated through Jamil Ibn Zaid, who is unknown.¹“

From this statement, it is evident and clear that the illustrious scholar, Shaukani, has provided numerous valuable insights and profound observations in dismantling the credibility of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** and demonstrating its weakness to those of intellect and understanding.

Firstly, he explicitly states that this narration has a ‘notorious flaw.’ From this, it becomes apparent that the words of critics and researchers concerning the flaws, failings and invalidity of this tradition are well-known and widely infamous among scholars, not hidden or obscure.

Secondly, he clarifies that the narrator of this tradition is Abd al-

¹ Irshad al-Fuhoool ilaa Tahqeeq al-Haqq min Ilm al-Usul, p. 126, Eighth Discussion

Rahim Ibn Zaid Ammi, narrating from his father, and both are extremely weak narrators.

Thirdly, to further emphasize the discrediting of Abd al-Rahim, he cites Ibn Maeen, who stated that Abd al-Rahim is a liar (*kazzaab*).

Fourthly, he supports his claim by quoting Bukhari, who declared Abd al-Rahim to be abandoned (*matruk*).

Fifthly, for the same purpose, he adds that Abu Hatim also regarded Abd al-Rahim as abandoned (*matruk*).

Sixthly, he mentions explicitly that **Hadees-e-Nujoom** has another chain of transmitters in which Hamza Naseebi appears, who is extremely weak.

Seventhly, to further establish Hamza Naseebi's unreliability, he cites Bukhari, who labelled him as a fabricator of traditions.

Eighthly, for the same reason, he quotes Ibn Maeen, who said that Hamza Naseebi is not worth even a single penny. What could be a greater insult or degradation than this?

Ninthly, for the same objective, he quotes Ibn Adi, who stated that most of Hamza's narrations are fabricated.

Tenthly, he adds that **Hadees-e-Nujoom** has also been narrated through Jamil Ibn Zaid, who is unknown (*majhul*).

These ten complete (تلك عشوة كاملة)¹ (points) constitute a complete and comprehensive discrediting of this narration, exposing widespread and undeniable flaws for those inclined toward falsehood and fabrication.

Forty-Eighth Reason: Allamah Shaukani, in his book Irshad al-Fuhool, criticized and refuted Hadees-e-Nujoom, highlighting its flaws and weaknesses

In **Irshad al-Fuhool**, Allamah Shaukani, in addressing the issue of the non-authoritativeness of the statement of a companion,

¹ Hinting at Surah Baqarah (2): Verse 196

thoroughly elaborates and clarifies the flaws, weaknesses, corruption, invalidity, and criticisms of **Hadees-e-Nujoom**. He presents clear and explicit arguments to those who contemplate, making evident the weakness, frailty, discredit, and disparagement of the tradition with utmost fairness. He states, “As for what some of those who argue for the authoritativeness of the statement of a companion rely on from what has been narrated from him (s.a.w.a.), that he said, ‘My companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided’—this is something that has never been authentically established. Discussions on it are well-known among the scholars of this field, to the extent that it is not valid to act upon it in the smallest ruling of the Shariah. How, then, could it be relied upon for such a significant and serious matter?”

From this passage, it is entirely evident that Allamah Shaukani, in opposition to those who rely on **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, firstly states that this tradition is among those that have never been authentically established. His emphasis on this point is so strong that it cannot escape the attention of those with sharp insight.

Secondly, he explicitly mentions that discussion about this tradition is well-known among scholars of tradition, who are well-aware of its flaws and criticisms, and they never regard it as authentic or established.

Thirdly, he indicates that the weakness of this tradition is such that acting upon it is not valid even in the smallest rulings of the Shariah, let alone in such a significant and serious matter as the authoritativeness of a companion’s statement.

In these three points, there is clear evidence of the flawed reasoning of those who rely on this apparent fabrication and its evident weakness.

Forty-Ninth Reason: Allamah Shaukani, in his book al-Qaul al-Mufid fi Adillah al-Ijtihad wa al-Taqleed, has also criticized and disparaged Hadees-e-Nujoom
Allamah Shaukani, in his book **al-Qaul al-Mufid fi Adillah al-**

Ijtihad wa al-Taqlēd, devoted significant attention to critiquing and discrediting **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, pursuing its refutation with meticulous effort. In the section where he addresses the arguments of the followers of emulation (*taqlēd*) and responds to them, he states, “Among the evidence they rely upon is the narration, ‘My companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided.’ The response is that this tradition has been narrated through various chains from Jabir and Ibn Umar. However, the leading scholars of criticism and evaluation (*jarh wa ta’deel*) have explicitly stated that none of these chains are authentic and that this tradition has not been proven to be from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). The experts of traditions have thoroughly discussed it in a manner that suffices and provides clarity. Anyone wishing to examine its chains and their weakness can do so by consulting relevant books on this subject. Briefly, this tradition does not provide any valid proof.”

From this skilfully crafted passage, it is clear and evident that Allama Shaukani elucidated and exposed the flaws and deficiencies of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** in the following ways:

Firstly, he indicated that the scholars of criticism and evaluation have explicitly stated that none of the chains of transmitters of **Hadees-e-Nujoom** are authentic.

Secondly, he conveyed that the scholars of criticism and evaluation have stated that this tradition has not been proven to be from the Noble Messenger (s.a.w.a.).

Thirdly, he clarified that the experts of traditions (*huffaaz*) have discussed this tradition in a manner that is both comprehensive and sufficient.

Fourthly, he explained that anyone who wishes to investigate the chains of transmitters of this tradition and their weaknesses can easily do so by consulting one of the books dedicated to this field.

Fifthly, at the end of his statement, he made an admission full of fairness, acknowledging that no valid proof can be established based on this tradition.

In these five points, there is sufficient evidence to silence the stubborn opponent and quell his objections.

Fiftieth Reason: Waliullah Ibn Habibullah Lakhnawi criticized the authenticity of Hadees-e-Nujoom

Waliullah ibn Habibullah Lakhnawi made commendable efforts in criticising **Hadees-e-Nujoom**, drawing upon the insights of earlier scholars and the analyses of later ones to disparage and undermine this narration. He contributed with precision and rigour to refute the claims of those who attempted to bolster their arguments using such narrations.

In his commentary on **Sharh Musallam al-Suboot**, after mentioning the arguments of some Ahle Tasannun scholars based on **Hadees-e-Iqtida** and **Hadees-e-Sunnatul Khulafa**, he writes, “As for countering these two traditions with the statement of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.), ‘My companions are like stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided’ which was narrated by Ibn Adi and Ibn Abd al-Barr, and with his statement, ‘Take half of your religion from Humaira’ (referring to Aisha), these imply the permissibility of following the opinions of any Companion, including Aisha, even if they contradict the opinions of the two Shaikhs (Abu Bakr and Umar) or the four Imams. This weakens your argument, as mentioned in **al-Mukhtasar** of Ibn Haajib. These can be refuted by stating that both narrations are weak.”

He continues in the footnote, “Regarding the second tradition, it is evident that it pertains to narration. As for the weakness of the first, Ahmad (Ibn Hanbal) stated, ‘This tradition is not authentic’ and Bazzar said, ‘Such a statement cannot be authentically attributed to the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.)’ As for the second narration, Zahabi classified it as a fabricated narration.”

Subki quoted his teacher as saying, “Any tradition that includes the term ‘Humaira’ has no basis, except for one tradition about women narrated by Nasai.” (As mentioned in **al-Taqreer**).

It is known that the first tradition, despite being narrated in the collections considered reliable by scholars, such as from Umar, his son (Abdullah), Jabir, Ibn Abbas, and Anas, with varying wordings, has its closest version to the mentioned wording as recorded by Ibn Adi in **al-Kamil** and Ibn Abd al-Barr in **Kitab Bayan al-Ilm**. In this version, Ibn Umar narrates that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, “The example of my companions is like the stars; whichever of them you follow, you will be guided.”

However, none of these narrations are authentic. This was stated by Ahmad Ibn Hanbal and Bazzar. Ibn Hazm, in his major epistle, declared it as “Fabricated, falsely attributed, and invalid.”

Nevertheless, there is an authentic tradition that conveys a part of its meaning. This is the tradition narrated by Abu Musa Ash’ari, where the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) said, “The stars are the safeguard of the heavens; when the stars disappear, what has been promised to the heavens will befall them. I am the safeguard of my companions; when I am gone, what has been promised to my companions will befall them. My companions are the safeguard of my community; when my companions are gone, what has been promised to my community will befall them.”

This was quoted in **al-Taysir** from **al-Taqreer**.

Regarding the second tradition (about Humaira), it has been mentioned that Hafiz Imad al-Deen Ibn Kasir asked the two experts viz. Mizzi and Zahabi, about it, and neither of them acknowledged it. It was also reported that many other scholars of traditions held a similar view. Zahabi classified it as one of the weak narrations with no known chain of transmitters. Subki and Hafiz Abu Hajjaj Mizzi both said, “Any tradition that includes the term ‘Humaira’ has no basis except for one narration related to women, recorded by Nasai.”

Thus, neither of these two traditions can serve as a valid counterargument against the earlier narrations.

Biography of Maulvi Waliullah Ibn Habibullah Lakhnavi

Maulvi Waliullah Lakhnavi is among the great scholars and eminent religious figures recognized by the Ahle Tasannun of this region (i.e. the Indian subcontinent). Some of his virtues and achievements should be noted.

Maulvi Waliullah himself in **Aghsaan-e-Arba'ah** while mentioning the children of his father, Maulvi Habibullah writes, "The eldest among them, in age, is the writer of these lines. I studied briefly under my noble father, completing elementary texts. From **Sharh Jami** to **Musallam al-Suboot**, I pursued studies under my uncle, Mullah Mubeen. After completing my education, I spent some time refining my learning, devoting much of my time to studying the works of earlier scholars and thoroughly examining the opinions of later scholars without neglecting even the smallest detail. I dedicated my life to teaching students of knowledge and spent a portion of my time authoring books.

I have faced many hardships but found divine protection and support to prevail over all difficulties. From the onset of youth, I was grieved by the loss of children. After the birth of children, I suffered the pain of their deaths. Now that I have passed sixty years of age, Allah the Almighty has blessed me with two sons and one daughter. May He, the Exalted, nurture them under His protection, grant them a natural lifespan, and bestow upon them knowledge and virtue. Verily, He has power over all things."

Maulvi Muhammad Inamullah, the son of Waliullah, stated in the appendix of **Aghsaan-e-Arba'ah** regarding his father:

"The blessed personality of his excellency was a master of both the transmitted and rational sciences, comprehensively knowledgeable in the branches and principles of Islamic disciplines. He was the author of numerous works, such as **Sharh Musallam al-Suboot** entitled **Nafaaes al-Malakoot**, the commentary **Ma'dan al-Jawaahir** with detailed explanations, **Hashiya Hidayat al-Fiqh** on acts of worship

and transactions, **Hashiya on Hashiya Kamaaliya – Sharh Aqaaed-e-Jalali, Hashiya Zawaaed Salaasah, Hashiya Sadra, Sharh Ghaayah al-Uloom, Ma’arij al-Uloom, Tazkerah al-Mizan**, the supplement to **Sharh-e-Sullam** by Maulvi Abdul Haqq, the supplement to **Sharh Sullam** by Mullah Hasan, **Risaalah Tashkeek, Kashf al-Asrar fi Khawass Sayyid al-Abrar, Mirat al-Momineen wa Tanbih al-Ghaafeleen fi Manaajib al-Sayyid al-Mursalin, Aadaab al-Salaateen, Umdah al-Wasaael**, and this treatise entitled **Aghsan-e-Arba’ah**. His writings remain a legacy in the world.

In summary, he devoted his entire precious life to authoring works and teaching students of knowledge. Many benefited from his knowledge, and his students became prominent and respected scholars. In the view of the noble class and rulers of Awadh, he was honoured and distinguished, attaining high positions and consequently becoming envied. At the age of eighty-eight, on the 10th of Safar, he departed for the divine mercy of the Most High, uttering words of remembrance. The year of his passing, as mentioned by Hakim Zahiruddin Jawad Fatehpuri, is affirmed and evident.

The pillar of religion, Maulvi Waliullah, with his superior grace and perfection in knowledge,

Responded with his life to a calling he had heard from the most exalted tongue.

In his uniqueness, which lay in his qualities granted by the Almighty, Glorious and Majestic,

It can be said, without effort or defect, that the year of his passing is free from flaw or imperfection.

With his departure, piety, the Sharia, virtue, knowledge, and action became disoriented and unstable.

Fifty-First Reason: Maulvi Siddiq Hasan Khan, in his book *Husul al-Ma’mul min Ilm al-Usul* critiqued *Hadees-e-Nujoom*

Maulvi Siddiq Hasan Khan, a contemporary scholar, in his book

Husul al-Ma'mul min Ilm al-Usul, despite initially referencing **Hadees-e-Nujoom** when discussing the issue of the justice of the Companions (*adaalah al-Sahabah*), ultimately acknowledges its criticism and weak status. He chronicles, "The discussion about the justice of a narrator pertains only to those other than the Companions. As for the Companions, there is no such issue because their justice is presumed. The Qazi said, 'This is the view of the predecessors (*salaf*) and the majority of the successors (*khalaf*).' Juwaini mentioned that there is consensus on this. The basis of this view lies in the general evidence from the Quran and Sunnah that affirm their justice. For example, the verses, '**You are the best nation**¹', '**We have made you a just nation**²', '**Allah is pleased with the believers**³', '**The forerunners**⁴', '**And those who are with him are severe against the disbelievers and merciful among themselves**⁵'.

Moreover, the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) said, 'The best generation is my generation.' He (s.a.w.a.) also said about them, 'If one of you were to spend gold equivalent to Mount Uhud, it would not equal a single measure or half a measure of what they gave.' Both these narrations are authentic (sahih).

As for the statement, '*My Companions are like the stars,*' there is a well-known debate about its authenticity.⁶

From this statement, it is evident that there is a well-known discourse regarding **Hadees-e-Nujoom**. The intended meaning of this well-known discourse is the condemnation and weakening of this narration, which has been repeatedly expressed by great and distinguished scholars of Ahle Tasannun, compelled by the Almighty.

¹ Surah Aal-e-Imran (3): Verse110

² Surah Baqarah (2): Verse 143

³ Surah Fath (48): Verse18

⁴ Surah Taubah (9): Verse100

⁵ Surah Fath (48): Verse 29

⁶ Husul al-Ma'mul min Ilm al-Usul, p. 56, Chapter on the Definition of Sahih

Beautiful Research with Subtle Precision Indication

It is worth mentioning that the tradition in **Sahih Muslim**, which mentions the stars as a safeguard for the heavens and the companions as a safeguard for the community, and which was previously mentioned incidentally in some earlier statements, although not identical to the **Hadees-e-Nujoom** under discussion, does not in any way benefit the supporters of **Hadees-e-Nujoom**. It does not free the grip of those who cling to and rely on it from the hands of precise critics and scrutinizers.

The detailed explanation of this summary is that this tradition is mentioned in **Sahih Muslim** with the following wordings:

Narrated to us Abu Bakr Ibn Abi Shaibah, Ishaq Ibn Ibrahim, and Abdullah Ibn Amr Ibn Aban, all from Husain. Abu Bakr said, ‘Husain Ibn Ali Jo’fi narrated to us from Majma’ Ibn Yahya, from Saeed Ibn Abi Burdah from Abu Burdah, from his father, who reports, ‘We prayed Maghrib (evening prayer) with the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.), then we said, ‘Let us stay here until we pray Isha (night prayer) with him.’ So, we stayed. He (s.a.w.a.) came out to us and said, ‘Are you still here?’ We replied, “O Messenger of Allah! We prayed Maghrib with you, and then we said we would stay until we pray Isha with you.” He said, ‘You have done well’ or ‘You have acted rightly.’

Then he raised his head to the sky—he would often raise his head to the sky—and said: “The stars are a safeguard for the sky, and when the stars are gone, what has been promised to the sky will come. I am a safeguard for my companions, and when I am gone, what has been promised to my companions will come. My companions are a safeguard for my nation, and when my companions are gone, what has been promised to my nation will come.

It is evident to the utmost clarity that the basis of this narration rests on Abu Musa Ashari, whose immense disgrace and significant scandals are innumerable. A portion of his inadequacies has been explained in my book **Istiqsaa al-Ifhaam** in such a manner that,

after reviewing it, no rational individual will harbour doubt or uncertainty about the wretched state and doomed fate of Abu Musa. Therefore, I direct the insightful reader to the aforementioned book, and here I suffice with some narrations and statements from prominent scholars of Ahle Tasannun that reveal the dubious nature of Abu Musa as a transmitter of traditions.

Abu Dawud Sulaiman Ibn Dawud Tayalisi chronicles in his **Musnad**:

Narrated to us by Wahb Ibn Khalid from Dawud from Abu Nadrah from Abu Said Khudri: Ashari sought permission to enter upon Umar three times, but he was not granted permission, so he turned back. Umar then sent for him and said:

“Indeed, I sought permission three times but was not granted it. I heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) say, ‘When one seeks permission to enter and is not granted it, he should turn back.’ Umar replied, ‘You must bring someone who knows this (or understands it), or else I will deal with you severely!’

Abu Saeed said, ‘Ashari came to me trembling, his face pale, and he stood before a gathering of the companions of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.). He said, ‘I implore anyone who knows knowledge of this to stand with me, for I fear this man (Umar) will act against me!’ I said, ‘I am with you’ and another said, ‘I am with you as well.’ This calmed him.

Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Hanbal Shaibani said in his **Musnad**:

Narrated to us by Sufyan, who narrated from Yazid ibn Khasifah, from Busr ibn Sa’id, from Abu Sa’id al-Khudri:

I was sitting in a gathering of the Ansar when Abu Musa came to us as if he were frightened. He said, ‘Umar commanded me to come to him, so I went and sought permission three times but was not granted it, so I returned. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘If one seeks permission three times and is not granted it, he should turn back.’ Umar said, ‘You must bring evidence for what you say, or I will punish you severely.’

Abu Saeed said, ‘Abu Musa came to us frightened—or perhaps

alarmed—and said, ‘I call you to bear witness.’ Ubayy ibn Ka’b said, ‘Only the youngest among you will stand with you.’ Abu Saeed continued, ‘I was the youngest of them, so I stood with him and testified that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘If one seeks permission three times and is not granted it, he should turn back.’¹

Ahmad ibn Hanbal also said in his *Musnad*:

Narrated to us by Yazid from Dawud from Abu Nadrah from Abu Saeed Khudri, “Abu Musa sought permission to enter upon Umar three times but was not granted it, so he turned back. Umar met him and said, ‘What made you turn back?’

He replied, ‘I heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) say, ‘If one seeks permission three times and is not granted it, he should turn back.’ Umar said, ‘You must bring proof for this, or I will punish you severely.’

Abu Musa went to the gathering of his people and implored them by Allah Almighty. I said, ‘I will stand with you’ and they bore witness to it. Thus, Umar let them go.²

Ahmad also recorded in his **Musnad**, “Narrated to us by Zaid Ibn Harun from Dawud from Abu Nadrah from Abu Saeed Khudri, ‘Abu Musa sought permission to enter upon Umar thrice but was not granted, so he turned back. Umar met him and said, ‘What made you turn back?’ He replied, ‘I heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) say, ‘If one seeks permission three times and is not granted it, he should turn back.’

Umar said, ‘You must bring proof for this, or I will punish you severely.’

Abu Musa went to the gathering of his people, imploring them by Allah Almighty. I said, ‘I will stand with you’ and they bore witness to

¹ Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, vol. 3, p. 374, H. 10646

² Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, vol. 3, p. 396, H. 10761

it. Thus, Umar let him go.¹

Abu Muhammad Abdullah Ibn Abd al-Rahman Darimi Samarqandi stated in his **Musnad**, “Abu al-Numan narrated to us saying, ‘Yazid Ibn Zurai’ narrated to us from Dawud from Abu Nadrah from Abu Saeed Khudri that Abu Musa Ashari sought permission to enter upon Umar three times, but he was not granted permission, so he returned. Umar asked him, ‘What made you return?’ Abu Musa replied, ‘I heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) say, ‘If someone seeking permission is not granted it after three attempts, they should leave.’ Umar said, ‘You must bring someone to testify with you for this, or else, I will take action against you.’

Abu Saeed narrated, ‘Abu Musa came to us while we were sitting in the mosque, among a group of the companions of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.). He was distressed by Umar’s threat. He stood before us and said, ‘I adjure you by Allah! Is there anyone among you who heard this from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) who will bear witness for me?’ I raised my head and said, ‘Inform him that I am with you on this’ and others also affirmed the same. This alleviated Abu Musa’s distress.²

Bukhari records in his **Sahih**, “Muhammad Ibn Salam narrated to us saying, ‘Makhlad Ibn Yazid informed us from Ibn Juraij from Ata from Ubaid Ibn Umair that Abu Musa Ashari sought permission to enter upon Umar Ibn Khattab, but he was not granted permission, as it appeared Umar was busy. Abu Musa then left. When Umar became free, he inquired, ‘Did I not hear the voice of Abdullah Ibn Qays? Grant him permission to enter.’ It was said to him, ‘He has already left.’ So, Umar called for him. When Abu Musa returned, he said, ‘We were commanded to do this (leave after three attempts).’ Umar responded, ‘You must bring proof for this.’

Abu Musa went to the gathering of the Ansar and asked them about

¹ Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, vol. 5, p. 561, H. 19178

² Sunan-e-Darimi, vol. 2, p. 355, H. 2629, Book of Seeking Permission, Chapter of Seeking Permission Thrice.

it. They said, ‘No one will testify to this for you except the youngest among us, Abu Saeed Khudri. So, he brought Abu Saeed Khudri with him. Umar then said, ‘This matter from the command of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) escaped me; I was preoccupied with trading in the markets’ meaning his involvement in business dealings.¹“

Bukhari also stated in his **Sahih**, “Ali Ibn Abdillah narrated to us from Sufyan from Yazid Ibn Khusaifah from Busr Ibn Saeed from Abu Saeed Khudri, who reports, “I was in a gathering of the Ansar when Abu Musa came as if he was alarmed. He said, ‘I sought permission to enter upon Umar thrice, but I was not granted permission, so I returned.’ Umar asked, ‘What stopped you?’ Abu Musa replied, ‘I sought permission thrice, but I was not granted it, so I returned. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) said, ‘If one of you seeks permission thrice and is not granted it, he should leave.’ Umar said, ‘You must bring proof for this. Is there anyone among you who heard this from the Prophet (s.a.w.a.)?’ Ubayy Ibn Ka’b said, ‘By Allah, no one will stand with you except the youngest of the people.’ I was the youngest of the group, so I stood with him and informed Umar that the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) said this.’

Ibn Mubarak reports from Ibn Uyaynah from Yazid from Busr Ibn Saeed, who said, ‘I heard Abu Saeed say this.’ Abu Abdillah (Bukhari) commented, ‘Umar sought verification, not that he rejected the report of a single narrator.’

Again, Bukhari chronicles in his **Sahih**, “Ata narrated to me from Ubaid Ibn Umair, who said, ‘Abu Musa sought permission to enter upon Umar, but it seemed that Umar was busy, so Abu Musa returned. Umar said, ‘Did I not hear the voice of Abdullah Ibn Qays? Grant him permission to enter.’ So, they called him back, and Umar asked, ‘What made you do what you did?’ Abu Musa replied, ‘We were commanded to do this.’ Umar said, ‘Bring me proof for this, or I will take action against you.’

¹ Sahih Bukhari, vol. 3, p. 6, Book of Selling

Abu Musa went to a gathering of the Ansar, and they said, “Only the youngest among us will testify.” Abu Saeed Khudri stood up and said, ‘We were indeed commanded to do this.’ Umar then said, ‘This matter of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) escaped me; I was preoccupied with trading in the markets.’¹“

Muslim records in his **Sahih**, “Abu Tahir narrated to me from Abdullah Ibn Wahb from Amr Ibn Haaris from Bukair Ibn Ashja’ from Busr Ibn Saeed that he heard Abu Saeed Khudri say, ‘We were in a gathering with Ubayy Ibn Ka’b when Abu Musa Ashari came, visibly upset, and stood before us. He said, ‘I ask you by Allah! Has anyone among you heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) say, ‘Seeking permission is to be done thrice; if you are granted permission, enter, and if not, leave?’ Ubayy asked, ‘What is this about?’

Abu Musa replied: ‘I sought permission to enter upon Umar Ibn Khattab yesterday thrice, but I was not granted permission, so I left. I came to him today, entered, and informed him that I had come yesterday, greeted thrice, and then left. Umar said, ‘We heard you, but we were preoccupied at the time. Why did you not wait until permission was granted?’ I said, ‘I sought permission as I heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) instruct.’ Umar replied, ‘By Allah! I will punish your back and your stomach unless you bring someone to testify to this.’

Ubayy Ibn Ka’b said, ‘By Allah! No one will stand with you except the youngest among us. Stand, O Abu Saeed!’ So, I stood and went to Umar and said, ‘I heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) say this.’²“

Muslim also stated in his **Sahih**, “Bring proof, or else I will take action!’ So, Abu Musa left. Umar said, ‘If he finds proof, you will find him by the pulpit in the evening, and if he does not find proof, you will not find him.’ When evening came, they found him there. Umar said, ‘O Abu Musa! What do you say? Have you found proof?’ Abu Musa replied, ‘Yes, Ubayy Ibn Ka’b.’ Umar said, ‘He is trustworthy.’

¹ Sahih Bukhari, vol. 8, p. 157, Book of Fastening to (Allah’s) Book

² Sahih Muslim, vol. 6, p. 178, Book of Etiquette, Chapter of Seeking Permission

Then he asked, ‘O Aba al-Tufail! What does he say?’ Ubayy responded, ‘I heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) say this, O son of Khattab! Do not be a source of hardship for the companions of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.)!’ Umar said, “Glory be to Allah! I merely heard something and wanted to verify it!”¹”

Abu Jafar Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Salamah Tahawi writes in his book **Mushkil al-Aasaar**, “Yunus Ibn Abd al-A’la narrated to us from Abdullah Ibn Wahb from Amr Ibn Haaris from Bukair Ibn Ashajj from Busr Ibn Saeed who heard Abu Saeed Khudri say, ‘We were in a gathering with Ubayy Ibn Ka’b when Abu Musa Ashari came, visibly upset, and stood before us. He said, ‘I ask you by Allah! Has anyone among you heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) saying, ‘Seeking permission is to be done three times; if permission is granted, enter, and if not, leave?’

Ubayy asked, ‘What is this about?’ Abu Musa replied, ‘I sought permission to enter upon Umar Ibn Khattab yesterday thrice, but I was not granted permission, so I left. Today, I came and entered upon him, and I informed him that I came yesterday, greeted three times, and then left.’ Umar replied, ‘We heard you, but we were preoccupied at the time. Why did you not wait until permission was granted?’ I said, ‘I sought permission as I heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) instruct.’ Umar said, ‘By Allah! I will strike your back and stomach unless you bring someone to testify to this!’

Ubayy Ibn Ka’b said, ‘By Allah, no one will stand with you except the youngest among us, the one next to you. Stand, O Abu Sa’id!’ So, I stood and went to Umar and said, ‘I heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.a.) peace be upon him and his family) say this.’²

¹ Sahih Muslim, vol. 6, p. 179, Book of Etiquette

² Mushkil al-Aasaar, vol. 1 p. 341, Chapter 174, H. 1184