

USUL HADITH

*a brief manual of*  
**Hadith Principles**



IMAM SAYYID SHARIF ALI AL-JURJANI

RIDAWI  
رضا  
PRESS

*a brief manual of*  
HADITH PRINCIPLES



USUL HADITH SERIES

*a brief manual of*  
**Hadith Principles**

IMĀM SAYYID SHARĪF ĀLĪ AL-JURJĀNĪ  
(740-816 AH / 1340-1413 CE)

*Translation and Notes*  
ABU HASAN





## **A Brief Manual of Ḥadīth Principles**

*by*

**Imām Sayyid Sharif Ālī al-Jurjānī**

*Translation and Footnotes*

**Abu Hasan**



### *Acknowledgements*

**Abu Nibras, Noori, Aqdas, Ūbaydullāh, Saiyed Ālī  
Hussain Ibrāhīm, Khālīd Khān**  
and to all others who contributed to this book

**A View of the Prophet's ﷺ Mosque**

Copyright © Ridawi Press

FIRST RELEASE: Ṣafar 1445/August 2023

Version 1.0

[feedback@ridawipress.org](mailto:feedback@ridawipress.org)  
[copyright@ridawipress.org](mailto:copyright@ridawipress.org)  
[complaints@ridawipress.org](mailto:complaints@ridawipress.org)  
[admin@ridawipress.org](mailto:admin@ridawipress.org)

*The translator can be contacted at:*  
[abu.hasan@ridawipress.org](mailto:abu.hasan@ridawipress.org)

Please include the name of the book in the subject of your mail for specific queries or comments. Permission is hereby granted to reproduce or utilise this material in any form or by any means, electronic or otherwise, as long as the content remains unchanged. This book is also made freely available by Ridawi Press and can be downloaded from: [www.ridawipress.org](http://www.ridawipress.org). Permission is granted to anyone to print this book for free distribution or for sale. Ridawi Press acknowledges that it costs money to print and distribute books, and it may therefore be necessary for publishers to recover this cost by selling it at a reasonable price. Ridawi Press does not benefit financially from the sale of these books, nor solicits any royalties. Permission is also granted to publishers to reprint in their own name provided the following notice is included in the colophon: "**Reprinted with royalty-free permission from Ridawi Press**".

# CONTENTS

## MONOGRAPH ON HADITH PRINCIPLES

Foreword		
Introduction	-----	1
<b>1 Kinds and Categories of Hadith</b>	-----	6
<i><b>Section One: Ṣaḥīḥ</b></i>	-----	6
<i>Grades of Ṣaḥīḥ</i>	-----	8
<i><b>Section Two: Ḥasan</b></i>	-----	12
<i>Types of Ḥasan</i>	-----	13
<i><b>Section Three: Ḍaʿīf</b></i>	-----	17
<i>Definition of Ḍaʿīf</i>	-----	17
<i><b>Terms and Definitions</b></i>	-----	19
<i>Musnad</i>	-----	19
<i>Muttaṣil</i>	-----	19
<i>Marfūʿ</i>	-----	19
<i>Muʾān-ʾān</i>	-----	20
<i>Muʾallaq</i>	-----	20
<i>Afrād</i>	-----	21
<i>Mudraj</i>	-----	22
<i>Mashʿhūr</i>	-----	23
<i>Gharīb-ʾAzīz</i>	-----	24

	<i>Muṣaḥḥaf</i>	-----	26
	<i>Musalsal</i>	-----	26
	<i>Iýtibār</i>	-----	28
	<b><i>Terms Specifically Used with Weak Narrations</i></b>	-----	28
	<i>Mawqūf</i>	-----	29
	<i>Maqṭūú</i>	-----	30
	<i>Mursal</i>	-----	30
	<i>Munqaṭiý</i>	-----	31
	<i>Múḍal</i>	-----	31
	<i>Shādh – Munkar</i>	-----	31
	<i>Muállal</i>	-----	32
	<i>Mudallas</i>	-----	34
	<i>Mudṭarib</i>	-----	36
	<i>Maqlūb</i>	-----	37
	<i>Mawḏūú - Forgeries</i>	-----	38
<b>2</b>	<b>Appraisal of Narrators: Criticism and Approval</b>	-----	43
	<b><i>Section One: Uprightness and Meticulousness</i></b>	-----	44
	<b><i>Section Two: Criticism and Indictment</i></b>	-----	46
<b>3</b>	<b>Receiving and Conveying Hadith (Tahammul, Ada)</b>	-----	48
	<i>1. Samāá</i>	-----	49
	<i>2. Qirā'ah</i>	-----	49
	<i>3. Ijāzah</i>	-----	49

4. <i>Munāwalah</i>	-----	50
5. <i>Mukātabah</i>	-----	51
6. <i>Iylām</i>	-----	51
7. <i>Wijādah</i>	-----	52
<b>4 Biographies</b>	-----	54
<i>Appendix A: The Fabricated Ḥadīth of Storks</i>	-----	57
<i>Appendix B: About the Author: Imām Sharīf Jurjānī</i>	-----	73
<i>Appendix C: Sources</i>	-----	85
Transliteration Key	-----	86
About the Translator	-----	90



## FOREWORD

Praise be to Allāh, blessings and greetings of peace upon His beloved Messenger and our master Muḥammad ﷺ.

This monograph on ḥadīth principles by Imām Sayyid-Sharīf is an excellent introduction to hadith sciences and nomenclature for students and non-specialists alike. This started off as an appendix to the translation of Imām Nawawī's *Arbayīn*. However, a plain translation of a brevilouquent epistle would be daunting to the non-specialist, and perhaps fail spectacularly in its stated purpose of enlightening the beginner. Hence, explanatory footnotes were indispensable, and kept piling up until eventually, what was expected to be an 'appendix' reached the size of the main work (i.e. *Arbayīn*). After consultation with reviewers, it was decided to release this as a separate work.

Many thanks to brothers, especially *ulamā*, who assisted in proofreading and in reviewing this work. Any mistakes that still remain are owing to my own shortcomings and gaps in knowledge. We ask Allāh tāālā to forgive us for our lapses.

*Wa billahi't tawfiq.*

***Abū Ḥasan***

20<sup>th</sup> May 2023 / 1<sup>st</sup> Dhu'l Qaádah 1444





## *In the Name of Allāh, the Most Beneficent, the Merciful*

This is a short and concise epistle on the principles of ḥadīth, which is comprised of an introduction and objectives in four chapters.

## INTRODUCTION

**Matn:** The text of the ḥadīth; the exact wording of the ḥadīth which imparts meaning.<sup>1</sup>

**Ḥadīth:** means speech in general<sup>2</sup> [i.e. literally], and it is not just the speech of RasūlAllāh ﷺ or the speech of the companions or their followers – and their affirmations.<sup>3</sup>

**Sanad:** description of the route<sup>4</sup> by which the text [*matn*] is transmitted.

**Isnād:** recounting the route of the ḥadīth, reaching until the speaker.<sup>5</sup>  
**Sanad** and **Isnād** are close in meaning; and a ḥadīth is deemed sound/authentic or weak based on these two aspects.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In a ḥadīth, the portion starting from where the chain of authority [*sanad*] ends; the portion which contains the words of the ḥadīth – i.e., the actual information being conveyed – be it the speech, action or implicit affirmation of RasūlAllāh ﷺ [Tabrīzī].

<sup>2</sup> However, in Islāmic terminology **ḥadīth** refers to the speech, action and affirmation of the Prophet ﷺ; also extended to refer to the speech of Companions or their followers.

<sup>3</sup> *Taqrīr* = Affirmation, consent, acceptance.

<sup>4</sup> The chain of transmission.

<sup>5</sup> The Prophet ﷺ, in case of *marfūʿ*, or Ṣaḥābah and Ṭābiʿīn in non-*marfūʿ* narrations.

<sup>6</sup> According to Ibn Jamāʾah, both terms are one and the same thing. [*Manḥal al-Rawī*, p.30]. Also, Ibn Ḥajar used one definition for the other in his *Nuzʿhah*, as noted by his student Sakhāwī in his commentary on Ḥafṣī's *Alfiyyah*: “As our shaykh said in the commentary of *Nukhbah*: [*Isnād*] ‘...is the route that connects to the text [*matn*]’ even though he said elsewhere that ‘[*Isnād*] is the recounting of the route [connecting] to the text.’ Even though, it is the definition of *sanad*.” [*Fatḥ al-Mughīth*, 1/23].

***Al-Khabar al-Mutawātir*** [Massively Reported]: A report whose narrators are so many in number, that it is ordinarily impossible<sup>7</sup> for all of them to have conspired together to establish and perpetuate a lie.

And this feature of multiple reporters should be all along the chain – in the beginning, the middle and the end.<sup>8</sup> Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ has said: Whoever seeks a ḥadīth that matches the above description will be frustrated in his attempts to find it. The ḥadīth: “***Actions are according to intentions***”<sup>9</sup> is not [among *Mutawātir* ḥadīth] – even though it has been reported by a number far greater than that required for it to be *mutawātir*; because it suddenly expands in the middle.<sup>10</sup>

However, the ḥadīth: “***Whoever attributes a lie to me deliberately, then let him reserve a seat for himself in Hellfire***”<sup>11</sup> is *mutawātir*. A multitude of companions have reported this ḥadīth. It is said that forty companions have reported [from RasūlAllāh ﷺ]; some said it is narrated by 62 companions, including the ten who were given glad tidings of Paradise [*āsharah mubash’sharah*], and the number of narrators continues to rise.

---

<sup>7</sup> It beggars belief that so many people would have colluded to create, propagate and sustain a lie. For example, Imām Ḥusayn ibn Ālī was martyred in Karbala – this is a *mutawātir* report. The details of the tragic event might be disputed or argued against; but inasmuch as Imām Ḥusayn was martyred by Yazid’s army – it is a *mutawātir* report.

<sup>8</sup> The ḥadīth is reported by multiple narrators in each generation.

<sup>9</sup> *Bukhārī* §1; *Muslim* §1907. *ṣaḥīḥ-gharīb* narration.

<sup>10</sup> This is because the ḥadīth was initially reported by only one Companion: Ūmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb ؓ. Only Ālqamah narrates from him - and only Ibrāhīm al-Taymiyy reports from him – and only Yaḥyā ibn Saʿyid reports from him. However, more than 250 narrators have reported from Yaḥyā, as mentioned by Naqqāsh. [*Fat’h al-Bari*, 1/17; *Tadrib al-Rāwī*, 1/355].

<sup>11</sup> *Bukhārī*, §110; Preface of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.

**Aâḥād:** [Lone narrator<sup>12</sup>] Reports that do not have as many narrators as the massively reported [*tawâtur*], which also includes *mustafîd*<sup>13</sup> reports. Ibn al-Jawzî<sup>14</sup> has said: It is impossible to estimate the number of ḥadīth in existence, even though many scholars have tried to enumerate the corpus of ḥadīth. According to Imām Aḥmad [ibn Ḥanbal] there were nearly 750,000 [ṣāḥih] ḥadīth, as he has said: “I have compiled my *Musnad* from more than 750,000 ḥadīth; if you differ on a matter, refer to it – and if you do not find a ḥadīth in it, then it is not reliable.”<sup>15</sup> The numbers [of ḥadīth] mentioned [in Imām Aḥmad’s quote] refer to the routes – not the ḥadīth narrations per se.<sup>16</sup>




---

<sup>12</sup> **Aḥād** – single; **Aâḥād**, plural of ‘single’; i.e. category of singles. Literally it means “sole narrator,” but in ḥadīth terminology this applies to even those ḥadīth which are reported by two or even three narrators. These are known as “lone,” to differentiate from “massively reported” or *mutawâtir* [*Tabrizî*]. **Aâḥād** are further sub-categorised as: *Mash’hûr*, *Âzîz* and *Gharîb* [*Zafar al-Amânî*], which will be explained further below.

<sup>13</sup> **Mustafîd:** ample, plenty. When there are two or more narrators for the same ḥadīth, jurists term it *mustafîd*, and ḥadīth scholars term it *mash’hûr*. Some other scholars have said that both are different and have specific attributes [*Tabrizî*].

<sup>14</sup> Imām Jamāluddīn Abu’l Faraj Âbdu’l Raḥmān ibn al-Jawzî [d. 597 AH].

<sup>15</sup> *Fa laysa bi-ḥujjah*: Lit. “then it cannot be used as evidence”.

<sup>16</sup> We have seen that a ḥadīth is composed of two parts: the chain of authorisation [*sanad*] and the text [*matn*] of the ḥadīth. A piece of information [text/matn] can be conveyed through multiple routes [as we have just seen, the ḥadīth: ‘**whoever deliberately attributes a lie to me...**’ is said to have been reported by 62 companions by the author of this work]. Murtaḍā Zabīdī has listed 98 companions in his *Al-La’ālī al-Mutanāthirah*, wherein he also says that Al-Îrāqī has cited Nawawī as saying that nearly 200 companions have narrated this ḥadīth. The text however is one – the routes of delivery are multiple and each route would be counted as a distinct ḥadīth. Thus, a single piece of information [text/matn] and 98 companions narrating it would count as 98 ḥadīth according to Imām Aḥmad’s description.

## OBJECTIVES

Know, that the text of the ḥadīth in itself, cannot be a basis upon which a ḥadīth is graded, except in rare cases. Rather, the grade of ḥadīth – whether it is a strong or a weak narration, or in between – is derived according to the states and attributes of the narrators (in that chain); and it depends on each narrator being upright and accurate or otherwise. Or, by the status of the chain of transmission [*isnād*] – whether it is continuous, interrupted, skipped [*irsāl*] or indeterminate [*muḍṭarib*]. Thus, based on the above factors, a hadith can be classified as:

- a) **Ṣaḥīḥ** – Sound
- b) **Ḍaʿīf** – Weak
- c) **Ḥasan** – Fair

These terms are used to describe the actual ḥadīth narration.<sup>17</sup>



If one looks at the attributes of narrators, such descriptions are used:

- The narrator is trustworthy [*thiqah*]; upright [*ʿād*l]; meticulous [*dābiṭ*].

Or that he is:

- **not** trustworthy [*ghayru thiqah*]
- indicted [*muttaham*]

---

<sup>17</sup> The actual **text** of the ḥadīth cannot be the basis of classification, as mentioned earlier, except in a few cases, such as exaggerated praise or condemnation of something or someone. Thus, when we say a ḥadīth is sound/ṣaḥīḥ, it actually means that it has been narrated via an uninterrupted chain of reliable, truthful and trustworthy narrators.

- an unknown narrator [*maj'hūl*]
- liar, dishonest [*kadhūb*]

and other such descriptions. It is then necessary to investigate the state of the narrator by reviewing critiques [*jarh*] and approvals [*tādīl*].<sup>18</sup>



When we consider the manner of receiving the ḥadīth and the modes in which the ḥadīth was transmitted [*akhdh-taḥammul-adā*], the discussion turns toward the attributes of the seeker of ḥadīth [i.e., *awṣāf al-ṭālib*; the manner in which the ḥadīth was received<sup>19</sup>].



When the discussion is about the names of the narrators, their ancestry or appellations,<sup>20</sup> we examine the personal details of the narrators and establish their identities.



These objectives are explained in four chapters.




---

<sup>18</sup> That is critiques or approvals of narrators in the *jarh-tādīl* literature or in narrator biographies, in which reports and opinions of authorities and well-known specialists of this science can be found.

<sup>19</sup> Various modes of receiving such as, *qirā'ah*: the ḥadīth was read out by the narrator or read out in front of him; *samā'a*: hearing of the ḥadīth; *ijāzah*: permission granted to narrate the ḥadīth; *munāwalah*: handing over written ḥadīth with permission to narrate.

<sup>20</sup> *Ansāb*: ascription towards ancestors, tribes, places of origin etc.

# CHAPTER ONE: KINDS AND CATEGORIES OF ĤADĪTH

(There are three sections in this chapter)

## SECTION ONE: ŞAHĪĤ (SOUND)

It is that Ĥadīth:

- whose chain of transmission is continuous [*muttaṣil*]
- which is narrated by upright, meticulous, accurate<sup>21</sup> narrators
- in which, each narrator reports from another who is similar to himself in attribute (i.e. upright and meticulous)
- in which, such a chain of transmission is safe from anomalies [*shudhūdh*] and subtle defects [*illaḥ*].

The meanings of the terms we use are as follows:

**Continuous** [*muttaṣil*]: There is no interruption in the chain in any manner.

**Upright** [*ādil*]: The narrator's state of being upright is not unknown or concealed; nor is the person's [character] criticised [*majrūḥ*].

**Accurate, Precise** [*dābiṭ*]: One who has preserved the Ĥadīth,<sup>22</sup> is alert and attentive.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> **Dābiṭ**: Precise, accurate, exact; meticulous.

<sup>22</sup> **Ĥāfiẓ**: literally, one who has memorised narrations or has extensive knowledge of hadith. Lucknawi says that in the parlance of Ĥadīth scholars, Ĥāfiẓ is the title given to a scholar who has in-depth knowledge of 100,000 Ĥadīth.

<sup>23</sup> **Mutayaqqiẓ**: Alert, attentive, aware; one who is not careless or forgetful.

**Anomaly** [*shudhūd*]: When a trustworthy narrator narrates a report which is in stark contradiction to the reports of all others.

**Subtle Defects** [*illah*]: Defects due to factors that are obscure<sup>24</sup> and abstruse; and hard to detect flaws.

Further, ṣaḥīḥ narrations differ in ranking based on various conditions for their being classed as ṣaḥīḥ.<sup>25</sup>

Imām Bukhārī<sup>26</sup> was the first to compile a book with exclusively ṣaḥīḥ narrations, followed by Imām Muslim.<sup>27</sup> The ṣaḥīḥ collections of these two scholars are the most reliable books [in Islām] after the Book of Allāh, the Most Glorious.

As for Imām Shāfiʿī's ﷺ statement: "I do not know of any book after the Book of Allāh, which is more accurate and reliable, than the *Muwattaʿ* of Imām Mālik"<sup>28</sup> – this was said before the two Ṣaḥīḥ compilations [of Bukhārī and Muslim] came into existence.



---

<sup>24</sup> Hidden from the majority but there are experts who are able to identify such defects.

<sup>25</sup> Imāms of ḥadīth have differing conditions for a narration to be considered as ṣaḥīḥ; and based on which, ṣaḥīḥ narrations fall in different grades as explained further.

<sup>26</sup> Imām Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl ibn Bardizbah al-Bukhārī [194-256 AH].

<sup>27</sup> Imām Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj al-Qushayri [d.261 AH].

<sup>28</sup> Brief bios of Imām Mālik and Imām Shāfiʿī follow.



## GRADES OF ṢAḤĪḤ

There are seven grades of ṣaḥīḥ narrations:

1. The highest grade of ṣaḥīḥ narrations are those which are found in both Bukhārī and Muslim.<sup>29</sup>
2. The ḥadīth found in Bukhārī.
3. The ḥadīth found in Muslim.
4. A ḥadīth that meets the conditions of both Bukhārī and Muslim, but is not found in their respective ṣaḥīḥ collections.
5. The ḥadīth deemed ṣaḥīḥ according to Bukhārī's conditions.
6. The ḥadīth deemed ṣaḥīḥ according to Muslim's conditions.
7. Those ḥadīth validated as ṣaḥīḥ by other scholars.

A number of ḥadīth in the two ṣaḥīḥ works are mentioned without chains of transmission<sup>30</sup> – such narrations abound in Bukhārī, in topic headings and introductions; a few can also be found in the book of Muslim.

---

<sup>29</sup> The term used to describe this is: *muttafaq ālayh*; meaning, both the shaykhs [i.e. Bukhārī and Muslim] are in agreement that the narration is ṣaḥīḥ (because both have slightly differing criteria to consider a narration as ṣaḥīḥ).

<sup>30</sup> The chain in which one or more narrators are omitted from the beginning of the chain is known as *Muāllaq* [suspended]; sometimes, only the matn of the ḥadīth [or a portion of it] is mentioned, and the entire chain of transmission is omitted. In Bukhārī, topic headings are drawn from ḥadīth wordings, but without explicitly qualifying them as ḥadīth or providing the chain of authority. A comprehensive analysis of such ḥadīth in Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī, along with the investigation and affirmation of the actual chains of transmission, can be found in Imām Ibn Ḥajar's work *Taghliq al-Taāliq*.

If it is mentioned in words that clearly indicate it to be a ḥadīth, such as:

- So-and-so said [*qāla fulān*]
- So and so did [*faāla*]
- Commanded [*amara*]
- Narrated [*rawā*]
- Mentioned [*dhakara*]

then such a statement will be considered as a ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth [in spite of *isnād* not being mentioned].

However, if it is reported in words that do not imply that it is a ḥadīth [or a portion thereof], then it is not considered as a ṣaḥīḥ narration; however, its being mentioned in the ṣaḥīḥ collection indicates that it could have a basis in a ṣaḥīḥ report.

As for Ḥākim's<sup>31</sup> saying: Among the criteria chosen by Bukhārī and Muslim for selection of ḥadīth in their respective collections, is that:

- The ḥadīth should be narrated by a well-known<sup>32</sup> Companion from RasūlAllāh ﷺ; i.e., a Companion, from whom two or more trustworthy narrators have narrated;<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Imām Abū ʿAbdullāh Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥamduwayh, ibn al-Bayyī [d. 405 AH]. Author of *Al-Mustadrak*.

<sup>32</sup> That is, well-known among ḥadīth scholars [Tabrīzī].

<sup>33</sup> It is not necessary for all the narrators to have narrated the SAME ḥadīth; it is acceptable even if these are different narrations. This specification of “at least two narrators,” is to establish that the said companion is well-known and to establish the identity of the narrator – whether the Companion or the Follower – that at least two trustworthy narrators have narrated from them, proving that they are **not** unknown [*maj'hūl*].

- And a well-known Follower [*tābiyī*] narrates from such a Companion; i.e., a *tābiyī* from whom two or more trustworthy narrators have narrated;<sup>34</sup>
- And thus for each narrator, at every level in the chain.<sup>35</sup>

This statement<sup>36</sup> however, is debatable.<sup>37</sup>

According to Shaykh Muhiyuddin al-Nawawī,<sup>38</sup> the two imāms did not stipulate such a condition – because there are ḥadīth in (both collections) which are narrated with a single *isnād*, such as the ḥadīth: “Verily, actions<sup>39</sup> [are dependent on intentions..]” and other such ḥadīth which are plentiful in both the ṣaḥīḥ collections.

Ibn Ḥibbān<sup>40</sup> said about the ḥadīth: “Verily actions are dependent on intentions,” that it is narrated ONLY by the narrators of Madīnah. This is not found among either the ʿIrāqī narrators, or the Makkan narrators,

<sup>34</sup> Similar to above; if at least, two *thiqah* narrators have reported from a *tābiyī*, it proves that he is ‘well-known’ and his identity is not obscure.

<sup>35</sup> Ibn Ḥajar said: Even though the condition mentioned by Ḥākim may not hold good in the case of some companions whose ḥadīth are found in Bukhārī, yet it is valid in the case of all others after them (i.e. *tābiyī* and those who report from them) – for there is not a single ḥadīth in Bukhārī whose narrator has only one downstream narrator. [*Ẓafar al-Amānī*, p142].

<sup>36</sup> Imām Ḥākim has said this in his *Madʿkhal ilaʾl Iklīl*, in which he has described ten different kinds/levels of Ṣaḥīḥ narrations.

<sup>37</sup> Sakhāwī says in *Fatʿh al-Mughīth* 1/48 that Imām Ḥākim rescinded this position later.

<sup>38</sup> Muhiyuddīn Shaykh al-Islām Imām Yaḥyā ibn Sharaf al-Nawawī [d. 676 AH] – a brief biography of the imām is included in the English translation of *Arbaʿyīn* published by Ridāwī Press.

<sup>39</sup> The famous ḥadīth; shortened in the text as “Verily actions...” which is expanded here.

<sup>40</sup> Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad ibn Ḥibbān ibn Aḥmad al-Dārimī al-Bustī [d. 354 ], the author of *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* and *Kitāb al-Thiqāt*.

or those of the Levant or Egypt. The lone narrator of this ḥadīth is: Yaḥyā ibn Saʿyīd al-Qaṭṭān al-Anṣārī,<sup>41</sup> who narrates from

- Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Taymī,<sup>42</sup> who narrates from:
- Ālqamah,<sup>43</sup> who narrates from:
- ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb.<sup>44</sup>

Both Bukhārī and Muslim have reported thus; and so have Abū Dāwūd, Tirmidhī, Nasāʾī and Ibn Mājah – with various narrators – but only AFTER Yaḥyā.<sup>45</sup>



---

<sup>41</sup> Imām Yaḥyā ibn Saʿyīd al-Qaṭṭān al-Tamīmī [d. 120-198 AH]. He is among the greatest ḥadīth scholars, *Amīr al-Muʾminīn fīʾl Ḥadīth* of his time, and a prominent student of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah.

<sup>42</sup> Imām Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥārith ibn Khālid al-Taymī al-Madani [d.120 AH].

<sup>43</sup> Imām Ālqamah ibn Waqqāṣ ibn Miḥṣan ibn Kaladah al-Laythī al-Madani.

<sup>44</sup> Amīr al-Muʾminin – the second rightly guided caliph – ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb ؓ.

<sup>45</sup> That is only Yaḥyā reports from the Companion.

## SECTION TWO: ĤASAN (FAIR)

Tirmidhī has described<sup>46</sup> it as the ĥadīth in whose chain, none of the narrators is accused,<sup>47</sup> nor is the narration *shādh*,<sup>48</sup> and it is reported via other routes as well.<sup>49</sup>

According to Khaṭṭābī,<sup>50</sup> it is that ĥadīth whose source is known and its narrators are well-known. A majority of ĥadīth narrations fall in this category.<sup>51</sup> As for interrupted [*munqaṭiʿī*] and similar narrations,<sup>52</sup> their sources are not ‘known’ [and therefore, cannot be considered ĥasan]. So also is the *mudallas* narration, if it is not clarified [that there is a concealment, i.e. *tadlīs*]. Some later scholars have said: [Ĥasan] is a narration with an element of weakness, even though it is close to being sound; due to the probability of [falsehood in it].<sup>53</sup> However, it is good enough for acting upon it.

---

<sup>46</sup> In his book *Al-Īlāl* which he appended to his *Al-Jāmiʿ*.

<sup>47</sup> Accused of lying or any other misdemeanour.

<sup>48</sup> See further below for a definition of *Shādh* narration.

<sup>49</sup> The conditions for *ḥasan* are similar to that of *ṣaḥīḥ* except for accuracy, as Ibn Ḥajar has said in *Nuzʿatuʾn Naẓar*: A *ḥasan* report is lesser to *ṣaḥīḥ* only in accuracy [of narrators] – but is the same in other attributes [of *ṣaḥīḥ*] – i.e., safe from anomalies [*shudhūd*] and subtle defects [*īlāl*], and reported via a continuous chain [*ittiṣāl*].

<sup>50</sup> Imām Abū Sulaymān Ḥamd ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Khaṭṭāb al-Bustī, al-Khaṭṭābī [d. 388 AH]; author of *Māālim al-Sunan*. His *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* is perhaps the first commentary on Bukhārī. He narrates from Imām Bukhārī via only two narrators.

<sup>51</sup> Ibn Daqīq argued that the same can be said about *ṣaḥīḥ* narrations: “whose sources are known and its narrators are well-known.”

<sup>52</sup> Such as *mawqūf*, *maqṭūʿ*, *mursal*, *mūdal*; definitions of all these follow.

<sup>53</sup> Due to unknown narrators in the chain and it is not known whether the skipped, missed and omitted narrators are truthful and trustworthy – or, weak or accused of lying.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ<sup>54</sup> has said: Ḥasan is of two types.

1. A report in whose chain of transmission [*isnād*] are narrators who may be unknown [with respect to their uprightness], but are not [unintelligent and] careless<sup>55</sup> in their narration; AND a similar ḥadīth is reported from a different route.
2. A report whose narrators<sup>56</sup> are known for truthfulness and honesty [*ṣidq-amānah*] – but fall short of the rank of ṣaḥīḥ-narrators in memory or accuracy, such that a solitary report by any such narrator is not deemed repudiated [*munkar*].<sup>57</sup>

Needless to say, both kinds should also be safe from anomalies [*shudūdh*] and subtle defects [*tālīl*].

The definition by later scholars<sup>58</sup> mentioned above is dependent on knowledge of Ṣaḥīḥ [sound] and Ḍaʿīf [weak] ḥadīth – because a Ḥasan [fair] narration falls in the middle.

---

<sup>54</sup> Imām Abū ʿAmr ʿUṯmān ibn ʿAbdu’l Raḥmān al-Shahrazūri, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ [577-643 AH].

<sup>55</sup> The person’s being upright may not be known, but he is not careless in receiving and delivering the report [Lucknawi, p.156] Tabrīzī contends that this description is self-contradictory and the author should have left it at ‘unknown state’; because, if the person is known to be careless, then he/she would not be ‘unknown’ and thus he would be classed as weak with certainty.

<sup>56</sup> This does not mean that every narrator is lesser than the ṣaḥīḥ narrators; rather even if all the narrators are trustworthy, but only a single narrator in the chain is lesser than the others – then the narration gets demoted to ḥasan and cannot be considered ṣaḥīḥ. [Summarised from Tabrīzī]

<sup>57</sup> See definition of *Munkar* where a solitary report may be rendered repudiated due to the status of the narrator.

<sup>58</sup> He refers to Ibn al-Jawzī [Lucknawi, p157].

[Ibn al-Jawzī's] saying "close to" means – the rank of the narrator of [a *ḥasan* hadith] is close to the rank of a *ṣaḥīḥ*-narrator, but the possibility of that narrator being a liar also exists, because the uprightness of all the narrators is not known.

The difference in the definitions of *ḥasan* and *ṣaḥīḥ* is that [overall,] the conditions for *ḥasan* are the same as *ṣaḥīḥ*– except that, in a *ṣaḥīḥ* narration, the uprightness of EVERY narrator should be known [with certainty], and every narrator should be highly accurate and an expert; but this is not a condition for a *ḥasan* report. It is therefore that we also stipulate: "it should be narrated via other routes [as well] which are similar," so that the narration is strengthened by other narrations.

As for a weak report, the narrators are far [lower] than the narrators of *ṣaḥīḥ* – and there is a possibility of either truth or falsehood<sup>59</sup> [on the part of the narrators] or essentially no probability of truth – as in the case of the *mawḍūʿ* ḥadīth [forgeries]. A ḥadīth is termed fair [*ḥasan*] based on the 'good opinion' about its narrators.

If it is said: *ḥasan* is either a *musnad*<sup>60</sup> report whose narrators are close to the rank of *thiqah* [trustworthy] narrators; or a *mursal-thiqah*,<sup>61</sup> and both types are reported via additional routes, and are safe from anomalies [*shudhūdh*] and subtle defects, then it would be a clear-cut and precise definition, and less complicated.

---

<sup>59</sup> It was mentioned earlier that it could be one or more narrators whose uprightness is not known; and hence, the narrator whose credentials are not known could possibly be truthful or a liar. In such a case, the report is deemed weak due to dubitable credentials. If the narrators are KNOWN to be liars, it is consigned to forgeries.

<sup>60</sup> The chain of narrators which is connected until RasūlAllāh ﷺ.

<sup>61</sup> A report in which a trustworthy narrator omits an upstream narrator from the chain.

And by **Musnad**, we mean, the report whose *isnād* is well connected until the end.<sup>62</sup> By **thiqah** or trustworthy, we mean: he is both upright and accurate. **Thiqah** mentioned above is not a specific narrator<sup>63</sup> as it will be presently discussed under the definition of **Mursal**.<sup>64</sup>

A *ḥasan* narration is evidence for acting upon, similar to *ṣaḥīḥ* narrations – therefore it was added along with *ṣaḥīḥ*.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ has said that Muḥiyus-Sunnah<sup>65</sup> was inexact in describing [all] the ḥadīth of *Sunan*<sup>66</sup> as *ḥasan* in his *Al-Maṣābīḥ* – because the *Sunan* also contain *ṣaḥīḥ* and *ḍaʿīf* [and not just *ḥasan*].

When Tirmidhī labels a ḥadīth **Ḥasan-Ṣaḥīḥ**, he means that it has been narrated via two routes. One of the routes qualifies to be *ṣaḥīḥ* and the other is *ḥasan*. Or he means the literal meaning of the word – that it is a ‘good’ narration and one is inclined towards it, and considers it as good. If a *ḥasan* report is narrated via another route, it may be upgraded to become *ṣaḥīḥ* – because it has two routes; each route bolsters the other. When we say “upgraded” we mean that, in its soundness, it is like *ṣaḥīḥ*; not that it has transformed into *ṣaḥīḥ* intrinsically [*bi ʾaynihi*].

---

<sup>62</sup> That is, reaches up to RasūlAllāh ﷺ.

<sup>63</sup> In the definition of *ḥasan* in the previous paragraph when he says: ‘the *mursal* of *thiqah*’ he does not refer to any specific *thiqah* narrator – it can be any *thiqah* [Lucknawi, p161].

<sup>64</sup> Tabrizī notes: this is a promise he did not keep. Meaning, he did not offer any further explanation while describing the *mursal* narration further below. The author is simply stating that *mursal* is a wide-spread practice among *thiqah* narrators.

<sup>65</sup> **The reviver of Sunnah**; the title of the vanquisher of heresies, Abū Muḥammad Ḥusayn ibn Masūūd ibn Muḥammad al-Farrāʾ al-Baghawī al-Shāfiʿī [433-516 AH].

<sup>66</sup> *Sunan* is pl. of *sunnah*; also the name of a specific category of ḥadīth compilations such as *Tirmidhī*, *Abū Dāwūd*, *Ibn Mājah* and *Nasāʾī*, which are known as *The Four Sunan*.



As for reports that are classed weak [*ḍaʿīf*] due to their narrator(s) being liars or profligates – merely being reported via multiple routes will not strengthen it, such as the ḥadīth: “***Seeking knowledge is obligatory***”<sup>67</sup>

Al-Bayhaqī has said that though this ḥadīth is famous among people, its chain of narration is weak. All the routes through which it is reported are weak chains.



---

<sup>67</sup> Ḥadīth via Anas ibn Mālik. The well researched position after examining the chains of nearly 40 routes of this ḥadīth is that it is a *ḥasan* report.

### SECTION THREE: ḌAYĪF (WEAK)

It is that ḥadīth in which, neither the conditions of *ṣaḥīḥ* nor *ḥasan* can be found, and there are varying degrees of weakness [of the hadith] based on the distance of the report from the conditions of being sound [*ṣaḥīḥ*].

Scholars are lenient concerning the chain of authority of a weak report – so long as it is not *mawḍūʿ* [forgery] – it can be mentioned in sermons, speeches and in merits of certain actions without notifying that it is a weak report.

However, weak narrations are inadmissible in regards to the Attributes of Allāh and in permissibility and forbiddance [*ḥalāl-ḥarām*].<sup>68</sup>

It is said that Nasāʿīy's practice [in his *Sunan*] was to include the ḥadīth of any narrator who was not deemed rejected by common agreement of ḥadīth masters.<sup>69</sup>

Abū Dāwūd also took from the same sources<sup>70</sup> [as Nasāʿīy] and included weak narrations if he could not find any other ḥadīth in that topic. [If he

---

<sup>68</sup> It is permissible to mention weak narrations in speeches and sermons when talking about merits of actions – such as patience, thankfulness, generosity, etc. – or about praise of certain luminaries, such as Ṣaḥābah. However, when it is a matter of creed or a ruling about an action or an issue, whether it is permitted or forbidden, a weak narration is inadmissible. This relaxation is only for a weak narration – not a forgery – it is impermissible to cite a forgery without mentioning its status.

<sup>69</sup> If a narrator was approved by some and criticised by others, he would use the report; but if a narrator was classed weak or rejected by everyone, he would not use that narration. It is reported that both Ḥākim and Khaṭīb considered Nasāʿīy's conditions for suitability of narrators as being far stricter than that of Muslim. [Lucknawī, p.204].

<sup>70</sup> A number of ḥadīth masters have narrated from Abū Dāwūd, including Nasāʿīy and Tirmidhī. In fact, Nasāʿīy took his method from Abū Dāwūd [Tabrizī].

had to choose,] he gave preference to a weak ḥadīth over the opinions of people.<sup>71</sup>

It is reported that Shaābī<sup>72</sup> had said: Take whatever these people narrate from the Prophet ﷺ, and as for their own opinions [or interpretations], throw it along with the chaff.<sup>73</sup> He is also reported to have said: [Independent] opinion is like carrion;<sup>74</sup> if you are in dire need of it, you are allowed to eat it.

It is reported from Shāfiʿī رحمہ اللہ that he said: ‘Concerning anything that I might have told you or a principle that I might have stated – if you find a saying of RasūlAllāh ﷺ which contradicts [my saying], in every such case, the saying of RasūlAllāh ﷺ is [now] my statement.’<sup>75</sup> He repeated this a few times.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> *Raʾay*: Lit. opinion, but here it is juridical opinion, or an expert’s independent opinion. Thus, in any issue, if there were no *ṣaḥīḥ* or *ḥasan* narrations, there would be ‘opinions’ of scholars. Abū Dāwūd preferred a weak narration over the opinions of scholars. Tabrīzī notes that this does not include interpretation and extrapolation [*qiyās*] based on *ṣaḥīḥ* ḥadīth.

<sup>72</sup> ʿĀmir ibn Sharāḥil al-Shaābī [d. 105 AH] among the greatest jurists and ḥadīth masters; he is among the most prominent *tābiʿī* imāms.

<sup>73</sup> *Ḥash*: weeds that are pulled out to be cast away.

<sup>74</sup> Animal that is not slaughtered according to Islamic law, or has died by itself, is carrion – *maytah*. It is forbidden to consume the meat of carrion, except when one is in dire need – such as death by starvation or threat of mutilation by an enemy; in such cases, Muslims are permitted to eat it and save their lives.

<sup>75</sup> Meaning: Abandon my saying and hold firm unto the saying of RasūlAllāh ﷺ, which supersedes my opinion.

<sup>76</sup> Bayhaqī mentioned this in his *Madʿkhal ilā Kitāb al-Sunan*, which is a preface to his work: *Al-Sunan al-Kubrā*.

## TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

It is pertinent to mention here a number of terms [*ibārāt*] which are applicable to any of the three categories – meaning: *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Ḥasan*, *Ḍaʿīf*. However, there are some terms which are specific to *Ḍaʿīf* [weak] narrations.

### I. TERMS WHICH ARE USED WITH ALL THREE CATEGORIES

1. ***Musnad***: It is that report which has an established chain of narration [*ittaṣala sanaduhu*] continuously up to the Prophet ﷺ.
2. ***Muttaṣal***: That whose chain of narration is **linked** without interruption; irrespective of whether it reaches high [*marfūʿ*] up to the Prophet ﷺ, or is stopped [*mawqūf*].
3. ***Marfūʿ [Elevated]***: A narration attributed to the Prophet ﷺ, whether his word, act or tacit approval<sup>77</sup> – irrespective of whether such a narration has a continuous chain or a broken chain.<sup>78</sup>

***Muttaṣal*** can either be *marfūʿ* or otherwise.

***Marfūʿ*** can either be with a continuous chain [*muttaṣal*] or non-continuous [*ghayr muttaṣal*].

***Musnad*** is continuous and elevated [*muttaṣal* and *marfūʿ*].

---

<sup>77</sup> *Qawl*, *fiʿl* or *taqrīr*.

<sup>78</sup> Any narration that says: “the Prophet ﷺ said” or ‘the Prophet ﷺ did thus’ or ‘thus it was done or said in the presence of the Prophet ﷺ and he did not criticise/comment’ is a *marfūʿ* narration. Now, such a *marfūʿ* narration is either narrated via a continuous chain, which is ***marfūʿ-muttaṣal*** – or, a *marfūʿ* narration can have gaps, i.e. broken chain – this becomes a ***marfūʿ-munqaṭiʿ*** narration.

4. **Muán-án:** That narration in which it is [explicitly said] narrator-X<sup>79</sup> **FROM**<sup>80</sup> narrator-Y. The correct opinion<sup>81</sup> is that it is considered as a continuous chain if it can be established that narrator-X has met narrator-Y,<sup>82</sup> and is [known to be] free from doing *tadlīs*.<sup>83</sup> Both the ṣaḥīḥ collections abound with *mu-ánán* narrations.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ has said: In recent times<sup>84</sup> it is often used to mean ‘permission’. If it is said: “From narrator-X, from a man, from narrator-Y,”<sup>85</sup> it is best<sup>86</sup> to consider it as interrupted and not as *Mursal*.

5. **Muállaq:** That narration in which one or more narrators are omitted from the beginning of the chain.

---

<sup>79</sup> In Arabic, the word *fulān* is a generic term to say ‘a person’ or ‘so-and-so’.

<sup>80</sup> The preposition *án* in Arabic means ‘from’. It is implied that narrator-X has heard FROM narrator-Y. It may also mean that they narrate FROM the narrator-Y but not directly.

<sup>81</sup> This is the opinion of Imām Muslim.

<sup>82</sup> That is: if a narrator X says: “I narrate FROM Y” – it can either mean, I “heard him narrate” which would make it a continuous chain; or it may mean: “I narrate FROM Y (via Z)” and the third narrator is not mentioned and is hidden. Here, if X and Y are contemporaries and it is established that they have met, it will be considered as continuous – and if they are either not contemporaries OR if it cannot be proven that they had ever met, it will NOT be a continuous chain, as is obvious.

<sup>83</sup> Lit. ‘misleading’; *tadlīs* will be defined presently. One condition for a *muán-án* ḥadīth to be deemed ṣaḥīḥ, is that the narrators should not be among those who do *tadlīs*.

<sup>84</sup> Lit. “in our age and in times close to ours”.

<sup>85</sup> ‘Fulān’ is translated as narrator-X or narrator-Y instead of “so-and-so.” *Fulān*, is a placeholder for the name of the person; and when it is said “from a man” – it means the person is unknown and not named; hence, the chain is interrupted.

<sup>86</sup> Lit. ‘close to’, i.e. close to the accurate position. [*Ẓafar al-Amānī*].

Muállaq literally means ‘suspended’ and is drawn from usage such as ‘suspended on the wall’ or ‘a suspended divorce’ as they both imply a gap [i.e. disconnect, *qaṭʿa al-ittiṣāl*].<sup>87</sup>

The omission [of narrators] can be either from the beginning of the chain [*isnād*], in which case it is known as **Muállaq**.

Or [the omission is] from the middle of the chain, and this is known as **Munqaṭiʿ**.

Or [the omission is] from the end of the chain, and this is known as **Mursal**.

Imām Bukhārī has frequently mentioned this kind of [i.e. *muállaq*] ḥadīth in his Ṣaḥīḥ [collection] as it is not beyond the ambit of *ṣaḥīḥ* – because these are *marfūʿ* ḥadīth transmitted via trustworthy narrators – though he [Bukhārī] has suspended [i.e. omitted *isnād*] – or because the same *muállaq* ḥadīth is narrated with the full chain elsewhere in his book.

6. **Afrād<sup>88</sup> (Singular Reports):** Either because the narrator is solitary<sup>89</sup> in a report that is distinctly separate from all other narrators; or being disparate due to a factor such as [being narrated by] people from a specific place; for example: “The narrators of Makkah are singular in

---

<sup>87</sup> However some scholars say that ‘suspended on a wall’ indicates a gap between the suspended thing and the wall and hence the metaphor to describe a *muállaq* narration is valid; but the example of ‘suspended divorce’ has no similarity – because in that case, it is ‘suspended’ due to a condition [i.e., the divorce will come into effect only if the condition materialises] not due to any ‘gap’. [Summarised from Sirājuddīn Bulqīnī’s note in *Mahāsīn al-Iṣṭilāḥ*, p76].

<sup>88</sup> *Fard*- singular; *Afrād*- plural. In some versions it is mentioned as *Ifrād*.

<sup>89</sup> No one else has reported it – hence, he is a singular or a solitary reporter.

this report” – this cannot be ruled as weak, except where it refers to a lone-narrator report [from that city].<sup>90</sup>

7. **Mudraj:** It is that narration wherein additional words or sentences from the speech of narrators are mixed up in the text of the ḥadīth in a way that it appears to be a part of the ḥadīth. [Consider the following cases:]

- a) When portions of two ḥadīth – whether the text or the *isnād* – are mixed up, as in the ḥadīth of Saʿyid ibn Abū Mariyam: “Do not hate [each other], do not be jealous, do not turn your backs on each other and do not compete with each other.”<sup>91</sup> Ibn Abī Mariyam [inadvertently] added the portion “do not compete with each other” from a different ḥadīth.<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> **Fard** is Singular; **Afrād**, plural. This can be of two types: Absolute [*Fard al-Muṭlaq*] or Restricted [*Fard al-Muqayyad*]. In the first case, if the narrator is alone in a report there are two possibilities concerning its acceptance.

a) If the narrator of the **Fard** narration contradicts a report of another narrator who is superior to him in memory and accuracy – this *fard* narration will be deemed an anomaly [**Shādh**] and rejected. According to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ this is similar to *Munkar*.

b) If the narrator of the **Fard** narration does NOT contradict others – such as a command that no one else has narrated – then it depends on the narrator. If he is trustworthy and an upright narrator, it is accepted; his being a solitary reporter is not an impediment to acceptance and such ḥadīth are found in both the Ṣaḥīḥ classics. And if the narrator is not trustworthy – then the ḥadīth is graded according to his rank.

Ibn Ḥajar has said in *Nukhbah*: If the narrator of the *Fard* contradicts someone superior to him – and he is himself a trustworthy narrator, it is *Shādh*; and if he is a weak narrator, the *Fard* ḥadīth is *munkar*. [Summarised from Lucknawi, pp 226-229].

Imām Dāraquṭniy has compiled ḥadīth of this type in a voluminous tome titled **Al-Afrād**.

<sup>91</sup> Ḥadīth of Anas ibn Mālīk in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, §2559.

<sup>92</sup> The last portion is from the ḥadīth of Abū Hurayrah in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* §2563 (next page):

- b) The narrator has a portion of a ḥadīth with text-A [*matn-A*] from a shaykh [but does not have *sanad* for it]; however, he has a ḥadīth with text-B with *sanad* from the shaykh. The narrator assumes both to be the same and narrates two different ḥadīth with different routes [sanads] as a single ḥadīth.
- c) The narrator hears a ḥadīth from a [group of scholars] which vary in either the *sanad* or the *matn*.<sup>93</sup> The narrator then joins them together and does not mention the variances.

In all the three cases discussed above, it is forbidden [*ḥarām*] to deliberately add them up.

8. ***Mash'hūr***: A ḥadīth that is famous among ḥadīth scholars, and it is transmitted by numerous narrators, such as: “Indeed RasūlAllāh ﷺ prayed the *qunūt* for a month, imprecating against a group of people.”<sup>94</sup> Or a ḥadīth that is famous among both ḥadīth scholars and the rest such as: “Indeed actions are according to intentions”;<sup>95</sup> or a ḥadīth that is only famous among others [and not ḥadīth scholars].<sup>96</sup>

---

The full ḥadīth is: “Beware of suspicion – for suspicion is the worst form of falsehood. Do not investigate the affairs of others; do not spy upon each other, do not vie with each other, do not be jealous of each other, do not foster hatred amongst yourselves, do not turn your backs upon each other – and be brothers together, as slaves of Allāh.”

<sup>93</sup> There are two different sanads or two different texts.

<sup>94</sup> Bukhārī §1003 and Muslim ; ḥadīth of Anas ibn Mālik ﷺ.

<sup>95</sup> Even though it is a solitary report as mentioned earlier.

<sup>96</sup> Thus *mash'hūr* can be (a) famous only among ḥadīth scholars (b) famous among ḥadīth scholars and others or (c) famous only among others and not ḥadīth scholars. A number of such ḥadīth are popular; Imām Sakhāwī examines a number of them in his work, *Maqāṣid al-Ḥasanah*; another notable work is Ājlūnī's *Kashf al-Khafā*.



Imām Aḥmad said [concerning the narrations:] “If someone comes asking – even if he comes [riding] on a horse [he should be given]”<sup>97</sup> and “The day of your sacrifice [corresponds to] the [first] day of your fasting”<sup>98</sup> – are famously circulated among commonfolk<sup>99</sup> – but there is no basis to consider these two as ḥadīth after scrutiny [*īyṭibār*].<sup>100</sup>

9. **Gharīb**: Uncommon, unfamiliar.<sup>101</sup> Such as the narrations of Zuhri<sup>102</sup> and savants like him, from whom ḥadīth are [extensively] reported due to their uprightness and accuracy; if only a single narrator reports through them, such a ḥadīth is known as *Gharīb*, or uncommon.

---

<sup>97</sup> This narration is found in *Abū Dāwūd* §1665; Bayhaqī in *Sunan*; Aḥmad in *Musnad* vide ḥadīth of Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī §1730; Ṭabarānī in *Al-Mūjam al-Kabīr* §2893; *Muṣannaf* Ibn Abī Shaybah 3/113, Bukhārī in his *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* 8/416; Abū Nuʿaym in *Ḥilyah* 8/379. All of them have reported this via the route: Muṣāb ibn Muḥammad ibn Shurāḥbīl from Yaʿlā ibn Abī Yaḥyā from Fatimah bint Ḥusayn from Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī ؓ. This is also reported by Imām Mālik in his *Muwattaʿ*, §1941 via Zayd ibn Aslam ؓ. The meaning of this ḥadīth: Do not deny a man if he comes on a horse asking you for food or grass for his horse, even if his outward condition suggests that he is not needy. This is advice to have a good opinion of people and to not suspect their intentions and to be generous in giving. [al-Qārī in *Mirqāt* 6/165, §2988 and Zurqānī in *Sharḥ Muwaṭṭaʿ*].

<sup>98</sup> Which means: the day of the week on which the 1<sup>st</sup> of Ramaḍān and the 10<sup>th</sup> of Dhu'l Ḥijjah fall will be the same. Thus if the first of Ramaḍān was a Monday, 10<sup>th</sup> Dhu'l Ḥijjah will also be a Monday. This is the meaning, though not proven to be a ḥadīth. Sakhāwī in *Maqāṣid*, Zarkashi in *Tadhkirah*, ʿĀjlūnī in *Kashf al-Khafā* and Suyūṭī in *Durar al-Muntatharah* have all ruled this ḥadīth as baseless.

<sup>99</sup> Lit. “in the marketplace”.

<sup>100</sup> This comment holds good for the second example as commented by scholars of ḥadīth. However, it is not true concerning the first example – as many scholars have considered it as reliable after scrutiny [Lucknawi, p257].

<sup>101</sup> Lit. *Gharīb*: strange, uncommon; named thus due to its exceptional occurrence [*gharābatihī*, *nudratihī*] – because no one else has narrated from them. [Lucknawi, p261].

<sup>102</sup> Imām Muḥammad ibn Muslim ibn Shihāb **al-Zuhri** al-Madanī [56-124 AH]

*Āzīz*:<sup>103</sup> [Further to the case above], if two or three narrators report from them – it is known as *Āzīz*. And if a group of people narrate from them, it will be termed as *Mash’hūr* [famous]. Solitary reports [*Afrād*] attributed to a place<sup>104</sup> will not be known as *Gharīb*.

A *Gharīb* narration can either be *ṣaḥīḥ*, such as the lone-narrator reports [*afrād*] found in *Ṣaḥīḥ* [collections], or non-*ṣaḥīḥ*; however, the latter is predominant.<sup>105</sup> Also, a *gharīb* narration can be:

- a) uncommon in **both the chain of authority and the text matter** [*isnād-matn*]; this is when the text-matter is narrated by a lone narrator [from a lone *ṣaḥābī*]
- b) in **only the chain of authority** [*isnād*] and not in the *matn*; such as the ḥadīth whose text is known via many Companions,<sup>106</sup> but a narrator reports solitarily from another *ṣaḥābī*. Tirmidhī describes this as: ‘uncommon via this route’ [*gharīb min hādha’l wajh*].

However, there cannot be a ḥadīth whose text [*matn*] is unfamiliar, but not its chain [*isnād*]. Except when a lone-narrator [*fard*] report is narrated by numerous narrators from the lone-narrator – in which case such a ḥadīth becomes uncommon-famous [*gharīb-mash’hūr*].

---

<sup>103</sup> Lit. *Āzīz*: precious, invaluable, cherished, rare.

<sup>104</sup> Such as: ‘a report unique to narrators of Makkah’ – this is a *fard*/solitary narration exclusive to narrators of one place; but merely being *fard* will not render it *Gharīb*.

<sup>105</sup> While some *gharīb* ḥadīth are also *ṣaḥīḥ*, usually they are either weak or repudiated reports. Imām Aḥmad is reported to have said: “Do not write down these *gharīb* reports, as they are usually repudiated [*manākīr*] and the majority of the narrators of *gharīb* reports are weak narrators [*ḍuʿāfā*]” [Tabrizī, p.104].

<sup>106</sup> And a number of narrators from each of the companions.

Concerning the ḥadīth: “**Actions are according to intentions**”, its isnād is ‘uncommon’ [*gharīb*] from the top end of the chain<sup>107</sup> – but is ‘well-known’ [*mash’hūr*] at the other end.<sup>108</sup>

10. **Muṣaḥḥaf**: Transposed. It can occur in the name of the narrator, such as the case in which Shúbah<sup>109</sup> narrates from Áwwām ibn **Murājīm** – with *rā* and *jīm*; Yaḥyā ibn Maýīn<sup>110</sup> interchanged it with *zā* and *hā* [and rendered it **Muzāḥīm**]. The transposition can also be in the text of the ḥadīth, such as the saying of the Prophet ﷺ: “Whoever fasted in Ramaḍān and followed with **six** [*sittan*] in Shawwāl”. A narrator transposed it to **some** [*shay’an*], with *shīn*.<sup>111</sup>
11. **Musalsal** is that report, where every narrator in the chain assumes the state or condition in which the ḥadīth was narrated, up until it reaches RasūlAllāh ﷺ. This can be:
  - a. **Qawlan**, in speech: The narrator says: “I heard X who says: I heard Y...until it reaches the highest end of the chain. Or the narrator says: “X informed me, by Allah: Y informed me, by Allāh...until the end [of the chain].<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> Because Yaḥyā ibn Saýīd is the lone narrator from a lone *tābiýi* from a lone *ṣaḥābī*.

<sup>108</sup> And from Yaḥyā, numerous narrators have reported it. Thus, the ḥadīth is ‘uncommon report’ [*gharīb matna’n*] at the top end – but not uncommon as regards to the chain [*lā isnāda’n*] at the other end. [Lucknawi, p.263].

<sup>109</sup> Imām Shúbah ibn al-Ḥajjāj [83-160 AH] ibn al-Ward; Amīru’l Mu’minīn fi’l Ḥadīth; Abū Bistām al-Azdī – the greatest scholar of Baṣrah.

<sup>110</sup> Imām Yaḥyā ibn Maýīn [d. 233 AH] ibn Áwn ibn Ziyād ibn Bistām Abū Zakariyyah.

<sup>111</sup> This is a sub-branch of ḥadīth sciences and the authorities in this field have written dedicated works such as: Imām Abu’l Ḥasan Dāraquṭnī’s *Al-Taṣḥīf*; Al-Áskarī’s *Al-Taṣḥīf wa’l Tahriḥ*; Al-Khaṭṭābī’s *Iṣlāh Khaṭa’ al-Muḥaddithīn*.

<sup>112</sup> Here, every narrator adds the oath – ‘by Allāh.’ Ḥadīth of Muslim, §2789.

- b. **Fiýlan**, in action: Such as the ḥadīth of interlocking hands.<sup>113</sup>
- c. **Qawlan-Fiýlan**, both speech and action: ‘O Allāh! Aid me in your remembrance, in thanking you and in worshipping you in the most beautiful manner.’<sup>114</sup> In the report of Abū Dāwūd, Aḥmad and Nasā’ī – the narrator<sup>115</sup> says: “RasūlAllāh ﷺ took my hand and said: “Indeed, I love you. Say: O Allāh! Aid me in your remembrance..”<sup>116</sup>
- d. **Şifatan**, in attribute: Such as the ḥadīth of jurists. A jurist narrates from another jurist. [RasūlAllāh ﷺ said:] **The buyer and the seller, both reserve the right to cancel the deal, as long as they have not parted [company].**<sup>117</sup>
- e. **Riwāyatan**, in narration: the ḥadīth in which the names of the narrators is the same; or the names of their fathers is the same; or their teknonyms are the same; or their surnames are the same; or the place, which every narrator hails from, is the same.<sup>118</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> **Tashbīk bi’l Yad** – Suyūṭī mentions the ḥadīth of Abū Hurayrah in which he narrates: Abu’l Qāsim ﷺ interlocked his hand with my hand and said: “Allāh created this earth on the sixth day..” Every narrator interlocks his hand with the person to whom he narrates; the next narrator does the same while narrating and so on.

<sup>114</sup> This is the duāā: **Allāhumma aýinni álá dhikrika wa shukrika wa ḥusni ibādatika.**

<sup>115</sup> The first narrator is Muāādh ibn Jabal ﷺ.

<sup>116</sup> Every narrator takes the hand of the person to whom he narrates and says: “Indeed, I love you. Say: “O Allāh, Aid me..” This ḥadīth is reported by Abū Dāwūd, §1522; Nasā’īy 3/53; Ahmed 5/235.

<sup>117</sup> Ḥadīth in Bukhārī, §2017, §2109, §2111; Muslim, 43/1531; Muwaṭṭa, §1374.

<sup>118</sup> Such as narrations of Muḥammadiyyīn (all narrators are named Muḥammad) or Aḥmadiyyīn or Irāqīyyīn (all narrators are from Iraq) or Maghāribah (all narrators are from north-west Africa,) and so on as mentioned in *Ḥaṣr al-Shārid* of Ābid Sindī.

Imām Nawawī – may Allāh have mercy upon him – has said: “I narrate three *musalsal* ḥadīth via Damascenes”.<sup>119</sup>

12. *Iyṭibār*, Evaluation. Scrutinizing the ḥadīth:

- a. Is it a lone-narrator report or not?
- b. Is it an accepted [*mārūf*] report?<sup>120</sup>



---

<sup>119</sup> Every narrator is a Damascene in the ḥadīth up until the *ṣahābī* narrating from RasūlAllāh ﷺ. One such ḥadīth is that of Abū Dharr narrating the Ḥadīth Qudsi: [Allāh tāālā says:] O My slaves! Every one of you is astray, except those whom I have guided..” Imām Nawawī ended his book *Al-Adhkār* with this ḥadīth and mentioned his sanad until Abū Idrīs al-Khawlānī al-Dimashqī who took it from Abū Dharr al-Ghifari when he entered Damascus. Imām Aḥmad has said – the people of Levant do not have a ḥadīth more distinguished than this. See ḥadīth §24 in *Arbayīn* vide *Muslim*, §2577.

Another interesting chain is mentioned by Lucknawi vide Suyūṭī: Ḥasan [al-Baṣrī] narrates from Ḥasan [ibn Āli] from Abī'l Ḥasan [father of Ḥasan, i.e. Mawlā Āli] from Jaddi'l Ḥasan [grandfather of Ḥasan, i.e. RasūlAllāh ﷺ] who said: “*Indeed, the best of beauty is beautiful character [inna aḥsana'l ḥasani al-khuluqu'l ḥasan]*.”

<sup>120</sup> Ibn Ḥajar says that the opposite of *munkar*, repudiated - is *mārūf*, accepted [*Nuz'hah*].

## II. TERMS USED TO DESCRIBE ONLY WEAK NARRATIONS

13. **Mawqūf**, stopped: Anything that is reported from a ṣaḥābī absolutely,<sup>121</sup> whether his/her speech or action – via a continuous chain [*muttaṣal*] or an interrupted chain [*munqaṭiʿ*]. It cannot be used as incontrovertible proof,<sup>122</sup> as per the most accurate position.

Sometimes, this term is also used with a non-ṣaḥābī – in a specific manner such as: “Maámar<sup>123</sup> terminated it at Hammām...”<sup>124</sup> or “Mālik<sup>125</sup> terminated it at Nāfiy.”<sup>126</sup>

If a companion says: “We used to do such-and-such a thing in the time of the Prophet ﷺ,” it is deemed a marfūʿ report; because it is apparent that the Prophet ﷺ had knowledge of that action and he implicitly approved it [*taqrīr*].

So also: “The companions [of the Prophet ﷺ] would knock at his door with their finger nails.”<sup>127</sup> This implies *marfūʿ* in meaning.

---

<sup>121</sup> That is without any qualification.

<sup>122</sup> *Ḥujjah*.

<sup>123</sup> Mámar ibn Rashīd [d.150 AH]; Shaykhu’l Islām Abū úrwah ibn Abī Ámr al-Azdi.

<sup>124</sup> Hammām ibn Munabbih Abū Úqbah al-Sanáʿnī [d. 131 AH], imām of ḥadīth and a disciple of the famous companion, Abū Hurayrah ؓ. Hammām is the author of *Ṣaḥīfah Ibn Munabbih*, considered to be oldest extant compilation of ḥadīth. Only two manuscripts are known to have survived – one in Damascus and the other in Berlin [Allāh táālā knows best].

<sup>125</sup> Imām Mālik ibn Anas.

<sup>126</sup> Nāfiy Abū Ábdullāh [d. 119 AH], a slave of Ábdullāh ibn Úmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb ؓ.

<sup>127</sup> Ḥadīth reported by Bukhārī in *Al-Adab al-Mufrad*, §1083.

The *tafsīr* [explanation of the Qur’ān] of a ṣahābī is *mawqūf*.

However, descriptions such as circumstances or background for the revelation [*sabab al-nuzūl*] of a certain verse, such as the saying of Jabir:<sup>128</sup> ‘The Jews would say so-and-so; and Allāh tāālā revealed so-and-so’. Such descriptions fall under *marfūū*.

14. **Maqtūū**, detached; which is reported about *tābiyīn* [followers of ṣahābah], that they said or did something, and stops there.<sup>129</sup> This cannot be used as compelling evidence or sufficient proof [*hujjah*].
15. **Mursal**, bypassed; a ḥadīth in which a *tābiyī* says, “RasūlAllāh ﷺ has said thus..” or “RasūlAllāh ﷺ did this...” [without mentioning the ṣahābī]. This [type of ḥadīth] is well-known [and accepted] in fiqh and its principles.<sup>130</sup> There is a difference of opinion concerning the definition of *Mursal*; the details of Imām Shāfiyī’s opinion on the status of *Mursal* are mentioned in various treatises on Uṣūl Fiqh.<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup> A reference to the ḥadīth in Bukhārī, §4528.

<sup>129</sup> A report which stops at the *tābiyī*, describing that he said or did something; and it does not reach a ṣahābī [in which case it would be *mawqūf*] or further up to the Prophet ﷺ [in which case it would be *marfūū*].

<sup>130</sup> *Mursal* applies only to a *tābiyī*’s direct attribution to the Prophet ﷺ; if any other narrator after this rank attributes directly to the Prophet ﷺ, without mentioning the chain of authority [*isnād*], such a ḥadīth will be termed *Munqaṭīy*. Some scholars have said that it only applies to senior *tābiyīs* and not juniors.

<sup>131</sup> The validity of *mursal* and accepting it as proof. Imām Shāfiyī has discussed this in his *Al-Risālah* and according to Imām Nawawī, Ibn al-Ṣalāh and commentators of Irāqī’s *Al-Alfiyyah*, Imām Shāfiyī does not consider it as evidence except with conditions. [Lucknawi, p347.] See Imām Shāfiyī’s *Al-Risālah*, *Al-Uṣūl* of Imām Sarakhsī, *Al-Tabṣīrah* of Shīrāzī, *Al-Burhān* of Imām al-Ḥaramayn; this is also explained in various commentaries of Irāqī’s *Al-Alfiyyah* and *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* of Imām Nawawī.

16. **Munqaṭiʿ** is that, whose isnād is not connected in any way. It could be because one or more narrators are omitted from the beginning of the isnād or in the middle or in the end. However, this term is used to describe the ḥadīth of those after the *tābiyīn*<sup>132</sup> with interrupted chains. For example: Mālik narrating from Ibn ʿUmar.<sup>133</sup>
17. **Mūḍal** is that ḥadīth in which two or more narrators are omitted from the chain, such as Mālik saying: “RasūlAllāh ﷺ has said”<sup>134</sup> or Imām Shāfiʿī saying: “Ibn ʿUmar has said:”<sup>135</sup>
18. **Shādh-Munkar**. Imām Shāfiʿī has said that *shādh* is a trustworthy [*thiqah*] narrator’s report that contradicts reports of all others.

According to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ: It depends on the case.

- If the narrator of the anomaly contradicts a narrator who is superior in memory and accuracy, such a report is *shādh-mardūd* [rejected].
- If the report is not contradictory – and the narrator is upright and is known for accuracy – it is *Ṣaḥīḥ*.

---

<sup>132</sup> Because a *tābiyī* has only one link – the *ṣaḥābī* – to RasūlAllāh ﷺ. If the *tābiyī* skips the *ṣaḥābī* and attributes directly to RasūlAllāh ﷺ, such a ḥadīth would be termed *Mursal*. Anyone after the *tābiyī* would have TWO links at the least; so any such ḥadīth which omits *tābiyī-ṣaḥābī* and more (that is from the *tābiyī* downward) is a *Munqaṭiʿ* narration, which also happens to be *Mūḍal*, a special category described next.

<sup>133</sup> Here Imām Mālik has omitted the *tābiyī* Nāfiʿ who reports from Ibn ʿUmar ﷺ.

<sup>134</sup> Imām Mālik is not a *tābiyī*; so he has omitted a *tābiyī* (for example Nāfiʿ) AND a *ṣaḥābī* (for example, Ibn ʿUmar).

<sup>135</sup> Imām Shāfiʿī did not meet ʿAbdullāh Ibn ʿUmar ﷺ. He narrates from Mālik narrating from Nāfiʿ narrating from ibn ʿUmar. Here, he has skipped two narrators.



- If it is reported by someone not accurate – but is closer to that rank, it is *Ĥasan*; and if he is far from being accurate, it is *Munkar*.

The descriptions ‘more accurate’ or ‘superior memory’ are used in a comparative sense meaning that, if the contradicting narrator is close to his rank [or similar], then it will not be a rejected report. It can be known from this classification,<sup>136</sup> what *Munkar* actually means.

19. ***Muállal***<sup>137</sup> A report with obscure reasons [for being weak,] and may have subtle and almost inscrutable defects even though it appears to be safe from defects.<sup>138</sup> This can be recognised by looking for clues such as: being transmitted by a sole narrator, or contradicts other narrators, or any other detail which will alert an expert whether:

- a. A report is truly connected, or if there is a skipped narrator [*irsāl*], or if there are signs of being terminated at the companion [*mawqūf*], though it appears to be an elevated [*marfūū*] report<sup>139</sup>
- b. Or the intermixing of two different reports [*idrāj*]

---

<sup>136</sup> Of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ; category 13 in his *Muqaddimah* [Lucknawi, p.361].

<sup>137</sup> Also known as *málūl*. Lit. defective. Ibn Ḥajar has said in *Nukhbah* that this is a complex subject, and such defects can be recognised only by people with extensive knowledge of ḥadīth and narrators, those with sharp intellects and vast experience in analysis of text/chains. Therefore, the only people who have spoken on this subject are the likes of Ālī ibn Madīnī, Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Imām Bukhārī, Yáqūb ibn Shaybah, Abū Ḥātim, Abū Zur’ah [al-Rāzī] and Dāraqutnī.

<sup>138</sup> Defects that will affect the soundness of ḥadīth and whether it can be accepted and used as evidence. [Lucknawi, p364].

<sup>139</sup> The sanad might be *muttaṣil* in itself, but a narrator was skipped in the chain; or the ḥadīth was *marfūū* in itself, but was reported as *mawqūf* by the narrator [Lucknawi].

- c. Or a misconception<sup>140</sup> which takes hold in a narrator's mind that he deems to be an established fact and therefore issues a ruling [based on his mistaken notion], or hesitates and holds back.

All of these are reasons that prevent a report from being considered *ṣaḥīḥ*, due to subtle flaws therein.

Take the ḥadīth narrated by Yaʿālā ibn ʿUbayd from Thawrī from ʿAmr ibn Dīnār from Ibn ʿUmar from the Prophet : “***Both the seller and the buyer have the option..***”<sup>141</sup>

The isnād is well connected [*muttaṣil*] and every narrator is upright and accurate; yet, it is defective [*muʿallal*], even though the text of the ḥadīth is *ṣaḥīḥ*. This is because ʿAmr appears in this isnād instead of his brother,<sup>142</sup> ʿAbdullāh ibn Dīnār, as narrated by leading narrators [*ayimmah*] among the disciples of Thawri. Yaʿālā<sup>143</sup> assumed that it was ʿAmr ibn Dīnār, whereas it should have been ʿAbdullāh ibn Dīnār.

The word *illah* or defect is varyingly used to mean falsehood or negligence or lapse in memory, etc. Sometimes, it is used to refer to a contradiction that is not detrimental [to the narration] such as the bypassing of a narrator [*irsāl*] by a trustworthy and accurate narrator.

---

<sup>140</sup> Due to a lapse in memory or an error.

<sup>141</sup> The ḥadīth in Bukhārī and Muslim mentioned earlier, has the same text and is via ʿAbdullāh ibn Dīnār and not via ʿAmr ibn Dīnār; even though, both are *thiqah* narrators.

<sup>142</sup> That is brother in Islām; because ʿAbdullāh ibn Dīnār and ʿAmr ibn Dīnār are not related. Abdullah ibn Dīnār is an ʿAdawī, a client of ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿUmar and he is a Madanī. Whereas ʿAmr is a Qurashi and a Makkī.

<sup>143</sup> Yaʿālā ibn ʿUbayd ibn Abī Umayyah al-Laḥḥām al-Ṭanāfusī. Ibn Maʿīn and Aḥmad considered him a trustworthy narrator, but he is considered weak, when narrating via Sufyān al-Thawrī.

It is said: Among a sub-category of *ṣaḥīḥ* is that with subtle defects [*ṣaḥīḥ-muállal*], just as it is said: ‘sound but anomalous’ [*ṣaḥīḥ-shādh*] report. The above ḥadīth of Yaālā ibn Ūbayd: “**Both traders have the option**” is from this kind.

20. **Mudallas** is that whose defect is concealed.

- a. **Either *Tadlis in Isnād***: If X narrates from Y – whom he has met or is a contemporary of – but has not heard from Y; yet X narrates in a manner that gives the impression that X has in fact heard from Y. Rightfully, he should **not** say: ‘Y has **narrated** to us’. Rather, he should say: “Y has said” or “Narrated from Y” etc.

Sometimes the concealer [*mudallis*] does not drop his own shaykh but instead, drops someone **before** him, who might be a weak narrator or younger to him,<sup>144</sup> thereby embellishing the ḥadīth,<sup>145</sup> as done by Aámash,<sup>146</sup> Thawri<sup>147</sup> and others.<sup>148</sup> This is extremely dislikeable and most scholars have deplored *tadlis*.

---

<sup>144</sup> Consider a chain where **B** narrates from X who narrates from Y who narrates from Z. Ideally, the chain should read: B->X->Y->Z. **Also consider**: B is *thiqah*, X is *thiqah*, Y is weak and Z is *thiqah*. Now, the *mudallis* narrator ‘B’ mentions the chain as B from X from Z, dropping Y. If someone looks at the chain without investigation, they would say: B,X,Z are all *thiqah* – so it is a *ṣaḥīḥ* chain, whereas Y was dropped by B, using ambiguous words [technically, the truth], which gives the impression that the chain is B->X->Z, but in reality it is B->X->Y->Z. This type is also known as *Tadlis al-Taswiyah* or just *Taswiyah*.

<sup>145</sup> Making it appear a better narration than it actually is.

<sup>146</sup> Imām Sulaymān ibn Mihrān al-Aámash al-Asadī [d. 148 AH], a prominent *tābiyī*.

<sup>147</sup> Imām Sufyān al-Thawrī.

<sup>148</sup> Lucknawi has listed 104 such narrators who did *tadlis*, citing from Ḥalabī’s *Tabyīn Asmā’a al-Mudallisīn*. Explanation as to why towering scholars did *tadlis* is beyond the scope of this book.

There is a difference of opinion concerning the acceptance of reports by a *mudallis* narrator. The preferred opinion is that its acceptance depends on the manner of *tadlīs*:

If the narration is said in words that are ambiguous and there is no clarity that the narrator has heard it [from the shaykh], then it is considered similar to a *Mursal* ḥadīth or as its variant.

If the narrator says in words that clearly indicate connectivity – such as “I have heard..” or “It was reported to us...” or “Narrate to us...” and such statements;<sup>149</sup> in this case the ḥadīth can be used as reliable evidence [*muḥtāj bihi*].

- b. **Or *Tadlīs of Shuyūkh*:** This is when a narrator reports from a shaykh that he has [indeed] heard from, but he mentions him by an unfamiliar name, or an unknown teknonym or an appellation or describes him in a manner that he is not [immediately] recognised – and [he does this] to conceal [the shaykh’s] identity.

This kind of *tadlīs* is milder [compared to the first] – however this results in obscuring the identity of the shaykh [from whom it is being narrated] and creating an [artificial] difficulty<sup>150</sup> in learning about the state of the shaykh.<sup>151</sup>

---

<sup>149</sup> “He read it out in front of us...” or “He informed us...”

<sup>150</sup> Creating a difficulty and frustrating researchers as to the identity of the shaykh because he is mentioned in a manner that he is not recognised and because of this certain well-known narrators are rendered as unknown. *Tadlīs* literally means ‘to conceal the defect in the cloth from the buyer’ as Bayhaqī puts it: *āyb e jāmah rā bar kharīdār ba-pūshīdan*.

<sup>151</sup> In the context of ḥadīth narration, ‘shaykh’ is the person from whom one takes the ḥadīth; thus, it is possible that a *thiqah* narrator’s ‘shaykh’ could be a weak narrator.

The degree of dislikability of such *tadlīs* is according to the objective of the *mudallīs*.<sup>152</sup> For example, [the *mudallīs*] has plenty of reports from the shaykh, and he does not like to mention that his reports are mostly from the same person.<sup>153</sup> Or the narrator is induced to do *tadlīs* because the shaykh whose identity he has camouflaged is not a *thiqah*, or is younger<sup>154</sup> to himself, etc.<sup>155</sup>

21. ***Mudṭarib*** is that, which is contradicted by other reports<sup>156</sup> [by the same or other narrators].<sup>157</sup> If two reports contradict each other – and if preference can be given to one report over the other, for reasons such as the narrator having a better memory (than the narrator of the other report) or that he has remained longer in the company of the shaykh (from whom contradictory reports are narrated). In such a case, the judgement will be in favour of the preferred narrator – and

---

<sup>152</sup> The narrator who does *tadlīs*.

<sup>153</sup> Hence, he mentions the shaykh by a different name – giving the impression that he reports from various narrators.

<sup>154</sup> Ḥārith ibn Abī Usāmah narrates from Abū Bakr ʿAbdullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿUbayd ibn Sufyān ibn Abī'd Dunyā; and Ibn Abī'd Dunyā is younger to Ḥārith. In his narration Ḥārith mentions the latter in many ways: “ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿUbayd” attributing him to his grandfather; “ʿAbdullāh ibn Sufyān” attributing to great-grandfather; “Abū Bakr ibn Sufyān” or “Abū Bakr al-Umawī”.

<sup>155</sup> In all these cases, the narrator mentions the shaykh such that he is not easily recognised.

<sup>156</sup> Irrespective of one or many reports that contradict it; irrespective of whether the contradiction is in the *sanad* or the *matn* or both. However, it is rare that there is a contradiction in *matn* but not in its *sanad*. This is one reason to rule it weak – because it suggests that the narrator might not be accurate [Lucknawi, p398].

<sup>157</sup> In one narration of Fāṭimah bint Qays ؓ: “***In [one’s] wealth, there is charity due, other than zakāt.***” In another narration by the same Fāṭimah bint Qays ؓ: “***In [one’s] wealth there is no charity except zakāt.***” Imam Ibn Ḥajar has a separate work on this category titled: *Al-Muṭṭarib fi Bayāni'l Muṭṭarib*.

his report will not be deemed *mudṭarib* [indeterminate] anymore. If not,<sup>158</sup> it will be *mudṭarib*.

22. **Maqlūb**: A report in which the chain is upended or mixed-up. Such as the ḥadīth reported by Sālim<sup>159</sup> – where his name is [erroneously] replaced with Nāfiy,<sup>160</sup> thereby making it an uncommon, and desirable narration.<sup>161</sup> The story of Imām Bukhārī is well known, when he arrived in Baghdad and the ḥadīth scholars tested his memory by intermixing the texts and chains of different ḥadīth.<sup>162</sup>



---

<sup>158</sup> If there is no possibility of favouring one report over the other – because the narrators of both reports have similar credentials etc., it is difficult to rule in favour of any; in such a case it is an indeterminate or *mudṭarib* report.

<sup>159</sup> Salim ibn ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿUmar ﷺ [d. 106 AH].

<sup>160</sup> Nāfiy ibn Hurmuz, the slave of ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿUmar ﷺ.

<sup>161</sup> In this case, both Sālim (the son) and Nāfiy (the slave) are students of ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿUmar and they both narrate from him.

<sup>162</sup> Khaṭīb has reported this event in *Tārīkh Baghdād*, 2/20. The scholars of Baghdad mixed up the isnād of one famous ḥadīth with the text of another famous ḥadīth and handed ten such mixed-up ḥadīth, each to ten scholars (a total of 100 ḥadīth) to test Imām Bukhārī. After the gathering had settled down, one of the ten examiners stood up and read out the *maqlūb* or mixed up ḥadīth. Bukhārī said: ‘I do not know this ḥadīth.’ He proceeded to read out the rest of his nine. Then the second stood up and did the same with his ten until all ten examiners had read out the 100 mixed up ḥadīth. Bukhārī’s answer for each one was: “I do not know this.” After they all sat down, Bukhārī turned towards the first examiner and said: ‘The first ḥadīth you narrated was with this isnād-matn; the correct ḥadīth is with this isnād and matn. The second ḥadīth..” and so on until he corrected all the ten ḥadīth. Then he turned to the second person and mentioned his *maqlūb* narration and the correct one and so on until he had mentioned ten *maqlūb* narrations of each of the ten examiners and the correct version in each case. The superior memory of Imām Bukhārī and his mastery of ḥadīth was acknowledged by everyone present.

## MAWḌŪŪ - FORGERIES

Any report falls under one of the following categories:

1. A report which must necessarily be affirmed as truthful, and which has been affirmed as authentic by the authorities [*imāms* of this science].
2. A report which should necessarily be considered false and *imāms* have confirmed that it is a forgery.
3. A report whose status is uncertain – as the possibility of both truth and falsehood exist – as is the case with any report.

It is not permissible for a scholar to narrate a forgery [*mawḍūū*] in any circumstance, in any manner – unless they mention together, its status as a forgery.

A forgery can be known by the confession of the person who fabricated the report, or by its flimsy wording, or when a narrator acknowledges an [inadvertent] mistake; such as the case with Thābit ibn Mūsā, the ascetic, in the ḥadīth: “One who prays a lot in the night, his face will be beautiful in the day”.<sup>163</sup>

---

<sup>163</sup> This is a ḥadīth reported by Ibn Mājah from Ismāyīl al-Talḥī from Thābit ibn Mūsā, the ascetic [*āābid-zāhid*] from Sharīk from al-Aāmash from Abū Sufyān from Jābir, attributing to the Prophet ﷺ. Ḥākim said about this: Thābit was writing down ḥadīth as Sharīk was dictating and he narrated the chain: “Narrated to us al-Aāmash from Abū Sufyān from Jābir ؓ who said: RasūlAllāh ﷺ said:” and then he paused, waiting for Thābit to write down. When he looked at Thābit, he said: “One who prays a lot in the night, his face in the day will be beautiful and bright.” This was Sharīk’s own comment addressed to Thābit, but Thābit [who was writing] assumed it to be the text of the ḥadīth and wrote it down [Lucknawi, p.432].

It is said that the shaykh was narrating to a group and a handsome man entered the gathering. The shaykh said in the middle of his narration: “One who prays plenty in the night..” Thābit assumed it to be a part of the narration and narrated it as a hadith.

There are various kinds of people who fabricated ḥadīth; the worst of them, and those who caused the most harm, were people known to be ascetics [and were otherwise pious], who fabricated it with the intention of doing good [and earning reward for such an action!]<sup>164</sup>

In addition to the above, heretics fabricated a number of ḥadīth. Then the experts and masters of ḥadīth sciences rose to investigate and expose the faults and cleanse the [corpus of ḥadīth] from [falsehood] and disrepute.

All praise belongs to Allāh.

Various heretical sects, such as the Karrāmiyyah, consider that it is permissible to fabricate a ḥadīth that encourages people to do good and deters from sins [*targhib-tarhib*]. For example, the narration from Abū Ismah Nūḥ ibn Abī Mariyam, that he was asked: “Where did you get these reports from Īkrimah<sup>165</sup> narrating from Ibn Abbās, for the virtues and rewards [*fadāyil*] that you list down for every sūrah in the Qur’ān?”

---

<sup>164</sup> So they fabricated ḥadīth extolling certain actions, and some others describing extreme punishment and censure, to warn against sins and bad deeds. They fabricated ḥadīth either because they were ignorant of the dire warnings against attributing a lie to the Prophet ﷺ or they interpreted that ḥadīth to mean – attributing a lie only if it harms the religion and that it would be commendable [according to their misinterpretation] if it were for a good cause, such as exhorting people to do good deeds and deterring people from bad deeds. [Summarised from Lucknawi’s *Ẓafar al-Amānī*, p.443]

<sup>165</sup> Abū Abdullāh Īkrimah [d. 104 AH] was a Berber slave of Ḥuṣayn al-Ānbarī, who gifted him to Ibn Abbās when he arrived in Baṣrah during the caliphate of Mawlā Ālī ﷺ.



He replied: “When I saw people turning away from the Qur’ān and busying themselves in the fiqh of Abū Ḥanifah, and the ‘Battles’<sup>166</sup> of Muḥammad ibn Is’ḥāq,<sup>167</sup> I fabricated these ḥadīth to encourage people [to read the Qur’ān].”

Many exegetes<sup>168</sup> have committed the mistake of including [forgeries] in their commentaries [*tafsīr*], except those whom Allāh has protected.<sup>169</sup> One of the stark [and deplorable] examples of forgeries included in [commentaries of the Qur’ān] is the alleged statement of the Prophet ﷺ, when he recited the following verse:

وَمَنْوَةُ الثَّالِثَةِ الْآخَرَى

And Manāt, the other third one.<sup>170</sup>

---

Īkrimah became the disciple of Ibn Ābbās and is prominent among those who narrate from him. Imām Ābdu’l Āzīm Mundhirī has written a short epistle: *Dhikru Hāl Īkrimah* mentioning various opinions of scholars about him.

<sup>166</sup> *Maghāzī*, lit. battles. But the reference is to his compilation of Prophetic biography which also included ḥadīth about battles, and named, *Kitābu’l Muḥtadā’ wa’l Mabāth wa’l Maghāzī*, [*The Beginning, The Proclamation of Prophethood and Battles*.] This book was reordered by Ibn Hishām [d. 218 AH] in his famous *Sīrat Ibn Hishām*.

<sup>167</sup> Muḥammad ibn Is’ḥāq ibn Yasār al-Madanī [80-151 AH].

<sup>168</sup> Such as Wāḥidi, Ibn Marduwayh, Thālabī, Zamakhshari, Bayḍāwī. The worst of the lot is Zamakhshari, who mentioned [such forgeries] with certainty, but without any *isnād* and Bayḍāwī merely copied him; whereas others mentioned the *isnād* [Lucknawi, p.445].

<sup>169</sup> Such as Imām Abī’l Barakāt Ḥāfiẓuddīn al-Nasafī al-Ḥanafī [d. 710 AH] in his *Madarik al-Tanzīl*, which is highly praised as bringing together the best qualities of Zamakhshari’s *Kash’sḥāf* and Bayḍāwī’s *Anwār al-Tanzīl*, and free from Mūtazilī beliefs of Zamakhshari, and weak narrations found in Bayḍāwī’s *tafsīr*.

<sup>170</sup> Sūrah al-Najm, 53:20.

It is [falsely] alleged that he ﷺ said [after he recited the above verse mentioning the idols worshipped by Makkan pagans]: ***These are high-flying storks;<sup>171</sup> and their intercession is to be hoped for.***

We have spoken at length on this issue, repudiating this false claim, in our discussion on the Prostration of Recitation.<sup>172</sup>

Similar is the statement mentioned by some scholars of juridical principles which is [purportedly said by the Prophet ﷺ]: ***If a ḥadīth is narrated from my [speech] – present it upon the Book of Allāh – if it is consistent with it, accept it; and if it opposes it, then reject it.***<sup>173</sup>

Khaṭṭābī said: This [narration] was fabricated by heretics and is repudiated by the ḥadīth: ***“I was given the Book and similar [revelation]”***<sup>174</sup> and in another narration: ***“I was given the Book, and similar to it – along with it”***.<sup>175</sup>

---

<sup>171</sup> *Gharānīq*, plural of *ghirnīq*; storks. The previous verse mentions Lāt and ʿUzzā, prominent idols worshipped by the polytheists of Makkah, together with Manāt.

<sup>172</sup> In his gloss on Ṭibī’s commentary of *Mishkāṭ al-Maṣābīḥ*. See **Appendix E** for a detailed exposition by ʿĀllamah Ṭibī on this apocryphal story – an utter falsehood – forged by renegades, to cast aspersions on the Qur’ān. It is this abominable lie that enemies of Islām have circulated as ‘Satanic Verses’ and which the apostate Rushdie chose as the name for his blasphemous work. This is similar to the false story of “Mohammed ﷺ going to the mountain,” which is one among the many forgeries of orientalist.

<sup>173</sup> A number of scholars have mentioned it as an obvious forgery: See ʿĀjlūnī in *Kashf al-Khafā*, 2/569; *Tadhkirah al-Mawḍūʿāt* of Ṭāhir Patnī, p.28; Shawkānī in *Al-Fawāyid al-Majmūʿah*, §291; Sagḥānī in *Al-Mawḍūʿāt*, §43; Khaṭṭābī in *Māʾālim al-Sunan*, 4/276;

<sup>174</sup> ʿĀjlūnī in *Kashf al-Khafā*, 1/89.

<sup>175</sup> Abū Dāwūd, §4604 (ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth); Tirmidhī, §2664; Ibn Mājah, §12.

Ibn al-Jawzī has compiled a book on forgeries in two volumes. According to Ibn al-Şalāh, [Ibn al-Jawzī] mentioned a number of ḥadīth therein which are only weak, and there is no evidence of their being fabricated; in all fairness, those should be specified as weak narrations [and not fabrications].

Shaykh Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-Şaghānī<sup>176</sup> has also compiled a work identifying forgeries named: *Al-Durr al-Multaqaṭ fi Tabyīn al-Ghalaṭ*.<sup>177</sup>




---

<sup>176</sup> The famous Ḥanafī Imām of Indian origin, Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn Haydar al-Şaghānī al-Baghādādi [d. 650 AH] – jurist, ḥadīth master, linguist.

<sup>177</sup> Well-known references in the genre [compilations of forgeries] are:

1. *Tadhkirah al-Mawḏūāāt*, Ṭāhir Maqdisi al-Qayşarānī [d. 507 AH]
2. *Al-Abāṭil wa'l Manākīr*, Jawrqānī [d. 543 AH]
3. *Al-Mawḏūāāt*, Ibn al-Jawzī [d. 597 AH]
4. *Al-Mawḏūāāt*, Al-Şaghānī [d. 650 AH]
5. *Mukhtaşar al-Abāṭil wa'l Mawḏūāāt*, Al-Dhahabī [d. 748 AH]
6. *Al-La'ālī al-Maşnūāh*, Suyūṭī [d. 911 AH]
7. *Tamyīz al-Tayyib mina'l Khabīth*, Ibn al-Dabīy [d. 944 AH]
8. *Tanzīh al-Sharīāh*, Abu'l Ḥasan Ālī al-Ārrāq al-Kinānī [d.963 AH]
9. *Tadhkirah al-Mawḏūāāt*, Ṭāhir Fattani [d. 986 AH]
10. *Mawḏūāāt al-Kubrā*, Ālī al-Qārī [d. 1014 AH]
11. *Al-Maşnūū fi Mārīfatī'l Mawḏūū*, Ālī al-Qārī [d. 1014 AH]
12. *Al-Fawāyid al-Mawḏūāh*, Al-Karmī al-Maqdisi [d. 1032 AH]
13. *Fawāyid al-Majmūāh*, Shawkānī [d. 1250 AH]
14. *Asnā al-Maṭālib*, Bayruti [d. 1277 AH]
15. *Al-Āthār al-Marfūāh*, Ābdu'l Ḥayy Lucknawī [d. 1305 AH]

## CHAPTER TWO: APPRAISAL OF NARRATORS CRITICISM & APPROVAL

Appraisal of narrators is permissible to safeguard the Shariāh.<sup>178</sup> These are tools by which one can differentiate between a sound ḥadīth and a weak one. It is necessary for the critic or the evaluator to be firmly grounded in these two subjects - because many of them<sup>179</sup> have erred by censuring narrators who ought not to be criticised.<sup>180</sup>

There are two sections in this chapter.



---

<sup>178</sup> This is mentioned because speaking about the defects of people is a sin in Islam and is forbidden – unless it is for a legitimate reason. In ordinary circumstances, this would be deemed as backbiting – talking ill of someone – and the Qur’ān deplores this action. However, to safeguard the shariāh, so that opinions and fake information may not be inserted by liars, dishonest people and profligates, Muslim scholars were candid about narrators and their behaviour. They spoke about the uprightness or corruption of narrators – whether they were truthful or liars. A hadith master once lamented near Imām Aḥmad that he spoke about the flaws of so many people – Imām Aḥmad reprimanded him and said: “If you keep quiet and I keep quiet, how will the ordinary man know the difference between truth and falsehood?” Another ḥadīth master used to say when discussing narrators: “Come let us backbite in the path of Allāh”.

<sup>179</sup> Among the masters of this science...Some of the severe critics would consider a narrator as unreliable for trivial reasons and were extreme in their criticism of narrators, even though such narrators were not to be rejected – critics such as Ibn Taymiyyah, Ibn al-Jawzī, Ūqaylī, Ibn Ḥibbān and others, as mentioned by Dhahabī in his *Mīzān al-Iṭtidāl* [Summarised from Lucknawi’s *Ẓafar al-Amānī*, p.485].

<sup>180</sup> It is therefore that Imām Abū Ḥanīfah was criticised unfairly – some criticised him for excessive extrapolation [*qiyās*], some said that he was not well-versed in the Arabic language; some others said that his ḥadīth reports were few. None of these issues are valid bases for the criticism of any narrator [Lucknawi, p.485].

## SECTION ONE: ON UPRIGHTNESS AND METICULOUSNESS

**Ādālah** (Upright and virtuous): The narrator must be an adult (above puberty), a Muslim, sane and **free from** [deplorable] traits such as being corrupt, profligate or a blatant sinner; nor should he be bereft of [admirable traits such as] chivalry and common courtesy.

**Dabt** (Accuracy, meticulousness): The narrator should be attentive and observant, he should be someone who has memorised well and is not negligent, nor forgetful, nor heedless, nor given to doubt and confusion, during both his states: of acquisition [*taḥammul*] and of delivery [*adā*] of the ḥadīth.

- If he narrates from memory, he must be a *Ḥāfiẓ*.<sup>181</sup>
- If he narrates reading out from his notes, he should be known for accuracy in making notes.
- If he narrates the meaning of a ḥadīth in his own words, he should be astute and well-aware of aspects<sup>182</sup> that could cause confusion [and lend the narration to ambiguity and potential misinterpretation].

---

<sup>181</sup> One who has memorised the ḥadīth.

<sup>182</sup> It is not permissible to reword the ḥadīth [*riwāyah bi'l maʾnā*] if the narrator is not an expert in the meaning of words and their implications, the reason a particular word is used, and different connotations of the word; knowledge of words that can be potentially confused or misinterpreted; and the extent to which one can reword the ḥadīth lest they distort the meaning of the ḥadīth. If one is not an expert in summarising or rewording in a manner that the original message is retained in spirit, it is not permissible for them to restate it – rather, it becomes obligatory for them to narrate that ḥadīth exactly, in the very same words handed to them. [Lucknawi, p.493]

It is not a necessary condition [for narrating a hadith] that the narrator should be male<sup>183</sup> or a freeman, or that he/she should be knowledgeable about the juridical import [of the ḥadīth] or the meanings of arcane words [*gharīb*]. [It is also not required] that the narrator should possess eyesight<sup>184</sup> or that such a report should have multiple narrators.<sup>185</sup>

A narrator's uprightness [*ādālah*] is known by the testimony of two upright witnesses or by the affirmation and avouchment of a multitude [*istifāḍah*].<sup>186</sup>

A narrator's being meticulous [*ḍabṭ*] is known when his narrations are corroborated by trustworthy narrators, who are themselves well-known for being accurate and meticulous. If a narrator is mostly consistent with other meticulous narrators – even if they contradict his [accuracy] on occasions – he will still be deemed as a confirmed accurate and meticulous narrator.




---

<sup>183</sup> Women, slaves, non-Arabs, people with disabilities such as blindness, are all equally eligible if they are upright and known to be accurate. Anyone who has perused the narrations of the Companions and their followers, especially those narrated by the Mothers of Believers, will have no doubt about this principle.

<sup>184</sup> Verbatim reports of narrators who are blind/visually impaired are also accepted.

<sup>185</sup> Reports of lone-narrators are accepted, as is commonly known.

<sup>186</sup> Such as the four imāms, whose uprightness is beyond doubt and who were famous in their own lifetimes for being pious and righteous. The greatness of these imāms and their devoutness was not only affirmed by commonfolk, but also by men in positions of power and authority. Most importantly, contemporary scholars vouched for their integrity and attested to their virtuous and spotless character.

## SECTION TWO: CRITICISM AND INDICTMENT

The reports of a narrator are not accepted if:

- he is known to be inattentive during the acquisition and hearing of the ḥadīth [*samāʾ* by the student] or during narration [*ismāʾ* by the shaykh] such as being sleepy or preoccupied with some other work [at that time]
- or when he narrates something from an unvalidated source<sup>187</sup>
- or when he makes a lot of errors when he is narrating from a validated source<sup>188</sup>
- or when he is known to narrate bizzare, anomalous, aberrant and repudiated reports [*shādh/shawādh*, *munkar/manākīr*]

If a person commits a mistake in narrating a ḥadīth, the correct version shall be brought to his notice. If he remains insistent on his own version and does not rectify his mistake, it is said that his credential of being upright will be revoked.<sup>189</sup>

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ said: This is in case of obduracy – but if this is due to an error of judgement and falling short in research, his uprightness will not be questioned.

---

<sup>187</sup> Because the source from which he narrates is not reliable, because it was not corrected, or verified against reliable or authoritative versions [Lucknawi, p.499].

<sup>188</sup> In some manuscripts of Sharīf's *Risālah*, it is mentioned as: “when **not** narrating from validated source.” However, going by context, it appears that the negation is not correct. The version preferred by Lucknawi makes sense and is therefore translated here.

<sup>189</sup> He will not be deemed upright and righteous anymore [*tasquṭu ʾadālatuhu*].

## NOTE

In these times,<sup>190</sup> scholars have turned away from requiring every condition<sup>191</sup> mentioned [for accepting ḥadīth narrations]. They are satisfied merely by outward affirmation of a narrator's probity [and do not investigate further].<sup>192</sup>

And concerning accuracy, [they find it sufficient] that a narrator has heard from his shaykh and affirms it by notes in his own hand, which can be reliably attributed to him – and his narration of the same which was consistent with the source-narrations of his shaykh [*li-aṣli shaykhihi*]. This is because the *ṣaḥīḥ*, *ḥasan* and other<sup>193</sup> ḥadīth have [already] been collected in books by imāms, so that none of the ḥadīth [that they knew] could be lost. The objective of [narration and] hearing ḥadīth is to keep alive the tradition of narration via a chain of authority [*isnād*], which is an exclusive attribute of our nation.<sup>194</sup>



---

<sup>190</sup> This monograph is an abridgement of Ṭibī's *Al-Khulāṣah*, and these are Ṭibī's words; this note appears as the 14<sup>th</sup> point after discussing various aspects of criticism. Here, Ṭibī speaks of his age, i.e., the 8<sup>th</sup> century. Lucknawi: "That is, in an age when the ḥadīth were already compiled in books and preserved in pages – and when ḥadīth scholars, the world over, had achieved their objective and reached their goal [in compilation of hadith]" [*Zaḡfar al-Amānī*, p500].

<sup>191</sup> Ṭibī discusses 13 aspects of 'criticism' and concludes with the 14<sup>th</sup> point: "In these times people do not require every single condition to be met.."

<sup>192</sup> In the monograph it is printed as: *mash'hūr*/famous; but in commentaries and Ṭibī's original it is *mastūr*, outwardly upright but his inner state is not known and thus, 'hidden'.

<sup>193</sup> Such as weak ḥadīth.

<sup>194</sup> No other community or civilisation has this unique and peerless tradition of narrating a piece of information through successive generations of upright and accurate reporters.



## CHAPTER THREE: RECEIVING AND CONVEYING ḤADĪTH<sup>195</sup>

It is valid and acceptable for a person to narrate a ḥadīth that he had heard or received before becoming a Muslim.<sup>196</sup>




So also when the ḥadīth was received before the person became an adult (became pubert) because Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, Ibn ʿAbbās, Ibn al-Zubayr [narrated the ḥadīth they] had heard before reaching puberty – and scholars have unceasingly been narrating<sup>197</sup> to children. There is a difference of opinion about the age in which a child is deemed eligible to receive the ḥadīth [i.e. hear it].

Some have said: The age of five.

Some have said: every child has a different age of cognisance; if the child can understand that which is being said and can answer [if a question is asked], we deem the receiving [samaʿ] of the child as valid even if he is younger than five – if not,<sup>198</sup> it is not valid.

---

<sup>195</sup> *Tahammul al-ḥadīth*: Lit. ‘bearing’ or receiving the ḥadīth.

<sup>196</sup> Because the person should be eligible at the time of the delivery/conveyance of the ḥadīth. For example, in Bukhārī etc. is a ḥadīth narrated by Abū Sufyān, Sakhr ibn Ḥarb [father of Muʾāwiyah , in which he recounts the exchange with Heraclius, the Roman emperor, and this was before he [Abū Sufyān] became a Muslim. Another example is that of Jubayr ibn Muṭʿīm , that he saw the Prophet  standing on the plains of ʿArafah before his emigration to Madīnah; and this was prior to Jubayr’s becoming a Muslim.

<sup>197</sup> Lit. making children hear the ḥadīth – i.e. receive it.

<sup>198</sup> If the child is not capable of being spoken to – and unable to understand and reply in a cogent manner, the child is deemed ineligible to have ‘received’ the ḥadīth, irrespective of his/her age.

There are seven modes in which ḥadīth can be received [by the narrator].

### **FIRST: SAMĀĀ**

Hearing the ḥadīth read out/recited by the master<sup>199</sup> [*samāā min lafẓ al-shaykh*]

### **SECOND: QIRĀ’AH**

Reading out / reciting the ḥadīth in front of the master [*qirā’ah ālayh*]

### **THIRD: IJĀZAH**

Authorisation granted by the master [*ijāzah*]; and there are different kinds of permissions

1. A specific authorisation for a specific thing [*ijāzatu muáyyan li muáyyan*] such as: “I grant you authorisation for the book of *Bukhārī*” or “I have given authorisation to so-and-so for everything that is included in my list of narrations [*fihristī*]”.
2. A specific authorisation for a non-specific thing [*ijāzatu muáyyan fī ghayr muáyyan*] such as: “I grant you authorisation for every thing that I have heard or everything that I have narrated”.
3. A generic authorisation [*ijāzatu’l úmūm*] such as: I have granted authorisation to all Muslims; or to [all] my contemporaries.

Rightly, the above three kinds of authorisations are valid and acceptable.

4. Authorisation to someone hitherto non-existent [*ijāzatu’l mādūm*] such as: “I grant authorisation to anyone born of so-and-so”.<sup>200</sup>

---

<sup>199</sup> That is, the source narrator.

<sup>200</sup> That is, hitherto non-existent; whether unborn or not even conceived.

The correct opinion is that such an authorisation is forbidden.<sup>201</sup>

However, if [the master] gives this to a specific individual and for his progeny, such as: ‘authorisation for you and all your offspring’ – such an authorisation is valid similar to a trust [*waqf*].<sup>202</sup>

The authorisation given to a child who is not of discerning age, is also valid, because it is merely a permission [*ibāḥah*] to narrate, and a permission can be given to anyone – prudent or otherwise.

Concerning forwarded authorisations [*ijāzatu’l mujāz*]: “I grant you licence for all the authorisations that I was granted.” It is highly desirable for both the giver and acceptor of the authorisation to be scholars, as this helps increase the reach [of *ijāzah*] and is needed by scholars.<sup>203</sup>

Also, it is important for the person granting authorisation to both say it orally and to write it down on paper; however, it will be valid even if it is only a written authorisation.

#### FOURTH: MUNĀWALAH

Handing over a written Ḥadīth [*munāwalah*]: The highest type of *munāwalah* is that which is accompanied by an [express] authorisation. *Munāwalah* means [a narrator] hands over the original [written]

---

<sup>201</sup> Because in this case, it is like ‘informing’ someone non-existent, which is impossible.

<sup>202</sup> Here, the permission is for someone existing AND for his progeny. This is the position of Abū Dāwūd. This is better than a vague permission given directly to someone who is hitherto non-existent [*mādūm*] [Tabrīzī].

<sup>203</sup> Some authorities have said that it is necessary for one to be a qualified scholar to receive such a permission, as it is reported from Imām Mālik. Ibn Ābdu’l Barr said: The correct position is that it is not allowed to give such a permission except to an expert [Tabrīzī].

narration and he says: “This is what I heard [*samāyī*]” or “my report [*riwāyatī*] from so-and-so narrator” and “I grant you authorisation to narrate this.” He then hands over the written matter or allows the person to copy it from the original.

Another kind of *munāwalah* is that the seeker [*tālib*] hands his written notes of ḥadīth to his shaykh, who is learned and astute. The shaykh studies the notes carefully and hands them back saying: “This is my [narration of the] ḥadīth, or [narrations] which I have heard. You can narrate them from me”. This is known as “presenting written notes” [*ārd al-munāwalah*]. There are other types of *munāwalah* as well.<sup>204</sup>

#### **FIFTH: MUKĀTABAH**

Correspondence [*mukātabah*]: The ḥadīth master grants [authorisation to] narrate to someone who is not present – or even if he is present – written in his own hand; or asks someone to write it for him. This can be either accompanied by an [explicit] authorisation, for example: “I have granted him authorisation...” or without [that]. The correct position is that narration in this mode is acceptable in both cases.<sup>205</sup>

#### **SIXTH: IYĪLĀM**

Notification [*iyīlām*]: The teacher/narrator [*shaykh*] informs the student: “this written record<sup>206</sup> is my narration” – but does not add : “narrate it from me”. The correct position is that it is not permissible to narrate

---

<sup>204</sup> Such as *munāwalah* accompanied by the Shaykh’s authorisation and *munāwalah* sans authorisation.

<sup>205</sup> That is with an explicit authorisation and without.

<sup>206</sup> In a book or in papers – in Arabic “written material” – *kitāb*.

[from the shaykh] in this manner, because of the possibility that the shaykh might have seen something untoward<sup>207</sup> and therefore did not give him an express authorisation.

## SEVENTH: WIJĀDAH

Found [*wijādah*]:<sup>208</sup> This word is derived from [the root] *wajada-yajid*, which means, “he found – he finds.”

This is when one finds a ḥadīth<sup>209</sup> in the writing of a shaykh<sup>210</sup> in a book, for which the said finder does not have authorisation to narrate from the shaykh;<sup>211</sup> in such a case, the finder says:

- ‘I have found [writtten]’ or
- ‘I have read it in the handwriting of so-and-so’ or
- ‘I have [found] in the book of so-and-so, in his own handwriting’

And then he narrates the chain of authority [*sanad*] and the text of the ḥadīth [*matn*; as found in the book].

This form of narration has been in practice in the past and [continues] until now [lit. ‘later ages’] – it is deemed similar to a *Mursal* ḥadīth and has a semblance of being a continuously connected chain [*ittiṣāl*].

---

<sup>207</sup> Untoward or inappropriate, either in the student – or in the written material [*Tabrīzī*].

<sup>208</sup> This word is not found in the vocabulary of ancient Arabs; it is a word derived by the masters of this science [*Ẓaḡfar al-Amānī*, p.524. *Tabrīzī*, p172 citing Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ].

<sup>209</sup> Ḥadīth along with isnād was found written.

<sup>210</sup> That which the person who ‘finds’ it recognises as the handwriting of so-and-so.

<sup>211</sup> A shaykh might have granted his pupil permission, but in this specific case, the shaykh might not have given permission to the person who found [or discovered] this ḥadīth in the handwriting of the shaykh.

Know however, that a group of ḥadīth scholars<sup>212</sup> were extremely strict concerning [receiving and conveying ḥadīth] and they said: We cannot take as evidence anything<sup>213</sup> unless it is narrated by the ḥadīth master from his memory. Some have said that narrating from written notes is also permissible until those notes remain in the possession [of the narrator].

On the other hand, some scholars were lenient and they said: It is permissible to narrate from copied notes – even if they were not cross-verified with the original.

The correct position is, if the ḥadīth narrator has received the ḥadīth [*taḥammul*], has accurately taken cognisance of it [*dabt*], and cross-verified it [*muqābalah*] according to the methods mentioned above, then it is permissible for him to narrate the ḥadīth – even if he does not have the written notes, as long the narration is safe from changes<sup>214</sup> – and certainly if he<sup>215</sup> is among those who are capable of detecting any modifications [in the narration].<sup>216</sup>



---

<sup>212</sup> Imām Nawawī in *Al-Taqrīb* attributed this to Imām Mālik and Imām Abū Ḥanīfah and they said: It is because of this reason that Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's narrations are fewer.

<sup>213</sup> That is all forms of bearing and conveying ḥadīth [*taḥammul*, *adā*] cannot be used as evidence [*ḥujjah*], except those ḥadīth where a ḥadīth master narrates from his memory.

<sup>214</sup> *Tagh'yīr*: change, transformation.

<sup>215</sup> The person who had those written notes.

<sup>216</sup> In which case, there will be an assurance of being safe from any addition or omission [Lucknawi, p.526].

## CHAPTER FOUR: BIOGRAPHIES <sup>217</sup>

**Şāḥābī**, Companion: A Muslim who saw<sup>218</sup> the Prophet ﷺ.

Some jurists<sup>219</sup> opine that a person should have remained in the company of the Prophet ﷺ for a considerable time to be deemed a Companion.

**Tābiyī**, Successor: Every Muslim who has remained in the company of a Companion. It is also said that just meeting a Companion will suffice – and this much is obvious.

A satisfactory discussion concerning names, teknonyms,<sup>220</sup> agnomens, titles, sobriquets; the ranks in knowledge and piety of people in these two grades [i.e. Companions and their followers] and those after them [among ḥadīth narrators], would lead to lengthy definitions and numerous details [beyond the scope of this brief epistle].



---

<sup>217</sup> *Asmā al-Rijāl* = Lit. Names of Men.

<sup>218</sup> That is in the worldly life of the Prophet ﷺ and the lifetime of the person seeing him. Technically, this means being in the company of – seeing is not a condition per se, because some companions were sightless – such as Ibn Umm Maktūm ﷺ.

<sup>219</sup> *Uşūliyyūn* – scholars of legal theory.

<sup>220</sup> *Kunyah*, in general, is referring to someone by attributes such as:

**Teknonym**: the practice of referring to parents by the names of their children; such as **Abū'l Ābbās** – father of Ābbās.

**Patronym**: referring to someone by the names of their fathers: **Ibn Ābbās** – son of Ābbās.

**Matronym** – referring to someone by the name of their mother **Yīsā ibn Maryam** – Yīsā son of Maryam ﷺ; **Ibn Umm Maktūm** – son of Umm-Maktūm [interestingly, this is a circular reference – his mother Ātikah was called Umm Maktūm – ‘mother of the concealed’ as Ābdullāh ﷺ was blind by birth].

**Mālik**<sup>221</sup> passed away in Madīnah in the year 179 AH; he was born in the year 93 or 91 or 94 or 97 AH.

**Abū Ḥanīfah** passed away in Baghdad in the year 150 AH; he was seventy at the time of his passing.<sup>222</sup>

**Shāfiʿī**<sup>223</sup> passed away in Egypt in the year 204 AH; he was born in 150 AH.

**Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal**<sup>224</sup> passed away in Baghdad in the year 241 AH; he was born in 164 AH.



**Bukhārī**<sup>225</sup> was born on Friday night, 13<sup>th</sup> of Shawwāl, 194 AH; he passed away on the night of Eid al-Fiṭr [1<sup>st</sup> Shawwāl], 256 AH, in the town of Khartank in Bukhārā. He was 55 years old.

**Muslim**<sup>226</sup> passed away in Nisabūr, 261 AH; he was 55 years old.

**Abū Dāwūd**<sup>227</sup> passed away in Baṣrah 277 AH.

---

<sup>221</sup> Imām Mālik ibn Anas ibn Mālik ibn Abī Āāmir ibn Āmr al-Aṣḥabī, Abū ʿAbdullāh.

<sup>222</sup> Imām Númān ibn Thabit ibn Zūṭā [or Marzubān] ibn Māh al-Kūfī, of Persian origin.

<sup>223</sup> Imām Muḥammad ibn Idrīs ibn ʿAbbās ibn ʿUthmān ibn **Shafiʿī** [who was a *ṣaḥābī*] ibn al-Sāʿib ibn ʿUbayd – al-Qurashi, al-Muṭṭalabī, al-Makkī, al-Shāfiʿī.

<sup>224</sup> Imām Aḥmad ibn ʿAbdullāh ibn Ḥanbal al-Shaybani; Abū ʿAbdullāh.

<sup>225</sup> Imām Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Mughīrah ibn Bardizbah al-Bukhārī, Abū ʿAbdullāh.

<sup>226</sup> Imām Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj ibn Muslim ibn Ward ibn Kūshādh al-Qushayrī al-Nīsābūrī, Abūʾl Ḥusayn.

<sup>227</sup> Imām Sulaymān ibn Ash-āth ibn Isʿhāq ibn Bashir al-Sajistānī; Abū Dāwūd.



**Tirmidhī**<sup>228</sup> passed away in Tirmidh, 279 AH.

**Nasā'ī**<sup>229</sup> passed away in 303 AH.

**Dāraqutnī**<sup>230</sup> passed away in Baghdad, in the year 385 AH and he was born in 306 AH.

**Ĥākīm**<sup>231</sup> passed away in Neyshabur<sup>232</sup> in 405 AH, and was born in 321 AH.

**Bayhaqī**<sup>233</sup> was born in 384 and passed away in Neyshabur in 458 AH.

May Allāh have mercy on them all.



*End of Sharīf al-Jurjānī's Epistle*

---

<sup>228</sup> Imām Muḥammad ibn Yīsā ibn Sawrah al-Tirmidhī; Abū Yīsā.

<sup>229</sup> Imām Aḥmad ibn Shuāyb ibn Ālī ibn Sinān ibn Baḥr al-Khurāsānī al-Nasā'ī; Abū Abdu'l Raḥmān.

<sup>230</sup> Imām Ālī ibn Ūmar ibn Aḥmad ibn Mahdi ibn Masūūd al-Dāraqutnī; Abū'l Ḥasan.

<sup>231</sup> Imām Muḥammad ibn Abdullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Hamduwayh ibn Nuāym ibn al-Hakam al-Ḍabbī al-Tuhmānī al-Nīsābūrī; known as Ibn Bayyī' and famous as al-Ĥākīm. He is the author of *al-Mustadrak*.

<sup>232</sup> It is officially Romanised as Neyshabur; it was known as Nishapur in Farsi and Nīsābūr in Arabic.

<sup>233</sup> Imām Aḥmad ibn al-Ĥusayn ibn Ālī ibn Mūsā al-Bayhaqī al-Khusrājirdī; Abū Bakr; he was a student of Imām Ĥākīm.

## APPENDIX A

# THE FABRICATED HĀDĪTH OF THE STORKS

## INTRODUCTION

*The gist of the issue and heinous allegation is that the Prophet ﷺ recited the verse of Sūrah al-Najm, which mentions the three idols of the Pagan Arabs, and thereafter – we seek Allāh's refuge – he said: “**these are lofty dieties<sup>234</sup> and from them intercession is hoped**”, and then prostrated! The idolators were overjoyed at what they took as the praise of their idols and they too prostrated. The pagans of Makkah were pleased and they began to claim that RasūlAllāh ﷺ had made peace with them by praising their idols (al-iyādhu billāh). According to various versions of this [false] story, the offensive lines were instigated by Satan and were issued upon the pristine tongue of the Prophet ﷺ. Some have said that– al-iyādhu billāh – the Prophet ﷺ was sleepy and he did not realise what he was reciting. And therefore verse 52 of Sūrah al-Ĥajj was revealed, effacing shayṭān's prompted ‘verses’. This is the claim of rumour mongers, which the enemies of our religion put forward, to defame Islām and cast aspersion on the Qur’ān. Orientalists refer to these, as the ‘Satanic Verses’.*

*There are many problems with this story and some claims contradict fundamental articles of faith.*

---

<sup>234</sup> *Gharānīq*, plural of *gharnīq*; literally means a stork or a crane – refers to idols; some have said that it refers to angels. Various dictionaries describe *gharnīq* as ‘a white water-bird with a long neck and long bill’ and some have described it as a ‘bird with dark feathers similar to a duck’.

Given below is the Sunni position:

1. The Prophet ﷺ recited Sūrah al-Najm and prostrated at the close of the sūrah. Imām Bukhārī and others have reported this event, but **none of them** mentioned the myth of the storks.
2. An overwhelming majority of scholars like Qāḍī Iyāḍ, Imām Rāzī and others have flatly rejected the story as patently false and based on fabricated narrations.
3. However, an objection still remains: if the story is entirely false, then what is the meaning of verse 22:52 in Sūrah al-Ḥajj that says:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ قَبْلِكَ مِنْ رَسُولٍ وَلَا نَبِيٍّ إِلَّا إِذَا تَمَعَّى أَلْقَى الشَّيْطَانُ فِي أُمْنِيَّتِهِ  
فَيَنْسَخُ اللَّهُ مَا يُلْقِي الشَّيْطَانُ ثُمَّ يُحْكِمُ اللَّهُ ءَايَتَهُ ۚ وَاللَّهُ عَلِيمٌ حَكِيمٌ

And We have not sent before you, from a Messenger or a Prophet, except that when he recited, the Devil sneaked something alongside [the Prophet's] recitation. So Allāh will efface that which shayṭān has slipped in between – and [Allāh will] clarify His verses. And Allāh is the Knower, the Wise.<sup>235</sup>

4. The response to the above objection is of two types:
  - a. The entire story is fictitious. No such event occurred where shayṭān sneaked in his words. As for the meaning of verse 22:52 above, there can be valid explanations without the need for this story.<sup>236</sup>

---

<sup>235</sup> Sūrah al-Ḥajj, 22:52.

<sup>236</sup> See Shaykh ʿAbdu'l Ḥaqq Dihlawī's explanation below.

- b. *There may be some truth as to how shayṭān tried to sneak in his own words, but not in the manner retold by heretics and enemies of Islām. There are plausible explanations which are consistent with fundamental beliefs. And this route is taken **only if** the reports of the story have some basis.*
5. *Whatever the case, the alleged words NEVER issued from the blessed tongue of the Prophet ﷺ, because the opening of the same sūrah [in which Lāt and Manāt are mentioned] clearly declares: **"He doth not speak of his own desire; rather, it is nothing but inspiration [wahy] revealed unto him"**<sup>237</sup>*
  6. *It should also be noted that immediately after the mention of Lāt and Manāt, the Qur'ān repudiates them as 'mere names, fantasies adopted by your forefathers and which you fancy; they do not exist in reality'<sup>238</sup> It is impossible that they can be praised – even if you take the āyah literally.*
  7. *The sūrah goes on to extol the lofty ranks of the Prophet ﷺ. It is therefore that he prostrated in gratitude, at the end of the sūrah. This is 40 verses after the mention of Lāt and Manāt. So the claim that the prostration was related to the idols is patently false.*
  8. *It should also be mentioned that scholars such as Ibn Ḥajar al-Āsqalānī investigated the routes and contested the claim of Imām Rāzī and Qāḍī Iyāḍ that none of the routes were authentic. This was an academic exercise – but everyone including Imām Ṭabarī*

---

<sup>237</sup> Sūrah al-Najm, 53:3-4.

<sup>238</sup> Sūrah al-Najm, 53: 23. See full translation below.

*and others who reported these narrations, agreed that it is impossible for the Prophet ﷺ to have uttered those words; there can be explanations for the narrations, but the undisputed fact is that the Prophet ﷺ never uttered those words.*

*And Allāh táālā knows best.*

*I have summarised the above from Állāmah Ṭībī's commentary on Mishkāṭ al-Maṣābīḥ and Shaykh Ábdu'l Ḥaqq Dihlawī's explanation in Madārij al-Nubuwwah, the translations of which follow.*



## FROM ṬĪBĪ'S COMMENTARY ON MISHKAT<sup>239</sup>

The first ḥadīth narrated by Ibn ʿAbbās ؓ: ***“The Prophet ﷺ prostrated after recitation of Sūrah al-Najm and everyone prostrated with him – Muslims and polytheists, the jinn and men.”***<sup>240</sup>

The Prophet ﷺ probably prostrated [in gratitude], because Allāh táālā has described his noble person in the beginning of the sūrah as ***‘he doth not speak of his own desire’***. And in this sūrah is the mention of his closeness to Allāh táālā – and that He showed His Messenger great and magnificent signs – and the Prophet ﷺ saw Allāh táālā with his waking eyes, neither did his sight stray away nor transgress [the limits]. These are unique and exquisite blessings for the Prophet ﷺ, upon which he bowed down and prostrated to Allāh táālā in gratitude.

As for the idolators [of Makkah] when they heard the mention of their three idols, Lāt, ʿUzzā and Manāt – they too prostrated.<sup>241</sup>

The story that mentions that the polytheists prostrated because the Prophet ‘praised’ their idols is an utter lie. That he said: ***“They are lofty birds;<sup>242</sup> and their intercession is hoped for”*** is a patent falsehood.

How can it even be imagined that ***he*** would say so?

---

<sup>239</sup> *Al-Kāshif ʿanī’l Haqā’iq*, 4/1; On Prostrations of Recitation in the Qur’ān.

<sup>240</sup> *Bukhārī*, §1071.

<sup>241</sup> without realising the idols were refuted as ‘mere names and absolute zilch in reality’.

<sup>242</sup> Referring to the idols; in Arabic *gharānīq*; lit. ‘birds’; known as ‘story of *gharānīq*’.

Especially when it is said in between:<sup>243</sup> *“He doth not speak of his own desire. It is not, except inspiration [waḥy], that is revealed unto him”*,<sup>244</sup> and the verse: *“Those are not, but [mere] names that you have named yourselves and your forefathers; Allāh táālā has not revealed any proof for them [or their existence]; they are not following except false notions [borne purely out of imagination] and their own whims [and fancies].”*<sup>245</sup>

How is it possible [that it can be construed as praise of idols] when the very verse mentioning idols starts with a repudiating question [and dismissing it with disdain].<sup>246</sup>

The verse starts with, ‘*Do you not see?*’ which is an explicit rejection and repudiation of polytheism. It means: “Do you hold these as partners alongside Allāh? Then tell me about their names, if they are gods – in fact, they are not, but mere names you have chosen yourself upon your own whims and fancies; and there is no proof that Allāh táālā has revealed these names.”

Imām [Fakhruddīn Rāzī] in his tafsīr has narrated from Imām Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq ibn Khuzaymah<sup>247</sup> that he was asked about this story. He replied: “It was fabricated by renegades” and he then wrote a book refuting this [lie].

---

<sup>243</sup> The verse of Lāt-Manāt is #19-20 falls in **between** the verse of the Prophet not speaking of his own desire is #2-3; and the denouncement of idols which is #23.

<sup>244</sup> Sūrah al-Najm, 53:3-4.

<sup>245</sup> Sūrah al-Najm, 53:23.

<sup>246</sup> *hamzah al-inkar* followed by *fā* indicates a statement. {**a-fa-ra’aytum**}: ‘*a*’ the hamzah, is a question; here it is a rhetorical question, rejecting the statement that follows.

<sup>247</sup> Imām Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq Ibn Khuzaymah, Abū Bakr al-Sullami [312-223 AH].

Imām Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī said: ‘This is a story which is not proven in any manner by way of narration.’ Then he analysed all the narrators in these reports and demonstrated that they were all castigated and disreputable.

Imām Abū Maṣṣūr al-Māturīdī in his *Khaṣīs al-Atqiyā’a* said: The truth of the matter is that the phrase: “Those are lofty birds..”, is a statement from the inspiration of the Devil to his minions among heretics and renegades [*zanādiqah*] and they spread this among people of weak and faltering faith, so they can sow doubts about our Formidable Religion. The noble person of the Prophet ﷺ is exonerated from such a [heinous] allegation as circulated in these reports.

A historian has said that the source of this fabricated report is Ibn al-Zabāriy. Those who wish to learn more about it may please refer to *Tafsīr al-Kabīr*. Allāh tāālā knows best. We will also mention Imām Muḥiyuddīn al-Nawawī’s similar analysis mentioned in his commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* in the third section.



### ***Ṭibī in the Third Section of Prostrations of Recitation***

***Narrated by<sup>248</sup> Ibn Masūūd that the Prophet ﷺ recited Sūrah al-Najm and prostrated [at the end]. And everyone present prostrated – except an old man from the Quraysh, who grabbed a handful of gravel – or dust – and raised it to his forehead and said: ‘This much is enough’. Ábdullāh [ibn Masūūd] said: Indeed, I saw him thereafter, slain as an infidel.***

---

<sup>248</sup> *Mishkāt al-Maṣābiḥ*, §1037.



***[Bukhārī & Muslim]. Bukhārī has the additional wording: The old man was Umayyah ibn Khalaf.***

Qāḍī Īyāḍ<sup>249</sup> has said: The reason everyone prostrated is because, as Ibn Masūūd ؓ has said: ‘It was the first verse of prostration revealed.’

As for what the historians and Qur’ānic exegetes write about the background of the verse, that the praise of false gods of polytheists occurred upon the tongue of the Messenger of Allāh – peace and blessings be upon him – such an allegation is patently false; none of it is true or reliable – neither by way of narration, nor by reason. Because praise of an idol is kufr – and in no way can it be attributed to the noble person of the Prophet ﷺ, nor that it could have issued from his blessed tongue. It is grossly incorrect and inappropriate to say that the Devil spoke upon his tongue – because the Devil has no power over him.



---

<sup>249</sup> Qāḍī Īyāḍ ibn Mūsā al-Yaḥsubī al-Mālikī [d. 544 AH].

## SHAYKH ÁBDU'L ĤAQQ DIHLAWĪ IN MADĀRIJ<sup>250</sup>

***The Truth about a Rumour:*** We had mentioned in passing that a group of emigrants to Abyssinia returned to Makkah, upon receiving news that the disbelievers of Quraysh had made peace with the Prophet ﷺ.

The details of this rumour are like this:<sup>251</sup>

One day the Prophet ﷺ, while inviting the pagans of Makkah to Islām, was reciting Sūrah al-Najm. When he reached the following verse:

أَفَرَأَيْتُمُ اللَّاتَ وَالْعُزَّىٰ ﴿١٩﴾ وَمَنْوَةَ الثَّالِثَةَ الْآخَرَىٰ ﴿٢٠﴾

Do you not see Lāt and Úzzā; and Manāt, the third other.<sup>252</sup>

Satan interfered and made the following words to reach the ears of the polytheists of Makkah:

***They are the lofty idols; and their intercession is hoped***

After completing the sūrah, the Prophet ﷺ prostrated. Muslims in attendance prostrated and polytheists also prostrated. There was not a single disbeliever in Masjid al-Ĥarām who did not prostrate. Except one – according to the famous narration – Umayyah ibn Khalaf al-Jumāhī, who picked up a handful of dust and wiped it on his forehead and said: “This much is sufficient.”

---

<sup>250</sup> *Madārij al-Nubuwwah*, 2/65; magnum opus of Imām Muḥaddith Ábdu'l Ĥaqq Bukhārī Dihlawī [d. 1095 AH], the finest and most authoritative work of Prophetic biography in the Persian language. The above is based on the Urdu translation of the same by Muftī Ghulām Muḥīnuddīn al-Naḥīmī [d.1391 AH / 1971].

<sup>251</sup> The shaykh has cited the rumour here; his analysis and refutation follows.

<sup>252</sup> Sūrah al-Najm 53:19-20.

After this, the idolators were very happy and said: “Muḥammad [ﷺ] has mentioned our idols, praised them and affirmed their intercession. So now onwards, we too shall respect him and accept him. [They further said:] Of course, we too do not consider [these idols as] creators, givers of sustenance, or givers of life and death. When Muḥammad [ﷺ] agrees with us, we too shall make peace with him and we will stop persecuting and tormenting his followers.” This news reached everywhere in the region and the Devil helped spread it. When this news reached the refugees [from Makkah] in Abyssinia, they returned to Makkah. This event caused immense distress and pain to the Prophet ﷺ, and to comfort him and give him solace, Allāh tāālā revealed the following verse:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ قَبْلِكَ مِنْ رَّسُولٍ وَلَا نَبِيٍّ إِلَّا إِذَا تَمَنَّى أَلْقَى الشَّيْطَانُ فِي أُمْنِيَّتِهِ  
فَيَنْسَخُ اللَّهُ مَا يُلْقِي الشَّيْطَانُ ثُمَّ يُحْكِمُ اللَّهُ ءَايَتَهُ ۚ وَاللَّهُ عَلِيمٌ حَكِيمٌ

And We have not sent before you, from a Messenger, or a Prophet, except that when he recited, the Devil sneaked something alongside [the Prophet's] recitation. So Allāh will efface that which shayṭān has slipped in between – and [Allāh will] clarify His verses. And Allāh is the Knower, the Wise.<sup>253</sup>

When this verse reached the disbelievers, they said: “Muḥammad [ﷺ] spoke well of our gods and praised them; he is now regretful and [disavowing what he said] – therefore, we too shall withdraw our truce”.

**[End of the Myth of Storks as it is retold]**

---

<sup>253</sup> Sūrah al-Ḥajj, 22:52.

Scholars of Islām have questioned the authenticity of this story.

Qādī Īyād analysed this in his *Al-Shifā*, and declared that [the narrations via which this story is told] are weak [and therefore, unreliable].

Imām Rāzī in his tafsīr has proscribed it as an utter lie, fabricated by renegades. It is said that it was one among the libels of Ibn al-Zabārī.

The Prophet ﷺ, whose blessed tongue is the Exponent of Truth, the Quintessence of Veracity, about whom Allāh tāālā has said: ***“He doth not speak of his own desire; indeed, [everything he saith] is not, but revelation [waḥy], inspired,”***<sup>254</sup> – how can it be possible that praise of idols could issue from his tongue? It is also impossible for the Prophet ﷺ to add something in the Qur’ān – deliberately, or mistakenly – that which is not a part of the Qur’ān. Especially adding something that blatantly contradicts the core message of the Unity of God [*tawḥīd*], brought by the Prophet ﷺ himself!

According to Bayhaqī, this strange and bizzare story is not established by any reliable report – and the narrators of the reports which mention it are disreputable and of questionable integrity.

Bukhārī has mentioned a ḥadīth in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*, that the noble Prophet ﷺ recited Sūrah al-Najm and at its close, he prostrated. All the Muslims and polytheists, the jinn and men present prostrated. This much is narrated via authentic routes and trustworthy narrators – but none of them has mentioned this *Myth of the Storks*. Without any doubt, anyone who alleges that the Prophet ﷺ had ‘respected’ idols [at any time in his life]

---

<sup>254</sup> Sūrah al-Najm, 53:2-3.

becomes a *kāfir*. Therefore, we know by narrated evidence<sup>255</sup> and rational proof, that the story is apocryphal and a patent falsehood. This is the opinion of majority of scholars and *ḥadīth* masters.

However, some scholars like Abū Ḥātim,<sup>256</sup> Ṭabarī,<sup>257</sup> Ibn al-Mundhir,<sup>258</sup> Ibn Isḥāq,<sup>259</sup> Mūsā ibn Ūqbah,<sup>260</sup> and Abū Maáshar,<sup>261</sup> and some others, have reported this story via weak and unreliable narrators and in reports which are interrupted [*munqaṭiʿ*], with skipped narrators [*mursal*], muddled [*muḍtarib*] or inauthentic [due to other reasons].

Irrespective of the quality of these reports, it appears that there is some basis for the story and therefore, it is necessary to find plausible explanations and valid interpretations for these narrations so that the distasteful implications are warded off – but some exegetes strayed into alleys far from the road of satisfactory explanation and plausible interpretation.

For example, they said: These words were issued from his blessed tongue [we seek Allāh's refuge] in a state of sleepiness, and he did not realise what he was saying. And when he came to know about it, then Allāh *táālā* clarified [that the words were not part of revelation]. This is reported by Ṭabarī via Qatādah.

---

<sup>255</sup> Via reliable and trustworthy narrators.

<sup>256</sup> Ḥāfiẓ Ábdu'l Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Idrīs al-Rāzī ibn Abī Ḥātim [d.327 AH] famous exegete and *ḥadīth* imām.

<sup>257</sup> Ḥāfiẓ Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Mundhir Al-Nisābūrī [d. 318 AH].

<sup>258</sup> Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭabarī, Abū Jaáfar [d. 323 AH].

<sup>259</sup> Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq ibn Yasār al-Madanī [80-151 AH].

<sup>260</sup> Abū Muḥammad Mūsā ibn Ūqbah ibn Abī Ayyash [d. 141 AH].

<sup>261</sup> Abū Maáshar Najīh ibn Ábdu'l Raḥmān al-Sindi al-Madanī [d. 170 AH].

Qāḍī Īyāḍ rejected this flatly and refuted this ‘explanation’ and he said that it is absolutely impossible for him to be overpowered by Satan in any state – whether in wakefulness or in sleep.

Some proffer farfetched explanations and say that the Prophet ﷺ was forced by Satan and he uttered these words in a state of confusion [al-īyādhū billāh] – and these words issued from him involuntarily. This one is worse than the first, downright vicious, and totally unacceptable because Allāh tāālā has said:

إِنَّ عِبَادِي لَيْسَ لَكَ عَلَيْهِمْ سُلْطَانٌ

Indeed upon my slaves – you do not have any power.<sup>262</sup>

Satan has no power over the slaves of Allāh. And if Satan indeed had such power, he could compel people to do things, and none of us would have the power to do any good deed.<sup>263</sup>

Another explanation put forward, is that the idolators of Makkah would describe their false gods in this manner, and the Prophet ﷺ was used to hearing this and it had lingered in his subconscious and it slipped out of his blessed tongue inadvertently [al-īyādhū billāh]. Qāḍī Īyāḍ has rejected this as well [as the Qur’ānic verse repudiates such a possibility].

Another explanation is that: When the Prophet ﷺ reached the verse: “*And Manāt, the third other,*” the polytheists present panicked and thought that the Prophet ﷺ would denounce their idols and deplore them, so they rushed to add these words along with the recitation of the

---

<sup>262</sup> Sūrah al-Ĥijr, 15:42 and Sūrah al-Isrā’a, 17:65.

<sup>263</sup> That is, Satan cannot compel humans to do a bad deed; however, he instigates them, seduces and incites them and convinces their *nafs* to obey him and follow him.

Prophet ﷺ, as it was their habit to cause disturbance during the recitation of the Qur’ān. This was attributed to the Devil because it was by *his* incitement that the polytheists did this act – or it can be said that these polytheists were devils among men [*shayāṭīn al-ins*].

Another rationalisation [*ta’wīl*] is that the Prophet ﷺ would recite the Qur’ān slowly and with pauses between verses. Satan was waiting for the opportune moment to add his evil bit. When the Prophet ﷺ paused after the verse, Satan began to recite in a voice and tone similar to that of the Prophet ﷺ and those sitting close to him mistook these words as the Prophet’s ﷺ own utterance and then spread this erroneous notion.

The author of *Al-Mawāhib*<sup>264</sup> said that it is an excellent explanation. Qāḍī Ibn al-Ārabī,<sup>265</sup> a towering Mālikī savant, also considers this as a commendable explanation and said that Allāh tāālā has informed that it has happened before with Prophets and Messengers, that on occasions, the Devil has interfered and added his own words in the middle of their speech. This verse [i.e of Sūrah al-Ĥajj, 22:52] clearly explains that it was the Devil who added these words in between the speech of the Prophet ﷺ and the words were not uttered by the Prophet’s ﷺ blessed tongue.

***If one objects:*** These rationalisations are necessary only if the story is well-established as truth; if the story is totally fake and apocryphal, what then would be the meaning of the verse 22:52 – “***And We have not sent a Prophet or a Messenger before you..***”?

---

<sup>264</sup> Imām Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Qaṣṭallānī [d. 923 AH].

<sup>265</sup> Imām Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdullāh ibn al-Ārabī [d. 543 AH].

What does ‘*prompting of the Devil*’ mean? And what is the meaning of “*abrogation and affirmation of abrogating verses*”

The answer is: If the story is deemed to be true, then the meaning of the word **tamannā** should be ‘recitation’ based on the word **umniyyah**, and one of its meaning is ‘reading’.

But if the story is deemed apocryphal and baseless, then **tamannā** takes the other meaning of ‘wishing for’ or the instigation of one’s lower-self [*nafs*] towards desire and inclination towards the mundane world [*dunyā*] and getting entangled in it; or the temptation deep within oneself - which has to be amended. Such human tendencies are permissible for Prophets as long as they are not continuous or persistent.<sup>266</sup>

The Prophet ﷺ has himself said: “Indeed there is a clouding upon my heart and I seek Allāh’s forgiveness for it”<sup>267</sup>

Sometimes, **tamanna** means: the Prophet’s desire for his people to accept the truth and faith; his desire for more people to become Muslims. Or the desire for something that draws people closer to faith – and because the

---

<sup>266</sup> The verse says: **idhā tamannā**; going by the second explanation, it means: ‘when they wished for something’ – **alqa’sh shaytānu**, the Devil tried to instigate and try to inveigle them – **fa yansakhu’llāhu mā yulqish’shaytānu**, Allāh ta’ālā will efface those thoughts and redirect them – **thumma yuhkimullāhu aāyatihi**, and then Allāh will instill the right thing in their hearts and guide them. See the full translation according to this approach at the end of this citation.

<sup>267</sup> *Muslim*, §2702; *Abū Dāwūd*, §1515. Qāḍī Īyāḍ has said: These are moments when his blessed heart was distracted from the remembrance of Allāh – because he was always preoccupied with the *dhikr*/remembrance of Allāh. He ﷺ sought forgiveness for that. It is also said that it is his concern for his *ummah* [followers] because he was shown their deeds and he was worried for them and therefore sought forgiveness.



Satan incites [*ilqā*] people against it, his [Prophet's] heart is overcome with grief [for his people]. Since Prophets are immune from sin – and from the instigation of the devil – and due to their honour and high esteem near Allāh, they are kept away from what the Devil seeks to add; Allāh tāālā shows His Prophets the signs which will keep them steadfast in their mission and focussed on the Hereafter. This is what: “**and Allāh will establish his signs**” means. There is infinite Wisdom in this which no one except Allāh tāālā knows. This is the summary of Bayḍāwī's explanation of this verse. In the end of his explanation of the verse, Bayḍāwī says: ‘herein is proof, that it is possible for Prophets to forget and be subject to confusing thoughts’. Allāh tāālā knows best.

*End of Citation from Madārij.*



## TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

The verse according to Shaykh Ābdu'l Ḥaqq's explanation means thus:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ قَبْلِكَ مِنْ رَسُولٍ وَلَا نَبِيٍّ إِلَّا إِذَا تَمَنَّى أَلْقَى الشَّيْطَانُ فِي أُمْنِيَّتِهِ  
فَيَنْسَخُ اللَّهُ مَا يُلْقِي الشَّيْطَانُ ثُمَّ يُحْكِمُ اللَّهُ أَيْدِيَهُ وَاللَّهُ عَلِيمٌ حَكِيمٌ

And We have not sent before you, among a Messenger, or a Prophet, except that when he wished, the Devil prompted alongside [the Prophet's] wish. Then Allāh will efface that which shayṭān tried to incite – and Allāh will instill His signs. And Allāh is the Knower, the Wise.<sup>268</sup>




---

<sup>268</sup> Sūrah al-Ḥajj, 22:52.

## APPENDIX B

### ABOUT THE AUTHOR OF THE RISĀLAH ON UṢŪL ḤADĪTH

**Imām Ālī ibn Muḥammad ibn Ālī al-Sayyid al-Zayn Abu'l Ḥasan al-Husayni al-Jurjānī al-Ḥanafī**, better known as **Al-Sayyid al-Sharīf**.<sup>269</sup> It is also said that his name was actually Ālī ibn Ālī ibn Ḥusayn.<sup>270</sup> He was born in the year 740 AH in Tagu, a town near Astrabad.<sup>271</sup> He completed his initial education in Shiraz, where he studied *Miftāḥ [al-ʿUlūm]*<sup>272</sup> and its commentary by the author Nūr al-Ṭāwūsī. Similarly, he studied the other commentary of *Miftāḥ* under the author's<sup>273</sup> son, Mukhlisuddīn Abi'l Khayr.<sup>274</sup> He then proceeded to Cairo and studied under prominent scholars such as Akmaluddīn Bābartī<sup>275</sup> and Mubārak-Shāh,<sup>276</sup> a student

---

<sup>269</sup> Summarised from the biographical notices in *Al-Ḍaw al-Lāmiy*, 5/328, §1087, Sakhāwī; *Al-Fawā'id al-Bahiyyah* of Lucknawi; *Al-Badr al-Ṭālīy* of Shawkānī 1/488.

<sup>270</sup> Sakhāwī says that the great grandson of Sayyid-Sharīf informed him of this in the year 886 AH in Makkah, Ibid. Also, he is known in Farsi as *Mir Sayyid*.

<sup>271</sup> **Al-Aḥlām** of Zirkli 5/7; Astrabad is also known as Gorgan [or Jurjān]; it is the capital of Golestan province in Iran, nearly 400 km from Tehran.

<sup>272</sup> **Miftāḥu'l ʿUlūm** [*Keys to Knowledge*] is a treatise on Arabic grammar, morphology, rhetoric, etc. by Imām Sirājuddīn Abū Yāqūb Yūsuf ibn Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Ālī al-Sakkākī [d.626 AH].

<sup>273</sup> The imām Quṭbuddīn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Rāzī [d. 776 AH].

<sup>274</sup> Mukhlisuddīn Abi'l Khayr Ālī is the son of Shaykh Quṭbuddīn Muḥammad.

<sup>275</sup> Imām Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd Akmaluddīn al-Bābartī [714-786 AH], famous theologian and Hanafī jurist; a student of Ḥanafī imāms such as Qiwāmuddin Kākī Muḥammad al-Sinjārī [d.749 AH] and Ḥusāmuddīn Ḥasan ibn Ālī Saghnāqī [d.710 AH]. He is the author of *Sharḥ Āqīdah Ṭahāwīyyah*, commentary on *Hidāyah* named *Īnāyah*, *Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Bazdawi*, *Al-Anwār Sharḥ al-Manar*, etc.

<sup>276</sup> Mubārak Shāh, the logician; a student of Aḍududdīn al-Yījī.

of Quṭbuddīn Rāzī and Aḍududdīn Al-Ījī.<sup>277</sup> In Cairo, he remained in the cloister [*khānqāh*] of Saʿīd al-Suādā<sup>278</sup> for four years. He then went to Turkey,<sup>279</sup> and after some time returned to Shirāz and engaged in teaching and issuing legal edicts.

Various scholars have mentioned that he read *Al-Mawāqif* of Aḍududdīn al-Ījī under his student, Mubārak-Shāh. Sharīf then wrote an extensive commentary on *Al-Mawāqif* and has become famous as the author of *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*.

He passed away on Wednesday, sixth of Rabīʿ al-Aākhir, 816 AH in Shirāz. His student Āfif al-Jarhī<sup>280</sup> writes: “The great scholar, peerless in his age, unequaled in his time, the king of righteous scholars, the pride of exegetes, a man of beautiful face and character, of immense humility, kind and gentle with the poor...”

---

<sup>277</sup> Qāḍī al-Qudāt Aḍududdīn ʿAbdu’l Raḥmān ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿAbdu’l Ghaffār Al-Yījī al-Shirāzī [680-756 AH]; famous imām of kalām – author of *Al-Mawāqif* and *ʿĀqidah al-Adudiyyah*; teacher of Saāduddīn Taftāzānī, Arab-Shāh al-Isfaraynī and others.

<sup>278</sup> The place was the palace of Saʿīd, a freed slave of the Fatimid ruler, Al-Mustaṣfir [1029-1094 CE/ ] and other viziers and notables after him. The *khānqāh* was built by the victorious king Ṣalāhuddīn Ayyūbī: Yūsuf ibn Ayyūb ibn Shādī ibn Marwān [1137-1193 CE] after he ended the Shiāh rule and entered Cairo. Sulṭān Ṣalāhuddīn expanded his kingdom from Iraq to Egypt and the Levant and is the founder of the Ayyubid dynasty. The plaque on the wall of the mosque reads: “**Mosque and Khanqa of Saʿīd as Suʿada. Monument No:480. (544 AH / 1149 AD).**”

<sup>279</sup> In the middle ages, Turkey was the seat of the Eastern Roman empire – or Byzantium – and hence known as ‘Rome’ or ‘Roman cities’ or ‘Roman lands’ in Arabic and Islamic literature. Jalāluddīn **Rūmī** (‘the Roman’) takes the appellation because of his domicile and later, because of his tomb in Konya, which is in today’s Turkey.

<sup>280</sup> Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdu’l Raḥīm al-Qurashi al-Bakri al-Jarhi Abī’s Sāādāt Afifuddīn al-Shāfiʿī [d.839 AH]

Another student, Abu'l Futūh al-Tāwūsī<sup>281</sup> writes: "He is so well-known that it is not necessary for me to mention his ancestry; his mastery of sciences is so great that it obviates the need to talk about his stature.."

Āynī<sup>282</sup> has said: "He was the greatest scholar of his time in the East, the master of sciences in his age. There were debates between him and Taftāzānī<sup>283</sup> in the court of Taimur the lame, and the ruler favoured Sayyid more than once". Describing his appearance and attributes, Āynī has said: "He was a venerable old man, with a white beard and a radiant face. He was eloquent in his speech and spoke clearly in crisp sentences. He was an expert in debate, research and critical analysis. His skill in argument was unmatched. He was a man of exceptional intellect, of diligence and hardwork".

Maqrizi has mentioned that he had a son Muḥammad, who followed in his father's footsteps and became a master in sciences. But he died very young and was not even forty when he passed away in 838 AH. He is buried alongside his father in Shīrāz.

Shawkānī writes: "His fame spread far and wide in his own lifetime as a peerless *imām*<sup>284</sup> in rational sciences;<sup>285</sup> and his books were sought and read all over the world..."

---

<sup>281</sup> Aḥmad ibn ʿAbdullāh ibn ʿAbdu'l Qādir Al-Tāwūsī al-Shāfiʿī Abul Futūh [790-871 AH].

<sup>282</sup> Imām Badruddin al-Āynī [762-855 AH]; Maḥmūd ibn Aḥmad al-Ḥalabī al-Qāhirī. Ḥadīth master, Ḥanafī Imām and prolific author. He was a contemporary of Sharīf and Taftāzānī.

<sup>283</sup> Imām Saʿāduddīn Taftāzānī [712-793 AH]; Masūūd ibn ʿUmar ibn ʿAbdullāh.

<sup>284</sup> Outstanding achiever and authority.

<sup>285</sup> Such as philosophy, astronomy, geometry, logic, theology, etc.

“He was immensely respected, especially in Persian countries and Turkey. They consider him along with Saáduddīn Taftāzānī as two of the foremost authorities in the rational sciences.”

Shawkānī has narrated an interesting anecdote which gives a glimpse in the humility, diligence and intelligence of Sharīf: “It is reported that he travelled to meet Quṭbuddīn Shīrāzī, the exegete of *Shamsiyyah*,<sup>286</sup> and requested to read the book. The shaykh excused himself because he had become old and his eyesight was failing him. He recommended him to go to one<sup>287</sup> of his students, who was teaching it but was living in another city. When he went to meet this teacher, he was busy teaching children of nobles. Sharīf requested to join his class. The teacher permitted him on the condition that he would not speak during the class. He also told him that there would not be a separate class and Sharīf would have to attend the same class [as that of the children of nobles].

So Sharīf would sit silently in the class during the day and would revise the lessons [of *Sharḥ al-Shamsiyyah*] in the night, in the Masjid, and say out loudly: ‘The author [of *Shamsiyyah*] says thus...and the exegete [Quṭub] says thus... the shaykh [Mubārak Shah] says thus... and I say...” One night, the shaykh happened to pass by and heard him and was immensely delighted at Sharīf’s annotations and he began to jump<sup>288</sup> with joy. Thereafter he permitted Sharīf to speak in the class at will.

---

<sup>286</sup> *Shamsiyyah* is a treatise in logic.

<sup>287</sup> This was Mubārak-Shāh.

<sup>288</sup> Literally, ‘dance’ – but this is not dance as understood in western context, which is forbidden in Islām. Rather, it would be spontaneous expression of joy by jumping and hopping.

It is said that Sharīf wrote his supercommentary<sup>289</sup> while he was still studying with the shaykh.”<sup>290</sup>

### ***His Teachers***

1. Nur al-Ṭāwūsī
2. Siraj Ūmar al-Bahīmānī
3. Mukhliṣuddīn Abu'l Khayr<sup>291</sup>
4. Āllāmah Mubārak Shāh
5. Khwājah Ālā'uddīn al-Āṭṭār [d. 802 AH]
6. Akmaluddīn al-Babarti [d. 786 AH]

Some researchers have said that Taftāzānī was among his teachers as he was 28 years his senior, but others have rejected this based on Sharīf's debates with him in the court of Taymūr.<sup>292</sup> Sharīf also met the following scholars: Shaykh Badruddin Muḥammad bin Qāḍī Samāwinah, Imām Shamsuddin Muḥammad ibn al-Jazary [d.833 AH], the imām of Qur'ān recitation and readings.

---

<sup>289</sup> It is the famous gloss on Mubārak-Shāh's *Sharḥ al-Shamsiyyah*.

<sup>290</sup> *Al-Badr al-Ṭāliq*, 1/489, §237. Shawkānī was originally a Zaydi-Shi'āh scholar from Yemen and a judge in the Zaydi imamate. He later turned away from the belief in superiority of Mawlā Āli ﷺ and it is said that he converted to Sunnism. He became a proponent of Ibn Taymiyyah's views; Salafis widely regard him as an imām of their ideology and quote his works, conveniently ignoring the fact that he is of Zaydi extraction. He was a prolific author. The work cited here is a compendium of biographies of scholars after the 7<sup>th</sup> Century.

<sup>291</sup> He is the son of Quṭbuddīn Muḥammad al-Rāzī [d. 776 AH].

<sup>292</sup> Taymūr or Timur or Tamerlane [1325-1405 CE/ 737-807 AH] was the founder of the Timurid empire, and claimed descent from Genghis Khān. He is the great-grandfather of Babur who founded the Mughal Empire in India.

### ***His Works:***

Sharīf wrote on various topics such as Tafsīr, Kalām, Grammar, Rhetoric, Fiqh, Logic, Philosophy etc. and his glosses on famous works are considered important references in those subjects. Imām Sakhāwī has mentioned that Sharīf's grandson informed him that he wrote nearly 50 books.

### **I. PUBLISHED WORKS**

1. ***Al-Tārīfāt***: A dictionary of terms used in kalām, philosophy, taṣawwuf and logic. It is one of his famous works. Imām Ābdu'l Ra'ūf al-Munāwī [d. 1030] compiled an appendix named: *Al-Tawqīf ālā Muhimmāt al-Taārīf*, published by Ālām al-Kutub, Cairo in 1990.
2. ***Sharḥ al-Mawāqif***: Commentary on the famous kalām work *Al-Mawāqif* of Qāḍī Aḍudduddīn al-Ījī. One of the most comprehensive works on *kalām* and has received multiple glosses by Fanari, Siyalkūtī and Isfaraynī.
3. ***Sharḥ al-Sirājiyyah***: A commentary on a monograph on inheritance law by Sirājuddīn al-Sajāwandī who lived around 600 or 700 AH.
4. ***Risālah fī Fanni Uṣūl al-Ĥadīth*** or ***Dībāj al-Mudha'ḥhab***. A short monograph on ḥadīth principles. There are two commentaries on it. The first is by Āllāmah Muḥammad Shamsuddīn Al-Tabrīzī, known as Mullā Ḥanafī [d. 900 AH], and the second is an extensive one, ***Ẓafar al-Amānī***, by Shaykh Ābdu'l Ḥayy al-Lucknawī al-Ḥanafī [1264-1304 AH].
5. ***Commentary on Sharḥ Mukhtaṣar al-Muntahā of Aḍud***: Imām Ūthmān ibn Ūmar ibn Abī Bakr ibn Yūnus al-Kurdī al-Isnā'iy

Jamāluddīn Abū Āmr **Ibn al-Ĥājib** al-Mālikī [d. 646 AH] wrote an elaborate treatise on Uṣūl named *Muntahā al-Sūl wa'l Āmal fi Īlmay al-Uṣūl wa'l Jadāl* which he later abridged as: *Mukhtaṣar al-Munataha al-Uṣūlī*. Qādī Ābdu'l Raḥmān ibn Ruknuddīn Aḥmad ibn Ābdu'l Ghaffār al-Bakrī Aḍuddīn al-Ījī al-Ĥanafī [700-756 AH] wrote a commentary on Ibn Ĥājib's work, upon which Sayyid-Sharīf has written this supercommentary. Another gloss on Aḍuddīn's is by Imām Saāduddīn Taftāzānī [d. 791 AH]. This supercommentary of Sayyid-Sharīf has received gloss by Shaykh Ḥasan al-Harawī al-Fanārī [d. 886 AH] and by Shaykh Muḥammad Abu'l Faḍl al-Jizāwī [d. 1346 AH].

6. *Abridgement of the Commentary on Mishkat al-Maṣābīḥ* by Ṭībī: Āllāmah Sharafuddīn Ḥusayn ibn Ābdullāh ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭībī Al-Shāfi'ī [d.743 AH] was the first to write a commentary on *Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ* of Waliyuddīn Abū Ābdullāh Muḥammad ibn Ābdullāh al-Khaṭīb al-Ūmarī al-Tabrizī [d. 737 AH] was Ṭībī's student and he compiled *Mishkāt* upon the suggestion of Ṭībī, who has mentioned this in his commentary, *Al-Kāshif án Haqā'iq al-Sunan*. This commentary of Ṭībī was abridged by Sayyid-Sharīf and has recently been published in four volumes.
7. *Muqaddimah fi's Sarf* (Persian) [*Naḥw e Mīr*]: Āllāmah Sharīf compiled this work when he was still a student and it is used as a textbook of Arabic grammar in the subcontinent and is included in madrasah syllabus.
8. *Ĥāshiyah Ṭawālīy al-Anwār*: Gloss on *Ṭawālīy*, a commentary by Aṣbahānī on the original text, *Maṭālīy al-Anzār* by Qādī Ābdullāh ibn Ūmar al-Bayḍāwī [d. 685 AH].



9. ***Ĥāshiyah ālā Sharĥ al-Kāfiyyah of Raḍiyuddīn:*** Gloss on a commentary of *Kāfiyyah* by Muĥammad ibn Ĥasan al-Astrābādī [d. 686 AH]. The original text *Al-Kāfiyyah* is a celebrated treatise on Arabic grammar by Ibn al-Ĥāġib [d. 646 AH].
10. ***Ĥāshiyah ālā Sharĥ Shamsiyyah:*** Gloss on the commentary by Quṭbuddīn al-Rāzī [d.776 AH] on the original text, *Al-Shamsiyyah*, by Najmuddin al-Kātibī.
11. ***Sharĥ Taṣrīf al-Īzzī***
12. Gloss on ***Al-Talwīĥ āla't Tawḍīĥ*** of Taftāzānī. *Al-Tanqīĥ* is a work on Uṣūl al-Fiqh by Sadru's Sharīāḥ Ūbaydullāḥ ibn Masūūd al-Maĥbūbī [d. 747 AH] and upon which he himself wrote a commentary titled *Al-Tawḍīĥ li Matn al-Tanqīĥ*. Taftāzānī's supercommentary is named *Al-Talwīĥ* upon which is Sharīf's gloss.
13. ***Hashiyah Mutawwal:*** This is a critical supercommentary on Taftāzānī's *Al-Mutawwal*. The book *Miftāĥ al-Ūlūm*, by Sakkākī is a famous work on various branches of Arabic linguistics such as morphology, rhetoric etc. Imām Saāduddīn Taftāzānī wrote two commentaries on it *Al-Mukhtaṣar*, a longer commentary named *Al-Muṭawwal*.
14. ***Al-Kubra wa's Ṣughrā*** (Logic) in Farsi; also available in Arabic translations.
15. ***Ĥāshiyah Kash'shaf*** of Zamakhshari: Marginalia on a portion of tafsīr of Sūrah al-Baqarah. In *Hadiyyatu'l Āārīfīn* it is said that he reached until the verse #26 of Sūrah Baqarah.

16. *Hashiyah Sharh al-Mutawassat* of Ibn Hājib's *Al-Kāfiyyah* by Ruknuddīn Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-Astrābādī [d. 715 AH]. Sharīf could not complete this work, but was later completed by his son Shamsuddin Muḥammad.
17. *Risālah Bahth wa'l Munāẓarah* : The etiquette of discussion, debate and argument.
18. *Ḥāshiyah Sharh Hikmatu'l Āyn*: A gloss on Mubārak Shāh's commentary on *Ḥikmatu'l Āyn*, by Najmuddīn Ālī ibn Ūmar al-Kātībī al-Qazwīnī [d. 675 AH]. Published in Qazan in 1319 AH.
19. *Risālah Tahqiq Ma'ana al-Ḥarf* : A monograph investigating the meaning of 'Word'. Published recently in Turkey.

## II. MANUSCRIPTS

20. *Tahqiq al-Kulliyāt*
21. *Taqāsīm al-Ūlūm*: A manuscript is present in The India Office Records in London.
22. *Ḥāshiyah Tajrīd al-Kalām* or *Tajrīd al-Āqāyid* by Naṣīruddīn al-Ṭūsī [d. 672].
23. *Risālah al-Wujud*
24. *Sharh Risālah al-Wad'a*: A gloss on a work by Aḍduddīn al-Yījī.
25. *Hashiyah on Sharh Miṭāḥu'l Ūlūm* of Sakkāki named *Al-Miṣbāh*
26. *Sharh al-Wiqāyah*

27. *Ĥāshiyah* on *Sharĥ Hidayatu'l Hikmah* of Shaykh Athīruddīn al-Abharī [d. 660 AH].
28. *Ĥāshiyah Sharĥ Matāliyy al-Anwār*: A commentary of Qutb al-Rāzī, named *Lawāmiyy al-Asrār*, on Logic; the original text, *Matāliyy* was written by Muḥammad ibn Abū Bakr al-Armawī.

### III. BOOKS MENTIONED IN BIOGRAPHIES<sup>293</sup>

29. *Al-Tarjuman fī Lughat al-Qur'ān* or *Al-Tarjumān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*. Haji Khalifah said that Sharīf has himself mentioned it in his gloss on *Kash'shaf*.
30. *Tafsīr Zahrawayn*: A commentary on the two lengthy sūrahs, Sūrah al-Baqarah and Sūrah Aāl Īmrān.
31. *Hashiyah Tafsīr Baydāwī*: A super commentary on the initial portions of *Anwār al-Tanzīl wa Asrār al-Ta'wīl* by Imām Ābdullāh ibn Ūmar al-Baydāwī [d. 685 AH] known as *Tafsīr Baydāwī*.
32. *Ĥāshiyah Āwārīf*: This is a gloss on the famous treatise on Taṣawwuf, *Al-Āwārīf al-Māārīf* of Shaykh Shihābuddīn Ūmar ibn Muḥammad al-Suhrawardi [d. 632 AH].
33. A gloss on Al-Asfahānī's commentary on *Tajrid al-Kalām*.

---

<sup>293</sup> I have seen nearly 30 books by Sharīf either published or as manuscripts This list was made from Sakhāwī's and Shawkānī's biographies and reordered in categories. I have also gleaned information from biographical notices in the preface of various published works, especially in the recently published commentary on *Kash'shaf*, by Dr. Rashid ibn Ūmar, who has listed 64 works and a few duplicates therein.

34. ***Ĥāshiyah Hidāyah***, famous textbook of Ĥanafī fiqh by Imām Burhānuddīn Marghīnānī [d. 593 AH].
35. ***Ĥāshiyah Sharĥ al-Tadhkirah***: Gloss on Naṣīr al-Ṭūsī's work.
36. ***Ĥāshiyah Hikmatu'l Ishrāq***: Marginalia on a treatise on Illuminationism or the Philosophy of Ishrāq by Shaykh Bahā'uddin Yaḥyā ibn Ĥabash al-Suhrawardi [d. 587 AH].
37. ***Ĥāshiyah al-Khulāṣah fī Uṣūl al-Ĥadīth*** of Ṭībī: This is a gloss on a work on ḥadīth principles, compiled by Állāmah Sharafuddīn Ĥasan al-Ṭībī [d. 743 AH], in which he has combined the works of Ibn al-Ṣalāĥ,<sup>294</sup> Nawawī<sup>295</sup> and Qāḍī Ibn Jamāāh.<sup>296</sup>
38. ***Ĥāshiyah Khabīṣi***: Gloss on *Al-Muwash'shāh fī Sharĥ al-Kāfiyyatu Ibn Ĥājib* by Muḥammad ibn Abū Bakr al-Khabīṣī [d. 801 AH].
39. Annotations on ***Sharĥ Shakk al-Ishārāt*** of Ṭūsī also known as ***Sharĥ Mushkilāt al-Ishārāt***.
40. ***Sharĥ Qaṣīdah Kaáb ibn Zuhayr [Bānat Su'áād]***
41. ***Al-Tuĥfah***
42. ***Sharĥ al-Mulakh'khaṣ***
43. ***Marātib al-Mawjūdāt***

---

<sup>294</sup> *Muqaddimah Úlūm al-Ĥadīth*

<sup>295</sup> *Al-Taqrīb wa'l Taysīr li Mārīfati Sunan al-Bashīr al-Nadhīr*.

<sup>296</sup> *Al-Man'hal al-Rawīy fī Mukhtaṣari Úlūm al-Ĥadīth al-Nabawī* by Imām Badruddīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Jamāāh [639-733 AH].

44. **Nisāb** (Persian)
45. **Maqālīd al-ʿUlūm**
46. **Hashiyah Ashkal al-Ta'sis**: A commentary on *Ashkal al-Ta'sis* in geometry, by Shamsuddin Samarqandi [d. 600 AH].
47. **Ĥāshiyah Tahrīr Iqlīdas** of Naṣīruddīn Ṭūsī: A commentary on Ṭūsī's translation of Euclid's Elements.
48. **Ajwibah Li-As'yilah Iskandar Sulṭān Tabriz**: Replies to queries by the Sulṭān of Tabriz.
49. **Risālah Ṣawt**: : A monograph investigating the meaning of 'Sound'.
50. **Manaqib Khwaja Baha'uddin Naqshband**: A work on the biography of the founder of the Naqshbandi path in Taṣawwuf, Khwājah Bahā'uddīn Naqshband [d. 791 AH].
51. **Wujud wa'l Ādam / Hast o Nīst** in Persian.
52. **Risālah fi ʿIlm al-Adwār**: A monograph on circular reasoning.
53. **Risālah Al Aafaq wa'l Anfus**: A monograph in the explanation of the verse: "Indeed We shall Shew them our signs in the horizons and in their own selves.." [Sūrah Fuṣṣalat, 41:53]
54. **Sharḥ ʿAwamil al-Miah: Al-ʿAwāmil al-Jurjānīyyah** or **Miyat ʿĀmil**: The text is by ʿAbdu'l Qāhir ibn ʿAbdu'l Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad al-Jurjānī al-Shāfiʿī [d. 474 AH]. Shawkānī has listed this commentary among Sharīf's works.
55. **Sharḥ Kitāb Chaghminī** on Astronomy, Geometry and Trigonometry.



## APPENDIX C

### SOURCES

Arabic text was copied from a website. The following print editions and commentaries were consulted for verification of the text and for clarifications:

1. ***Risālah fī ʿIlm Uṣūl al-Ĥadīth***: by Sayyid ʿĀlī ibn Muḥammad al-Husaynī al-Jurjānī (740-816 AH). Published by Maktabah Dār al-Quds, Sanaa, 1992,
2. ***Sharḥ Dībāj al-Mudhaʿhhab***: by Shamsuddīn Muḥammad al-Ĥanafī al-Tabrizī (d. 900 AH), edited by Aḥmad Muṣṭafā al-Ṭaḥṭāwī, Published by Dar al-Faḍīlah, Egypt & UAE.
3. ***Ẓafar al-Amānī bi Sharḥ Mukhtaṣar al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī***: by the Indian Ĥanafī jurist, Shaykh ʿĀbd al-Ĥayy al-Lucknawī, Farangi-Maḥalli (d. 1304AH). Published by Maktab al-Maṭbūʾāt al-Islāmiyyah of Aleppo, 3ed. 1416 AH (Abū Ghuddah Edition).
4. ***Madārij al-Nubuwwah***: Imām Muḥaddith ʿĀbdul Ḥaqq Dihlawī, in Farsi; Urdu translation by Shaykh Ghulām Muṣṭafā Naʿīmī.
5. ***Al-Ḍaw al-Lāmiy***: Imām Shamsuddīn Muḥammad ibn ʿĀbdul Raḥmān al-Sakhāwī [d. 902 AH].
6. ***Al-Badr al-Ṭāliy***: Qāḍī Muḥammad ibn ʿĀlī al-Shawkānī [d. 1250 AH].



# TRANSLITERATION KEY

Arabic Letter	Latin Character	Arabic Example	Transliteration	Similar Sound
أ ء	a	أمير	amīr	amazing
ب	b	باب	bāb	basket
ت ة	t	تاج	tāj	t in French trois
ث	th	ثابت	thābit	thing
ج	j	جسد	jasad	jam
ح	h	حسن	ḥasan	similar to hose no English equivalent voiceless pharyngeal fricative
خ	kh	خبر	khabar	similar to Scottish loch no english equivalent
د	d	دار	dār	d in French dais
ذ	dh	ذكر	dhikr	there
ر	r	راشد	rāshid	trilled r as in rose
ز	z	زكي	zaki	zebra
س	s	سهل	sahl	solid
ش	sh	شاب	shāb	shock
ص	ṣ	صبر	ṣabr	pharyngeal s no English equivalent
ض	ḍ	ضياء	ḍiyā'a	similar to daughter no English equivalent

Arabic Letter	Latin Character	Arabic Example	Transliteration	Similar Sound
ط	ṭ	طب	ṭibb	pharyngeal <b>t</b> no English equivalent
ظ	ẓ	ظل	ẓill	pharyngeal <b>z</b> no English equivalent
ع	á, í, ú, ý	عرب علم عمر عيد	árab ilm úmar ýid	voiced pharyngeal fricative no English equivalent
غ	gh	غار	ghār	as in French <b>r</b> <b>r</b> ester voiced uvular fricative
ف	f	فجر	fajr	<b>f</b> lower
ق	q	قريب	qarīb	a guttural <b>k</b> voiceless uvular stop no English equivalent
ك	k	كتاب	kitāb	<b>k</b> in
ل	l	لباس	libās	<b>l</b> ate
م	m	مال	māl	<b>m</b> orning
ن	n	نور	nūr	<b>n</b> oon
هـ	h	هدى	hudā	<b>h</b> ouse
و	w	وزير	wazīr	<b>w</b> ord
ي	y	يد	yad	<b>y</b> ellow



Arabic Letter	Latin Character	Arabic Example	Transliteration	Similar Sound
إ	i	إدام	idām	insight
أ	a	أتم	atam	advent
أ	ā	باب	bāb	father
ي	ī	سرير	sarīr	tree
و	ū	طور	ṭūr	root
ع	āā	عالم	āālim	-
عي	ýī	عيد	ýīd	-
عو	úū	عود	úūd	-
ش	sh'sh sh-sh	الشمس	ash'shams ash-shams	-
أ	a' or a-	مأمور	ma'mūr	-
ئ	i'y or i-y	بئس	bi'ysa bi-ysa	-
ؤ	u' or u-	لؤلؤ سؤلک	lu'lu' su-lika	-
	,	أصحاب تكحيل أسهل	aṣ'hāb tak'hīl as'hal	separator to distinguish between sounds represented by letter pairs
	-	أصحاب تكحيل أسهل	aṣ-hāb tak-hīl as-hal	separator to distinguish between sounds represented by letter pairs

Arabic Letter	Latin Character	Arabic Example	Transliteration	Similar Sound
	superscript	من	mi <sup>n</sup>	to indicate an elision
	-	مآرب	ma-ārib	separator when elongation follows a vowel

*In transliteration of Arabic names, the definite article ‘**al**’ is not transcribed always for readability, even though it may be incorrect in the original. The following rules are followed:*

- a. The ‘al’ is retained when used as an auxiliary, as in Abu Bakr **al**-Bayhaqī and Badruddīn **al**-Āynī.*
- b. It is omitted when used alone, as in Bayhaqi or Āynī.*
- c. It is retained when the full name of the book is transcribed, but omitted when the book is known by its popular name like Durr al-Mukhtār.*



## ABOUT THE TRANSLATOR

Abu Hasan is a student of Islamic sciences and Sacred Law. Ḥanafī-Māturīdī and aspirant to the Qādirī path, he is an ardent admirer and follower of Imām Aḥmad Ridā Khān al-Baraylawī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ عَلَيْهِ. He translates bits and pieces from classical texts in the course of his learning for his own edification which he shares as helpful notes to beginners like himself. Some of his articles/translations can be found on *tanwir.org* and *ridawi.org*; he also writes on the Islamic forum, *sunniport.com*. His books, translations and infographics can be found on *ridawipress.org*.



RIDAWI



PRESS