

THE RAINWATER
TREATMENT HADITH
AND
SALAFI FLOTSAM

PART 1

BY

**MUJLISUL ULAMA OF SOUTH AFRICA
P.O Box 3393
Port Elizabeth, 6056
South Africa**

Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	3
The Argument	3
The Objective	3
The Salafi Snare	5
NOTE!.....	7
ZAHABI, IBN HAZAM & CO.	8
RASULULLAH'S RAINWATER REMEDY	10
THE REFUTATION IN BRIEF	10
THE REFUTATION IN DETAIL	21
Shihaabud Deen Al-Qalyubi	23
THE ISNAAD OR CHAIN OF NARRATION	26
RAZEEN BIN MUAWIYAH AL-ABDARI AL-ANDALUSI	39
IBNUL ATHEER'S METHODOLOGY	46
ALLAAMAH ABDUL HAYY ON ISNAAD.....	65
Imaam Razeen	68
DIFFERENT VERSIONS.....	72
WHO IS IBNUL ATHEER?	76
ILMUL HADITH.....	78
Jam'ul Fawaaidh	81
Tayseerul Wusool.....	85
The Comments of a Shaikh of Al-Azhar University	89
Imaam Razeen's Shuyookh.....	100
THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE MUWATTA OF IMAAM MAALIK.....	106
RAZEEN'S 'ZIYAADAAT' HAVE THEIR ASAANEED	116
IMAAM RAZEEN'S ISNAAD	120
THE BOGEY OF "CHAINLESS" NARRATIONS	123
THE DIGRESSION	128
CONSENSUS	144

INTRODUCTION

The Argument

The renowned Shaaafi' Faqeeh (Jurist) Imaam Qalyubi (rahmatullah alayh) mentioned in his Kitaab a Hadith in which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) presented the Rainwater Remedy for sicknesses.

A pseudo-salafi student, leaning on the baseless flotsam arguments of Salafis, criticized the Hadith, peddling it with his twaddle as a fabrication. In support, he could only venture to present an ambiguous and spurious comment of Allaamah Zahabi. His denigration of the Hadith based on Salafi stupidity has displayed the student's extremely deficient 'research'. Our refutation of the drivel arguments of the Salafis and pseudo-Salafis masquerading as Hanafis follow in the ensuing pages by the Fadhl of Allah Azza Wa Jal.

Our response and refutation of the neo-salafi's uncalled for redundant criticism with its examine and spurious arguments consist of two parts. The first part is a *Brief Response* while the second part is the *Detailed Response*. Readers who are not interested in the detailed academic response which is replete with technicalities, should read the brief response which adequately answers the excrescential flotsam of the neo-salafi student who had deemed it appropriate to fix the illustrious Imaam Razeen Al-Abdari as a target for his downright stupid criticism.

The Objective

The primary objective of our *Detailed Response* is not really the puerile and stupid criticism of the neo-salafi

fellow. The *Brief Response* answers and demolishes his drivel more than adequately. The primary objective is to present another instalment in our series of Refutations to combat the scourge of Salafi'ism, and the purpose is to guide confused Muslims.

This exercise is not merely to refute and score points. Indulgence in wasteful exercises is not permissible. Our refutation is not to engage in tit for tit matches. We neither have the leisure nor the inclination for such wasteful indulgences which are nugatory of the Objective (*Maqsad*) of life on earth. This treatise has been prepared for the guidance of those Muslims - laymen, Madrasah Students and Ulama - who are cast into confusion by the deceptions of the Salafis who raise the false flag of “*Qur'aan and Sunnah*”. While Salafis and their neo-Salafi poodles will view this Refutation subjectively and spin the facts and truths to suit their baseless *nafsaani* narratives, Muslims of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah will find the fog of confusion clearing when they study this treatise with the objective of realizing the Truth.

In this treatise we have therefore traversed beyond the Hadith pertaining to the Rainwater Treatment to cast a panoptical gaze on a variety of Salafi notions and arguments which though appearing speciously viable to the ignorant, unwary and to molvis and sheikhs of shallow and superficial learning, are in reality flotsam stupidities which minister to the satanic design of undermining the fourteen century immutable Shariah which has reached us reliably from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) via the avenues of the Sahaabah and the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen of the first century of Islam.

The Salafi Snare

Ignorant and unwary Muslims of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah are enticed into deception by Salafis dangling the chimera of their hollow slogan, "*Qur'aan and Sunnah*". The hollowness of their slogan and the insincerity underlining it are conspicuously exposed when their incoherent and erratic methodology of manipulating the process of Hadith Classification is subjected to close scrutiny. It will be then easily recognizable that the Salafi juhhaal are spinning Hadith Classification to suit their pernicious narrative which is quite obviously the scuttling of the Shariah as proffered by the Ahlus Sunnah - the Four Math-habs, viz., Hanafi, Maaliki, Shaafi' and Hambali. The Salafi trap to undermine and abrogate the Shariah is their subterfuge of the Hadith Classification process which they manipulate unskilfully in their satanic endeavour to abrogate the masaa-il of the Shariah by attacking the authentic Ahaadith which constitute the basis on which the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen had structured the Edifice of the Shariah.

The Salafi accusation that the Math-habs are the products of the opinion of the Fuqaha in conflict with the Qur'aan and Sunnah is a dastardly canard. While the Math-habs are in reality the Qur'aan and the Sunnah, the Salafi doctrine has its origin in the seventh century of the Islamic era.

The objective of the Hadith Classification process of the later Muhadditheen was never for reviewing and re-interpreting the Shariah. Its only objective was to prevent infiltration of extraneous teachings and tenets into the already-established and finalized model of the Shariah presented by the Sahaabah and the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen.

Placing the divine seal of authenticity on the Shariah, the Qur'aan Majeed declares:

"This Day have I perfected for you your Deen, and have completed for you My Favour, and have chosen for you Islam as your Deen." (Al-Maaidah, Aayat 3)

That "Day" was during the last days of the blessed life of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The Divine Law which was completed, perfected and finalized on that Day may not be subjected for review by anyone nor examined by any concept of process of rules and principles formulated several centuries after that Day. The Shariah which the Sahaabah and their Students imparted to the Ummah was the complete and perfect Divine Code on whose authenticity the Qur'aan places its seal.

Any attempt to re-examine and revise that perfected Shariah of that Day transmitted to the successive generations of the Ummah by way of reliable narration comes within the purview of the Qur'aanic castigation:

"They intend to extinguish the Noor of Allah with their mouths (with their flotsam and jetsam arguments), whilst Allah will complete His Noor even though the unbelievers detest it." (As-Saff, Aayat 8)

Knowingly or unknowingly, the Salafi deviants are plodding the path of the errant *zindeeq* modernists whose masters in the vile plot to destroy Islam are the orientalist. Both groups of Satanists – the modernists and the Salafis – have the common aim of destroying the Divine Shariah by way of satanic re-interpretation. While the methodology of the modernists is the subjection of the Shariah to the

flotsam they term “enlightened reasoning”, the way of the Salafis for achieving the same goal is the erratic science of Hadith Classification with its vagaries of bewildering conflict and contradiction.

NOTE!

This Treatise has been primarily prepared for the benefit of Talaba (Madrasah Students) who are cast into confusion by the deceptive arguments of the moron Salafis.

This kitaab is not directed at the Salafis. Discussion with them is squandering of sacred time and indulgence in futility. In the words of the Qur’aan, ‘they are more astray than dumb animals’.

For Salafis the best response is the Qur’aanic Aayat:

“When they (the Muttaqeen) hear laghw (futility and drivel), they turn away from it, and they say: For us are our deeds and for you are your deeds. Salaam on you. We do not follow the jaahileen.”

A Student who studies this treatise as well as our other two publications:

- (1) Tresses of Jannat, parts 1 and 2***
- (2) The Scourge of Salafi’ism, parts 1 and 2,***

will, Insha’Allah, be adequately equipped to neutralize the stupid and deceptive arguments of the moron Salafis. All their arguments are bereft of Shar’i substance --- “Full of sound and fury signifying nothing!”

ZAHABI, IBN HAZAM & CO.

In this treatise we have subjected some authors, authorities and experts to somewhat robust treatment. Among such experts are Allaamah Zahabi, Ibn Hazam and some others. While acknowledging their expertise and vast knowledge in the subjects of *Asmaaur Rijaal (Hadith Narrators)* and Hadith Classification, it is necessary to highlight that we are not their *muqallideen* (blind followers).

Their expertise and views are utilized in so far as these would serve the Objectives of the Haqq. Such opinions which are in conflict with the Haqq, with the Shariah, and with the rulings of the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen of the first century of Islam are discarded as flotsam – the products of opinion unsubstantiated by any Shar'i daleel.

Taqleed (blind following) of personalities which appeared on the scene of Islam several centuries after the era of *Khairul Quroon*, is not a sacrosanct doctrine propagated by the Shariah. The views of all such authorities are necessarily to be examined in the light of the principles of the Shariah. Blind submission is permissible, in fact Waajib, for only the Rasool (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This *Taqleed* is extended to the Sahaabah and the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen on the command of the Qur'aan and Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The kind of *Taqleed* which binds the Ummah to the Math-habs of the Sahaabah is not lawful for the likes of Allaamah Zahabi and Ibn Hazam who are non-entities in relation to the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen. The divergences and opinions uncorroborated by Shar'i daleel may not be accepted and

followed, for in so doing, the following Qur'aanic stricture becomes applicable:

“They (Bani Israaeel) take their scholars and their saints as gods besides Allah, and (also they take as god) Isaa, the son of Maryam.”

Blind *Taqleed* is incumbent for only Allah and His Rasool (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had extended this self-same *Taqleed* to his Sahaabah and to all those who taught the Shariah imparted by the Sahaabah, and the very first exponents of this Shariah after the Sahaabah were the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen, the Students of the Sahaabah.

Therefore, our adversaries should not attempt to brow-beat and confuse people with their endeavour to impose blind following of Zahabi and Ibn Hazam, and others when the views of these experts favour the flotsam of these opponents of the Math-habs. Thus, when reading any robust treatment meted out to any of these experts, it is in the light of the backdrop which has been explained here.



RASULULLAH'S RAINWATER REMEDY

THE REFUTATION IN BRIEF

For those who may not be interested in the lengthy arguments of a technical and academic nature, we present here a brief refutation.

In refutation of a Hadith pertaining to treatment for sicknesses with rainwater and Qur'aanic recitation, a pseudo-salafi student, in an article captioned: '*A lengthy unreliable Hadith on cure with rain water*', presents the following flotsam arguments to bolster his charge of fabrication against the Hadith of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He contends that:

- (a) The Hadith appears in the "*non primary*" kitaabs, *Jami'ul Usool* and *Jam'ul Fawaaid*.
- (b) Both these sources do not mention the chain for this narration.
- (c) They reference the narration to 'Razeen' who does not "usually cite the chains for his narrations".
- (d) Senior latter-day Muhadditheen stated that they were unable to locate several narrations that Razeen had cited in his book.
- (e) Allamah Zahabi said: "In his (Razeen's) books are some very unreliable narrations."
- (f) The chain of this narration is yet to be located.
- (g) The Hadith has **exaggerations** which are usually found in fabricated Hadiths.

(h) The popular reliable Hadith sources have no mention of this Hadith.

(i) There is a real chance of the Hadith being a fabrication.

In a nutshell, the above are the pseudo-salafi critic's spurious *dalaa-il*. But, every one of the aforementioned specious arguments is baseless. The critic's research on this issue is extremely defective. Due to this deficiency he has committed the very serious error of categorizing this **Saheeh** Hadith a 'fabrication' (*Maudhoo*).

First argument

(a) *The Hadith appears in the "non primary" kitaabs, Jami'ul Usool and Jam'ul Fawa'id.*

The appearance of a Hadith in a 'non primary' source is not a principle for classifying a Hadith a fabrication. Numerous non primary Hadith kutub are of the highest standard of authenticity and reliability. Kutub other than the *Sihaah Sittah* (Bukhaari, Muslim, Abu Dawood, Tirmizi, Nasaai' and Muwatta Maalik, and according to some, Ibn Maajah) also enjoy a high degree of authenticity. The two kitaabs mentioned by the neo-salafi, in fact comprise of the Ahaadith of these Six Kitaabs collectively called *Usool*.

That Ahaadith are not authentic merely because they happen to be in the so-called 'non primary' kutub, is an extraction from some Salafi's thumb which the

misguided student has understood to be a principle in the knowledge of Hadith classification.

Second argument

(b) Both these sources do not mention the chain for this narration.

Firstly, this charge is false. Both the Kutub do mention the *Sanad* for every Hadith taken from Imaam Razeen's Kitaab in which he explicitly states that all the Ahaadith in his Kitaab are from the *Sihaah Sittah*. Since Imaam Razeen, and following him, the Author's of *Jaami'ul Usool* and *Jam'ul Fawaaid*, truncated only that well-known section of the *Sanad* which links the Compilers of the *Sihaah Sittah* to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), it is incorrect to contend that the Chain of the Narration is not mentioned. Thus, Imaam Razeen mentions, for example, that the Hadith narrated by Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) is from the *Sihaah Sittah*. This averment is in fact the *full Isnaad* of the Hadith.

If any person narrates a Hadith from a Sahaabi and says that it is in Bukhaari, then it will be only a Salafi moron or a pseudo-salafi moron who will contend that the Hadith has been truncated, i.e. narrated without its *Sanad*. But this claim is erroneous in view of the fact that the *Isnaad* from Bukhaari to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is *ma'roof* – *well-known and confirmed*. Any one interested in the full Chain of Narrators should ascertain it from Saheeh Bukhaari. There is no incumbency for a person in this age to narrate the names of all the narrators of Ahaadith

which he cites from any of the authentic Kutub, and these are not restricted to the *Sihaah Sittah*.

Real Truncation is to narrate a Hadith without *Sanad* and which has not been acquired from any reliable and authentic Kitaab or *Thiqah* (trustworthy and uprighteous) Source, e.g. like a Bid'ati saying: "*Hadhrat Abu Bakr (radhiyallahu anhu)* mentioned the virtues of *mawlid*." The narration is minus *Isnaad* and cannot be attributed to any well-known, famous, authentic Kitaab to enable one to ascertain its validity. A narration subjected to such truncation will obviously be rejected and not accepted as authentic.

But the type of 'truncation' employed by illustrious Muhadditheen such as Imaam Razeen, Imaam Baghawi, Ibnul Atheer and many others, and by the eminent Fuqaha is never grounds for classifying a Hadith as *Dha'eef* (weak) and *Maudhoo'* (fabricated). These Muhadditheen of later times do not perpetrate Real Truncation. They explicitly state the Source, e.g. *Sihaah Sittah*. Only morons understand that a Hadith attributed to Bukhaari, for example, is a truncated narration. The full *Sanad* could easily be ascertained from *Saheeh Bukhaari*.

Thousands of Ahaadith of the *Sihaah Sittah* compiled by Imaam Razeen and many other Muhadditheen in their kutub are all superficially truncated. It is indeed moronic to aver that a Hadith is *Maudhoo'* simply because the full *Isnaad* is not mentioned. It is more than adequate for establishing authenticity if an

Imaam of Hadith – an Authority of the Shariah - says that the Ahaadith are in *Sihaah Sittah*.

The practice of the Fuqaha and the later Muhadditheen was to resort to this kind of superficial truncation of Hadith narrations since they had no need for the *Isnaad*. The issue of Chains had already been finalized by the early Muhadditheen and the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen.

Third argument

(c) *They reference the narration to 'Razeen' who does not "usually cite the chains for his narrations".*

This is another notorious lie of Salafis and their blind followers, the pseudo-salafis masquerading as Muqallideen of the Math-habs.

The neo-salafi critic of Imaam Razeen and the Hadith in question, due to the deficiency of his research has grossly failed to understand the rank of Al-Imaam, Al-Muhaddith Allaamah Razeen Bin Muawiyah Al-Abdari. Imaam Razeen was among the prominent Akaabir Mukharrijeen (Hadith Examiners) and among the Aimmah Muhadditheen. When an Authority of this calibre cites a Hadith without deprecating and criticizing it, it confirms the authenticity of the Hadith. Insha-Allah, our detailed Response adequately shows the extremely lofty pedestal which Imaam Razeen occupies in the firmament of Hadith and Fiqh. It is essential to understand that Imaam Razeen was not just any Zaid, Bakr, Tom, Dick and Harry.

If all the Ulama of this age are shoved into Imaam Razeen's kurtah pocket, there will be ample space for several more of such groups to be squeezed in.

Fourth argument

(d) Senior latter-day Muhadditheen stated that they were unable to locate several narrations that Razeen had cited in his book.

The inability of latter-day Muhadditheen to locate some narrations cited by Imaam Razeen from the *Sihaah Sittah*, may not be used as an argument to classify a Hadith as being unreliable or fabricated. It is exceptionally grave to brand a Hadith of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) '*Maudhoo*' just because some Hadith examiners who appeared on the scene 6, 7, 8 and 9 centuries after Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), had failed to locate the sources of some of the Ahaadith cited by Imaam Razeen. The spuriousness of this flimsy argument should be quite obvious.

The inability of a Muhaddith to locate the source of a Hadith narrated by another illustrious Hadith Authority is not a principle for branding the Hadith unreliable or a fabrication, or to even cast aspersions on its authenticity. The authenticity of the Hadith is in fact the *Thiqah* Authority who declares it reliable and authentic. Allaamah Ibn Hajr who was unable to locate even the sources of many of Imaam Bukhaari's *Ta'leeqaat* (truncated narrations), commented: "*I did not find it.*" His inability is not grounds for labelling Imaam Bukhaari's truncated Ahaadith fabrications or unreliable.

Fifth argument

(e) *Allaamah Zahabi said: "In his (Razeen's) books are some very unreliable narrations."*

Allaamah Zahabi's criticism is apodalic and eristic. Having failed to present even a single Shar'i or rational argument for refuting the Hadith narrations of Imaam Razeen, Zahabi conceded that Imaam Razeen was '*Al-Imaam Al-Muhaddith Ash-Shaheer*'.

Furthermore, Zahabi did not claim that the 'Rainwater Hadith' is a fabrication. He had not even made reference to it. His statement refers to "some" allegedly "very unreliable narrations". Nowhere does he say that the specific Hadith under discussion is a fabrication. The only one who has classified it a 'fabrication', is the pseudo-salafi critic.

It is also necessary to say that Zahabi's notion of some of Imaam Razeen's narrations being "unreliable" is a subjective conclusion. He advances no rational argument for his contention. There is no reason why we should opt for the *taqleed* of Zahabi when an illustrious Muhaddith of the calibre of Imaam Razeen who appeared more than two centuries before Zahabi, had accepted the Hadith to be *Saheeh*. Zahabi's criticism has been dismissed by great Authorities. Insha-Allah, we shall elaborate more in our detailed Response where it shall be shown that Zahabi was the victim of bigotry and many of his averments and views are spurious. His comment has been baselessly employed by the neo-salafi critic.

Sixth argument

(f) *The chain of this narration is yet to be located.*

This is yet another falsity blurted out by an unthinking mind. The Chain of Narration of the Hadith is confirmed by the fact that the illustrious Compiler, Imaam Razeen, a Muhaddith of impeccable standard, declared explicitly in the Introduction of his Kitaab, *Tajreedus Sihaah*, that the Sources of all the Ahaadith in his Kitaab are the Six Hadith Kutub. The authenticity of the Hadith is further corroborated by other eminent Muhadditheen such as Ibnul Atheer, Al-Faasi and Ibn Dabee'. This is explained in detail in our detailed response.

Furthermore, the inability of locating the Chain of a Hadith cited and accepted by an illustrious Imaam of Hadith is not valid grounds for rejecting the Hadith as a 'fabrication'. Yes, if some graveworshipper or a man belonging to the Ahl-e-Bid'ah cites a narration for which there is no substantiation in the Kutub of Hadith, then there will be justification for dismissing the Hadith without branding it a fabrication. If the genuinely chainless/truncated narration is in conflict with the Shariah, it will only then be labelled a fabrication. But, if it pertains to the sphere of *Fadhaa-il*, it shall not necessarily be lambasted unless it has been made a basis for bid'ah.

Imaam Razeen who is a senior Authority of Hadith is in fact the *Sanad*. In his own right, he is the Chain of Narration establishing the authenticity of the Hadith. There is no need to dwell beyond this illustrious Imaam of Hadith in search of a Chain. More in our detailed Response, Insha-Allah.

Seventh argument

(g) *The Hadith has **exaggerations** which are usually found in fabricated Hadiths.*

The moron neo-salafi while audaciously slandering the Hadith, has not enumerated the "exaggerations" in this specific Hadith. If he presents these, we shall, Insha-Allah, tackle the issue. He has not even explained what exactly he means by "exaggerations" in the context of the Ahaadith of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He has simply lapped up the flotsam which the Salafis have disgorged.

Eighth argument

(h) *The popular reliable Hadith sources have no mention of this Hadith.*

There is no principle which labels a Hadith *Maudhoo'* or unreliable merely because it does not appear in the Sihaah Sittah. In fact, this Hadith does exist in one of the Sihaah Sittah of which there were a variety of manuscripts extant during the age of Imaam Razeen. 90% or more of the *Saheeh* Ahaadith do not appear in the six popular Hadith books. Besides the Six, there are many other popular Hadith kutub among which are Jaami'ul Usool, Jam'ul Fawaaid, Imaam Razeen's *Tajreedus Sihaah*, and many more, which are listed in the detailed response.

As far as popularity is concerned, Imaam Razeen's Kitaab is extremely popular. Acknowledging the popularity of Imaam Razeen's Kitaab, even the critique Zahabi says: *"He stayed in Makkah for an age where*

he heard Bukhaari from Eesa Bin Tharr Al-Harawi, and Muslim from Al-Hasan At-Tabari. He has a popular book in which he has compiled the Six Kutub."

Ibn Razeen's *Tajreedus Sihaah*, and Ibn Atheer's *Jaami'ul Usool* in which this particular Hadith is recorded, are extremely popular. These kutub are not obscure, lacking in status or academic lustre or authenticity as the moron Salafis attempt to convey. All of these kutub are reliable sources. In fact, the neo-salafi student, acknowledging the popularity of Imaam Razeen's *Tajreedus Sihaah*, says: "*His book: 'Tajridus Sihah' is famous.*" This should clinch the flimsy 'popularity' idea.

The ninth argument

(i) There is a real chance of the Hadith being a fabrication.

The hallucinated chance is not a *daleel*. It is an arbitrary, stupid claim devoid of any basis. It is the baseless conclusion of one who lacks the ability to correctly cogitate and excogitate.

The neo-salafi chap has not advanced a single valid argument for this baseless contention and stupidly fabricated hypothesis. In fact, even Allaamah Zahabi has not labelled the Rainwater Hadith a fabrication. While he claims that some narrations of Imaam Razeen are "unreliable", he does not say that this particular Hadith or any other specific Hadith of Imaam Razeen is *Maudhoo'*. It is only the pseudo-salafi student who has mustered up the audacity to brand

this *Saheeh* Hadith of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) so unceremoniously.

Should we briefly accept that "some" narrations in Imaam Razeen's most popular (*Mashhoor*) Kitaab are "unreliable", what is the rational argument for claiming that the Rainwater Hadith is included among the "*some unreliable*" narrations? There is not even an iota of *daleel* to substantiate this spurious claim. In addition, ascribing unreliability to some of the Ahaadith in Imaam Razeen's Kitaab is tantamount to the attribution of unreliability to the *Sihaah Sittah*, for all the Ahaadith in *Tajreedus Sihaah* are from the Six famous Hadith Kutub.

In his conclusion, the critic says: "*In such a situation, **caution** demands that we abstain from spreading, sharing or publicizing this narration.*"

Imaam Razeen and the illustrious Authors of *Jaami'ul Usool*, *Jam'ul Fawaaid*, *Taysirul Wusool*, etc. had a better understanding of the concept of "caution" regarding Hadith narration. They were great Authorities of Hadith, and they had deemed it appropriate and valid to include this Hadith in their highly authentic kutub. The conclusion of the neo-salafi chap is thus dismissed as utterly baseless.

(The Rainwater Treatment Hadith appears at the end of this book).

THE REFUTATION IN DETAIL

A Hadith of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) prescribing a remedy for the treatment of sicknesses, has been subjected to criticism by a pseudo-salafi student who is supposed to be a Hanafi. In the attempt to enhance the brisance of his critique, the student concluded that the Hadith is a '*fabrication*'. His belated denial of labelling the Hadith a '*fabrication*', subsequent to the publication of our '*Brief Refutation*', reproduced in the foregoing pages, does not exonerate him from the calumny he has uttered against the illustrious Imaam Razeen who has included the Hadith in his famous *Tajreedus Sihaah (An Abridgement of the Six Authentic Hadith Kitaabs)*.

In a nut shell, the student's research underlining his baseless conclusion is extremely defective. Far from the Hadith being *Maudhoo'* (a *fabrication*), it is palpably *Saheeh* (Authentic). Insha-Allah, in the ensuing pages, we shall show the deficiency in the student's research. His arguments are spurious and his conclusion of the Hadith being a fabrication is egregiously baseless (baatil), and plainly a Salafi disgorgement.

The students arguments: primary and non-primary sources

His first argument is: "*A similar narration appears in the following non primary sources: Jami'ul Usool, hadith: 5655, Jam'ul Fawa'id, hadith: 7539. Both the above sources do not mention the chain for this narration. They reference this narration to 'Razin'.*" (The highlighting is the student's)

The reason for highlighting the term '*non primary*' is ostensibly to detract from the worth and status of the Hadith. This is improper. "*Non primary*" should not be misconstrued to mean unreliable or unauthentic. But this is the objective for having highlighted the term.

The idea that a Hadith is *Dhaeef* (Weak) or *Maudhoo'* (Fabricated) simply on account of it being recorded in a non primary source is baseless. Non primary sources can be just as authentic as the *Sihaah Sittah* which are the Primary Sources in relation to the Muhadditheen who appeared centuries after the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and Fuqaha of the initial era of Islam. Since the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen had absolutely no reliance on the later 'primary sources' of Hadith kutub for the *Istimbaat* (Deduction) of masaa-il, these Primary Sources have no relevance to the Shariah which was transmitted to us by the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and the illustrious Fuqaha. They were not 'primary' to the Sahaabah and Taabi'een for the simple reason that their authors had not as yet been even born. Furthermore, the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen who had formulated and codified the Shariah which was imparted to them by the Sahaabah had no reliance on text books for dissemination of the Shariah. They did not teach from kutub.

Non-Primary are the Kutub besides the *Sihaah Sittah* which are the "primary" sources. The *Sihaah Sittah* are Bukhaari, Muslim, Nasaai', Tirmizi, Abu Dawood and Muwatta Imaam Maalik. Some authorities substitute Muwatta with Ibn Maajah. These primary Hadith Kutub played absolutely no role in the formulation and codification of the Shariah by the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen whose reliance was on the Knowledge they acquired from the Sahaabah.

The criterion for authenticity is not necessarily being a narration from a primary source. A non-primary source can be just as authentic as the primary sources. In fact, the sources of the Aimmah Mujtahideen had greater authenticity than the later 'primary' sources. Non-primary sources in the category of authenticity occupied by primary sources are Hadith Kutub such as *Tajreedus Sihaah*, *Jaami'ul Usool*, *Jam'ul Fawaaid*, *Tayseerul Wusool*, and numerous other Hadith Kutub. This aspect shall be explained further on, Insha-Allah.

Why the student has inserted the name *Razeen* of the illustrious Muhaddith in inverted commas is a conundrum. Who exactly was Razeen? Insha-Allah, this topic shall be elaborated later.

Shihaabud Deen Al-Qalyubi

The Rainwater Remedy Hadith was not acquired from a storyteller, nor was it selected from any compendium of Fabricated Narrations. It was acquired from the kitaab, *Kitaabul Qalyubi*. This is a kitaab consisting of numerous anecdotes compiled by the illustrious Shaafi' Faqeeh, Ahmad Shihaabud Deen Al-Qalyubi . He was not a storyteller. He was one of the greatest and most illustrious of the Shaafi' Fuqaha. He passed away in the year 1069 Hijri. The following are extracts from a brief biography of Imaam Qalyubi by the illustrious 11th century Hanafi Faqeeh, Hadhrat Muhammad Ameen Bin Fadhlulah Al-Muhibbi Al-Hamawi of Damascus:

"He (i.e. Imaam Qalyubi) was the Imaam, the Aalim, the Aamil, the Faqeeh, and the Muhaddith. He was one of the

leaders of the Senior Ulama on whose fame and lofty status there is consensus...

He acquired (his knowledge of) Fiqh and Hadith from Shamsur Ramli with whom he spent three uninterrupted years – a time when he was cut off from his family. He was in the constant association of An-Nuruz Ziyaadi, Saalim Ash-Shabsheeri, Ali Al-Halbi, Subki and others among the famous Shuyookh.

Akaabir Shuyookh such as Mansur At-Tukhi, Ibraaheem Al-Barmaawi, Sha'baan Al-Fuyumi and others among the Akaabir Shuyookh narrated from him.

His personality inspired great awe. No one had the ability and courage to talk in his presence except to cast down his head in awe and fear. He never associated with the rulers. He was ascetic and constantly in ibaadat.....

He authored numerous kitaabs. Among these are: Haashiyah ala Sharhil Minhaaj lil Jalaalil Mahalli, Haashiyah ala Sharhil Azhariyyah, Haashiyah ala Sharhi Shaikh Ali Al-Aajrumiyyah, Haashiyah ala Sharhi Eesaaghuji, etc., etc.

This very concise character sketch is adequate to show the status of Allaamah, Fahhaamah, Al-Faqih, Al-Muhaddith, Al-Imaam Shihabud Deen Qalyubi. He was a master *par excellence* of all branches of Deeni Uloom as well as of the branches of secular knowledge. It is inconceivable for a Faqeeh and Muhaddith of this calibre to latch on to a *Maudhoo'* (*fabricated*) narration to pass time in story-telling. It is also inconceivable that an illustrious Authority of the Shariah of Imaam Qalyubi's stature was unaware of *maudhoo-aat* and *waahiyaat* narrations. He was a great Zaahid and Wali as well.

Great Shuyookh were his Asaatizah, and among his students there was a galaxy of great Shuyookh. The numerous kutub he wrote testify to the lofty status of his Uloom.

If the student will not tolerate to attribute a fabrication to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), can we expect a Giant of Uloom of Allaamah Qalyubi's stature to act recklessly thereby ascribing a fabrication to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and securing an abode in Jahannam?

There is no need for us to traverse further than Allaamah Qalyubi for the production of evidence for the authenticity of the Hadith. Nevertheless, as a bestowal of a favour, we shall proceed further in this domain. From whence did Allaamah Qalyubi acquire this Hadith? The Hadith was taken from Muhaddith Razeen's *Tajreedus Sihaah* or from *Jaami'ul Usool* or from *Jam'ul Fawaaidh* or perhaps from some other highly authentic source whose authenticity was confirmed beyond doubt. Only a moron can imagine that a highly placed illustrious Authority of the calibre of Allaamah Qalyubi would stoop to the level of accepting a fabricated Hadith or a narration lacking in authenticity, and attributing it to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

We shall now proceed to view the other sources which the student has cited in his article.

THE ISNAAD OR CHAIN OF NARRATION

With regard to the *Isnaad* of narrations, the student critic of Imaam Razeen avers: "*Both the above sources (i.e. Jaami'ul Usool and Jam'ul Fawaaid) do not mention the chain for this narration. They reference this narration to 'Razin'.*"

The student does not state his objective for this averment. Nevertheless, the inference is quite apparent. He attempts to convey the idea that since the aforementioned two sources do not mention the *Isnaad*, the Hadith in question is baseless and fabricated. A Hadith recorded in an authentic and highly placed *kitaab* will be *Saheeh* regardless of the truncation of its *Sanad* (*Chain of narration*). Due to deficiency of research, the student appears to be unaware of this well-established fact. He has failed to understand that the omission of the *Asaaneed* in *Tajreedus Sihaah*, *Jaamiul Uusool* and *Jam'ul Fawaaid* is in reality not *truncation*. The authors of these Kutub clearly stated that the *Asaaneed* are in the *Usool* (The Six Hadith Kutub). Whoever desires the *Asaaneed*, should refer to the *Usool*. Their omission was simply for the sake of brevity.

The Muhadditheen of the later ages deleted the *Chains of Transmission* from their Abridgements and Compendiums since there was no utility for the *Isnaad*. Consider the *Kitaab*, *Jaami'ul Usool*. "*Usool*" refers to the *Sihaah Sittah* (The Six Most Authentic Hadith Kutub). The Compilers of the *Usool* such as Imaam Bukhaari and Imaam Muslim, etc. had devoted their entire lives sifting through the vast treasure of more than 600,000 Ahaadith. It was their function to do the sifting and to establish authenticity, and

to classify the Ahaadith in terms of the criteria they had formulated.

Further elaborating on the truncation of the Ahaadith (deleting the Chains of Narrations), Ibnul Atheer states: "*.....The first act commenced with was to delete the Asaaneed just as the Jamaa't (of Muhadditheen) mentioned earlier had done. May Allah have mercy on them. (The Jamaat includes Imaam Razeen). For us (i.e. later-day Muhadditheen) in following them is a virtuous characteristic because the initial objective of mentioning the Asaaneed was to confirm the Hadith and its authenticity. This was the function of the early Muhadditheen (such as Imaam Bukhaari and Imaam Muslim) –Rahmatullah alayhim).. Verily, they have freed us from that task, hence there is no need for us to mention that (the Asaaneed) which they have already accomplished, and liberated us therefrom.*

Therefore, I have not recorded (in Jaami'ul Usool) except the name of the Sahaabi who narrated the Hadith from Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) if it is a khabr, or the name of the one who narrates from a Sahaabi if it is an athar....."

Regarding the text of the Hadith, I have mentioned only that which is a Hadith from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or an athar from a Sahaabi. I have not narrated statements of the Taabieen and those after them from the Mathaahib of the Fuqaha and Aimmah except rarely. In so doing I followed Al-Humaidi (Rahimahullaah)....."

Regarding the Ahaadith which I found in the Kitaab of Razeen without finding it in the Usool, I recorded them from his Kitaab in exact form

It would have been an exercise in superfluity for the later Muhadditheen such as the illustrious Imaam Baghawi, Allaamah Razeen, Ibnul Atheer, Ibn Dabee' and many others to have repeated the *Asaaneed* for the Ahaadith which they had acquired from the kutub of Usool, because

all of these Chains of Narration are well-known and could be ascertained by making reference to the relevant Hadith Kutub. Imaam Baghawi who flourished during the same era as Imaam Razeen, says in the introduction of his *Masaabeehus Sunnah*:

"I have deleted the mention of the Asaaneed for fear of prolixity (unnecessary lengthening), and relying (for authenticity) on the narration of the Aimmah."

It was not the function of Muhadditheen of the calibre of Imaam Baghawi and Imaam Razeen who came centuries after Imaam Bukhaari and others of his status, to examine and classify Ahaadith in terms of authenticity, reliability, unreliability, etc. This duty was executed *par excellence* by the Muhadditheen of Imaam Bukhaari's calibre centuries prior to Imaam Baghawi and Imaam Razeen, hence the latter had no imperative need to include the *Asaaneed* in their compilations.

The fact that they truncated the Ahaadith, i.e. dispensed with the *Asaaneed*, and included it in their Compilations without criticism, testifies for the authenticity of the narrations. It is inconceivable that Aimmah of Hadith of the lofty status of Imaam Baghawi and Imaam Razeen and others would have accepted and narrated fabricated narrations or narrations which they believed to be *Dhaeef and Waahi*, then have the immoral audacity of attributing it to the Sihaah Sittah. Their acceptance of the Ahaadith without reservations and without criticism, more than adequately substantiates their authenticity.

These Muhadditheen were not chancers. There is no blemish registered against their names and integrities by anyone. They were illustrious souls of the highest category of Taqwa and Wara'. They were not writing stupid thesis for the acquisition of stupid 'doctorates' to be known as 'duktoors'. They were not signs of Qiyaamah such as the duktoors and sheikhs of this era who pursue the dunya with deeds which are intended for the Aakhirah. Their compilations were intended and designed for the practical implementation of the Sunnah for the purposes of the Aakhirah.

Hadith Compilations such as *Tajreedus Sihaah* of Imaam Razeen, *Misbaahus Sunnah* of Imaam Baghawi and *Jaami'ul Usool* of Imaam Ibnul Atheer which appeared several centuries after the era of the Mutaqaddimeen Muhadditheen such as Imaam Bukhaari, Imaam Muslim, etc., were not compiled for the same objective for which Saheeh Bukhaari, Saheeh Muslim, etc. were compiled. The function of the early Muhadditheen was to establish authenticity. Their function and objective were to deal with the *Asaaneed*.

Centuries later came the era of the later Muhadditheen who neither duplicated the obligation of the early Muhadditheen nor did the circumstances call for such duplication. It was not their hobby to squander life in superfluity and the needless prolixity of narrating *Asaaneed* when this issue had been settled and finalized centuries earlier.

The primary objective of their Compilations was the practical implementation of the Sunnah, and to make the means for the attainment of this objective easily available

for the Zuhhaad (those who had devoted their lives to Ibaadat). Thus, says Imaam Baghawi in the introduction of his *Misbaahus Sunnah*:

"Therefore (know) that these words (i.e. the Ahaadith in his Compilation) emanate from the Breast of Nubuwwah, and (these words) are the Sunan from the Mine of Risaalah. (These are) Ahaadith which have come from Sayyidul Mursaleen, Khaatamun Nabiyyeen. They are the Lanterns (for dispelling) darkness. They have emanated from the Niche of Taqwa from that which the Aimmah have narrated in their Kutub.

I have compiled it (these Ahaadith) for those who are devoted to Ibaadah so that it be for them after the Kitaab of Allah Ta'ala a share of the Sunan, and an aid for their Taa-at (worship and obedience).

I have dispensed (deleted) the Asaaneed (Chains of Narration) for fear of involving them in prolixity (unnecessary lengthening), and reposing reliance (for authenticity) on the narration of the Aimmah."

This then is the objective of these Compilations consisting of truncated Ahaadith. It is inconceivable that these illustrious Muhadditheen of Imaam Razeen's and Imaam Baghawi's lofty calibre were 'stupid storytellers' who had recklessly accepted *Dhaeef, Maudhoo' and Waahi* narrations for their highly authentic Compilations intended for practical implementation by the Zuhhaad. All the Sufis – those who adopted zuhd (worldly renunciation) and devoting themselves to ibaadat – were not Ulama of the Zaahiri dimension of Uloom. There was an imperative need for such Sufis to have adequate knowledge of the Sunnah. Sufi'ism minus the Shariah and Sunnah is

Satanism. It is from the kutub of Aimmah such as Imaam Razeen and Imaam Baghawi that the Zuhhaad acquired considerable knowledge of the Sunnah.

These illustrious Aimmah of Hadith had to exercise extra caution when they recorded narrations in their Compilations intended for practical implementation in daily life. How utterly moronic and unjust to accuse these noble Aimmah who were Auliya of the highest rank, of acting carelessly and recklessly with emphatic attribution of lies and falsehood to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)!!!

All our Tom, Dick and Harry students of this day, and all the yelping Salafi mongrels of modernity know and understand the Hadith: *"He who attributes a lie to me intentionally should prepare his abode in the Fire."* Now, did Imaam Razeen and Imaam Baghawi (both Hadith Truncators) fail to understand the gravity of the warning of this Hadith while the morons and mongrels of this modern immoral age have understood it?

Categorically refuting the charge of the morons and mongrels, Imaam Baghawi says in his introduction:

"I have indicated therein that (of the narrations) which are Dhaeef or Ghareeb, and I have steered away from mentioning Munkar and Maudhoo' narrations."

This was also the conduct of Imaam Razeen. The very same reasons and the very same objective for which truncation was adopted by Imaam Baghawi, applied to Imaam Razeen as well. Both flourished in the same era. The Ahaadith compiled by them were absolutely *Saheeh* as far as they were concerned. They were satisfied as to the

authenticity of the Ahaadith which they had included in their Kutub. Sources which were available to them were not necessarily available to the likes of Allaamah Zahabi more than two centuries later.

The combined total of narrations, minus repetitions, in the *Usool* is approximately 7,000. What happened to the vast balance of 590,000 Ahaadith? There is no Muhaddith who has ever claimed that authentic Ahaadith are confined to his Compilation or to the Six which constitute the *Usool*. Most of the kutub in which the balance of the Ahaadith was recorded were destroyed during the invasion of the barbarian Mongols. Further, the vast majority of the Ahaadith was not even compiled in book form. Innumerable Saheeh Ahaadith were transmitted from generation to generation, from Shaikh to Shaikh, in an unbroken Chain of narration. Hence, when a Hadith, not found in the *Sihaah Sittah*, is narrated by a *Thiqah* expert Muhaddith or an accomplished Faqeeh – one who is Al-Imaam, Al-Muhaddith, Al-Fahhaamah - one whose Asaatizah were prominent and great Shuyookh, and whose Students too were great Shuyookh – then we can say that only a moron will brand his narration a fabrication to be assigned to the garbage. Insha-Allah, this issue shall be elaborated further on.

But, this destruction by the Tartars and the non-compilation in book form of thousands of narration did not result in any segment of the Shariah being lost. The formulation of the Shariah never was dependent on the Hadith Kutub which the illustrious Muhadditheen of later eras had compiled. The Shariah was completed and perfected during the very age of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The Sahaabah who had fanned out into the Islamic World, had acquired their

Knowledge of the Shariah from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). They transmitted this immutable Shariah to the Taabi'een in whose age flourished the greatest Aimmah Mujtahideen and Fuqaha. Thus, the Shariah was transmitted reliably and authentically from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) via an unbroken Golden Chain of Fuqaha – Fuqaha who in entirety were independent of the Compilations of the Muhadditheen of later years.

The noble Authors and Muhadditheen/Fuqaha who had compiled kutub such as *Jaami'ul Usool* and *Tajreedus Sihaah*, etc., had no need for the *Isnaad* of the Ahaadith which they extracted from the *Usool* and from other authentic Compilations which had existed during their age or which had reached them from reliable and authentic sources, from above or from contemporaries.

Allaamah Muhammad Waliyuddin At-Tabrezi (rahmatullah alayh), the author of the famous Hadith kitaab, *Mishkaatul Masaabeeh*, commenting in his Introduction on the methodology of discarding the *Asaaneed* adopted by Imaam Baghawi (rahmatullah alayh) in his *Misbaahus Sunnah*, states: "*His (Imaam Baghawi's) narration is Saheeh, and he was from among the Thiqaat (the highly authentic and reliable Muhadditheen). His narrating (without the Isnaad) was tantamount to Isnaad.*"

Allaamah Tabrezi, in his enumeration of the illustrious Muhadditheen such as Imaam Bukhaari and Imaam Muslim, includes Abul Hasan Razeen Ibn Muawiyah Al-Abdari, that is, the name 'Razeen' mentioned by the student who contends that Imaam Razeen's Hadith is a fabrication. Allaamah Tabrezi further states in his Introduction: "*Verily, when I attribute a Hadith to them (i.e. to the great*

Muhadditheen), it is as if I am attributing it to Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)." Allaamah Tabrezi, in *Mishkaatul Masaabeeh*, has adopted the same methodology of discarding the *Isnaad* adopted by Imaam Baghawi in his *Misbaahus Sunnah*. Thus when they accepted a Hadith and narrated it from a Muhaddith without criticizing it, then according to their own explicit statement, it was an attribution to Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Any conflicting view proffered centuries later, belatedly, by the likes of Zahabi, are to be set aside.

The certitude which these great Muhadditheen had regarding the authenticity of their narrations was so absolute in their minds that they could claim without trepidation: *"When I attribute a Hadith to them (the Muhadditheen), it is like I am attributing it to Nabi (sallallahu alayh wasallam)."*

All of us are aware that Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had said: *"He who speaks a lie on me, should prepare his abode in the Fire."* Did Imaam Baghawi and Imaam Razeen, Ibn Atheer and many other later Muhadditheen not know this Hadith? Were they unaware of the effect of this Hadith and of the consequences of attributing fabrications and drivel to Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? How is it possible and conceivable that the neo-Salafi Madrasah student understands the purport of the Hadith warning against fabrication, but Imaam Baghawi and Imaam Razeen despite being Muhadditheen and Auliya of high rank, were unaware? How is it possible for such illustrious Muhadditheen and Fuqaha to accept fabricated and drivel Ahaadith and attribute it to Rasulallah (sallallahu

alayhi wasallam) despite their Taqwa, Wara' and expert Knowledge?

Explaining an aspect of the methodology of brevity and truncation adopted by him in his *Mishkaatul Masaabeeh*, Allaamah Tabrezi states: *"Little will you find me saying: 'I did not find this narration in any kitaab; I found (a narration) in conflict with it.' Now if you find this (statement), then attribute the deficiency to the paucity of my knowledge, not to the Honourable Shaikh (Imaam Baghawi). Allah forbid! May Allah elevate his status in both worlds."*

Here Allaamah Tabrezi explains that his inability to have located in any other Kitaab a truncated Hadith (a Hadith minus its *Isnaad*) recorded by Imaam Baghawi in his *Misbaahus Sunnah*, may not be attributed to any perceived deficiency of the Muhaddith. Rather, it should be attributed to the deficiency in the research or paucity of knowledge of the writer/researcher. Thus, when a renowned authority of Hadith such as Imaam Baghawi, Imaam Razeen and many others who are on a pedestal in proximity to the lofty status of the Mutaqaddimeen Muhadditheen, narrate a Hadith minus its *Isnaad*, no attention whatsoever shall be paid to the one who seeks to deprecate the Hadith with comments such as *"There is no basis for it"*, *"I am not aware of it"*, *"It is weak"*, etc. etc. Such comments levelled at the compilations of illustrious Muhadditheen, Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and our noble Fuqaha whose kutub constitute the Pivot of the Shariah, shall be dismissed with contempt. Similarly, will the comment: *"I have not found it."*, which Ibn Hajar directs to many of the *Ta'leeqaat* of Imaam Bukhaari, be set aside and attributed to the paucity and deficiency of Ibn Hajar's research. It will be only morons

who will claim on this basis that many of the truncated narrations of Imaam Bukhaari are fabrications and drivel.

In his *Sharah of Mishkaatul Masaabeeh, Mirqaatul Mafaateeh*, Mullah Ali Qaari states: "It is permissible to narrate Hadith from the reliably compiled kutub which are well-known because the attribution of the kitaab to its Author is authentic, e.g. the Sihaah Sittah and other kutub besides these.....Ibn Burhaan said that according to all the Fuqaha *amal* on the Hadith is not dependent on his (the Faqeeh's) having heard it. (*Simaa'*). When the manuscript of the Sunan is authentic according to him, *amal* on the Hadith (practical implementation) is permissible."

Regarding another Hadith minus *Isnaad*, also attributed to Razeen Bin Muawiyah, it is mentioned in *Bahrur Raa-iq: "Al-Balbaniy said in Sharh Talkheesil Jaami': This Hadith is narrated in Jaami'ul Usool and it is attributed to the Kitaab of Razeen Bin Muawiyah Al-Abdari who had compiled in it from the Six Kutub.....This Hadith is Mash-hoor and is mentioned in all the Kutub of our AshaabAnd even if it (the Hadith) is Munqati' according to the People of Hadith (the Muhadditheen), the fact that our noble Ulama and illustrious Ashaab and Fuqaha have made Istidlaal with it, despite the abundance of refutation of the opposition, eliminates the suspicion of its Dhu'f (Weakness). The Shuhrat (prominence) of the Hadith manifestly indicates the confirmation of this Hadith in reality even though its Sanad became truncated thereafter..."*

The Hadith referred to by Al-Balbaniy is not the Rainwater Hadith. It is another Hadith ("*Place them (women) behind (the men) as Allah has placed them behind.*"). Our Fuqaha-e-Ahnaaf as well as the Fuqaha of the other Math-habs, cite

this Hadith as their *Mustadal* (basis for deduction/proof) for a *hukm* of the Shariah, and they cite it as a *Marfoo' Hadith* (linking up to *Rasulullah – sallallahu alayhi wasallam*). Thus, regardless of the truncation of the Hadith, it is highly authentic, and its appearance in Imaam Razeen's *Kitaab* further highlights its authenticity, no matter what the deviated Salafis say and lament.

Although *Muhaqqiq Ibnul Humaam* believes this Hadith to be *Mauqoof* (the Chain terminating at a Sahaabi), the vast majority, if not all, of the Hanafi *Fuqaha* maintains that it is *Marfoo'*, hence they explicitly state: "*Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:.....*"

The authenticity of this truncated Hadith of Imaam Razeen is thus established par excellence.

Our *Fuqaha* have accepted the narrations of Imaam Razeen for substantiating other *Masaa-il* as well. Regarding the superiority of the Day of Arafah when it coincides with *Jumuah*, it is mentioned in *Raddul Muhtaar*:

"Ash-Shurumbulaaliyyah narrating from Az-Zaylaee: 'The best of days is the Day of Arafah when it coincides with the Day of Jumuah. It is superior to 70 Hajj which are not on Jumuah.' Razeen has narrated this Hadith in Tajreedus Sihaah."

Tabyeenul Haqaaq Sharh Kanzud Daqaaq cites Imaam Razeen to confirm the authenticity of this Hadith which is the basis for the *mas'alah*, hence it is mentioned: "*.....Razeen Bin Muawiyah narrated it in Tajreedus Sihaah."*

Haafiz Ibn Hajar commenting on this Hadith (the *Jumuah* Hadith) of Imaam Razeen, unable to negate it or proclaim it

a fabrication, could go only as far as saying: *"I am not aware of it."* But his unawareness does not transform the Hadith into a fabrication or drivel.

Notwithstanding Al-Munaawi's rejection of this Hadith as being baseless, our Fuqaha have accepted it. It is also supported by Imaam Ghazaali in his *Al-Ihya*, and we do not accept the rubbishing of Imaam Ghazaali's narrations by some Ulama. Their 'rubbishing' is in fact *baatil and thoughtless*, not so the Ahaadith which Imaam Razeen and Imaam Ghazaali narrate. *Butlaan* may not be attributed to the Ahaadith of Imaam Razeen.

Commenting on the allegation of the abovementioned Hadith of Imaam Razeen Bin Muawiyah being *Maudhoo'* (a fabrication), Mullah Ali Qaari states in *Al-Hazzul Aufar fil Hajjil Akbar*: *"The claim of some juhhaal (ignoramus) that this Hadith is Maudhoo', is baatil (baseless) and mardood (rejected), for verily, Imaam Razeen Bin Muawiyah Al-Abdari is among the Akaabir (Senior) Mukharrijeen. His word is a Sanad (daleel/proof) by the Aimma of the Muhadditheen. (On the assumption) that his narration is not Saheeh, then at a minimum it will be Dhaeef"*

Stating the rule relative to *Dhaeef* Ahaadith, Mullah Ali Qaari explains: *"Regarding the view of some Muhadditheen that the Isnaad of this Hadith is Dhaeef, if this be assumed to be so, then (it is of no significance) for it does not harm the objective. Verily, a Dhaeef Hadith is valid in the matter of fadhaail (virtues) of A'maal according to all the Ulama and the authorities (of the Shariah)"*

Ibnul Atheer, the illustrious Author of *Jaami'ul Usool* states:

"Then again those Ahaadith which I found in Razeen's Kitaab, but not in the Usool, I recorded those Ahaadith from his Kitaab as they appear in their specific locations and I left them without symbols. Furthermore, I left a blank space for the name of the mukhrij (recorder) of the Hadith in the hope that I examine another version of these Usool and I come across those Ahaadith. In that case I shall document the name of the mukhrij. I have shown in the opening parts of this Kitaab some of this type of Ahaadith which Razeen narrated, whereas I did not find them in the Usool. In the remaining (Ahaadith of this kind) I left blank spaces so that it could be understood that they are of the same kind." (Volume 1, page 55)

"In so far as the Ahaadith which I found in the Kitaab of Razeen (rahimahullah) are concerned, which Ahaadith I did not locate in the *Usool* which I have read, heard and related from, I have preserved those Ahaadith without any symbol and without mentioning the *mukhrij*. Perhaps I locate them or someone else locates them and inserts the Hadith with the symbol of its *mukhrij*." (Volume 1, page 63)

RAZEEN BIN MUAWIYAH AL-ABDARI AL-ANDALUSI

The Hadith pertaining to the Rainwater Treatment, which is the subject of this discussion, has been sourced from Imaam Razeen's *Kitaab Tajreedus Sihaah* which is an abridgement of the *Usool* (Bukhaari, Muslim, Abu Dawood, Tirmizi, Nasaai' and Muwatta Imaam Maalik). In his Abridgement, are found a number of Ahaadith whose sources Ibnul Atheer and others could not locate despite the fact that Imaam Razeen had acquired these narrations from the

Usool. Such Ahaadith in Imaam Razeen's *Kitaab, Tajreedus Sihaah*, are called *Az-Ziyaadaat* (Extra Narrations). In fact the term '*az-ziyaadaat*' illustrates the deficiency of the research of the later examiners or their inability to locate the different versions of the *Usool* which were available centuries earlier to Imaam Razeen. It will be shown later, Insha-Allah, that some of these so-called *Ziyaadaat* which Ibnul Atheer and others could not locate in the *Usool*, were found in some of the *Six Kutub*.

Some have branded the Rainwater Treatment Hadith as well as many others of the "*Ziyaadaat*" as *Dhaeef*, *Maudhoo*', etc. It has already been explained above that truncation, i.e. deletion of the *Isnaad*, is not a valid ground for summarily labelling a Hadith '*Dhaeef*' or '*Maudhoo*'.

The Ahaadith called '*Ziyaadaat*' are extras in relation to the later Muhadditheen such as Ibnul Atheer, who were unable to locate the sources for these narrations which Imaam Razeen attributes to the *Usool*. As far as Imaam Razeen was concerned, not a single Hadith in his *Kitaab* can be called '*ziyaadah*' (extra) in view of the fact that all the narrations in his *Kitaab* are from the *Usool*, hence he named his Compilation, *Tajreedus Sihaah*.

The criticism of the so-called *Ziyaadaat* in *Tajreedus Sihaah* is baseless and irrational, unbefitting of Scholars of Hadith regardless who they may be. Whoever has criticized the so-called *Ziyaadaat* of Imaam Razeen, did so without evidence. Like Zahabi who blurted out some ambiguous comment of criticism without furnishing even a single *daleel* for his arbitrary view, others too, who have ventured

criticism have miserably failed to proffer any evidence for their baseless contentions.

The recklessness and bigotry which Zahabi employed in criticizing those with whose beliefs he is in disagreement have been elaborately explained by his own Student, the illustrious Shaafi Imaam Taajuddeen Subki. Mentioning this, Allaamah Anwar Kashmiri states:

“Taajuddeen Subki (d.771 Hijri) is the Student of Allaamah Zahabi. He (Taajuddeen Subki) has authored the famous Kitaab, Tabaqaatush Shaafi’iyyah. In this Kitaab, for fulfilling the Student’s obligation to his Ustaadh, he has gone beyond bounds in praising Zahabi and conferring accolades on him. However, along with his praise, he has in several places of this Kitaab Tabaqaat, explicitly criticized the Bid’ah and bigotry of his Ustaaz. May Allah reward him goodness in abundance. Perhaps he (Taajuddin) has inherited the attribute of proclaiming the Haqq from his august father- Allaamah Taqiyyuddin Subki). Some of his criticism is mentioned here:

(1) Our Shaikh Zahabi would baselessly and virulently attack the Ahlus Sunnah. Whenever he would write about Imaam Ash’ari, he would leave no stone unturned in demoting him. Therefore no reliance should be placed on his (Zahabi’s) criticism of any Ash’ari nor on his support of any Hambali.Since denigrating the Ahlus Sunnah had become his second nature he had even lightly criticized Imaam Bukhaari....

(2) On page 197, Vol.1, he (Subki) said that there are many excellences in the life of Allaamah Zahabi, nevertheless, his history is replete with bigotry. May Allah not apprehend him. He has abundantly spoken ill of the Ahl-e-Deen (i.e. the Fuqara who are the men of piety) and has insulted them.

He has abundantly wagged his tongue against the Shaafi' and Hanafi Imaams. Sometimes he raised the flag (of criticism) against the Ashaa'irah, and sometimes he drifted (inclined) towards the Mujassimah (anthropomorphists). Thus, Allaamah Subki has negated reliance on his (Zahabi's) historical recordings.

(3) On page 249, Vol.2, he wrote (about his Ustaaz): 'While you claim that you are free from tajseem (the attribution of anthropomorphism to Allah Ta'ala), we observe you digging in its darkness, and you are regarded as among the seniors of those who invite towards it (tajseem). You claim that you have expertise in the science of Usoolud Deen whereas you have not understood even the rudiments of this science.

In the biography of Ibn Jareer, Allaamah Subki narrated the criticism of Zahabi by Haafiz Abu Saeed Salaahuddeen Alaaee' (d 761 Hijri) as follows: 'I have no doubt in his piety and his efforts of research regarding people. But, there is certitude in the fact that he was overwhelmed by the math-hab of ithbaat (i.e. tajseem (anthropomorphism), abstention from and detestation of Ta'weel, and Tanzeeh Baari... . He would grossly exaggerate in praising the anthropomorphists, and overlook their errors to the extreme length of presenting excuses therefor.

On the contrary, when he dealt with someone from the other camp, e.g. Imaamul Haramain and Imaam Ghazaali, he would not laud any praises. But he would conspicuously highlight any criticism which others had made, and he would repeatedly mention these to keep the focus on the criticism. He would ignore their numerous virtues and excellences. If he discovers any error of these personalities, he would most certainly highlight it. He would regard his

methodology as being the fulfilment of a trust.... His attitude was solely motivated by differences in beliefs.”

After narrating the aforementioned criticism of Allaamah Alaai’, Allaamah Taajuddeen Subki commented: *“The condition of our Shaikh Allaamah Zahabi is substantially worse than what Muhaqqiq Alaai’ has mentioned. Although he is our Shaikh and Ustaadh, it is imperative to follow the Haqq. His extreme bigotry which exceeded all bounds, reached the limits of mockery. I fear for his apprehension in this regard on the Day of Qiyaamah in the Presence of Allah Ta’ala. Perhaps a person of insignificant status may be superior than him by Allah Ta’ala. We supplicate to Allah Ta’ala to deal with him (i.e. Allaamah Zahabi) leniently. May Allah Ta’ala inspire in their hearts forgiveness for Zahabi.*

Our Mashaaikh and seniors have advised us to refrain from studying his (Zahabi’s) kitaabs, and that we should not place reliance on his statements. In fact, he (Zahabi) would ensure that his books of history should not fall into wrong hands to avoid his errors being advertised.

Regarding Allaamah Alaai’s comments about his (Zahabi’s) piety and virtue, I too at one stage had laboured under this notion (that he was a man of taqwa and wara’). But, I now say that it is possible that he was under the impression that his methodology was valid in the Deen. However, I have yaqeen (complete conviction) that he was aware that certain issues were false, albeit he himself would not fabricate the falsehood for attributing it to others. Nevertheless, I am certain that he loved baseless fabrication to be published in his books. In fact, I have certitude that he desired readers to believe in the truth of such fabrications because he cherished in his heart animosity and malice for

those who were his adversaries. It was his desire that others should develop abhorrence for them.

In addition I also believe that Allaamah Zahabi was not fully aware of the meanings of many words and customary expressions. He thought of promoting his conjectured belief whilst he was not accomplished in the knowledge of the Shariat.After the death of Allaamah Zahabi, when there was a need, I carefully studied his kutub, and I discerned that his research and comments on the states of narrators (of Hadith) were defective and doubtful”

In the biography of Imaaamul Haramain, in his *Tabaqaat*, Allaamah Taaaj Subki states: “*Allaamah Zahabi was not aware of Sharhul Burhaan nor did he possess any expertise in the science of Kalaam. However, he listened to some drivel of a few Hambali youngsters, and believed it to be the truth, and included it in his kitaab.*”

In the margins of the Ahaadith in *Mustadrak of Haakim*, pertaining to the *fadhaail* of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Ahl-e-Bait, Allaamah Zahabi wrote: ‘*I regard them to be baatil.*’ However, he has not presented any daleel for claiming these narrations to be baatil (baseless).. Ibnul Wardi states in his *Taareekh*: “*Allaamah Zahabi has narrated many things which he had heard from youngsters whom he had gathered around him. Thus, he caused distress to others with such narrations.*” (*Ta’leeqaatus Saifis Swaqeel*) -- Anwaarul Baari

This commentary is adequate to dislodge Allaamah Zahabi from the lofty pedestal the Salafis and others have assigned to him. In the sphere of *Asmaaur Rijaal* Allaamah Zahabi’s views pertaining to many narrators are to be

discounted as baseless, on account of the foregoing explanation, and because of his bigotry against the Ahlus Sunnah.

This is the same Haafiz Alaa-ee who the Salafi supporters of the student cited in their abortive attempt to prove the invalidity of the validity of *Mursal* Ahaadith as basis for the formulation of Ahkaam. Even he has negated the impartiality of Zahabi.

The So-called Ziyaadaat of Imaam Razeen

It must be reiterated with emphasis that the inability to locate the sources of the so-called Ziyaadaat is never proof for claiming that the narrations are fabricated, drivel, etc., moreover when the illustrious Fuqaha who are the Bastions of the Shariah, have accepted these Ahaadith as *Mustadallaat*. The Hadith Kutub available to Imaam Razeen were not available to the later Muhadditheen who came centuries after him. Furthermore, there were a variety of *Nusakh (manuscripts)* of the *Sihaah* in circulation at the time. With the passage of time these were lost to the Ummah.

Allaamah Muhammad Bin Ismaaeel mentions in his *At-Tahbeer li Eedhaahi Ma'aanit Tayseer*: "Razeen said: 'Whatever from Nasaai' has been narrated here (u.e. in *Tajreedus Sihaah*) is from *An-Nuskhatul Kubra....*" Thus, the Ziyaadaat for which the later Muhadditheen could not locate sources were most probably from Nasaai's *Al-Kubra* or from any of the several Muwatta manuscripts or from perhaps other manuscripts of the other Kutub of the *Sihaah*. Whoever has a problem with the sources from whence Imaam Razeen acquired the so-called Ziyaadaat should firstly locate the sources, then proffer their criticism.

Criticism without basis is stupidity and emotionalism. A comment such as “*I did not find it*”, is drivel. It only reflects on the deficiency of the researcher. A comment such as , “*I think it is baatil*”, should be dismissed as stupid and baseless. It is a flimsy and irrational attempt to discount the so-called Ziyaadaat of Imaam Razeen, and to label them ‘fabrications’, ‘weak’, etc. Such categorization based on conjecture is plain emotionalism. It is devoid of rational argument, and bereft of academic value for the simple reason that the researcher proffers not a single *daleel* to substantiate his opinion..

IBNUL ATHEER’S METHODOLOGY

Imaam Razeen's Kitaab, *Tajreedus Sihaah* is an Abridgement of the *Usool (Sihaah Sittah)*. The narrations termed Ziyaadaat (Extras) are *extraneous* to the *Usool* in relation to the Muhadditheen who appeared on the scene after Imaam Razeen. Since they were unable to locate these narrations in the available manuscripts of the age, they were constrained to designate such *riwaqyaat 'Ziyaadaat'*. They were not '*ziyaadaat*' for Imaam Razeen since he had sourced all his narrations from the Six *Usool* Kutub.

Imaam Razeen’s *Tajreedus Sihaah* was the fundamental basis of Ibnul Atheer’s *Jaamiul Usool* project. It is conspicuously obvious that Ibnul Atheer had studied Imaam Razeen’s *Tajreedus Sihaah* from which he compiled his *Jaami’ul Usool*. From the *Muqaddimah (Introduction)* of *Tajreedus Sihaah*, Ibnul Atheer was satisfied that all the Ahaadith in Razeen’s Kitaab were from the *Sihaah Sittah*, hence he states in the *Muqaddimah* of his *Jaamiul Usool*:

“I saw many Ahaadith in his (Imaam Razeen’s) Kitaab which I did not find in those Usool (Kutub) which I had read, heard and from which I had copied. That (i.e. not finding the Ahaadith in the Usool) is because of the different manuscripts (nusakh) and ways of narration (turuq).

I have recorded such Ahaadith from his (Imaam Razeen’s) Kitaab in their precise forms and specific locations, and I have left them without any symbol. I have left a blank space for the name of the Mukhrij of these Ahaadith, for perhaps I search and stumble on other Nusakh (manuscripts/versions) of these Usool (the Sihaah Sittah), then I shall confirm the name of the Mukhrijeen of these narrations (the so-called Ziyaadaat).”

Regarding the Ahaadith which I found in the Kitaab of Razeen (rahimahullaah) and which I did not find in those (Kutub) of the Usool which I had read and which I had heard and from which I have copied, I have recorded them, but I have not allocated any symbol for them nor have I mentioned who is their Mukhrij. Perhaps I may find them or someone else besides me may find them, and allocate the (requisite) symbols to them, and indicate the one who is their Mukhrij.”

It is quite obvious that Ibnul Atheer was convinced of the authenticity of all the Ahaadith in Imaam Razeen’s Kitaab. This is borne out by:

* Ibnul Atheer having unhesitatingly recorded the so-called Ziyaadaat in his *Jaami’ul Usool*

*. He left blank spaces in the beginning of all such narrations for later insertion of the actual Narrator (Mukhrij).

* He does not even offer the slightest hint of the Ziyaadaat being suspected of fabrication or weakness. This is borne out by his explanation that the reason is the different versions of the *Usool* in circulation.

* He did not summarily dismiss the so-called Ziyaadat as baseless. He did not claim that these Ahaadith do not exist in the Sihaah Sittah. On the contrary, he explained that he could not find them in those versions which were at his disposal.

* He cherished the hope of him or others stumbling on the other versions which were available to Imaam Razeen and from which he had acquired the Ahaadith. The blank spaces would then be filled.

* He did not criticize a single Hadith from the so-called Ziyaadaat nor did he even cast any aspersion to assail the authenticity of these narrations.

It will be shown later, Insha-Allah, that a number of Ahaadith which Ibnul Atheer could not locate in the *Usool*, do in fact exist in the Sihaah Sittah.

Furthermore, Imaam Razeen has explicitly stated in the *Muqaddimah* of his *Tajreedus Sihaah* that:

- * He extracted all the Ahaadith from the Sihaah Sittah.
- * He made use of several versions of Muwatta Maalik.
- * He extracted Ahaadith from Imaam Nasaai's *Al-Kubra*.

The methodology adopted by Ibnul Atheer, alone is adequate to dismiss the bunkum observation of Zahabi who has baselessly, without providing a single rational argument, cast aspersions at the so-called Ziyaadaat of Imaam Razeen.

Hadith Authorities such as Ibnul Atheer, Ibn Dabee', Sulaimaan Al-Faasi, Qaadhi Hibatullah and others who flourished centuries ago cited and reproduced Imaam Razeen's so-called Ziyaadaat without any criticism. Ibnul Atheer adopted the intelligent position of leaving blank spaces at the Ahaadith whose sources he was unable to locate from the Six Usool Kutub which were at his disposal at the time of compiling his *Jaami'ul Usool*.. He did not label the Ahaadith weak or fabricated, etc. Later, other Ulama as well as Ibnul Atheer, himself, had managed to locate the sources of some of the so-called Ziyaadaat.

Consider the Hadith:

“Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘Mu’tarakul Manayaa is between sixty and seventy (years).....”

Commenting on this Hadith, Ibnul Atheer said: *“I did not find it in the Usool.”* In other words he did not find this Hadith with the term, *“Mu’tarakal Manayaa”* in the Six Kutub which were available to him. This Hadith is in Bukhaari, Tirmizi and other Hadith Kutub without the term, *mu’tarakul manayaa*. However, Mullah Ali Qaari states in his *Mirqaatul Mafaateeh Sharh Mishkaatul Masaabeeh*: *“In the words of Ahmad (Imaam Ahmad bin Hambal) and Tirmizi (stating a) Marfoo’ narration: ‘Mu’tarakal Manayaa is between sixty and seventy (years).’ However, in Al-Jaami’ it is attributed to Hakeem Tirmizi. And Allah knows best.”*

It is also mentioned in *Kashful Khafaa’*: *“In the words of Ahmad, Tirmizi, Ibn Maaajah, Abu Ya’la, Al-Askari, Al-Qudhaa-ee, Raamhurmuzi and others besides them (there*

are the words): “Mu’tarakul Manayaa is between sixty and seventy (years).”

The very same as above is narrated in *Al-Maqaasidul Hasanah*, and also in *Fataawa Hindiyyah*. So while Ibnul Atheer and others did not manage to locate the source, many others have.

Another Hadith among the so-called Ziyaadaat is :

Ibn Mas’ood (radhiyallahu anhu) narrated: ‘Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘Five aayaat made me happy. With them for me there is the world and whatever there is in it.....”

In *Tayseerul Wusool*, it is mentioned that the *Mukhrij* of this Hadith is Razeen whereas Ibnul Atheer left a blank space in his *Jaami’ul Usool* for later insertion of the source. The Author of *At-Tahbeer li Eedhaahi Ma-aanit Tayseer*, comments:

“In fact, he (Razeen) is not the Mukhrij. But, Abu Ubaid has narrated it in his Fadhaail; Saeed Bin Mansur and Abd Bin Humaid narrated it. Ibn Jareer narrated it (in Jaami’ul Bayaan). Ibnul Munthir narrated it. A-Tabaraani narrated it (in Al-Mu’jamul Kabeer). Al-Haakim narrated it (in Al-Mustadrak) and Baihqi narrated it in Shu’bul Imaan.” All the narrators are Rijaal Thiqaat (authentic narrators).

Another Hadith among the so-called Ziyaadaat, is:

“Ka’b (radhiyallahu anhu) narrates: ‘Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘The aayat: ‘They will

destroy their homes with their own hands.....’ was revealed about the Yahood.....”

Commenting, the annotator of At-Tahbeer, says: *“Its Isnaad is Saheeh. The author says that based on his (Ibnul Atheer’s) principle, he left a blank space (because he could not determine the source in the Usool). However, the meaning of the Hadith is thaabit (confirmed and authentic) in terms of all narrations. It is (well) known. Every sentence in it has testification.”*

Thus, even this narration for which Ibnul Atheer could not locate the source, is authentic.

Hadith No.60 of Jaami'ul Usool: *"An-Nawaas Bin Sam'aan (radhiyallahu anhu) said that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: 'Verily, Allah explains the similitude of Siraat Mustaqeem.....'"* Although Ibnul Atheer says: *"I have not found it in the Usool...."*, he nevertheless states at the end of the Hadith: *"Tirmizi narrated it."* Citing the number of the Hadith in Tirmizi, the annotator, Al-Arnaut quotes Imaam Tirmizi's categorization of the Hadith: *"He said: 'This Hadith is Hasan Ghareeb.' We further say that Imaam Ahmad has narrated this Hadith in Al-Musnad.... And its Isnaad is Saheeh. Haakim has narrated it in Al-Mustadrak, and he said: 'It is Saheeh in terms of the criterion of Muslim'. Zahabi has concurred with him."*

Regarding Ahaadith numbers 76, 77 and 78, Ibnul Atheer says: *"I found these Ahaadith in Razeen's Kitaab, and I did not find them in the Usool."* However, either Ibnul Atheer or someone else later discovered the Usool sources for these Ahaadith. Hadith No.76 is narrated by Abu Daawood. Hadith No.77 is narrated by Bukhaari while Hadith No.78 is

narrated by Bukhaari and Tirmizi. Whoever had stumbled on the sources had made the entries in *Jaami 'ul Usool*.

The methodology Ibnul Atheer adopted in his *Jaami 'ul Usool*, was to insert a letter of the alphabet as a symbol at every Hadith to indicate the source. If the Hadith is in Bukhaari he adopted the letter *khaa* (خ); for Muslim, the symbol *Meem* (م); for Muwatta Maalik, the symbol is the letter *Twaa* (ط); for Tirmizi, the symbol is *Taa* (ت); for Abu Daawood, the letter *Daal* (د); for Nasaai', the letter *Seen* (س).

Ibnul Atheer did not reject or slate the Ahaadith in the Kitaab of Imaam Razeen which he could not find in the *Usool* manuscripts available to him. Accepting the validity of such narrations, he recorded them in his highly authentic *Jaami'ul Usool*, and left a blank space in the beginning of the Hadith for insertion of the appropriate symbol should he or anyone else manage to locate the Hadith in other manuscripts of the *Usool*.

In Volume 1 of *Jaami'ul Usool* are 19 Ahaadith of Imaam Razeen regarding which Ibnul Atheer said that he did not find them in the *Usool*. Despite this averment, Ibnul Atheer confirms that Ahaadith No's 60,76, 77, 78, 97 and 98 (the first six of the 19) are in fact from the *Usool*. He allocated the relevant symbol to each one to denote the Kitaab from the *Usool* which is the source of the Hadith.

Hadith No.97: "Hanzalah Bin Rabee' Al-Usaidi (radhiyallahu anhu).....said: 'Abu Bakr met me, He said: 'How are you O Hanzalah?'....." Muslim and

Tirmizi narrated this Hadith.....Ahmad has also narrated it." Although Ibn Atheer said that he did not find this Hadith in the *Usool*, it is recorded in Muslim and Tirmizi.

Hadith No.98: *"Verily Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) would send someone to her family after Isha' with the message that: 'Why do you not give peace to the Recording Angels?'"* This Hadith is recorded in Muwatta Maalik although Ibnul Atheer said that he did not find it in the *Usool*.

Hadith No. 182 appears in the *Taraajeem* of Imaam Bukhaari. Ibnul Atheer acknowledges this. The authenticity of this Hadith is also confirmed by Al-Haafiz in Al-Fath where he comments: *"Its Isnaad is Saheeh"*. Daaruuqutni says: *Its Isnaad is Saheeh."*

Hadith No. 306 does appear in the *Usool* although Ibnul Atheer says that he did not find it therein. The annotators confirm this fact. No.306 is narrated by Abu Daawood in his Sunan, and its *"Isnaad is Jayyid (excellent, unblemished)"*. Ibn Majah also records it. Ibn Hibbaan, Haakim and Al-Busairi have authenticated it. Even the Salafi Annotator says: *The statement of the Author (i.e. Ibnul Atheer) –Rahimahullaah -, 'I did not find it in the Usool.', is problematic on account of what has been mentioned about (its narration) in Abu Daawood."*

Regarding Hadith No. 839, the annotator says: *"Its meaning is narrated by Abu Daawood in a lengthy Hadith."*

With regard to Hadith No.1124, Imaam Razeen says in his Kitaab: *"Abu Daawood said : 'This Hadith is Munkar.'" However, Ibnul Atheer avers in his Jaami'ul Usool: "I did not find it in the Kitaab of Abu Daawood."* Commenting

on this statement, the annotator, Arnaut says: *"In fact, it is in Sunan Abu Daawood, and he said: 'This Hadith is Munkar.'*" The annotator confirms the correctness of Imaam Razeen's version. However, Ibnul Atheer did not find it in Abu Daawood, not because of deficiency of research, but because of the existence of different manuscripts. The manuscript which was available to him did not have this, hence he correctly commented: *"I did not find it."*

Hadith No.1243 which Ibnul Atheer could not locate in the *Usool* manuscripts available to him, does exist in Muwatta Maalik, Abu Daawood and Nasaai'.

Hadith No.7000 of *Jaami'ul Usool*: *"Abu Saeed Khudri (radhiyallahu anhu) narrated: 'Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: 'He who has even an atom of Imaan in his heart will come out from the Fire..''"* Ibn Atheer commenting, says: *"And in the narration mentioned by Razeen (it comes): 'Verily Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: 'The people of Jannat will enter Jannat, and the people of the Fire (will enter) the Fire. Then Allah will say (to the Angels): 'Take out from the Fire whoever has in his heart an atom of Imaan.'*

Ibnul Atheer was unable to locate the source of this latter portion/version of the Hadith, hence he simply attributed it to Razeen. Commenting on Ibnul Atheer's inability to locate the source from the Sihaah Sittah, San'aani, the author of *At-Tahbeer li Eedhaahi Ma-aanit Tayseer*, states:

"It is indeed surprising, for verily, this Hadith is in Saheeh Bukhaari. (It is) of the Hadith of Abu Saeed Khudri (radhiyallahu anhu) in entirety....." (*At-Tahbeer*, Vol.1, page 128) In fact this Hadith is also found in Saheeh Muslim.

The abovementioned few Ahaadith taken at random from *Jaami'ul Usool* of Ibnul Atheer and the comments by him and annotators, prove that the narrations referred to as *Ziyaadaat* of Razeen are to be found in the *Usool*. Ibnul Atheer's comment: "*I did not find it (in the Usool)*", should not be misconstrued to mean that the Ahaadith do not exist in the *Usool*. Also, there is no aspersion cast on Imaam Ibnul Atheer for his comments of : '*Lam ajid hu*' (*I did not find it*). He could not find the Ahaadith, termed *Ziyaadaat*, in the manuscripts available to him.

Besides these random examples, sources for many other so-called *Ziyaadaat* have been located after Ibnul Atheer had recorded: "*I did not find it in the Usool.*"

The *jahaalat* of the Salafis is apparent from their discussion on another Hadith among the so-called *Ziyaadaat* of Imaam Razeen. The relevant Hadith is

"Put them (women) at the back as Allah has placed them at the back."

The Salafi, Shaikh Abdullah Bin Baaz, states in his book, *At-Tufatul Kareemah*:

"It is narrated in Kashful Khafa' from Al-Maqaasid and from Az-Zarkashi that it (this Hadith) is Mauqoof on Ibn Mas'ood. Abdur Razzaaq has sourced it, and At-Tabaraani from his tareeq (way). It is not Mar'foo'."

The annotator, Ziyaad Tuklah, who is a junior compared to Shaikh Bin Baaz, commenting on this Hadith, says:

"From the Marfoo' perspective, there is no basis for this Hadith. The mutual concurrence of the Fuqaha in regarding

it to be a Hadith is indeed surprising, e.g. As-Sarakhsi of the Hanafis, in Al-Mabsoot; Qaadhi Iyaadh in Ikmaalul Mu'lim; Ibn Rushd in Bidaayatul Mujtahid, and Al-Quraafi in Az-Zakheerah, they are from the Malikiyyah; At-Taqi Al-Hisni from the Shaafis, in Kifaayatul Akhyaar; Ibn Qudaamah in Al-Mughni and other Hanaabilah after him, and Shaukaani in Nailul Autaar.”

Imaam As-Sarakhsi (Hanafi), died 483 Hijri; Qaadhi Iyaadh (Maaliki), died 544 Hijri; Ibn Rushd (Maaliki), died 520 Hijri; Al-Quraafi (Maaliki), died 684 Hijri; At-Taqi Hisni (Shaafi'), died 829 Hijri; Ibn Qudaamah (Hambali), died 620 Hijri. These are Fuqaha from all Four Math-habs. Besides them, there are numerous Fuqaha of all the Math-habs, and many more earlier than Imaam As-Sarakhsi. All of these Fuqaha appeared on the Islamic horizon of Uloom a thousand and more years before the jaahil, Ziyaad Tuklah who claims, as do all Salafis, that the Hadith in question is not *Marfoo'*

At least his seniors accept that it is Mauqoof on Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu). Yet the illustrious Fuqaha of all the Math-habs have accepted this Hadith as *Marfoo'*, and have utilized it as their *Mustadal (basis for formulating Shar'i Ahkaam)*. This stance of the eminent Fuqaha alone debunks the contention of the Salafis echoed by Tuklah. Mentioning the variety of sources and views pertaining to this Hadith, Tuklah says:

“Ibn Hajar said in Ad-Diraayah: ‘I did not find it as Marfoo’.....The one who attributed it to Dalaailun Nubuwwah of Baihqi, imagined it as Marfoo’. As-Surooji thought from some of his Mashaaiikh that it is in the Musnad of Razeen.’

Az-Zarkashi said: *‘I saw one who had attributed it to Saheehain (Bukhaari and Muslim). But it is erroneous.’*

Tuklah says: “Razeen Al-Abdari As-Saraqusti narrated it in *At-Tajreed* from the Hadith of Huzaifah (radhiyallahu anhu), as it appears in the nuskah of *Jaami’ul Usool and Mishkaatul Masaabeeh*.”

Those who claim that the narration of Ibn Mas’ood (radhiyallahu anhu) is not a Hadith, have failed to present any evidence for their contention. They arbitrarily make claims which they are unable to substantiate. Ibn Hajar’s inability to establish its *Marfoo’* status, does not negate the validity and authenticity of this Hadith.

The assertion that As-Surooji’s contention of the Hadith being in *Dalaailun Nubuwwah* as *Marfoo’* is mere imagination, is drivel and bunkum. In this regard, the Salafis cite as support the statements of Az-Zailaee who said:

“As-Surooji says in Al-Ghaayah: ‘Our Shaikh As-Sadr Sulaimaan narrated it and attributed it to the Musnad of Razeen.’ (Zailaee comments): ‘Verily, this jaahil mentions that it is in Dalaailun Nubuwwah of Baihaqi. I searched for it and I did not find it neither as Marfoo’ nor as Mauqoof’.”

Firstly, As-Surooji and his Shaikh As-Sadruddeen Sulaimaan were great personalities. They were outstanding Hanafi Fuqaha of an extremely lofty pedestal. Presenting a character sketch of Qaadhil Qudhaat Sadruddeen Sulaimaan Al-Hanafi, Allaamah Zahabi states in his *Taareekhul Islam*:

“As-Shaikh Sadruddeen Qaadhil Qudhaat Abul Fadhl Al-Azraee, Al-Hanafi (died 677 Hjri) was an Imaam and a

Mutabahir Aalim. He was an Aarif of the intricacies and subtleties of the Math-hab. The jurisdiction of the Hanafiyyah terminated with him in Misr and Shaam.

....He was of the senior Hanafiyyah in the sphere of Fatwa. He issued Fatwa for more than thirty years. He had adopted much solitude and seclusion. He mingled very little with people, and he shunned leadership and futility.”

All biographers speak highly of As-Surooji, the Student of Shaikh Sadruddeen Sulaimaan. He too, like his Shaikh, was an outstanding expert in all spheres of Knowledge. Both these illustrious personalities were great Hanafi Fuqaha acknowledged and respected by the Ulama of all Math-habs.

To say the very least, it was extremely unjust for Az-Zailaee to refer to either of these noble Hanafi Fuqaha as ‘jaahil’. In so doing Az-Zailaee has demoted and denigrated himself. In fact, he has betrayed his own dimension of jahaalat. While he has proclaimed either As-Surooji or Sadruddeen Sulaimaan as ‘jaahil’, Zailaee has not presented a dot of evidence to vindicate his own statement of jahl.

Az-Zailaee labelled either Shaikh As-Surooji or Shaikh Sadruddeen Sulaimaan as ‘jaahil’ on the stupid basis of his (Az-Zaila-ee’s) inability to locate the Hadith in *Dalaailun Nubuwwah of Imaam Baihqi*. If Shaikh As-Surooji had erred in claiming that the Hadith is in *Dalaailun Nubuwwah*, it does not entitle Az-Zaila-ee to brand him a ‘jaahil’. Since they were contemporaries, it would not be unreasonable to attribute Az-Zaila-ee’s indiscretion to *hasad and ta-assub*.

Furthermore, Az-Zaila-ee's inability to find the Hadith does not necessarily mean that it is not in *Dalaailun Nubuwwah*. It is quite possible that the version in which As-Surooji or his Shaikh saw the Hadith differs from the version which was at Az-Zaila-ee's disposal. Allaamah Anwar Shah Kashmiri states that 21 years ago he saw in the possession of Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, a manuscript of Imaam Baihaqi which differed from the printed version. He averred that the hand-written version was the correct one.

Whatever criticism Salafis heap on Imaam Razeen is baseless and devious stratagems unsubstantiated by evidence or designed to mislead. Consider the following dubious statement of Tuklah:

“Verily, Ibnul Atheer has explicitly mentioned in the Muqaddimah of Jaami’ul Usool that he had found in Razeen’s Tajreed of the Sihaah Sittah such ziyaadaat which are not to be found in his Usool of these (Six) Kutub..”

This statement is a deliberate attempt to misrepresent and mislead. Tuklah, with this statement, endeavours to create the notion that according to Ibnul Atheer the so-called Ziyaadaat are not to be found in any of the Six Kutub. But this is not what Ibnul Atheer says in Jaami’ul Usool or any where else. He did not say that the so-called Ziyaadaat of Imaam Razeen are not to be found in any of the Sihaah Sittah. He merely said that he did not find them in the versions *which he had read, heard and copied from*. Then he explicitly explained that due to the different versions of the Sihaah Sittah, he could not locate the Ahaadith. He therefore, left blank spaces by such Ahaadith for later insertion of the names of the Mukhrijeen. Far from

supporting the Salafi view, Ibnul Atheer accepted the authenticity of Imaam Razeen's Ahaadith. This has already been explained in the foregoing pages.

This fact is so conspicuous that even Tuklah is constrained to qualify the Six Kutub with the pronoun, '*his*'. Thus he is compelled to say: "*...his Usool of these Kutub.*" Why say "his Usool", i.e. The Usool of Ibnul Atheer, when he is not the compiler of these Six Kutub? By "*his Usool*" is meant the versions examined by Ibnul Atheer. Ibnul Atheer himself confirms that he was unable to locate some Ahaadith in the *Nusakh* available to him.

Whilst the Salafi juhhaal claim that there is no basis for the so-called Ziyaadaat of Imaam Razeen, great and illustrious Ulama and Fuqaha have upheld the validity and authenticity of these Ahaadith as we have shown in this treatise. The claims of the denigrators of Imaam Razeen are baseless, being the effects of subjectivism and emotionalism.

The strongest *daleel* for the authenticity of the Hadith is the acceptance by the Fuqaha of all Four Math-habs. The ruling of the Fuqaha is the final word in Authenticity, not the views of the stragglers regardless of who they may be. Such views which conflict with the *Qubool* of the Fuqaha are to be dismissed and discarded into the waste. The Shariah is not reliant on the views of the stragglers of the post-Khairul Quroon era. The stupidities of the juhhaal Salafis of the current 14th and 15th centuries, who mushroomed fourteen centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayjhi wasallam) are ludicrous.

The great Sahaabi, Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu) made a statement. The Fuqaha of the

Khairul Quroon accepted it as a *Marfoo'* Hadith. That is the final word. The Ummah does not need the flotsam and jetsam which the juhhaal Salafis disgorge in their abortive and despicable attempt to scuttle the *Mauqoof* narrations of the Sahaabah, and to demote them from the pedestal of Hadith. In general, the Sahaabi's statement, is tantamount to Rasulullah's statement.

Kindergarten entities such as Al-Albaani, Bin Baaz and Al-Arnou't of this century have no relevance in the firmament of Islamic Uloom which was emblazoned by the Aimmah Mujtahideen and Fuqaha of the Khairul Quroon era. Any of their views which conflict with the rulings of the Fuqaha of the Mathaahib have their abode in the sewerage drains of jahaalat.

With the Giants of Uloom, Wara and Taqwa – with our illustrious Aimmah Mujtahideen and Fuqaha of the Khairul Quroon, all standing behind us in a solid wall of steel as the Qur'aan describes: *Bunyaanul Marsoos*, - with these *Warathatul Ambiya* of the first class, all standing behind us, the comparative non-entities like Zarkashi, Suyuti, Zailaee, Zahabi, Shaukaani, Ibn Tuloon, Zurqaani, Ibn Taimiyyah, Albaani and all the others whom the current-day Salafi juhhaal cite selectively, are meaningless phantoms drifting pass like clouds of illusion.

We follow Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Abu Yusuf, Imaam Muhammad and the numerous other Ahnaaf Fuqaha. What Imaam Sarakhsi, Kaasaani, Imaam Maalik, Imaam Shaafi', Imaam Ahmad and others of this calibre say is the final word. Whatever else is disgorged by others is flotsam which does not warrant even a glance. Summing up our attitude,

is the following *Malfooth* of Allaamah Anwar Shah Kashmiri:

Someone had asked him: Have you seen the treatise of the Ghair Muqallideen, namely: *Al-Kitaabul Mustataab* ? Allaamah Kashmiri responded: “*I do not read the books of juhala (ignoramus) and humaqā’ (morons).*” Thus, all of these Salafis and neo-Salafis masquerading as Hanafis are *juhala and humaqā’*. Their stupid ‘dalaal’ are all trash and the effects of emotionalism (*nafsaaniyat*). Their views and arguments are devoid of Shar’i substance.

Thus, the Hadith of Ibn Mas’ood is the valid *Mustadal* for the Ahkaam which all Four Math-habs have structured on its basis. Regardless of the view that it is the statement of Ibn Mas’ood (radhiyallahu anhu), it is in the category of *Marfoo’* despite the chagrin of the juhhaal and humaqā’. As much as they endeavoured to denigrate the Hadith, all of them are constrained to say that its *Isnaad is Saheeh*.

The attitude of the novice, Tuklah, betrays the pernicious agenda of the Salafis. It is their plot to scuttle the Shariah, hence Tuklah attempts to rubbish away the Consensus of the Fuqaha of all Math-habs on the Hadith of Abdullah Ibn Mas’ood (radhiyallahu anhu). Tuklah stupidly expresses surprise at the Consensus of the Fuqaha of the four Math-habs on the ruling that the narration of Ibn Mas’ood (radhiyallahu anhu) is a Hadith.

The Salafis seek to bamboozle the ignorant and unwary with the technicalities of Hadith classification. Hence, they labour the argument of *Marfoo’* and *Mauqoof*. In their abortive endeavour to discard this particular Hadith as drivel, they deny its *Marfoo’* status claiming that it is the

statement of Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu), hence it holds no weight.

The disdain which the Salafis display for the *Aathaar* (*Narrations*) of the Sahaabah, demonstrates their disrespect for the Sahaabah. They do not consider the Fatawa of the Sahaabah binding, hence they demote the *Aathaar* of the Sahaabah from the lofty pedestal of Hadith.

Islam is the Deen for practical implementation. It is not an academic project for assignment to the intellectual domain where it will calcify and fossilize to become an artefact for antiquity. Islam is not an empty theory. Discarding the technicalities of *Marfoo'* and *Mauqoof*, the irrefutable bottom line pertaining to this particular narration is that it was spoken by the very senior Sahaabi, Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallaahu anhu) about whom Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

- “Aquire the (Knowledge of) the Qur'aan from four persons: From Ibn Umm Abd (i.e. Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood), Muaaz Bin Jabal, Ubayy Bin K'ab and Saalim Maula Abi Huzaifah.”
- “If I had to appoint a Khalifah over my Ummah without consulting anyone, I would appoint Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood.”

Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu) was among the most senior Ulama among the Sahaabah. All are agreed, even Salafis, that the statement in question (i.e. *'Assign them (women) to the back as Allah has assigned them to the back.'*) was made by Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu).

Regardless of whether the narration is *Marfoo'* or *Mauqoof*, the irrefutable fact is that it is the Fatwa of such a Sahaabi who was among the greatest Fuqaha. He had lived in the company of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) night and day, so much so that he was regarded as a family member of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Now when such a great Sahaabi Faqeeh issues a Fatwa, it is indeed satanic to seek to minimize its importance and significance with the veil of technicalities.

Whether the statement was made by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or whether it is the Fatwa of Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu), it matters not for the purpose of *amal* (practical application). It is binding on the Ummah. The Fatwa of Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu) is therefore tantamount to the Fatwa of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). But the deviant Salafis seek to minimize and even neutralize the importance of the *Athaar* of the Sahaabah by driving a wedge between the Fatawa of the Sahaabah and the statements of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) whereas, Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) equated the Sunnah of his Sahaabah to his own Sunnah. The differentiation attempted by the Salafis is for the purpose of promoting their mischief of scuttling the Shariah as taught by the Four Math-habs of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah.

This Salafi mischief is quite apparent from Tuklah's stupid surprise. The Consensus of the Fuqaha of all Four Math-habs evokes surprise in this Salafi non-entity. The dimness of his mind fails to comprehend that the Consensus is due to the Hadith having emanated from Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu) who had imparted it to his

Students, the Fuqaha of the Taabi'een era, and they in turn to their Students until it reached us intact by way of reliable narration transmitted from the authorities of the Shariah from generation to generation.

ALLAAMAH ABDUL HAYY ON ISNAAD

Allaamah Abdul Hayy Lucknowi states in his *Al-Ajwibatul Faadhilah*:

“Although Isnaad is essential in all matters of the Deen, however, sometimes the narration of a reliable Narrator and the explicit mention to whom it is attributed, is a substitute for it (for the Isnaad), especially in the later ages.....If extremism is adopted in demanding Isnaad in every act, then the objective will be lost. Hence, the explicit mention of a reliable Narrator suffices.

Thus, they (the Fuqaha) validate *amal* (practising in accordance) and *ithbaat* (citing as evidence) with the Ahaadith compiled in reliable Kutub (of Fiqh and Hadith) even if an uninterrupted (muttasil) chain to the narrator of the Hadith or the author of the reliably compiled Kitaab is not found by the *aamil* and the *muthbit*.

Furthermore, they have also validated reliance in Masaa-il of Fiqh on the reliable Hanafi authorities even if the musalsal sanad (unbroken chain) to the senior Aimmah is not available to the Mufti.

Ali Al-Qaari says in *Mirqaatul Mafaateeh* at the juncture where the author of *Mishkaat* states: ‘*Verily, when I attribute a Hadith to them (the Muhadditheen) it is as if I am attributing it to Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)....*’:

‘It is understood from the discourse of the Author that it is permissible to narrate Hadith from the reliable Kutub

whose attribution to their authors is famous and authentic, such as the Six Kutub and other compiled Kutub.....

Ibn Burhaan (Abul Fath Ahmad Bin Ali Bin Burhaan Al Faqeeh Ash-Shaafi' –d 518 Hijri) said: "According to all the Fuqaha Amal bil Hadith is not reliant on simaa' (hearing it from the source). In fact, if the manuscript of the Sunan is authentic to him, amal with it is permissible even if he had not heard it."

Ibnul Humaam says in Fathul Qadeer: 'The method of the Mufti narrating from the Mujtahid is one of two acts. Either it has a sanad or he takes it from a well known prevalent Kitaab such as the Kutub of Muhammad Bin Al-Hasan or similar other famous Kutub of the Mujtahideen. Because it is in the category of Khabrul Mutawaatir (Narration of the highest class of authenticity) or of the Mash-shoor class (of narrations). So has Ar-Raazi narrated.Yes, when a narration of An-Nawaadir is found in a famous Kitaab such as Al-Hidaayah and Al-Mabsoot, then that will be support (and confirmation) of that Kitaab (of An-Nawaadir)."

"And, Al-Qunyah narrating from Usoolul Fiqh of Abu Bakr Raazi, it is said : 'It is permissible for a person who looks in the well-known prevalent Kutub of a person whose Math-hab is well-known, to say: *"He has said so and so", even though he had not heard it from anyone, e.g. the Kutub of Muhammad Bin Al-Hasan, the Muwatta of Maalik and similar other Kutub because its existence in this manner is in the category of Al-Khabarul Mutawaatir and Istifaadhah. There is no need for Isnaad.*"

It is mentioned in *Tadreebur Raawi Sharh Taqreebun Nawawi*: “Al-Ustaaz Abu Ishaq Al-Isfiraani has narrated *Ijmaa’* on the permissibility of narrating from reliable Kutub, and Ittisaal of Sanad to the authors is not conditional. This includes the Kutub of Hadith and Fiqh.”

At-Tabari (Al-Faqih Ash-Shaafi’ Al-Imaam d. 504 H) said in his Ta’leeq: “Whoever finds a Hadith in an authentic Kitaab, it is permissible for him to narrate it and to make Ihtijaaj with it. A group from the Ashaabul Hadith says that it is not permissible for him to narrate it because he did not hear it. This is erroneous.

Imaamul Haramain has narrated similarly from some Muhadditheen (i.e. the impermissibility of narrating what has not been heard). However, he (Imaamul Haramain) said: “They are a faction. No consideration is paid to them in Haqaaikul Usool (the nature and realities of the principles)...They are not Aimmah of Hadith.”

Izzuddeen Bin Abdus Salaam said: “Regarding reliance of the authentic and trustworthy Kutub of Fiqh, verily, the Ulama of this era have enacted consensus of the permissibility of reposing reliance on them and to derive support from them because verily, authenticity has been acquired with them (these Kutub) just as it is acquired by narration.....Those who think that the people (i.e. the Ulama) have enacted consensus on error are in greater error than them.....” He (further) said: “....He who says that the condition for Takhreej from a Kitaab is reliant on Ittisaal of its sanad, verily, he has violated *Ijma’*.” (End of Allaamah Lucknowi’s discourse)

When a prominent recognized Authority narrates a Hadith, his very narration (*Naql*) without criticizing the Hadith, is

the *daleel* (evidence/proof) for its authenticity. Let us now see who was Razeen.

Imaam Razeen

Abul Hasan Razeen Bin Muawiyah Al-Abdari was "Al-Haafizul Jaleel (the illustrious Haafiz of Hadith), the Author of Kitaabut Tajreed – a Collection of the Sihaah (Sihaah Sittah). He died after the year 525 Hijri." (Mirqaatul Mafaateeh Sharh Mishkaatul Masaabeeh)

In his *Al-Hazzul Aufar*, Mullah Ali Qaari states: "Imaam Razeen Bin Muawiyah Al-Abdari was from the Akaabir Mukharrijeen, and his word was a Sanad by the Aimmah of the Muhadditheen."

"Abul Hasan Razeen Bin Muawiyah was an expert Faqeeh from the Ashaab of Imaam Maalik Bin Anas. He was the Maaliki Imaam in the Haram of Allah Ta'ala (Makkah). He was the Imaam of the Musjid. He (acquired knowledge) from Faqeeh Abul Hasan Ali Bin Abdullah As-Saqali, Abul Abbaas Ahmad Ibn Shaatibi and others."

(At-Tahbeer fil Mu'jami Kabeer)

"Shaikh Abul Hasan Razeen Bin Muawiyah Bin Ammaar Al-Abdari Al-Maaliki was a Faqeeh and a Faadhil of the Ashaab of Maalik Bin Anas from the people of Saraqustah from the land of Andalus (Spain). He was The Maaliki Imaam in the Haram of Allah Ta'ala. He acquired Fiqh from Abul Hasan Ali Bin Abdullah As-Saqali and Abul Abbaas Ahmad Bin Ash-Shaatibi and others besides them." (Al-Muntakhab min Mu'jami Shuyookhis Sam'aani)

"Abul Hasan Razeen Bin Muawiyah Al-Abdari was the Maaliki Imaam of Makkah. Al-Haafiz Abu Musa said: "He had

ma'rifat (well-grounded expertise and knowledge) in Hadith, its Riyaal (Narrators) and in Fiqh." (Ikmaalul Ikmaal)

"Razeen Bin Muawiyah: He was Al-Imaam Al Muhaddithush Shaheer, the author of Kitaabut Tajreedis Sihaah. He lived in Makkah for a very long time. He heard Saheeh Bukhaari from Eesa Bin Abi Tharr, and Saheeh Muslim from Abi Abdillahi At-Tabari.

The Qaadhi of the Haram, Abul Muzaffar Muhammad Bin Ali At-Tabari, Zaahid Ahmad Bin Muhammad Bin Qudaamah, Haafiz Abu Musa Al-Madeeni and Al-Haafiz Ibn Asaakir narrated from him. He was the Maaliki Imaam in the Haram." (Siyar A'laamun Nubala')

The author of this kitaab is the Critic Allaamah Zahabi. Despite criticizing Imaam Razeen, he (Zahabi) is constrained to observe that he was a famous Imaam and Muhaddith.

Ibn Bashkuwaal said about Imaam Razeen: *"He was a pious man, a Faadhil, and an Aalim of Hadith, etc." (Ad-Dibaajul Muthah-hab and Haashiyah As-Shalbi)*

Even Ibnul Qayyim, the Student of Ibn Taimiyyah, acknowledging the status of Imaam Razeen, says: *"Razeen Bin Muawiyah, the Author of Tajreedus Sihaah, is among the most learned of his age in Sunan and Aathaar. He was from the Maalikiyyah.... The Author of Jaami'ul Usool relied on his Kitaabut Tajreed." (Mukhtasar As-Sawaa-iq)*

Ignoring their great Imaam Ibn Qayyim, the Salafis, true to their form and norm of *jahaalat*, lambast Imaam Razeen without presenting any rational evidence for their baseless conclusions.

Lauding accolades on Imaam Razeen, Ibn Atheer, the Author of *Jaami'ul Usool*, states:

"When I saw these kutub (the Hadith kutub of the later Muhadditheen), I observed that the Kitaab of Razeen was the greatest and the most comprehensive in view of it encompassing the Six Kutub which constitute the basis of the Kutub of Hadith."

In his *Jaami'ul Usool*, Ibnul Atheer Jazari, states: *'Regarding the Kitaab of Razeen, Ash-Shaikh, Al-Imaam, Al-Aalim Abu Ja'far Al-Mubaarak Bin Al-Mubaarak Bin Ahmad Bin Zuraiq Al-Haddaadul Muqri conveyed it to me (granting me) Ijaazah (Permission to narrate) in the year 589 Hijri. He said: 'Al-Imaam Al-Haafiz Abul Hasan Razeen Bin Muawiyah Al-Abdari informed us in the year 525 Hijri'.*

Ibnul Atheer who was an accomplished Muhaddith, had also compiled in his *Jaami'ul Usool* the so-called *Ziyaadaat* from Imaam Razeen's *Tajreedus Sihaah*. If he had the slightest doubt as to the authenticity of Imaam Razeen's so-called *Ziyaadaat*, he would not have included them in his *Kitaab* which was an Abridgement of the *Sihaah Sittah*. It is indeed moronic to conjecture that a great Imaam of Hadith contaminating and debasing his highly authentic work with *Maudhoo' and Waahi* narrations. His *Kitaab* consists of the *Ahaadith* of only the *Sihaah Sittah*.

Did such a great, noble and illustrious Muhaddith of Ibnul Atheer's calibre fail to understand the recklessness of accepting and compiling *khuraafaat* (drivel/nonsense/rubbish) which are the implied designations awarded to the *Saheeh* so-called *Ziyaadaat* of Imaam Razeen by the morons and mongrels of these times? What need did Ibnul Atheer have to 'despoil' his beautiful highly-placed, highly authentic *kitaab*, *Jaami'ul Usool* with narrations which have been recklessly and baselessly branded *Maudhoo'*?

Even Abdul Qadir Al-Arnaut, the Salafi annotator of *Jaami'il Usool*, glowingly praising Ibnul Atheer writes: *"He is Al-*

Imaam, Al-Baari' Majdud Deen Abus Sa'aadaat Al-Mubaarak Bin Muhammad Bin Muhammad Bin Abdil Kareem Bin Abdil Waahid Ash-Shaibaani Al-Jazari, then Mausali, famously known as Ibnul Atheer.....He acquired (knowledge of Hadith) from a Jama'at (of Muhadditheen) in Mausil, among them were the Khateeb of Al-Mausil, Abul Fadhl Abdullah Bin Ahmad Bin Muhammad At-Tusi. In Baghdad he heard (studied Hadith) from Abul Qasim who was in the companionship of Ibnul Khalil and Abdul Wahhaab Bin Sukainah. Then he returned to Mausil and narrated Hadith, and the people benefited.

.....He was of the Beauties of the age (i.e. physically, intellectually, morally and spiritually).

He was a person of powerful Deen of the Straight Path. He was Aarif, Faadhil, Wari (exceptionally pious – a man of the loftiest standard of Taqwa). He was highly intelligent, etc., etc. He was accomplished in the Knowledge of Arabic, the Qur'aan, Nahw Lughat Hadith and Fiqh. He authored famous kitaabs (a long list of kutub follows).....

Undoubtedly, he (Ibnul Atheer) has bestowed a favour (rendered a wonderful service) to Islam and its people with this great Kitaab (Jaami'il Usool) for which (this Ummah) will be perpetually grateful."

He furthermore describes this wonderful Kitaab " *a wonderful treasure*". Is it ever possible for such an illustrious Authority of the Deen who had bestowed such a wonderful treasure to Islam and the Ummah to weave false narrations into his "Wonderful Treasure Trove"? Is it conceivable for such an outstanding authority and expert of the Science of Hadith to accept fabrications and compile them into his Wonderful Treasure Trove without providing the slightest hint of the falsities, thereby misleading the Ummah into the den of the devil and the dregs of Hell?

DIFFERENT VERSIONS

The Aimmah of Ahaadith had numerous students – hundreds and even thousands. Numerous among them had recorded the Ahaadith from their Asaatizah. There were thus bound to be differences in the variety of written records. To cite just one example is the Muwatta of Imaam Maalik. Two of his prominent Students among many others who had recorded the Muwatta are Imaam Muhammad (died 189 Hijri) and Imaam Yahya Bin Yahya Al-Masmoodi (died 204 Hijri). Although both recorded in writing the Ahaadith which Imaam Maalik had narrated to them, their compiled versions differ.

The inability of later Imaams to locate in the *Usool* some of the narrations which Imaam Razeen had recorded in his *Tajreedus Sihaah* may not be presented as grounds for condemning, demoting or rubbishing any of the Ahaadith of *Tajreedus Sihaah*. Imaam Razeen had compiled in this Kitaab only Ahaadith from the *Usool*, hence he named it, *Tajreedus Sihaah*.

Debunking the misconception which developed in later centuries after him, Imaam Razeen states: "*Know that, verily, I have entered (into my Kitaab) such Ahaadith from different manuscripts of Muwatta (of Imaam Maalik) – the manuscripts of Ibn Shaaheen, Daaraqutni and from the Riwaayat of Muwatta of Ma'an. Some manuscripts differed from others in this respect. And, all of them are Saheeh.*" (Taudheehul Afkaar of Ameer San'ani, d.1182 Hijri)

From the very act of recording these Ahaadith in his *Jaami'il Usool*, and leaving blank spaces for insertion of the

source when discovered, and his categorical assertion that his inability of finding the source was due to different manuscripts and Chains of Narrations which were not available to him, it should be quite clear that each and every Hadith in Imaam Razeen's *Tajreedus Sihaah*, is authentic having acquired it from the *Sihaah Sittah*. It is on the basis of this conviction that Ibnul Atheer accepted the Ahaadith for inclusion in his *Jaami'il Usool*.

The term, *Ziyaadaat* in this context should not be misconstrued and understood to refer to such Ahaadith for which there are no *Asaaneed*, nor should it be understood to mean that Imaam Razeen had acquired the narrations from sources other than the *Sihaah Sittah*. Thus, it is mentioned in *Taudheehul Afkaar*:

"... "It is far-fetched (not feasible) that Razeen was unaware of this, for he was in Makkah. It was well-known to the people of his age that he had collected such Kutub which no one in his age had collected."

It should be quite obvious that it was not possible for such an illustrious Imaam as Razeen whose reliability and integrity are universally acknowledged by all Authorities of the Shariah, to have included in his famous Kitaab narrations from sources other than the *Sihaah Sittah*, hence he named his Kitaab, *Tajreedus Sihaah*. Those who appeared later called some of his narrations *Ziyaadaat* on the basis of their inability to locate the sources in the *Usool*. The designation, *Ziyaadaat-e-Razeen* is thus manifestly erroneous.

Regarding those of Razeen's narrations in Ibnul Atheer for which the latter had left blank spaces for later insertion of the sources, it is mentioned in *Taudheehul Afkaar*:

"...It is inconceivable that he (Ibnul Atheer) while intending to compile the Six Usool, would introduce Ahaadith which are not found therein."

This fact is simple logic. That is precisely why he entered the Ahaadith of Razeen in his *Jaamiul Usool*, despite his (Ibn Atheer's) inability to locate the narrations in the *Usool*. He was convinced of their existence in the *Usool*, but the manuscripts wherein these narrations are to be found were not available to him. For better understanding, we repeat Ibnul Atheer's statement:

"Verily, I have written it (these narrations) from his (Razeen's) Kitaab whilst I did not find it in the Usool. I have left these narrations without symbol (i.e. without saying from which kitaabs of the Sittah it was sourced), and I have left a blank space for (the insertion of) the narrator of it, for perhaps I may search for other manuscripts of these Usool and discover them. Then I shall confirm (in the blank spaces) the name of its narrator."

Therefore the claim that there are extra (*ziyaadaat*) narrations in Razeen's Kitaab, which are not to be found in the *Usool* is manifestly erroneous.

Allaamah Zahabi had committed this grave error, hence labelled the *Ziyaadaat* in general, without targeting any specific Hadith in this category (i.e. the *Ziyaadaat*), as 'unreliable'. But for this conclusion he has not proffered any

valid basis. His conclusion remains an arbitrary opinion unsubstantiated by rational evidence.

Many have misunderstood the truncation of the Ahaadith by Imaam Razeen. Without applying their minds constructively, they simply believed that the narrations have no *Isnaad*, hence unreliable. In reality the truncation (shortening/deleting) relates to that segment of the *Isnaad* between himself and the Recorders of the Ahaadith in the *Usool*. These Recorders are Imaam Bukhaari, Imaam Muslim, Imaam Maalik, Imaam Nasaai' , Imaam Abu Daawood and Imaam Tirmizi. Truncating the *Isnaad* between himself and these Authorities, and terminating the truncation at the juncture of the great Imaams, never means narration of Ahaadith without their *Asaaneed*. It is more than adequate for confirming authenticity to narrate a Hadith by referencing it to Bukhaari, Muslim, Abu Daawood, Nasaai', Tirmizi and Muwatta Maalik. It is only a jaahil or a scholar who had failed to apply his mind either because of carelessness or subjectivity, who blurt out that the Hadith is unreliable despite the narrator claiming that it is in one of the *Usool*.

Imaam Razeen's Kitaab, *Tajreedus Sihaah*, is an explicit statement which categorically claims the existence of all his narrations in the *Usool*. That Ibnul Atheer, Zahabi or any one else failed to locate the narrations in the *Usool* is not a rational argument for denying the existence of the Ahaadith in the *Usool*. Thus it will be found that those who had failed to find the source, acquitting themselves with the statement: "*Lam ajid hu*" ("*I did not find it.*") . He does not reject nor denounce the Hadith which a recognized authority of Hadith such as Imaam Razeen cites. The one who

criticizes the Hadith seeking to demote its status or rejecting it as a 'fabrication' without providing any rational grounds, commits a grave act of injustice, and the danger of refuting the Words of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Despite his inability to locate the Ahaadith (the Ziyaadaat) in the *Usool* manuscripts at his disposal, Ibnul Atheer did not criticize the narrations nor did he delete them. He accepted their authenticity in view of the fact that a great Authority had narrated them. Hence he included these ziyaadaat narrations of Imaam Razeen in his *Jaami'ul Usool* which according to all Ulama is a "Wonderful Treasure Trove".

WHO IS IBNUL ATHEER?

Deviates who scandalously attempt to demote the Narrations of Imaam Razeen into negation with their rubbish arguments of subjectivity, present this illustrious Imaam of Hadith as some Zaid, Bakr, Tom, Dick or Harry who sucked out Hadith narrations from his thumb. It is therefore essential to first understand who this illustrious Imaam of Hadith was in order to appreciate the status of his Hadith narrations.

Imaam Ibnul Atheer flourished in the same era as Imaam Razeen. He died in the year 606 Hijri whereas Imaam Razeen departed from this world in 535 Hijri. Both were among the most famous, most illustrious Muhadditheen of the later age. While they were extraordinary specialist and experts in the Ilm of Hadith, they were also accomplished Fuqaha.

About Ibnul Atheer's famous kitaab, *Jaami'il Usool*, Yaqoot Al-Hamawi, the author of *Mujamul Buldaan*, averred: *"I maintain with absolute certitude that there never was a book like Jaami'ul Uloom."*

The Salafi Annotator, Al-Arnaut, lauding praise and accolades on Imaam Ibnul Atheer, says:

"The Kitaab (i.e. Jaami'ul Uloom) is one of those great Kutub, which was compiled by Imaam Abus Sa'aadaat Majduddeen Al-Mubaarak Bin Muhammad Bin Muhammad Bin Abdul Kareem Bin Abdul Waahid Ash-Shaibaani Al-Jazari, then Al-Mausili who is famously known as Ibnul Atheer of the 6th Hijri century.

The Author (Ibnul Atheer) has relied on the Ahaadith contained by the Six Usool which are reliable by the Fuqaha and Muhadditheen. These Six are Muwatta, Bukhaari, Muslim, Abu Daawood, Tirmizi and Nasaai' which embrace a major portion of the Ahaadith which have been authentically narrated from Nabi-e-Kareem. He (Ibnul Atheer) compiled them and included them all in a single compilation which he had beautifully systematized and simplified rendering it more beneficial."

In his *Jaami'ul Usool*, Imaam Ibnul Atheer says:

"From the Usool (Principles) of Furudhul Kifaayaat is the Ilm of the Ahaadith of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Aathaar (Sayings) of his Sahaabah (radhiyallahu anhum). These Usool constitute the second foundation of the Dalaail (proofs/evidences) of the Ahkaam (laws). Its knowledge is a lofty issue and occupies an exalted pedestal. Only he who hones his nafs by diligently following the Commandments and

Prohibitions of the Shariah and eradicating deceit from his heart and tongue can encompass the knowledge (of these *Usool*.)

This *Ilm* of Hadith and *Aathaar* consists of principles, laws, precepts, parlance and technical terminology which the Ulama have mentioned and the Muhadditheen and Fuqaha have elaborated on. The *Taalib* of *Ilmul Hadith* and *Aathaar* needs to be versed and acquainted with these after his study of linguistics which are the basis of understanding the Hadith in view of the Shariah Mutahharah being revealed in the Arabic language.

ILMUL HADITH

The composition of *Ilmul Hadith* and *Aathaar* consists of a variety of Branches of Knowledge:

- * The *Ilm* of *Rijal* (the Knowledge of the narrators) - their names, their lineages, their ages and their times of death
- * *Ilm* of the narrators' qualifications and credentials allowing for acceptance of their narrations
- * *Ilm* of the sources (of procurement of narrations) of the narrators, and how they acquired these from their sources and division of their Chains
- * *Ilm* of the texts/words of the narrators, their communication of what they heard, conveying same to those who acquired from them and an account of their ranks
- * *Ilm* of the permissibility of relaying Hadith paraphrased, narration of portions of the Hadith, (narration of) interpolation, attribution of extraneous matter and the

addition by a *Thiqah* (trustworthy narrator) of something to the Hadith

* *Ilm* of the *Musnad Ahaadith*, their conditions, their categories

* *Ilm* of *Mursal Ahaadith*, their sub-division into *Munqati'*, *Mauqoof*, *Mu'dhal*, etc, and the differences of the Ulama in regard to their acceptance and rejection

* *Ilm* of *Jarh* and *Ta'deel* (examination of narrators for establishing reliability/unreliability), its validity and its application, and the knowledge of the classes of the criticised narrators

* *Ilm* of the types of *Saheeh* and *Kaathib* Hadith, classification of *Khabr* into these two types and into *Ghareeb*, *Hasan*, etc.

* *Ilm* of the *Tawaatur*, *Ahaad*, *Naasikh* and *Mansookh Akhbaar*

* And other *Uloom* (Branches of Knowledge) which the *Aimmah* of Hadith are agreed upon and which are popular in their circles.

Thus a person who masters these (Sciences of Hadith) enters the Portals of this *Ilm* and he encompasses it from all its directions. Relevant to his deficiency in these sciences he falls from the premier stage. He is thus denied attainment of the highest pedestal.

The primary function of the *Muhaddith* is to narrate the *Ahaadith* precisely as he had heard. If he pursues anything more than this, it will be an increment in excellence and an ideal choice.

May Allah Ta'ala imbue us all, O Assembly of Students, with the acceptance of the *Dalaail*, and may He inspire us to follow the *Salaf Saalih* among the *Aimmah*. May He

bestow to us all, the highest ranks of Ilm Naafi' (Beneficial Knowledge) and may He grant us all, the *taufeeq* of practically implementing (in daily life) the Hadith, be these of the high or low class. Verily He hears Du'aas and is the One Who accepts (supplications)."

The above elaboration pertains to just one Branch of Islamic Uloom, viz. The Branch of Hadith. Besides *Ilmul Hadith*, there are the Branches of Qur'aan Tafseer, Usool of Tafseer, Fiqh, Usool of Fiqh, Ilmul Kalaam, etc.

Imaam Razeen and Imaam Ibnul Atheer were repositories of all Branches of Shar'i Uloom. In addition, the vital component of their disposition was *Khashiyat*, *Taqwa* and *Wara'*, which are the Qur'aanic requisites for being a qualified Aalim of the Deen in terms of the Qur'aan Majeed, for Allah Ta'ala says:

"Verily, of the servants of Allah, only the Ulama fear Him."

Minus these essential requisites, a man can never be an Aalim regardless of the proximity of his Darul Uloom certificate and of the length and quality of his turban, and regardless of his possession of several duktoor certificates and titles. Minus *Khashiyat*, he remains a moron – a jaahil.

How is it ever possible for illustrious Authorities of the Shariah of Imaam Razeen's and Imaam Ibnul Atheer's calibre to have included in their highly authentic works fabricated narrations? And that too, not one but many as some morons and mongrels suggest and imply?

A recognized critic and examiner of Hadith who audaciously blurts out in regard to Imaam Razeen's

narrations, for example, "*There is no basis for it*", or "*It is a fabrication.*", has indeed failed to apply his mind and his heart.

The very first *Asal (Basis)* for the validity and authenticity of the Hadith is Imaam Razeen himself. If the examiner fails to discern this conspicuous fact, then he must be spiritually blind, and it is such spiritual blindness which overshadows a scholar's intellectual ability.

The Uloom pertaining to *Ilmul Hadith* as expounded by Ibnul Atheer as mentioned above, is indeed a formidable array. Is it conceivable that he had included in his Treasure Trove (Jaamiul Usool) numerous fabricated narrations so unjustly attributed to Imaam Razeen by miscreants? Only one who panders to nafsani subjectivism can display such reckless audacity. For the attainment of intellectual equilibrium which is conditional for unbiased and objective examination and criticism, the miscreant stands in dire need of some spiritual evacuant.

Jam'ul Fawaaidh

Besides Imaam Qalyubi's Kitaab, Imaam Razeen's *Tajreedus Sihaah* and Imaam Ibnul Atheer's *Jaami'ul Usool*, the Rainwater Treatment Hadith also appears in *Jam'ul Fawaaidh*.

The neo-Salafi critic has attempted to demote this Kitaab from its lofty pedestal by describing it as a "non primary" source. The motive is obviously to denigrate the Rainwater Treatment Hadith which the Author of *Jam'ul Fawaaidh*

acquired from Ibnul Atheer's *Jaami'il Usool*, and he in turn from *Tajreedus Sihaah* of Imaam Razeen.

The full name of the Kitaab is *Jam'ul Fawaaidh min Jaami'ul Usool wa Majma'uz Zawaaid*.

The Author is Muhammad Bin Muhammad Bin Sulaimaan Bin Al-Faasi. He is described as Al-Imaamul Jaleel (an Imaam of great and lofty rank), Al-Muhaddithul Mufannin (A Muhaddith of multifarious Branches of Knowledge), Fardud Dunya fil Uloom Kulliha (A unique, incomparable and peerless specimen in all branches of Knoweldge), etc. etc. The litany of accolades and qualifications is testimony for the lofty status of his Kitaab, *Jam'ul Fawaaid*, and for the lofty pedestal which he occupies in the firmament of Qur'aanic and Hadith Knowledge, and for the fact that we are not dealing with just any Zaid, Bakr, Tom , Dick and Harry.

The attempt to denigrate the Hadith as a fabrication by demoting the status of *Jam'ul Fawaaid* with the term "*non primary*" testifies to the deficiency of the critic's research.

This illustrious Imaam acquired his *Uloom* from Akaabir Mashaaiikh. Among these illustrious senior Mashaaiikh are Qaadhil Qudhaat, the Mufti of Marakesh, Abu Mahdi Isaa As-Suknaani, Allaamah Muhammad Bin Saeed Al-Mureeghini Al-Marakeshi, Muhammad Bin Abi Bakr Ad-Dalaa-ee, and Shaikhul Islam Saeed Bin Ibraaheem . He was among the greatest of his Mashaaiikh. He stayed in the company of Allaamah Abu Abdullah Muhammad Bin Naasir Ad-Dur'ee for four years acquiring expertise in Tafseer, Hadith, Fiqh, Tasawwuf and other branches of Knowledge

Then he journeyed to Egypt where he acquired further Uloom from the illustrious Ulama of the age such as Nurul Ajhuri, Ash-Shuhaabeen Al-Khafaaji, Al-Qalyubi, Muhammad Bin Ahmad Ash-Shubari, Ash-Shaikh Sultan and others. All had bestowed to him *Ijaazah*.

He also acquired Uloom from the Hanafi Shaikh, Khairuddin Ar-Ramali, and in Damascus from As-Sayyid Muhammad Bin Humzah and Muhammad Bin Badruddeen Al-Hambali. He is the author of numerous Kutub of high standard in all disciplines. He passed away in Damascus in the year 1094 Hijri.

This very brief sketch was necessary to impress on the minds of readers that this illustrious Authority of the Shariah who was an Aalim and Imaam of Uloom of the loftiest calibre was not a moron who can be expected to compile chaff and rubbish fabrications into his unique and outstanding Kitaab, *Jam'ul Fawaaid*. This highly-placed authoritative Kitaab does not fall from its lofty pedestal by calling it '*non primary*'. While it may be non primary in relation to the *Usool* (Bukhaari, Muslim, etc.), it renders a grave injustice to this illustrious Shaikh of Islam to convey to ignorant and unwary readers with the term '*non primary*' the idea that this august personality of Islam and his treasure trove (*Jam'ul Fawaaid*) is of mediocre standing, unreliable, and simply a collection of fables and fabrications.

An Authority of the calibre of Muhammad Bin Sulaimaan Al-Faasi is not one to besmirch his authoritative Works with fabrications thereby misleading the Ummah and courting the Wrath of Allah Azza Wa Jal. If there had been the slightest suspicion of this particular Hadith (the

Rainwater Treatment Hadith) being a fabrication as the neo-Salafi critic has most injudiciously stated, never would this great Authority and the other Authorities whom he followed have accepted the Hadith without even a hint of criticism.

The very presence of the Hadith in Kutub such as *Jam'ul Fawaaid*, *Jaami'ul Usool and Tajreedus Sihaah* –all relying on the Sihaah Sittah – is the seal of authenticity which no one can challenge nor has challenged. It is indeed most regrettable that a Madrasah student, influenced by the Salafis, of this age of the dearth of Uloom of the Deen, could have displayed the audacity to label a Hadith a fabrication – a Hadith which illustrious authorities of the Shariah had authenticated. The attitude displayed by the critic smacks of Salafi influence.

The critic's statement: *"Both the above sources do not mention the chain of this narration. They reference this to Razin."*, is laughable and too ludicrous for intelligent comment. The fellow is simply blissfully unaware of these Kutub and their illustrious Authors – who they were - what are their qualifications and what lofty pedestal they occupy in the sphere of Hadith, Fiqh, Tafseer, etc., etc.

For us weak students of this age, the awe-inspiring credentials of the Akaabir Narrators of Hadith are more than adequate for convincing us of the authenticity of their narrations. We do not follow the stupid *minhaaj* of the deviant Salafis who believe themselves to be on the level of the Aimmah Mujtahideen among the Fuqaha and Muhadditheen.

Tayseerul Wusool

The other Kitaab which the neo-Salafi critic had attempted to denigrate for bolstering his claim of fabrication, is *Tayseerul Wusool*. The author of this Kitaab is Allaamah Abdur Rahmaan Bin Ali, popularly known as Ibnud Dabee' Ash-Shaibaani Az-Zabeedi Ash-Shaafi (944 Hijri). His Kitaab, *Tayseerul Wusool* is an abridgement of Imaam Ibnul Atheer's *Jaami'il Usool*. He is the illustrious Student of many illustrious Mashaaikh among whom are Ash-Shaikh Al-Faqeeh Nuruddeen Ali Bin Abi Bakr Hattaab, Al-Faqeeh Jamaaluddeen Muhammad At-Tayyib Bin Ismaaeel. His age at the time when he had studied by these Authorities was ten years.

Thereafter his Mashaaikh and Asaatizah were:

Shaikh Taqiyuddeen Umar Bin Muhammad Al-Fataa Bin Mu'aibid Al-Ash'ari, Allaamah Al-Muhaddith Zainuddeen Ahmad Bin Ahmad Bin Abdul Lateef Ash-Sharji, Shaikh Jamaaluddeen Bin Ahmad Bin Muhammad Taahir Bin Jam'aan, Ibraaheem Bin Abil Qasim Bin Jam'aan, and Shaikh Al-Muhaddith Shamsuddeen Muhammad Bin Abdur Rahmaan As-Sakhaawi.

Among the numerous Kutub he had authored, is *Tayseerul Wusool* which embraces the Six Usool. The illustrious Author of this Kitaab, Imaam Ibn Dabee' Ash-Shaibaani states in the introduction of his famous Kitaab:

"I have come across numerous Kutub compiled by the Aimmah of Hadith of the early and the later eras. From these Works I did not see a more beautiful Compilation than *Jaami'ul Usool* of the Hadith of the Rasool (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), which was authored by Al-Imaam Al-

Allaamatul Kabeer Majduddeen Abus Sa-aadaat Ibnul Atheer. He had compiled therein the Ahaadith of the famous Six Usool – Saheeh Bukhaari, Saheeh Muslim, Muwatta Imaam Maalik, Sunan Abi Daawood As-Sijistaani, Jaami Abi Isaa Tirmizi and the Sunan Abi Abdur Rahmaan An-Nasaai' (*Rahima humullaah Ta'ala*)."

This alone should apprise us that we are not dealing with a moron who is unable to distinguish between night and day – *Maudhoo' and Saheeh*.

This illustrious Author and Imaam of Hadith states in the introduction of his magnificent Kitaab: "I have named it: *"Tayseerul Wusool ilaa Jaami'ul Usool min Hadithir Rasool (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)*." The meaning of this title is: "The Simplification of Reaching *Jaami'ul Usool* of the Hadith of the Rasool (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)." *Jaami'ul Usool* is Ibnul Atheer's Compilation comprising of the famous Six Hadith Kutub, all the Ahaadith of which are authentically narrated from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

If Imaam Ibn Dabee', Author of *Tayseerul Wusool* had any reservations about the so-called "ziyaadaat" of Imaam Razeen, all of which were accepted as valid by Ibnul Atheer and by the Author of *Jam'ul Fawaaid*, he would not have included the Hadith in his Kitaab and authenticate it with the statement that it is from "the Hadith of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)." How is it conceivable that such a great Imaam of Hadith and Faqeeh whose entire life was devoted to learning and teaching Hadith and Fiqah, and who had authored numerous Kutub of the Deen, to include the Hadith in his magnificent Kitaab and to add that "it is

from the Hadith of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam))"? Whoever believes this to be possible can only be a Salafi moron or a pseudo Salafi Madrasah student influenced by the deviates.

After narrating the Rainwater Treatment Hadith in *Tayseetul Usool*, Ibn Dabee' (the Author) states: "*Razeen narrated it.*", in the same tone and tenor as it says for other Ahaadith: "*Shaikhaan (Bukhaari and Muslim) narrated it.*" He makes no further comment for he believes with conviction that Ahaadith accepted by Bukhaari and Muslim are all authentic, and likewise with the Ahaadith narrated by Imaam Razeen in his *Tajreedus Sihaah*. There was certitude that Imaam Razeen was not passing off a falsehood – a fabrication in the names of the Six Usool. Despite the inability of others locating the so-called 'ziyaadaat' of Imaam Razeen, these illustrious Muhadditheen who authored their magnificent Kutub 'blindly' accepted the validity and authenticity of the Hadith on the basis of the assurance by Imaam Razeen that he had acquired it from the *Usool*.

But then comes a moron Salafi of this age, trapped in *jahl-e-murakkab* (compound ignorance) adding in the notes his rubbish comment: "*There is no basis for this Hadith--- it is not of the talk of Nubuwwat.*" This moron annotator who perhaps is ignorant of the rudiments of *Istinja'*, makes such brazen and blatant rubbish claims without proffering even a semblance of evidence to bolster the flotsam he has disgorged. What is the *daleel* for contending that there is no *asal* for this Hadith and that it is *not of the kalaam of nubuwwat*? The moron who has made this rubbish annotation has no hope of providing any proof for his absolutely stupid and moronic comments.

The *asal and the sanad* are in fact Imaam Razeen. There is no need to traverse beyond Imaam Razeen. It was because there was no such need that the great Muhadditheen of the later eras did not feel the need to traverse beyond Imaam Razeen. It was universally accepted that this great Imaam had acquired all the Ahaadith of his *Tajreedus Sihaah* from the *Usool* notwithstanding Ibnul Atheer's inability to locate same in the *Usool*. It was Ibnul Atheer's conviction that indeed all of these so-called 'ziyaadaat' were sourced from the *Usool* that dictated to him to leave blank spaces by the Ahaadith for later insertion of the names of the Narrators once he or any one else had located same from such manuscripts of the *Usool*, etc. which were not available to him at the time when he was writing his Kitaab, *Jaami'ul Usool*. The later Muhadditheen did not even see the need to leave blank spaces. They authenticated the so-called "ziyaadaat" of Imaam Razeen by simply stating: "*Razeen narrated it.*", in the same way as it would be said: "*Bukhaari narrated it. Muslim narrated it.*"

In the Muqaddimah (Introduction) of *Tayseerul Wusool*, the illustrious Author, Ibn Dabee', says: "Qaadhil Qudhaat, Sharfuddeen Hibatullah Ibnul Baarzi, says in the Khutbah of his Kitaab (Tajreedul Usool min Hadithir Rasool):

"Verily, Aba Al-Hasan Razeen Bin Muawiyah Al-Abdari compiled the Six Usool. His Kitaab is the most comprehensive in this discipline. And the most beneficial since it embraces the Six Usool which are the basis of Hadith and its principles.

The Shaikh, Al-Imaam, Al-Aalim Majduddeen Abus Sa'adaat Al-Mubaarak Bin Muhammad Bin Muhammad Bin Abdul Kareem Al-Jazari, then Al-Mausili, i.e. Ibnul

Atheer, -Rahimahullaah- studied the Kitaab of Razeen which embraced these Usool (the Six Hadith Kutub). Then he adopted a form for it Wallaah! He improved its arrangement and its excellence. He enhanced its *tafseel and tabweeb* (division into sections and chapters). He effected this in his Book which he named *Jaami'ul Usool fi Ahaadeethir Rasool*.

It (Jaami'il Usool) is the pick of the selection (of Kutub of its kind). It is the fabulous object of search.

I expended maximum effort in its acquisition and narration, and I resolved to be totally involved with it even if it be only by studying it."

The Comments of a Shaikh of Al-Azhar University

Muhammad Haamid Faqi, a Shaikh of Al-Azhar in Egypt wrote an annotation on *Tayseerul Wusool*. It is appropriate in this discussion to comment on the convoluted opinion of this Shaikh who appears to lack in depth of Knowledge. In his introduction to *Tayseerul Wusool* whose illustrious Author, Ibn Dabee' is taken into Jannatul Firdaus with Shaikh Faqi's praises and accolades, he (the Azhari Shaikh) says:

" I could not lay my hands on the Kitaab of Razeen. In fact, I don't think that it has been printed.....There is little in the Kitaab (Tayseerul Wusool) from him (Razeen). The compilation of Razeen is not among the Kutub which are reliable according to the Rijaal (authorities) of Hadith."

This sweeping claim of unreliability made by the Azhari Shaikh testifies to his own unreliability. He overlooks the fact that Ibn Dabee', the Author of *Tayseerul Usool*, himself an accomplished Muhaddith and an Authority of the Shariah, has accepted the Hadith of Imaam Razeen for

inclusion in his famous Kitaab without casting the slightest aspersion or blemish on the authenticity of the Hadith.

Regarding the illustrious Author of *Tayseerul Wusool*, the Azhari Shaikh states in the very same introduction: *"He (i.e. Ibn Dabee') was among these unique/extraordinary Rijaal and Ulama whose voice everlastingly and loudly proclaimed the Haq and their Call unto Allah despite the ages having taken them away, and them having departed from this worldly abode. They have settled in the Abode of Mercy and Honour – He is Abdur Rahmaan Bin Ali famously known as Ibnud Dabee' Ash-Shaibaani.*

Verily, by offering the people Kitaab Tayseerul Wusool Ilaa Jaami'ul Usool, he has bestowed to Islam and its people such a favour whose barakaat is perpetual and all-embracing as long as there remains Aql (Intelligence) in people to understand (and appreciate) the excellence of Sunnatun Nabawiyyah, and as long as the people will have such hearts able to perceive Noor within its recesses and search for guidance from its way.

That Favour of Ibn Dabee' will remain appreciated as long as there remains on earth one who will say: Laa ilaaha ill al laahu Muhammadur Rasulullah. Therefore, may Allah reward him (Ibn Dabee') the best of rewards, his predecessors and those after him who had adopted his methodology and walked along his path in the service of the Deen.....They (the illustrious Muhadditheen among whom he includes Ibnud Dabee') have placed these Diamonds (which includes Tayseerul Wusool) in the hands of the people without them remunerating nor awaiting any thanks. They (these Muhadditheen, including Ibnud Dabee')

only hoped for the Pleasure of their Rabb. They only executed the obligation which was incumbent on them."

On the cover of the book, the Azhari Shaikh describes, Ibnud Dabee' as "*Al-Allaamah Al-Muhaddith*". It is inconceivable that this great Al-Allaamah, Al-Muhaddith who had bestowed such a valuable treasure and favour to Islam and its people – who had presented Diamonds to the Ummah – would ever have been so reckless as to include in his Compilation, *Tayseerul Wusool* any fabricated narration, then aggravated the recklessness and abuse of Amaanat with deafening silence, without making the slightest comment or criticism. The Azhari Shaikh who was attached to the liberal government institution of Al-Azhar, most certainly did not apply his mind, to say the least, when he disgorged his disparagement of Imaam Razeen's Kitaab, *Tajreedus Sihaah*.

All Hadith Authorities have cited from *Tajreedus Sihaah* without criticizing the so-called 'ziyaadaat' of Razeen. There is nothing but glowing praise and accolades from the illustrious Muhadditheen who had compiled *Jaami'ul Usool*, *Jam'ul Fawaaid*, *Tajreedus Usool* and *Tayseerul Wusool*. All of these Muhadditheen had as their fundamental basis for their respective compilations the Kitaab of Imaam Razeen, namely, *Tajreedus Sihaah*.

Notwithstanding their inability to trace the sources of a few Ahaadith in *Tajreedus Sihaah*, these Muhadditheen accepted without equanimity Imaam' Razeen's so-called 'ziyaadaat' for inclusion in their famous and fabulous Compilations. Ibnul Atheer's conviction as to the authenticity of Imaam Razeen's Ahaadith compelled him to

leave blank spaces at each of the so-called 'ziyaadaat' for later insertion of the narrators by himself or anyone else who may have access to the manuscripts of the *Sihaah Sittah* which Imaam Razeen had used to compile his *Tajreedus Sihaah*.

After Ibnul Atheer, the Author of *Jam'ul Fawaaid*, simply included these narrations in his fabulous Kitaab simply attributing the Ahaadith to Razeen without following Ibnul Atheer's method of leaving blank spaces. Commenting on Ibn Dabee's method of having attributed the so-called 'ziyaadaat' directly to Imaam Razeen, and for having dispensed with the blank spaces reserved by Ibnul Atheer for insertion of the narrators, San'aani says in *Taudheehul Afkaar*: *"It is surprising that Shaikh Muhammad Bin Sulaimaan (Ibn Dabee') had attributed the Takhreej to Razeen in his (Ibn Dabee's) Kitaab, Jam'ul Fawaaid min Jami'ul Usool Wa Majmauz Zawaa'id.....This (method of Ibn Dabee') of attributing it to Razeen creates the idea similar to attributing to Bukhaari as being the final source whereas Ibnul Atheer had left blank spaces for it. He did not attribute the Hadith to Razeen (as the ultimate source) because it was not him (Razeen) who had made Takhreej of it. The reality is that Razeen is not among the Mukhrijeen of those Ahaadith (the so-called ziyaadaat).*

Verily, Ibnul Atheer had left blank spaces for the Ahaadith of Razeen, hence it devolved on him (i.e. on Ibn Dabee') to also have left the blank spaces as Ibnul Atheer had done, or he should have searched for the sources from whence these narrations were acquired thereby providing considerable benefit.

I have mentioned this because, for a certainty, it is inconceivable that Razeen was not aware of it (i.e. of the ultimate source) whilst he was in Makkah where he had accumulated such an abundance of Kutub that it became well-known to the people of his age that no one in his time had accumulated so many Kutub.

Then Ibn Dabee' in his Kitaab, Tayseerul Wusool which is an abridgement of Jaami'ul Usool, did as Shaikh Muhammad Bin Sulaimaan (author of Jam'ul Fawaaid) did regarding the blank spaces of Ibnul Atheer. Thus he (Ibn Dabee') says: "Razeen is the mukhrij of it." This is a grave error.

It would have been better if he had left the blank spaces as Ibnul Atheer had done."

In his dissertation, Sam'aani has made the following points:

- * It is not proper to say for any of the narrations in Imaam Razeen's *Tajreedus Sihaah*, that he (Imaam Razeen) is the *Mukhrij* of the Hadith.
- * Imaam Razeen is not the *Mukhrij*. On the contrary he is the *Mukharrij*, for he has clarified that he has sourced the Ahaadith of *Tajreedus Sihaah* from the *Sihaah Sittah*.
- * The *Mukhrijeen* of all the Ahaadith in his *Tajreedus Sihaah* are the *Aimmaah* of the *Sihaah Sittah*.
- * It is this conviction which compelled Ibnul Atheer to leave blank spaces at those Ahaadith of *Tajreedus Sihaah* which he could not locate in the *Usool* manuscripts at his disposal.
- * It is inconceivable that Imaam Razeen did not acquire the Ahaadith from the *Sihaah Sittah*. Firstly, he has declared that the narrations are from the *Sihaah Sittah*. Secondly, he

had accumulated a vast treasure of Kutub in Makkah, and this was a well-known established fact. Thus, he had such manuscripts of the *Usool* which others centuries after him did not have.

* It was therefore best to have left the blank spaces which had been Ibnul Atheer's methodology because of the possibility of stumbling on the manuscripts from which Imaam Ibn Razeen had acquired the narrations.

So convinced were the illustrious Authors of *Jam'ul Fawaaid and Tayseerul Wusool* of the authenticity of Razeen's so-called Ziyaadaat, that they deemed it valid to dispense of Ibnul Atheer's method, and to directly attribute the Ahaadith to Razeen in the same way as one would attribute Ahaadith to Bukhaari, Muslim, etc.

It should be understood that during the early eras of Islam, the Muhadditheen had innumerable Students recording the Ahaadith narrated by their Mashaaiikh. This was the reason for the existence of different versions of the *Sihaah*. Referring to this fact, San'aani states that Imaam Razeen himself said in the Khutbah of his Kitaab:

"Know that, verily, I have entered (in my Kitaab) Ahaadith from the different manuscripts of Muwatta of Ibn Shaaheen, Ad-Daaraqutni and from the Riwaayat of Muwatta by Ma'n. Some manuscripts differed from others regarding these Ahaadith. And, all of them are Saheeh."

Thus, there is no conundrum regarding the so-called "ziyaadaat" of Imaam Razeen. He declared with emphasis: *"All of them are Saheeh."* This single declaration of Imaam Razeen clinches the whole baseless argument developed by

the neo-Salafi Madrasah student indoctrinated by Salafi influences.

The Azhari Shaikh has preposterously blurted out that the Kitaab of Imaam Razeen is not among the reliable kitaabs of Hadith. This is a claim devoid of substance and *daleel*. It is simple to advance a claim bereft of evidence. He has not proffered a single basis or *daleel* for his contention. No one is his muqallid. No one feels constrained to simply lap up whatever he has disgorged without any proof whatsoever. His contention is therefore dismissed as utter baseless flotsam. If he was aware of the status of Imaam Razeen, he would not have mustered up the audacity to blurt out drivel.

Allaamah Zahabi

In his extremely deficient research smacking strongly of Salafi influences, the student critic states: "Allamah Dhahabi (rahmatullah) writes: *"He added in his books some very unreliable narrations. He would have done better had he kept his book free from them."* (Siyar A'lamin Nubala, Vo.20 pg.205)

Firstly, this neo-Salafi fellow has added his own 'ziyaadaat' (extras/exaggeration) to Zahabi's words. The translation of Zahabi's statement on page 205, Vol.20 is: *"He entered into his Kitaab such extras (ziyaadaat) which are weak. If he had abstained, he would have done better."*

We say with emphasis that Zahabi has put forth a claim without providing any substantiation. His claim is devoid of substance. While advancing a claim is simple, providing the proof is entirely another matter. We are not the

muqallideen of Allaamah Zahabi, hence we do not submit to his arbitrary claims for which he has been unable to provide substantiation. Since there is no *daleel* for the audacious claim made by Zahabi it has to be dismissed as baseless.

Zahabi also did not say "*books*". He made reference to one specific kitaab of Imaam Razeen, and that is *Tajreedus Sihaah*. However, the Madrasah student says that Zahabi had said that Imaam Razeen had added "some very unreliable narrations in his books."

Zahabi's attribution of "weak" narrations to Imaam Razeen is debunked by Zahabi himself. In a brief biographical sketch of Imaam Razeen presented by Zahabi in his *Siyar A'laamin Nublaa'*, Zahabi says:

"Razeen Bin Muawiyah Ibn Ammaar : Al-Imaam Al-Muhaddith Ash-Shaheer (*He was an Imaam and a famous Muhaddith*). He is the Author of the Kitaab, *Tajreedus Sihaah*. He resided in Makkah for an age. (Mentioning Imaam Razeen's Ustaadhs/Shaikhs), Zahabi says): In Makkah he heard Saheeh Bukhaari from Isaa Bin Abi Tharr, and Saheeh Muslim from Abi Abdillah At-Tabari."

Mentioning the great Shuyookh who were Imaam Razeen's Students, Zahabi says:

"Those who narrated from him were the Qaadhi of the Haram, Abul Muzaffar Muhammad Bin Ali Tabari, Zaahid Ahmad Bin Muhammad Bin Qudaamah (the father of Shaikh Abu Umar), Al-Haafiz Abu Musa Al-Madani and Al-Haafiz Ibn Asaakir. He (Imaam Razeen) was the Imaam of the Maalikis in the Haram."

These Mashaaikh and Students of Imaam Razeen were prominent and famous Ulama and Muhadditheen. Furthermore, in the biographical sketch, Zahabi establishes the integrity and credentials of Imaam Razeen by citing a Hadith with a long Chain of noble and illustrious Narrators among whom is also Imaam Razeen. The narration is the famous Hadith: "*Verily, deeds are with intentions.....*" The Golden Chain with Golden Links of Narrators is presented by Zahabi as follows: Abdul Haafiz – Ibn Qudaamah – his father Ahmad Bin Muhammad – *Razeen Bin Muawiyah* - Al-Husain Bin Ali, Abdul Ghaafir Bin Muhammad – Muhammad Bin Isaa – Ibn Sufyaan – Muslim – Ibn Qa'nab – Maalik – Yahya Bin Sa-eed – Muhammad Bin Ibraaheem Alqamah Bin Waqqaas - from Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) who narrated from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)

While all of these names in the Chain in which Razeen features are illustrious personalities, outstanding among them are Ibn Qudaamah (the Hambali Author of *Al-Mughni*), Imaam Muslim, Imaam Maalik, and his Student, Ibn Qa'nab who, according to some, had surpassed even Imaam Maalik.

It is inconceivable that an illustrious Muhaddith of Imaam Razeen's lofty calibre would ever have added weak, unreliable and fabricated narrations to his famous and highly placed Hadith Kitaab, *Tajreedus Sihaah*. It is also unacceptable to suggest that this great *Thiqah* Muhaddith is guilty of the despicable lie of claiming that his Kitaab comprises the Ahaadith of the Sihaah Sittah, when even drivel was added. He was the then Imaam of the Haram in

Makkah Muazzamah. Illustrious Ulama sat at his feet acquiring knowledge of Hadith. No one had ever accused him of teaching *maudhooaat and waahiyaat*. No one among the authorities of the Shariah had accused Imaam Razeen of introducing fabrications in his *Tajreedus Sihaah* besides some deviant Salafis of this age. Not even Zahaabi has made this slanderous claim.

Shaukaani who appeared only yesterday, has also criticized Imaam Razeen without any valid basis. He has merely claimed that Imaam Razeen has added fabrications, etc. to his Kitaab. But for this preposterous calumny, Shaukaani has not advanced even a semblance of proof. Regardless of his 'knowledge', his claim without evidence is unacceptable and stands rejected. Any person can blurt out: "*There is no basis for this hadith; it is a fabrication, etc.*" But such stupid statements will remain slander as long as the claims cannot be backed up by evidence. Whoever has blurted out that Imaam Razeen's *Riwaayaat* are 'fabrications', 'weak', etc. has essentially disgorged rubbish which the Salafi fellow has lapped up from the internet sites operated by the Salafis. Shaukaani who appeared on the scene about six centuries after Imaam Razeen is a relative non-entity. His word has no weight against the authenticitation of an illustrious Muhaddith of Ibnul Atheer's stature.

Stating his drivel for which he has no proof, Shaukaani said: "*Ibnul Atheer has palpably erred by mentioning in Jaami'ul Usool the ziyaadaat of Razeen, and not alerting of the inauthenticity of the narrations....*"

This arbitrary and stupid criticism of Shaukaani, lacking in basis, must necessarily be dismissed as drivel and flotsam,

especially since it is directed to such Ahaadith which Imaam Razeen categorically claimed to have been acquired from the Sihaah Sittah. That Shaukaani was unable to locate the narrations in the manuscripts of the Sihaah available to him, is never a ground for branding the authentic Ahaadith as fabrications, etc.

Dismissing such contumacious rubbish levelled at Imaam Razeen, Mullah Ali Qaari states in *Mirqaat, Sharh Mishkaat*: *"Regarding the statement of some juhhaal (morons) that this Hadith is maudhoo', it (their stupid statement) is baatil and mardood, for verily Imaam Razeen Bin Muawiyah Al-Abdari, was from the Akaabir (very senior) Mukharrijeen, His Word is Sanad (Proof) by the Aimmah of the Muhadditheen."*

Even Ibn Qayyim, the student of Ibn Taimiyyah, has this to say about Imaam Razeen: *"Razeen Bin Muawiyah, the Author of Tajreedus Suhaah was among the most learned of his age in Sunan and Aathaar... The Author of Jaami'ul Usool (Ibnul Atheer) relied on his (Razeen's Kitaab.)"* Haafiz Abu Musaa states: *"He (Razeen) had expertise in Hadith, Rijaal and Fiqh."*

Salafis and neo-Salafis of this age expect us to adopt taqleed – blind and stupid following – of the likes of Shaukaani who mushroomed just yesterday, 13 centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) while they reject the Waajib and intelligent Taqleed of the Aimmah Mujtahideen whose sources of Knowledge were the Sahaabah.

Regarding a certain Hadith in Razeen's *Tajreedus Sihaah*, Haafiz Ibn Hajar says: *"I do not know its condition."* Ibn

Hajar's unawareness is not a *daleel* for labelling the Hadith a fabrication. While Ibn Hajar who appeared on the scene more than three centuries after Imaam Razeen, was unaware, Razeen was fully aware. He categorically states that the Ahaadith in his Kitaab are from the *Sihaah Sittah*. Ibn Hajar's inability to locate the Ahaadith in the manuscripts at his disposal is never a ground for claiming that the so-called 'ziyaadaat' of Razeen are baseless fabrications. In fact, Ibn Hajar did not venture to proclaim these Ahaadith of Imaam Razeen fabrications. Furthermore, relative to Imaam Razeen, Ibn Hajar is a junior. Great Muhadditheen, superior in rank to Ibn Hajar, such as Ibnul Atheer, had accepted the authenticity of Imaam Razeen's so-called 'ziyaadaat' in his famed Work, *Tajreedus Sihaah*.

Zahabi appeared on the scene more than two centuries after Imaam Razeen. Therefore, there is no need for any excogitation to understand the simple fact that the sources which were available to Imaam Razeen for establishing the authenticity of Ahaadith were unavailable to Zahabi. Being more than two centuries closer to the era of Nubuwwat than Zahabi, by itself is a factor of immense import.

Imaam Razeen's Shuyookh

The Shuyookh from whom Imaam Razeen acquired his Ilm of Hadith, etc. were not story-tellers. They were great Mashaaikh and Muhadditheen of their time. We shall briefly mention just two of these illustrious Ustaadh of Imaam Razeen.

Ash-Shaikh As-Sudooq Isaa Abu Maktoom Al-Ansaari Al-Harawi

Zahabi states in his *Taarikhul Islam wa Wafayaatil Mashaahiri wal A'laam*:

“Abu Maktoom was born in the year 415 Hijri. He heard (i.e. acquired knowledge of Hadith) from Abu Abdullaah As-San'aani, the Saahib of Taqwa the entire Musnad of Abdur Razzaaq, and from his father Saheeh Bukhaari and Kitaabud Da'waat of his father, and also other kutub.

A Jamaa't (of Ulama) narrated from him the Saheeh. Among them are (the illustrious Muhadditheen) Abu Taufeeq Mas'ood Bin Sa'd Al-Andalusi, Abu Ubaid Ni'mat Bin Ziyaadatillaah Al-Ghifaari and Ali Bin Humaid Bin Ammaar Al-Makki. And Abu Taahir As-Silafi narrated from him with Ijaazah.”

In *Siyar A'laamin Nubalaa'*, Zahabi describing him says: *“Ash-Shaikh As-Sadooq Abu Maktoom Isaa Bin Al-Haafizil Kabeer Abu Tharr Bin Ahmad Al-Ansaari Al-Harawi. He acquired substantial (Knowledge) from his father, from Muhammad Bin Al-Husain As-San'aani and from others.”*

Al-Husain Bin Ali At-Tabari –the Mufti and Muhaddith of Makkah

Zahabi says about him: *“He heard Saheeh Muslim from Abdul Ghaafir Al-Faarsi. He also heard from Umar Bin Masroor and Abu Uthmaan As-Saabuni. He heard Sahih Bukhaari in Makkah from Kareemah.*

As-Sam'aani said: “He was an expert in Fataawa. He acquired Fiqh from Naasir Bin Al-Husain Al-Umari Al-Marwazi.” (Zahabi says): “ Al-Haafiz Ismail, Abu Taahir As-Silafi, Abu Ghaalib Al-Maawardi, Ahmad Bin Muhammad Al-Abbaasi Al-Makki, Razeen Bin Muawiyah Al-Abdari, Abu Ali Bin Sukkarah, Abu Bakr Muhammad Bin Al-Arabi Al-Qaadhi and Abul Hajjaaj Yusuf Bin Abdil Azeez Al-Mayuraqi, etc. narrated from him.

If the Salafi fellow had engaged in proper *mutaa-la'ah* , he would not have failed to understand the lofty pedestal Imaam Razeen occupies in the firmament of Hadith. Among his Students were illustrious Ulama, Fuqaha and Muhadditheen. Some of them are Az-Zaahid Ahmad Bin Muhammad Bin Qudaamah, Shaikh Abu Musa Al-Madeeni, Qaadhil Qudhaat Abu Muzaffar Muhammad Bin Ali At-Tabari, Al-Haafiz Ibn Asaakir, Al-Faqeeh Al-Haafiz Al-Qaadhi Abul Hasan Muhammad Bin Khalaf Bin Saa'id Al-Ghassaani, Al-Imaam Al-Muarrikh As-Sam'aani, Shaikh As-Saalih Abu Hafs Umar Bin Iyaad Al-Yahsabi, Ash-Shaikh Al-Faqeeh Abul Qasim Khalaf Bin Faraj Bin Ar-Rawi Al-Qantari, As-Shaikh-Al-Imaam Abu Ja'far Al-Mubaarak Bin Al-Mubaarak Bin Ahmad Bin Zuraiq, Al-Haddaad Al-Waasiti and Ash-Shaikh Waleed Bin Muwaffaq Al-Jayyaani. These personalities and authorities of the Shariah were among the Students of Imaam Razeen. To divest the mind of the critic, it will be salubrious to briefly describe some of these illustrious Students of Imaam Razeen.

Az-Zaahid Ahmad Bin Muhammad Bin Qudaamah (d 558 Hijri)

Zahabi says in his praise: “He was a Zaahid, Saalih, devoted to Allah. He was a man of piety and truth and was most eager for goodness.”

Salaahuddin Khaleel As-Safadi says in his *Al-Waafi bil Wafayaat*: “Ahmad Bin Muhammad Bin Qudaamah. He was a Saalih man, the father of Shaikh Abi Umar and Shaikh Al-Muwaffaq. He heard (studied) Saheeh Muslim by Razeen Al-Abdari and he narrated it (i.e. by the Ijaazah

of Imaam Razeen).He was a man of spiritual states (haalaat) and karaamaat (miracles).

Shaikh Abu Musaa Al-Madeeni (d 581 Hijri)

Regarding this Student of Imaam Razeen, Zahabi states in his *Tathkiratul Huffaaz*:

“Abu Musaa Al-Madeeni was Al-Haafizul Kabeer (a Great Haafiz of Hadith) and Shaikhul Islam... He was born in Zil Qa’dah, 501 Hijri.He heard (studied) Hadith from Abu Mansur Muhammad Bin Abdullah Bin Mandawaih, Ghaanim Al-Burji, Abu Ali Al-Haddaad, Abul Fatah Muhammad Bin Abdullah Bin Khurdast, Muhammad Bin Abdullah Ash-Sharaabi Baleezah, Abur Rajaa’ Muhammad Bin Abi Zaid, Muhammad Bin Taahir Al-Maqdisi Al-Haafz, Abu Zakariyya Bin Mundah, Hibatullah Bin Hasan Al-Abraquhi and Hibatullah Bin Al-Haseen Al-Baghdaadi.....He had authored numerous beneficial kutub. He had perfect expertise (ma’rifat in Hadith). A vast number of narrations emanate from him. He became the leader in this field (of Hadith) His narrations are of lofty *Isnaad*.

From him narrated from Abu Sa’d Sam’aani, Abu Bakr Muhammad Bin Musaa Al-Haazami, Abdul Ghani Bin Abdul Waahid, Abdul Qadir Bin Abdullah Ar-Rahaawi, Muhammad Bin Makki As-bahaani, Abu Najeeh Muhammad Bin Muawiyah Al-Muqri, Naasih Abur Rahman Bin Al-Hambali and others. Abdullah Bin Barakaat Al-Khushoo-ee and a group (of Muhadditheen) narrated from him with his *Ijaazah*.

As-Dabeeshi said: “ Abu Musaa lived until he became the outstanding personality of his time. He was the Shaikh of

his age with regard to *Isnaad* (of Ahaadith), and regarding *Hifz* (of Ahaadith).” Sam’aani said: “I heard (studied) from him.... He was *Thiqah* (most reliable) and *Sudooq* (most Truthful). Abdul Qaadir said: “In *Asbahaan* he acquired (Knowledge) which no one in his age had acquired. To this he added *Hifz* and *Itqaan*.” Abu Mas’ood Kowtaah said: “Abu Musaa is a hidden Treasure.” He presented from his memory the *Kitaab, Uloomul Hadith* of Haakim to Al-Haafiz Ismaaeel.”

Qaadhil Qudhaat Abu Al-Muzaffar Muhammad Bin Ali Tabari (d 524 Hijri):

In *Shajaratun Nooriz Zakiyya* it is mentioned:

“Al-Qaadhi Abu Qaasim Ahmad Bin Muhammad Bin Khalaf Al-Hufi who was a Faqeeh, Aalim and Imaam acquired knowledge from Ibnul Arabi, As-Silafi and the Qaadhi of the Haramain Ibn Al-Muzaffar Ar-Tabari.” Qaadhil Qudhaat Al-Tabari was the student of Imaam Razeen.

Ibn Bishkawaal sates in his *As-Silah fi Taarikhi Aimmatil Andalus*: “The Qaadhi of the Haramain, Abul Muzaffar Muhammad Bin Ali Bin Husain At-Tabari wrote in a letter to us from Makkah informing us (of Ahaadith) from him (Imaam Razeen).”

He was an accomplished Muhaddith as well as a Faqeeh and the Chief Qaadhi.

Al-Haafiz Ibn Asaakir

Describing him, Allaamah Zahabi states in his *Siyar A’laamin Nubalaa’*: “*Ibn Asaakir Abul Qaasim Dimashqi was a Thiqah of the Deen. He was Al-Imaam, Al-Allaamah, Al-Haafizul Kabeer (a great Haafiz of Hadith), Al-*

Mujawwid and he was the Muhaddith of Shaam.....He was most intelligent, a Haafiz (of Hadith), and far sighted. He was incomparable and there was no likeness to him in his age.”

Ibn Asaakir is a famous Muhaddith who had authored numerous kutub. The Ulama have written abundantly in praise of Ibn Asaakir. A whole treatise could be compiled on the greatness of Ibn Asaakir.

Al-Imaam Al-Haafiz As-Sam’aani

About him, Zahabi says: *“He was Al-Haafizul Kabeer (a great Haafiz of Hadith), unique, Thiqah (Reliable) and the Muhaddith of Khurasaan.....He was the author of numerous kutub.*

We briefly touched on just a few of the illustrious Muhadditheen who had sat at the feet of Imaam Razeen – this great Muhaddith whom the Salafis, neo-Salafis and moron Madrasah students of today accuse of including fabrications in their famous and fabulous Hadith Compilations. In effect, they accuse this great Imaam of attributing fabrications to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Does the intelligence of a Mu’min accept such villainous slander? How is it possible that an Imaam of Hadith and Fiqh whose Asaatizah (Shuyookh) and Students are great Muhadditheen and Fuqaha, would attribute fabrications to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Does the neo-Salafi fellow have a greater understanding than Imaam Razeen of the Hadith which warns of Hell-Fire for a fraud who attributes fabrications to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Does this miscreant student have greater Taqwa and Ma’rifat than Imaam Razeen? How

is it possible that this Salafi fellow has understood that the Rainwater Treatment Hadith is a ‘fabrication’ whilst such great Imaams and Muhadditheen as Imaam Razeen, Imaam Ibnul Atheer, and numerous Ulama and Muhadditheen who acquire Ahaadith from Imaam Razeen did not decry or fault the Hadith?

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE MUWATTA OF IMAAM MAALIK

One of the primary reasons for the later Muhadditheen, after Imaam Razeen, being unable to locate some of the Hadith narrations in *Tajreedus Sihaah*, was the unavailability of the variety of manuscripts of the *Sihaah* which were at the disposal of Imaam Razeen. Muhammad Bin Ismaaeel Ameer As-San’aani says in his *Taudheehul Afkaar*: “.....*It is inconceivable that Razeen was unaware whilst he was in Makkah where he had accumulated so many kutub that it was well-known to the people of his age that no one of his time had accumulated so numerous kutub like him.*”

The Aimmah of Ahaadith had numerous students – hundreds and even thousands. Numerous among them had recorded the Ahaadith from their Asaatizah. There were thus bound to be differences in the variety of written records. To cite just one example is the Muwatta of Imaam Maalik. Two of his prominent Students among many others who had recorded the Muwatta are Imaam Muhammad (died 189 Hijri) and Imaam Yahya Bin Yahya Al-Masmoodi (died 204 Hijri). Although both recorded in writing the Ahaadith which Imaam Maalik had narrated to them, their compiled versions differ.

The inability of later Imaams to locate in the *Usool* some of the narrations which Imaam Razeen had recorded in his *Tajreedus Sihaah* may not be presented as grounds for condemning, demoting or rubbishing any of the Ahaadith of *Tajreedus Sihaah*. Imaam Razeen had compiled in this Kitaab only Ahaadith from the *Usool*, hence he named it, *Tajreedus Sihaah*.

Debunking the misconception which developed in later centuries after him, Imaam Razeen states: *"Know that, verily, I have entered (into my Kitaab) such Ahaadith from different manuscripts of Muwatta (of Imaam Maalik) – the manuscripts of Ibn Shaaheen, Daaraqutni and from the Riwaayat of Muwatta of Ma'an. Some manuscripts differed from others in this respect. And, all of them are Saheeh."* (Taudheehul Afkaar of Ameer San'ani, d.1182 Hijri)

The manuscripts of the *Usool* at the disposal of Imaam Razeen were not available to the Muhadditheen long after him. Precisely for this reason, Imaam Ibnul Atheer states in the Introduction of his *Jaami'ul Usool*: *"Regarding the Ahaadith which we have found in Razeen's Kitaab, whilst I did not find it in the Usool, I have reproduced them precisely as they appear in his Kitaab, and I have left them without any symbol. I have left a blank space (at the Hadith) for (later insertion of) the name of its narrator for perhaps I search and find other manuscripts of these Usool (i.e. the Sihaah Sittah). Then I shall establish the name of the one who had narrated it."*

This illustrious Muhaddith did not proclaim these truncated Ahaadith fabrications. He accepted the authenticity of the narrations. Thus he did two things: One: He included these

Ahaadith in his authentic Compilation of the Sihaah. Two: He left blank spaces for later insertion of the names of the narrator should he or anyone else find the relevant manuscripts.

Ibnul Atheer's statement: *"I did not find it"*, casts no aspersion on Imaam Razeen nor does it affect in the least the authenticity of the narration. There are numerous *Ta'leeqaat* of Imaam Bukhaari in his Saheeh about which Ibn Hajar said: *"I did not find it. (Lam ajidhu.)."* Shall the aspersion which the morons direct to Imaam Razeen now also be directed to Imaam Bukhaari?

Regarding the existence of other manuscripts, Imaam Razeen himself states in the Introduction of his *Tajreedus Sihaah*: *"Know that verily I have included (in my Kitaab) from different manuscripts of Muwatta (of Imaam Maalik) of Ibn Shaaheen, Daaraqutni and the Riwaayat of Ma'n such Ahaadith about which some manuscripts differed. And all of them are Saheeh."*

In addition to this explicit confirmation of the existence of different versions of manuscripts, it also answers the question of the detractors and critics who ask: *"Where did Imaam Razeen say that all the Ahaadith in his Kitaab are Saheeh?"* He mentioned this fact in the Khutbah of his Kitaab, *Tajreedus Sihaah*.

San'aani further says: *"Furthermore, he (Imaam Razeen) said elsewhere (in his Kitaab): 'The unanimity of Nasaai' and Tirmizi, and the unanimity of one of them with some of the manuscripts of Muwatta regarding some Ahaadith, its simaa' (having heard it) is confirmed for him, and it has*

been narrated by the Tareeq of Ahl-e-Bait from Ali (radhiyallahu anhu) and Ibn Abbaas (radhiyallahu anhu) and others besides them.”

Imaam Suyuti said: *The Ruwaat of Imaam Maalik are innumerable. None of the other Imaams is known to have so many Ruwaat as him (Imaam Maalik). ”*

Khtaeeb compiled a kitaab of 993 Ruwaat (Narrators) from Imaam Maalik. According to Qaadhi Iyaadh there are more than 1300 Ruwaat of Imaam Maalik. Allaamah Abdul Hayy Lucknowi said that according to Qaadhi Iyaadh that he had come across 20 Manuscripts of Muwatta. Qaadhi Iyaadh further said that according to some, there were 30 manuscripts of Muwatta.

The popular *Nuskhah (Manuscript)* of Muwatta is that of Yahya Bin Yahya Al-Masmudi Al-Andalusi (died 234 Hijri). When reference is made of Muwatta Imaam Maalik, his (Al-Masmudi's) manuscript is intended. Yahya Al-Masmudi undertook two journeys to be in Imaam Maalik's company. Yahya had first acquired Muwatta from Ziyaad Bin Abdur Rahman Al-Lakhmi who was the first to have introduced the Math-hab of Imaam Maalik in Andalus. Yahya had also acquired Muwatta from Imaam Maalik's most prominent Student, Abdullah Bin Wahb.

The Hadith: *“I have been commanded to fight people until they say La ilaha ill al laah....”* is found only in the manuscripts of Ibn Wahab and Ibn Qaasim. It is not found in the other Muwatta manuscripts.

Ibn Wahab: Abu Muhammad Abdullah Bin Salmah Al-Fihri Al-Misri...He acquired Knowledge of Hadith from four hundred Mashaaikh. Among them is Imaam Maalik, Laith Bin Sa'd, Muhammad Bin Abdur Rahmaan, Sufyanaan, Ibn Juraij and others. He was a Mujtahid, not a Muqallid. He acquired the methodology of Ijtihad and Tafaqquh from Maalik and Laith. During his age he was a prolific narrator of Ahaadith. Zahabi and others have said that in the Works he had authored are a hundred thousand Ahaadith. Twenty thousand are his own narrations. Despite this, there is no Munkar narration in the Ahaadith he narrated. *Saaqit and Maudhoo* narrations are out of the question.

The Hadith: *‘Narrated by Abu Hurairah that verily Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘Allah said: Whoever does a deed in which he associates another besides Me.....’* is found only in the Muwatta of Ibnul Qaasim and the Muwatta of Ibn Ufair. Among the *Mutafarridaat* of Ma'n Bin Isaa's *Nuskah* of Muwatta is the following Hadith: *Aishah said: Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would perform Salaat during the night, and after he had completed.....’*

Among the *Mutafarridaat* of Qa'nabi's manuscript is the Hadith: *“From Ibn Abbaas –Verily Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “Do not commit excesses about me as the Nasaaraa had committed excess regarded Isaa the son of Maryam.....”* Ibn Bukair Al-Misri's manuscript has a Hadith which is found in only the manuscript of Imaam Muhammad's Muwatta. The relevant Hadith is: *Verily, Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “Jibraeel advised me (so abundantly) about the neighbour.....”*

Sa'eed Bin Ufair's *Nuskah* has the following Hadith: ".....*He said: O Rasulullah! Verily I fear that I am destroyed.....*" This Hadith is considered to be among his *Mutafarridaat*. However, according to Allaamah Abdul Hayy Lucknowi it is also found in the Muwatta of Imaam Muhammad.

The Muwatta Manuscript of Abu Mus'ab Az-Zuhri was the last Muwatta which was presented and read before Imaam Maalik. Abu Mus'ab's Muwatta and Abu Huzaifah's Muwatta contain approximately one hundred Ahaadith in excess of the Ahaadith in the other Muwatta manuscripts.

Suwaid Bin Saeed Al-Harawi's Muwatta has the following Hadith which is not found in other manuscripts: "*Abdullah Bin Amr Bin Al'A's narrated that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: 'verily, Allah will not extract Knowledge.....'*"

Imaam Muhammad's Muwatta has the following *Tafarrud*: "*Verily A'maal is according to the niyyat....*"

A very significant fact related to this Hadith in Muwatta, is Ibn Hajar's stance. It is salutary to mention that despite his vast knowledge of Hadith and the Shariah in general, he professed unawareness of this Hadith in Muwatta. According to him this Hadith is not in Muwatta. Imaam Subki responding, pointed out that this Hadith is in the Muwatta's riwaayat of Muhammad Bin Al-Hasan. Thus, when Ibn Hajar or any other Muhaddith say: "*I did not find it*", such statement is meaningless in so far as determining the status of the Hadith. The statement merely presents the unawareness of the Muhaddith.

With this deluge of Muwatta variants, many of which were not available to the Muhadditheen after Imaam Razeen, the so-called *Ziyaadaat* of Imaam Razeen should not at all be surprising. It is indeed moronic and grossly unjust to accuse this Illustrious Imaam of having included drivel and fabrications in his wonderful, highly authentic *Tajreedus Sihaah* which was the very first Compilation of the *Sihaah Sittah* in the history of Islam.

Before Yahya Al-Masmudi could acquire the whole of Muwatta, Imaam Maalik passed away in 179 Hijri, depriving Al-Masmudi of three *Baabs*:

Baab Khuroojil Mu'takif ilal Eed

Baab Qadhaail I'tikaaf

Baab An-Nikaah fil I'tikaaf

Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal said: "I heard Muwatta from more than ten persons from among the Huffaaz Ashaab of Imaam Maalik. In his *Musnad*, Imaam Ahmad adopted the Riwaayat of Abdur Rahmaan Bin Mahdi; Bukhaari adopted the Riwaayat of Abdullah Bin Yusuf At-Tinneesi; Muslim that of Yahya Bin Yahya At-Tameemi An-Nisaaburi; Abu Dawood adopted the Riwaayat of Al-Qa'nabi, and Nasaai' adopted the Riwaayat of Qutaibah Bin Sa'eed.

Allaamah Abdul Hayy Lucknowi states in his Commentary on the Muwatta Maalik by Imaam Muhammad Shaibaani: "A number of manuscripts of Muwatta are in these days available in the Arab lands. These are:

- (1) The *Nuskhah* of Yahya Bin Yahya Al-Masmudi. This manuscript is prevalent in India and Pakistan.
- (2) The *Nuskhah* of Ibn Wahab
- (3) The *Nuskhah* of Ibnul Qaasim

- (4) The *Nuskhah* of Ma'n Bin Isaa
- (5) The *Nuskhah* of Al-Qa'nabi
- (6) The *Nuskhah* of Abdullah Bin Yusuf Ad-Dimashqi
- (7) The *Nuskhah* of Yahya Bin Yahya Bin Bukair Abu Zakariyya
- (8) The *Nuskhah* of Sa'eed Bin Ufair
- (9) The *Nuskhah* of Abu Mus'ab Az-Zuhri
- (10) The *Nuskhah* of Mus'ab Bin Abdullah Az-Zubairi
- (11) The *Nuskhah* of Muhammad Bin Mubaarak As-Suri
- (12) The *Nuskha* of Sulaimaan Bin Burd
- (13) The *Nuskhah* of Abu Huzaafah As-Sahmi Ahmad Bin Ismaaeel. Of the Ashaab of Maalik he was the very last one to die.
- (14) The *Nuskhah* of Suwaid Bin Sa'eed Abu Muhammad Al-Harawi
- (15) The *Nuskhah* of Muhammad Bin Al-Hasan Shaibaani (the Student of Imaam Abu Hanifah)
- (16) The *Nuskhah* of Yahya Bin Yahya Tameemi.

As-Suyuti mentioned fourteen manuscripts of Muwatta in his *Tanweerul Hawaalik*. He said: “*Al-Haafiz Salaahuddeen Al-Alaa'i said: 'A Jamaa't of numerous (Narrators) narrated Muwatta from Maalik. In their Riwaayaat are differences pertaining to anterior and posterior arrangement, increase and decrease (of and in narrations). The manuscript with the most narrations is the Riwaayat of Al-Qa'nabi....'*”

Ibn Hazam said about the Muwatta of Mus'ab that it contained about 100 Ahaadith more than all the other Muwattas.

The following statement of Imaam Maalik throws much light on the differences of narrations which explain the different Math-habs. The Khalifah Haroon Rashid highly pleased and enamoured with Muwatta, had requested Imaam Maalik for permission to hang his Muwatta on the Ka'bah for the benefit of the masses. Imaam Maalik responded: *“Do not do so, for verily the Sahaabah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) differed regarding the Furoo’ (particular masaa-il), and they scattered in the lands (of Islam). And all of them were correct.”* Haroon Rashid complied with this order of Imaam Maalik.

Ibn Sa’d mentions in his *At-Tabaqaat* from Imaam Maalik that when the Khalifah Al-Mansoor came for Hajj, he said to Imaam Maalik: *“I have resolved to have manuscripts of your Kitaab prepared, and to send a copy to every city of the Muslimeen. I shall order them to learn what is therein and not to refer to any other kitaab besides it (i.e. Muwatta).* Imaam Maalik responded: *“Do not do so. Verily, many versions have reached the people. They have heard (a variety of) Ahaadith and have narrated them. Every community has adopted what has reached them and ordered their Deen accordingly. Therefore, leave the people and what every city has adopted for themselves.”*

The purpose of this digression is merely to show the validity of the Math-habs and that the roots of the Math-habs are in the Sahaabah.

Al-Abhari Abu Bakr said: *“The total of narrations in Muwatta from Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah and the Taabieen is 1720. Of these 600 Ahaadith*

are Musnad. 222 are Mursal. 613 are Mauqoof. 285 are statements of the Taabieen.”

With this plethora of Muwatta *Nusakh* silhouetted in the background of Imaam Razeen’s Treasure Trove, *Tajreedus Sihaah*, the first combined Compilation of the Sihaah in the history of Islam, and most assuredly different variants of the other kutub of the *Usool* as well, we can say without the least hesitation that those who have accused this illustrious Muhaddith of having included *maudhoo’*, *waahi* and *saaqit* narrations in his famous and fabulous Kitaab are downright stupid. They are morons who simply blurt out *ghutha* of the *nafs* to promote whatever agenda they have or simply to pander to their egotistical subjectivism. Moron Madrasah students, influenced by Salafis, sometimes crave to present the image of the ‘researcher’. They are in dire need of some spiritual evacuants for creating equilibrium in their flawed process of excogitation.

Enhancing the brisance of the refutation against the excessively spurious and apodalic argument of the Salafi critic who had deemed it appropriate to take on for battering a Giant of Shar’i Uloom such as Imaam Razeen, is the latter’s explicit claim in the Muqaddimah of *Tajreedus Sihaah* of the fact that he had extracted Ahaadith from different variants of Muwatta such as the Muwatta of Shaaheen, the Muwatta of Daaraqutni and the Riwaayat of Ma’n – variants which were not at the disposal of the later Muhadditheen such as Ibnul Atheer, Shaikh Muhammad Sulaimaan Al-Faasi, Ibn Dabee’ and others.

***RAZEEN'S 'ZIYAADAAT' HAVE THEIR
ASAANEED***

Indurating the authenticity of the Ahaadith of Razeen for which he could not locate sources, Ibnul Atheer adopted the methodology of leaving blank spaces at the relevant Ahaadith for later insertion of the Recorder of the narrations should he or others stumble on the manuscripts from which Imaam Razeen had acquired his information. This fact by itself is adequate to vouch for the authenticity of the so-called Ziyaadaat of Razeen. If Ibnul Atheer and the other Muhadditheen had entertained the slightest doubt as to the authenticity of these narrations, they would not have included the Ahaadith in their Compilations. They would at the minimum have made some adverse comment to assault the validity of the narrations to prevent others from acting in terms of fabrications and drivel.

Despite Zahabi's ruthlessness in criticizing narrators and narrations, he had not dared to assault the integrity of Imaam Razeen nor did he assail the specific Rainwater Treatment Hadith which the miscreant critic has so stupidly deemed appropriate for making it a target of criticism. With his reckless cut and paste job he has conspicuously displayed Salafi influence.

Razeen's 'truncations' are not truncations

The moron defenders of the critic who believes himself to be sufficiently qualified to assault the indomitable Muhaddith Razeen baselessly claim that truncation of a Hadith is grounds for casting aspersions when the *Isnaad* of the Hadith is not found anywhere. This charge levelled at the likes of Imaam Razeen is utterly baseless and it highlights the stupidity of the claimants. They have failed to

understand the meaning of ‘truncation’, hence their stupid dilemma. They further stupidly claim that the *Asaaneed* of Imaam Razeen’s so-called ziyaadaat are not to be found anywhere. Both their understanding and their research are deficient.

The morons have no sanad

We see these morons citing statements of Zahabi, Maqdisi and others in substantiation of their contentions, yet they have not produced their *asaaneed* for these citations. They resort to wholesale and corrupt truncation, yet they expect others to swallow their claims hook, line and sinker. We find every one in this age who assumes the right to quote Ahaadith saying that the Ahaadith they are quoting are in Bukhaari or Muslim or Abu Dawood, etc. They quote from the Muhadditheen and Fuqaha without presenting their ‘sanad’. No one produces any *Isnaad* for their citations. They as well as the audience are contented with the name Bukhaari or Muslim, etc. When moron paper ‘muhadditheen’ of this age, eight centuries after Imaam Razeen, say that the Hadith is in Bukhaari, the moron is blindly accepted. However, when an Authority of Imaam Razeen’s calibre who flourished 8 centuries ago, and who was just two centuries after Imaam Bukhaari, says that the Ahaadith in his Kitaab are from the Sihaah Sittah, then the morons – the Salafis, neo-Salafis and moron students influenced by Salafi’ism - imply that he is a ‘liar’ and that he had included ‘rubbish’ in his Kitaab simply because their research does not attain the lofty level of Imaam Razeen’s research.

Razeen’s Tajreedus Sihaah is the Sanad for all the Asaaneed

Imaam Razeen did not cite Ahaadith for which he had no *Isnaad*. He declared explicitly that the Ahaadith in his Kitaab are from the Sihaah Sittah, hence he named his fabulous Kitaab, *Tajreedus Sihaah*. When someone says that the Hadith is in Bukhaari or Muslim or in any other authentic Kitaab, he has not cited a Hadith without its *Isnaad*. The *Isnaad* from Imaam Bukhaari to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is *Ma'roof – well-known and established*. There is absolutely no need to traverse beyond the Sihaah Sittah when quoting a Hadith from one of these authentic kutub.

It suffices that Imaam Razeen said that the Ahaadith are from the *Usool*. It suffices that the great Muhaddith Ibnul Atheer accepted the validity of the authenticity of the Ahaadith and reserved blank spaces for later insertion of the names of the Recorders should the manuscripts be discovered. He did not accuse Imaam Razeen of citing Ahaadith without *Isnaad*.

If searchers are unable to find the *Isnaad of a Hadith* any where it does not follow that the Hadith is without *Isnaad*, especially when such a righteous, reliable Authority as Razeen says that he had acquired the Hadith from the *Usool*. The deniers should state with clarity that they believe that Imaam Razeen is a 'liar' for naming his kitaab *Tajreedus Sihaah*. He specifically makes reference to the variant Muwatta manuscripts, and he added: "*All of them are Saheeh.*" It is moronic and slanderous to aver that despite being aware of the alleged 'fabrications', he included them in his *Tajreedus Sihaah*.

It is a huge deception to peddle the idea that the truncated so-called *ziyaadaat* narrations have no authentic *Asaaneed* because these have not been located. Thus Ibnul Atheer and the Muhadditheen after him refrained from casting any aspersions on the Ahaadith cited by Imaam Razeen despite their inability to locate the *Asaaneed*.

If some Tom, Dick or Harry cites a Hadith claiming that a Sahaabi had narrated it, but he is unable to name the authority or the Kitaab from whence he had acquired the narration, a lie may be attributed to him explicitly. But when a Muhaddith of Razeen's lofty stature states that the Ahaadith are from the *Sihaah Sittah*, it will be unjust, stupid and slanderous to say or to even imply that his citations are drivel (*waahi*), fabricated (*maudhoo'*), etc. Similarly, to claim that the *Ta'leeqaat* (*truncated narrations*) of Imaam Bukhaari are without *Isnaad* is moronic and only serves to highlight the ignorance of the claimant.

The discussion on the large variety of Muwatta *Nusakh* should be more than adequate for comprehension of this issue. Ahaadith in one Muwatta are not to be found in other versions of Muwatta. Thus, if Imaam Razeen had cited a Hadith from a Muwatta manuscript which is no longer extant, it will be ignorance to reject the Hadith on the spurious basis that the Muwatta copies available do not have the Hadith.

Thus, relative to Authorities – Muhadditheen and Aimmah Mujtahideen—truncation is not a defect nor grounds for denying the authenticity of the Ahaadith they cite, especially when they maintain with clarity the source from

which the Ahaadith have been acquired, in this case, *Tajreedus Sihaah* which is the *Sanad* for the Rainwater Treatment Hadith which Imaam Razeen had acquired from one of the *Usool* kutub. Imaam Razeen did not suck the Hadith from his thumbs. The truncation of Authorities is superficial. It is not Ahaadith minus *Isnaad*.

IMAAM RAZEEN'S ISNAAD

Imaam Razeen's own *Isnaad* relevant to the *Usool* is not a conundrum. Elaborating his *Isnaad*, he states in the *Muqaddimah* of his *Tajreedus Sihaah*:

“The *tareeq* of my *Simaa*’ is as follows:

Bukhaari: From Shaikh Abu Maktoom Isaa Bin Abi Tharr Al-Harawi *from* his Father Shaikh Imaam Al-Haafiz.....Bin Ahmad Al-Harawi *from* his Shuyookh.....Abu Muhammad Al-Hamawi and Abu Ishaq Al-Mustamli...Al-Haithan Al-Kuhmeehaani. All of them *from* Muhammad Bin Yusuf Bin Matar Al-Firabi. And with this.....Abu Mus’ab from Maalik .

And Shaikh Isaa Abu Maktoom Ibn Tharr has granted me *Ijaazah* (to narrate) the different (variants) of Muwatta.

Muslim: Regarding the Asal of Muslim, I have heard it in Musjidul Haraam from Shaikh Al-Imaam Husain Bin Ali At-Tabari *from* his Shuyookh Abdul Ghaafir Bin Muhammad Al-Faarsi *from* Abu Ahmad Musaa Bin Isaa *from* Ibraaheem Bin Muhammad Bin Sufyaan *from* Muslim Bin Al-Hajjaaj – Radiyallahu anhum ajameen

Kitaabus Sunan (Abu Dawood).....Isaa Bin Abu TharrThen I heard it in Musjidul Haraam from Ash-Shaikh Al-Imaam Ibraaheem Bin Umar Al-Basri having recited it to himhe wrote it from the Asal of Abu Ali.....Abu Ali heard from Al-Qaadhi Abu Amr Al-Haashimi. Abu Amr heard from Abu Ali Al-Lu'luee who heard it from Ali Abu Daawood As-Sijistaani –Radhiyallahu anhum.

Saheeh Tirmizi: I have with me the original manuscript which I had heard from Ash-Shaikh Abul Hajjaaj Yusuf Bin Ali Bin Muhammad Bin Abdullah Bin Ali Al-Qudhaaee

Ash-Shaikh Al-Imaam.....Bin.....Bin Muhammad Al-Harawi --
- Al-Qaadhi Abu Aamir Mahmood Bin Al-Qaasim Al-Azdi ---
Abu Muhammad Abdul Jabbaar Bin Muhammad Al-Marwazi –Abul Abbaas Muhammad Bin Ahmad Bin Mahboob Al-Marwazi –Abu Isaa Muhammad Bin Isaa Bin Saurah At-Tirmizi

Know that people had made haste andfrommashwarah (consultation) before completionin this Asl (i.e. Saheeh Trmizi).....in some manuscripts are differences. Thus, this is its reason.

And the Kitaab which has been prepared is this (*i.e. Tajreedus Sihaah*). It was completed in the year 502 Hijri.....Ahaadith from all the *Ummahaat* (*i.e. the Usool*)

Whatever has been mentioned here from Nasaai' is from the large manuscript (*An-Nuskhatul Kubra*) because in it are *Ziyaadaat*.....”

(The blank spaces are due to the illegibility and splodges in the original unprinted manuscript. This will be apparent from the Arabic text reproduced here from the original)

[illegible][illegible]

The above broken extracts have been cited from a smudged, handwritten copy of Imaam Razeen's *Tajreedus Sihaah*. Very little of the text is legible. *Tajreedus Sihaah* has not been printed as yet. That Imaam Razeen by himself constitutes the authentic *Sanad* for the Rainwater Treatment Hadith, and for every Hadith he has included in his *Tajreedus Sihaah* is confirmed by his own *Isnaad* linking him to the Compilers of the Sihaah Sittah.

THE BOGEY OF "CHAINLESS" NARRATIONS

The morons defending the critic's denial of the authenticity of the Ahaadith cited by Imaam Razeen have presented the spurious argument of "chainless" narrations. To pull wool over the eyes of laymen who do not understand what is being discussed with these technical arguments, the morons quoted Hafiz Al-Alaa'i, a Shaafi' authority.

Firstly, as far as the Ahnaaf are concerned, Hafiz Al-Alaa'i's exposition pertaining to Hadith classification is flawed and not acceptable. His view cannot be imposed on us. We are not his muqallideen. Secondly, the views of Al-Alaa'i which have been cited by the morons have absolutely no relevance to the subject matter under discussion. The discussion revolving around Imaam Razeen and the Ahaadith he has compiled in his *Tajreedus Sihaah* is beyond the ambit of the topic which Al-Alaa'i discusses in the passages which the morons have presented without applying their brains. Either they have not understood the subject matter we are discussing or they are deliberately seeking to bamboozle readers with irrelevancies.

The topic of Al-Alaai' presented by the morons discusses "chainless" narrations – Ahadith which have no *Isnaad*. Broadly speaking, i.e. without conceding correctness to Al-Alaai's view pertaining to *Mursal narrations* – it is accepted that "chainless" narrations cannot be accepted. However, the issue of "chainless" narrations in so far as Imaam Razeen is concerned is a bogey. It is a red herring which the morons are presenting to bale out their neo-Salafi companion from the quandary in which he has cast himself with his stupid cut and paste job to peddle the idea of him being a 'research scholar' in the field of Hadith when in reality he is nothing of the sort. He has as yet not reached the kindergarten level in this sphere.

Imaam Razeen in *Tajreedus Sihaah* has not cited so-called "chainless" narrations. This is the slanderous falsehood which the fellow and the morons have attributed to Imaam Razeen. This illustrious Muhaddith has stated with emphasis in the Muqaddimah of *Tajreedus Sihaah* that he had acquired all the Ahadith from the *Usool*, and that "*Kulluha Saheeh*" (*All are Saheeh*), hence he presented in detail his *Isnaad* to Bukhaari, Muslim, etc.

The issue here is not of "chainless" narrations. The Chains of all the Ahaadith in *Tajreedus Sihaah* are confirmed without ambiguity. When a Muhaddith of Razeen's stature says that the Ahaadith are from the *Sihaah Sittah*, his assurance has to be incumbently accepted. Those who believe otherwise, should openly say that Imaam Razeen was a "liar", a "fabricator", a "fraud", etc, and they will then do so at the peril of the destruction of their Imaan. Not a single one of the later Muhadditheen, especially those who had utilized *Tajreedus Sihaah* as the basis for their

own Compilations, had alleged or even alluded that the Ahaadith of *Tajreedus Sihaah* for which they could not locate the sources were fabrications or baseless, or that Imaam Razeen had lied when he stated that the narrations are from the *Sihaah Sittah*.

Ibnul Atheer's methodology which has already been explained earlier, as well as the Muhadditheen after him, confirm the authenticity of the Narrations. It is indeed moronic to aver even today if someone says that the Hadith he is quoting is from Bukhaari, that such a Hadith is "chainless" simply because the narrator has not cited his own chain for linking up with Bukhaari who appeared a thousand years earlier. The *Isnaad* from Bukhaari or Muslim or any other one of the *Sihaah* is well established to the Sahaabah or to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). These great Muhadditheen of the *Usool Kutub* have liberated us from searching for the *Asaaneed* from their junctures to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It suffices that the Hadith appears in the *Usool*.

The argument that the so-called Ziyaadaat of Imaam Razeen are not to be found in the *Sihaah Sittah* is bunkum and rubbish. When a Muhaddith who is most reliable in every sphere of the Deen, claims that he acquired the Ahaadith from the *Sihaah Sittah*, it will be stupid and slanderous to decry or reject his claim.

The inability of those appearing centuries after Imaam Razeen to locate the *Nusakh* from whence he had acquired the Ahaadith is not a valid argument for refuting the authenticity of the narrations nor is it rational or valid to claim that due to this inability of locating the Manuscripts,

the ‘ziyaadaat’ are not in the *Sihaah Sittah*. We have already mentioned the numerous manuscripts of Muwatta which were available during Imaam Razeen’s age, and even he had made explicit reference to this fact in his *Tajreedus Sihaah*. Thus, there is no rational and no honest reason for intransigent obduracy in trying to stupidly sustain the idea that the so-called Ziyaadaat had not existed in the *Sihaah Sittah* despite Imaam Razeen’s assurance.

The morons in presenting their argument which has no relation to the issue being discussed, cite a quote from Hafiz Al-Alaai’. Are we correct to charge them with a lie and falsehood? They have not presented their *Isnaad* to enable readers to verify whether the quote has been authentically attributed to Al-Alaai’. Thus, the narration they cite from Al-Alaai’ is genuinely chainless, hence should be rejected. The book

from which they cite Al-Alaai’, is not on the pedestal of Bukhaari or of any other of the *Sihaah*. *Jami at-Tahsil* is an unknown kitaab to the Ummah. If the morons are desirous of pursuing their stupid “chainless’ and brainless argument, they should first explain elaborately and establish the authenticity of what they are quoting and of the kitaab itself. We do not follow blindly just any kitaab or just any personality.

The summary of what we have said in the “chainless’ diversion introduced by the morons in defence of the neo-Salafi critic, is that it has no relevance to the Rainwater Treatment Hadith cited by Imaam Razeen for the simple reason that it is not chainless. Its Chain is well established and confirmed to the juncture of the *Sihaah Sittah*, and from

that link onwards, the Chain is *Ma'roof* unto Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In the context of this discussion the view of Al-Alaa'i is simply not approbate.

Since the morons had proffered this argument which is unrelated to the issue, we deem it appropriate to also digress from the main topic to respond to their bunkum conclusions extravasated from Al-Alaa'i's view stated in the quote. Quoting Al-Alaa'i, the morons state:

“As for those who accept it and draw proof from it (i.e. chainless narrations from the era of the Tabi'in), they are Malik, Abu Hanifah and their followers and most Mu'tazilah and one of two narrations from Ahmad ibn Hanbal. They have different views on accepting it:

One view is accepting every chainless narration regardless of how distant the era is from the time of the Tabi'un, and even the chainless narration of one in our time when he says: “The Messenger of Allah (sallaAllahu alayhi wasallam) said.... None have stated this in this manner besides some extremists from the later Hanafis. This is disapproved flexibility, and is in fact completely rejected and baseless by the consensus on every era of taking into consideration the chains of transmission and analysing the trustworthiness of narrators and their criticism.....The obviousness of the invalidity of this view dispenses of speaking at length on it.”

Let us examine this statement of Al-Alaa'i. Firstly, we re-iterate that this section of the discussion pertaining to the aforementioned statement of Al-Alaa'i is a digression from the Rainwater Treatment Hadith as far as we are concerned

because the issue here is not “chainless” narrations. The Ahaadith in *Tajreedus Sihaah* are not “chainless” as the neo-Salafi fellow and his moron defenders are eager to convey to unsuspecting, unwary and ignorant people. Imaam Razeen has categorically asserted that the Ahaadith in his Kitaab are from the *Sihaah Sittah*. Thus the *Asaaneed* of all his narrations are confirmed. The failure by subsequent Muhadditheen appearing centuries later, to locate the relevant Manuscripts from whence Razeen had acquired the narrations is not grounds for arbitrarily branding the Ahaadith “chainless”, “*waahi*” and “*maudhoo*’. Atrophied brains disgorge such stupidities.

THE DIGRESSION

Let us now commence with the dissection of the digression.

(a) While Al-Alaai’ in the aforementioned statement discusses *Mursal* narrations, the morons, displaying their *jahaalat*, translate *Mursal* as “chainless narrations”. This is a brainless translation. *Mursal* is not a chainless narration. It has a valid *Isnaad*. *Mursal is a Munqati’ Hadith from whose Sanad a Raawi (Narrator) has been discarded at the end of the Sanad, e.g. the statement of a Taabi’ee: ‘Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said.....’*

According to the Fuqaha, Ashaab-e-Usool, Khatib Al-Haafiz Abu Bakr Baghdaadi and a Jamaa’t of Muhadditheen, *Mursal* is a narration in which there is discontinuity in the *Isnaad*. It is not a narration without *Isnaad*. It is not “chainless” as the morons aver.

(b) A chainless narration is called *Muallaq*. Saheeh Bukhaari is replete with chainless narrations. Even such

Ta'leeqaat are not baseless. They are not drivel (*waahi*). There are innumerable *Ta'leeqaat* such as *Balaaghaat* of Imaam Maalik, *Ta'leeqaat* of Imaam Bukhaari and the *Ta'leeqaat* of Abu Dawood Sijistaani. Even these “chainless” Ahaadith are authentic. This is not the occasion for a detailed exposition of this issue.

(c) Al-Alaai states with clarity the Math-hab of Imaam Maalik, Imaam Abu Hanifah and Imaam Ahmad regarding *Maraaseel*. According to Imaam Maalik, Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Ahmad and the vast majority of the Fuqaha *Ihtijaaj* with *Mursal* is valid. Thus, *Ahkaam* of the Shariah can be formulated on the basis of *Maraaseel*. Al-Alaai's view is not *hujjat* against the Ahnaaf. We follow our Math-hab. It is downright stupid and contemptible to attempt to scuttle the Math-hab of the Ahnaaf and Maalikiyyah 13 centuries after these illustrious Aimmah.

(d) In fact, the idea that *Mursal* is totally discarded and unfit for *Ihtijaaj* according to the Shaafi' Math-hab is false. Even according to the Shaafi' Math-hab, *Mursal* in certain circumstances is a valid basis for *Ihtijaaj*. This is not the occasion for details. It suffices to say that *Mursal* is not discarded entoto by the Shaafi' Math-hab.

Regarding *Mursal* narrations, Allaamah Shabbir Ahmad Uthmaani says in *Fadhlul Baari Sharh Bukhaari*: “According to the Salaf, *Mursal* was *Hujjat* as is the Math-hab of Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Maalik and one view of Imaam Ahmad. Therefore, during that (initial) phase, the need was not felt to separate *Mursal* from *Marfoo'*. Even *Maqtoo'*, because of its great benefit was also added. Imaam Shaafi' was the very first one to deny the *Hujjiyat*

of *Mursal*. Before him no one had denied the *Hujjiyat* of *Mursal*. In this regard Ibn Jareer Tabari stated the existence of *Ijma' on the Hujjiyat of Mursal* before Imaam Shaafi'. Although Ibn Hajar differed with this view of *Ijma'*, after exhaustive searching he managed to come up with only two or three names who denied the *Hujjiyat* of *Mursal*. This fact itself is proof for the consensus of the general body of Salaf on the fact of *Mursal* being *Hujjat*."

(e) Al-Alaai' has not specified who the so-called "*ghulaat*" (*extremists*) among the Muta-akh-khireen Hanafiyyah are. His claim of extremism is baseless. The morons should specify who are these so-called "*ghulaat*" among the Ahnaaf, and how and where did they commit 'extremism'. There is not a single Faqeeh among the Ahnaaf of any era who conducted himself like today's moron 'duktoors' and neo-Salafi madrasah students who, despite not having completed studies at kindergarten level, set themselves up as 'research' scholars in stupid Salafi-inspired attempts to scuttle the Math-habs of the Authorities of the Salaf-e-Saaliheen.

Al-Alaai's criticism against the Ahnaaf is utterly baseless. There is no substantiation for the baatil he has attributed to the Ahnaaf relevant to the *Maraaseel*. The Ahnaaf have their principles which are valid, recognized and accepted. The view of the Shaafi' Math-hab does not detract from the validity of the Hanafi view nor can it be imposed on us.

(f) The imperative need and benefit of *Isnaad* is acknowledged. There is no Math-hab which takes up issue against this unanimous view. It is a general principle which the morons have miserably failed to utilize against Imaam

Razeen. The averment about the importance of *Isnaad* is superfluous and has no relevancy to the discussion. The *Asaaneed* of the Ahaadith of *Tajreedus Sihaah* are extant and confirmed by Imaam Razeen's emphatic declaration in the Khutbah of his Kitaab.

Haafiz Al-Alaai' appeared on the scene more than two centuries after Imaam Razeen. The morons have presented nothing from him in contradiction of Imaam Razeen. They have merely introduced a superfluity with the redundant quotation from Al-Alaai'. It is redundant to the discussion since it has no bearing on the Ahaadith in *Tajreedus Sihaah*.

The contention of the morons that our view "is against the Consensus of the Ummah", is false and bunkum. They speak ambiguously to bamboozle readers. Which view are they referring to? They must be specific. If they are referring to our statement that Imaam Razeen is in fact the *Sanad* for the Hadith, then they have not proffered any *daleel* to dislodge this claim made by us. In a supine attempt to present a semblance of *daleel*, they aver: "*Hafiz al-'Ala'i says such a view is so ridiculous and fasid that there is no need to even attempt to refute it.*"

Firstly, assuming that this statement of Haafiz Al-Alaai' can be validly directed at our view, we say that we are not the muqallideen of the 8th century Haafiz Al-Alaai'. He may be an authority for Shaafi's, but not for us. Thus, his statement is not *daleel* against us.

Secondly, the statement of Haafiz is not related to what we have affirmed. Haafiz discusses an issue apart from what

we have averred. His statement is related to the baseless assumption attributed to “*ghulaat*” Hanafiyyah of the later eras. His claim is riddled with ambiguity. While it appears specious, it is devoid of substance for want of specification and elaboration. It is not so easy to get away with the charge of “*ghulaat*” levelled at the Ahnaaf.

Thirdly, the statement of Haafiz is inapplicable to the Ahaadith in *Tajreedus Sihaah*. If it is, then all the Kutub of the *Sihaah* have to be condemned as ‘spurious’ and the products of *ghulaat*, for Imaam Razeen is saying nothing other than that he had acquired the Ahaadith from the Six *Usool* Kutub. Thus, he is in fact the indisputable *Sanad* at the juncture where he links up with the *Sihaah*.

Thus, Al-Alaai’s averment does not create even a kink in our contention that *Imaam Razeen is the Sanad*.

There are several Math-habs pertaining to *Mursal* Ahaadith:

(1) Imaam Maalik, Imaam Abu Hanifah, their Jamhoor Ashaab and one view of Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal: *Mursal* is valid for *Ihtijaj*.

(2) Unconditional Acceptance of the *Maraaseel* of the Taabi’een and their followers

(3) If the *Mursal* is narrated by the Ahl-e-Naql after the third century it is accepted. This is the view of Isaa Bin Abaan, Abu Bakr Ar-Raazi, Bazdawi and the majority of the Muta-akh-khireen Hanafiyyah. Qaadhi Abdul Wahhaab Al-Maaliki said that this is also the apparent view according to him.

(4) Acceptance of *Mursal* is confined to the Taabi'een. This is the view of the Jamhoor Maalikiyyah and one view of Imam Ahmad bin Hambal

(5) Acceptance is confined to the *Maraaseel* of the senior Taabi'een. This view is mentioned by Abdul Barr.

(6) There is no difference between *Mursal* and *Musnad*. Both are on par regarding the incumbency of *Hujjat*. This is the view of Muhammad Bin Jareer At-Tabari, Abul Faraj Al-Maaliki and Abu Bakr Al-Abhari Al-Maaliki.

In brief, there prevails huge differences of opinion among the Authorities on the issue of *Mursal* Ahaadith. We have merely touched on the tip of the iceberg in the discussion on *Mursal*. This is not the occasion for elaborating this issue. It is merely to show that the view of the Ahnaaf is valid. Thus, the view of those who reject *Mursal* Ahaadith as a basis for deduction of Ahkaam cannot be imposed on anyone of the Authorities who subscribe to the contrary view. The Ahnaaf are not the muqallideen of the refuters of the validity of *Mursal* Ahaadith. We can therefore safely and with conviction dump Al-Alaai's view.

Since the morons have unnecessarily introduced the superfluous argument of *Mursal* narration in a deflated attempt to scuttle the position of the Ahnaaf, we deem it appropriate for the benefit of Hanafis, and for the better understanding of Shaafis, to dilate a bit on this topic. In his, *Ma'rifatul Hujajush Shar'iyyah*, Al-Qaadhi Al-Imaam Sadrul Islam Abul Yusr Muhammad Bin Muhammad Bin Husain Al-Bazdawi (d 493 Hijri) says:

“Maraaseel according to us (Ahnaaf) are Hujjat. According to Shaafi’ it is not hujjat. The correct view is what our Ashaab (the Ahnaaf) have said. Verily, every Mursal is Musnad in reality. The Ummah has enacted Consensus on Irsaal, for verily, the Sahaabah (Ridhwaanullaah alayhim) would say: “The Nabi said so.” The Taabi-oon after them would say similarly. The Saalihoon thereafter would also say so. And so would all the Ulama after them. And even Shaafi’ said so in some instances. (In fact) they would even say: “Allah Ta’ala said so.”

Since it is established by them that the statements of the Ruwaat are the statements of the Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), it is permissible for them to say: “The Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said so.” Thus, an Aadil will adopt irsaal in such instances.”

Our interest is in the *Ijma’* stated by our Aimmah, not the ‘consensus’ to which Al-Alaai’ refers to in the aforementioned quote cited by the morons. Furthermore, out of the more than 450 biographies of eminent Hanafi and Shaafi’ Muhadditheen in the first and second volumes of *Anwaarul Baari* there is no mention of Al-Alaai’ although the biography of his student’s student, Haafiz Ibn Hajar does appear.

According to us, the word of a Thiqah Authority is valid *Daleel* for the authenticity of Ahaadith regardless of what the moron Salafis say and believe. Our *dalai-il* are as old as Islam. Al-Haafiz Qaasim Bin Qutlubugha (died 879 Hijri) states in *Munyatul Al-Maee*:

“The Mutaqaddimeen of our Ashaab would record in writing the Fiqhi Masaa-il and their Adillah from the Ahaadith-e-Nabawiyah with their Asaaneed, such as Abu Yusuf in Kitaab *Al-Kharaaj and Al-Amaali*, and Muhammad in Kitaab *Al-Asal and As-Siyar*. And so would At-Tahaawi, Al-Khassaaf, Ar-Raazi and Al-Karkhi do, except in *Al-Mukhtasaraat*. Then came those who relied on the Kutub of the Mutaqaddimeen. Then they narrated the Ahaadith without narrating the Sanad and source. Thus, the people relied on these Kutub. “.....

It is mentioned in Al-Imaam Ibn Maajah:

“Whatever our (Hanafi) Fuqaha (Rahima-humullaah) have mentioned from Ahaadith and Aathaar in their works without narrating the Sanad (i.e. so-called “chainless” according to the brainless critics) nor the source as is the practice of As-Sarakhsi in *Al-Mabsoot*, Al-Kaasaani in *Al-Badaai’* and Al-Murghheenaani in *Al-Hidaayah*, they are Ahaadith and Aathaar which they had acquired from our Mutaqaddimeen Aimmah such as Imaam A’zam, Imaam Abu Yusuf, Imaam Muhammad, Ibnul Mubaarak, Hasan Al-Lu’luee, Ibn Shujaa’ Ath-Thalji, Isaa Bin Abaan, Al-Khassaaf, Al-Karkhi and Al-Jassaas (Rahimahumul-laah).

“Then appeared the *Mukharrijoon (Scrutinizers)* of Al-Hidaayah, Al-Khulaasah, etc. and searched for these Riwaayaat (Narrations) in Hadith Compilations compiled after the second century. When they could not find these (Riwaayaat) in these compilations they (summarily) issued the verdict of *gharaabah (obscure, weak, etc. – not fit for istidlaal)*.

“Some of these (scrutinizers) then entertained vile opinions about the Aimmah Fuqaha, hence they attributed paucity of Hadith knowledge to these Fuqaha. This is inconceivable (for the Fuqaha). On the contrary, As-Sarakhsi, Al-Kaasaani and Al-Murgheenaani relied in this regard on their Aimmah who were well-known for Hifz, Thiqaah and Amaanat, just as Baghawī had relied in his *Masaabeeh* on the authors of the famous *Dawaaween (Hadith Compilations)*.

“In brief, during the second century there was an abundance of Hadith kutub intensively and extensively distributed. It was during this century that the Hanafi and Maaliki Fiqh were formulated in the light of Ahaadith and Aathaar which had been accorded acceptance by the Aimmah of Fataawa from the Sahaabah and Taabieen. And so did the Ashaab of Abu Hanifah and Maalik (radhiyallahu anhumā) fill the world with Ilm, Fiqh and Hadith while Bukhaari, Muslim and the other Compilers of the well-known Sittah (Rahimahumullaah Ta’ala ajma-een) were not even born.”

The inception of Islam was not during the third and fourth centuries of the Hijri era. The idea of the morons lead to this conclusion. They seek to submit the *Amal of the Salaf of the first century of Islam* to the Hadith classification of those who appeared hundreds of years thereafter. Islam was perfected and finalized during the very age of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), hence the termination and finalization of Nubuwwat.

The Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and Fuqaha among the Sahaabah, Taabi’een and Tab-e-Taabi’een merely

systematized and codified the Shariah. They added nil to Islam. The Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and the Fuqaha were performing Salaat, fasting, performing Hajj and executing all the Ahkaam of the Shariah hundreds of years prior to the birth of Imaam Bukhaari, Imaam Muslim and the rest of the first wrung of illustrious Muhadditheen. In fact, these Muhadditheen had executed the Ahkaam of the Deen practically long before they had compiled and finalized their mission of Hadith compilation. They found Islam intact and perfect when they appeared on the scene. Not an iota of Islam was lost during the period between the Sahaabah and the Mujtahideen nor in the period between the latter and the Muhadditheen.

The Mujtahideen did not introduce new Ahkaam. They followed Islam as they acquired it from their senior Mashaaikh. Unlike the later scrutinizers, the early Muhadditheen such as Imaam Bukhaari, etc. were subservient to their respective Math-habs. Even those among them who were Mujtahid, understood perfectly that the *Amal of the Salaf of the first century is Shar'i Hujjat which cannot be abrogated by any of their Hadith classification exercises*. The Fuqaha have explicitly declared the Shar'i Hujjat of the *Amal of the Salaf of the first century*.

The Fiqh of the Aimmah of Iraq is based on the ta'leem of Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu). The Salaf's *amal* was on this Ta'leem. The Fataawa of Hadhrat Ali (radhiyallahu anhu) and Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas (radhiyallahu anhu) support numerous of the Masaa-il of the Fuqaha of Iraq.

After the departure of the Sahaabah, Taabi'een and those who were in their company, there developed considerable confusion in Hadith narrations. This necessitated the formulation of the knowledge of *Asmaaur Rijaal*. Those who have some expertise of this Knowledge know that Narators who may be *aadil* according to one Imaam of Hadith, may not be *aadil* and even be condemned by another Imaam of Hadith. This is not the juncture for elaboration. We are merely making a passing reference to the state of confusion prevailing in later times, and that the Shariah for its authenticity and validity was NEVER dependent of the Hadith classification of the Muhadditheen who appeared centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Only downright juhala with corroded brains entertain the convoluted idea that the Islam of the first century – the Islam taught by the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen – was defective and had still to be corrected and perfected a couple of centuries later in the way the Christians had organized and formalized their Christianity many centuries after the departure of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) from the dunya. This is the logical conclusion of the Salafi and Neo-Salafi morons who seek to pass themselves as Mujtahideen and Muhadditheen.

Should we momentarily assume that the Riwaayat on which the Mutaqaddimeen Fuqaha – those centuries before the era of the Muhadditheen – were *Dhaeef* (in reality they were not), then too, the *Amal of the Jamhoor of the first century* authenticates the narrations which the Muhadditheen classified '*dhaeef*' centuries later. One of the tenets of

Usool is: *Amal authenticates Dhaeef narrations*, i.e. the *Amal* of the Sahaabah and Taabieen.

There is no need to harness brains to understand that the Deen of the Sahaabah and Taabieen in whose age flourished the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and the illustrious Fuqaha, was not reliant on Bukhaari and Muslim of centuries later. And, even after the compilation of the Hadith Kutub, the Shariah was not dependent on these Kutub. The Fuqaha had no need to utilize the Hadith compilations for formulating *Ahkaam* for the simple reason that the Shariah had already been completed and perfected centuries earlier and it was being transmitted from generation to generation by way of authentic narration. Thus, the Hadith Kutub are irrelevant in relation to the Fuqaha-e-Mutaqaddimeen.

The Ahaadith which the Fuqaha had used as their *Mustadallaat* are all *Saheeh*. Only morons deny this irrefutable fact which common sense also substantiates. Those who had found fault with the Ahaadith of Hidaayah had failed to apply their minds. They failed to understand that Al-Murgheenaani did not formulate any new *Ahkaam*. The Laws of the Shariah he had compiled and expounded in his fabulous Kitaab were already formulated by Imaam Abu Hanifah and the Fuqaha of that era centuries before Saahib-e-Hidaayah. Ahaadith of Hidaayah which were found to be ‘weak’, were highly authentic centuries earlier when they were utilized as *Mustadallaat*.

The Fuqaha-e-Muqaddimeen were the Students of the Sahaabah and the Students of the Students of the Sahaabah. Their reliance for establishing the authenticity of the Ahaadith and reliability of the Ruwaat was not in need of

the *Asmaaur Rijaal* which developed centuries later. *Asmaaur Rijaal* is cluttered with ambiguities and incongruity. It is not *Ilm* such as the Fiqh of the Mutaqaddimeen. Ulama who are experts in the science of *Asmaaur Rijaal* say:

“He who has a panoptical gaze on the kutub of Asmaaur Rijaal will discover bewildering wonders therein. He will find that some Raawi (Narrator) who is among the Pillars of the Deen against whom there is an abundance of criticism. You will find in the kutub of Asmaaur Rijaal that he is depicted as a destroyer of the Deen, and in the Ummah he is portrayed as if he is like Abdullah Bin Saba’ in the plot to deracinate Islam. On the other hand among the Ruwaat will be found an enemy of the Deen from the extremist Mu’tazilis and the perpetrators of Tashayyu’ and Rifdh (Shi’ism) and evil bid’ah. However, despite all of this the Muhadditheen had authenticated his narrations.”

(Nukhabul Afkaar Sharh Ma-aanil Aathaar—Imaam Badruddin Al-Aini)

The authenticity of the Ahaadith of our Fuqaha are flawless. Even Ad-Daarauqutni who displayed extreme prejudice, hostility and bigotry (*ta-assub*) for Imaam Abu Hanifah and his Ashaab, was constrained to say about Imaam Muhammad (the Student of Imaam Abu Hanifah): “*Verily he is among the Thiqaat Huffaaz (of Hadith)*” as reported by Az-Zaylaee in his Takhreej. Imaam Muhammad was the author of many voluminous kutub of Hadith and Fiqh. Thus the charges which moron duktoors level against the Mutaqaddimeen Fuqaha are downright stupid.

The claim of the morons that the statement of a recognized Shar'i Authority is inadequate to establish authenticity is baseless. It is the product of paucity of knowledge of the subject. In his *Al-Ajwibatul Faadhilah*, Allaamah Abdul Hayy Lucknowi states:

“Although in all Deeni affairs *Isnaad* is necessary, sometimes the narration of a reliable person is its substitute, and it is explicit confirmation of the one to whom the *Isnaad* is made. This is especially so in the later eras on account of the lack of the established conditions for the assiduous observance of *Isnaad*. If severity in searching for the *Isnaad* is adopted in every matter, the objective will be lost. Hence, the *Tasreeh* of the reliable one suffices.

“It is for this reason that *amal* (acting in accordance) with the Ahaadith compiled in reliable Kutub even though the *Muttasil* (unbroken) Link to the narrator of the Hadith is not found or to the author of the authoritatively compiled kitaab.

“Similarly, they (the Authorities) say that it is permissible in matters of Fiqhi Masaa-il to repose reliance on the narrations of the authorities of the Hanafiyyah Millat even if the Mufti is unable to locate the unbroken sanad linking up with the Aimmah above.

“(Mullah) Ali Qaari comments in *Mirqaatul Mafaateeh* on the statement of Saahib-e-Mishkaat: “Verily, when I attribute a Hadith to them, it is as if I have attributed it to Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).....”

“It is understood from the statement of the Author that it is permissible to narrate Hadith from reliable Kutub which are famous, and which are authentically attributed to their Authors, e.g. The Six Kutub and other Kutub besides these, be it for Ahkaam or for Ihtijaaj....

“It is also understood from the statement of the Author that when narrating from the reliable Kutub for purposes of *amal* or *ih-tijaaj* it is not a condition that the narration be linked to the author of the kitaab. Hence, Ibn Burhaan (Abul Fatah Ahmad Bin Ali Bin Burhaan –d 518 Hijr) said: “According to all the Fuqaha *Amal bil Hadith* is not reliant on its *simaa’* (i.e. having heard it being narrated). When the Nuskah (Manuscript) of the Sunan is authentic to him, *amal* with it is permissible even though he did not hear it.”

(End of Mullah Ali Qaari’s dissertation)

“Ibnul Humaam says in *Fathul Qadeer*: “The way of narrating for the Mufti from the Mujtahid is one of two aspects: Either he has a Sanad or he takes it from a well-known Kitaab which is in vogue and in circulation among the people such as the Kutub of Muhammad Bin Al-Hasan and similar other Kutub of the Mujtahideen because it is on the level of *Khabr Mutawaatir* or *Mash-hoor*. So has Raazi narrated.”

Stating the validity of narrating from Kutub such as Al-Hidaayah, Allaamah Abdul Hayy says: “.....Yes, if a narration of the *Nawaadir* is located in, for example, a famous Kitaab such as Al-Hidaayah or Al-Mabsoot, then it will be supportive of that Kitaab (*An-Nawaadir*).”

Continuing the discussion, Allaamah Luckhnowi says: “It is mentioned in *Al-Qunyah* narrating from *Usoolul Fiqh of Ar-Raazi*: ‘Regarding the statements of a man whose Math-hab is well-known and his *Nusakh* are in vogue – it is permissible for someone who has read in these manuscripts, to say: ‘*A certain man said so and so.*’, even if he had not heard it from anyone, e.g. the Kutub of Muhammad Bin Al-Hasan, Muwatta of Imaam Maalik, etc. because its presence in this manner is tantamount to *Khabr Mutawaatir and Istifaadhah*. Therefor there is no need for Isnaad.”

Al-Qaadhi Al-Imaam Sadrul Islam Al-Bazdawi (died 493 Hijri) says:

“Shamsul Aimmah (Imaam Sarakhsi) mentioned: ‘There is nothing wrong for one who has read and correctly understood what is written in the famous Kutub prevalent in society, to say: ‘He (i.e. the author) has said so or his Math-hab is so,’ without saying that he has informed me, because it (the authentic Kitaab) is *Mustafeedh* (i.e. it is widely and abundantly prevalent), hence it is in the category of *Khabrul Mash-hoor* by which the Math-hab of the author is known, even if he has not heard it from him (from the author). Hence, there is nothing wrong in mentioning it...” (*Kashful Asraar Sharh Usoolil Bazdawi*)

In his, *Usoolus Sarakhsi*, Shamsul Aimmah Sarakhsi (died 483 Hijri) critizing some Muhadditheen who refuted the validity of citing from the famous Kutub, says:

“*Some Juhhaal (morons) among the Muhadditheen deplore this. In fact they even criticized Imaam Muhammad (rahmatullah alayh) for the Kutub he had authored.....This is jahl (ignorance) because the*

Kutub of every Imaam of a Math-hab are well-known and famous in society.....”

“.....Kutub of this kind (e.g. the Kutub of Imaam Muhammad Bin Al-Hasan, Muwatta of Imaam Maalik, etc.) are not in need of *Isnaad*.” (*Al-Fusool fil Usool*)

CONSENSUS

The ‘consensus’ claimed by the morons on the basis of Al-Alaai’s statement, is baseless. Such consensus was claimed rashly by some without applying their minds.

“Al-Iraaqi adds in his Alfiyyah that Al-Haafiz Aba Bakr Muhammad Bin Khair Bin Umar Al-Amawi Al-Isbeeli, the uncle of Abul Qasim As-Suhail said in his Barnaamij: *‘There is consensus of the Ulama that it is not proper for a Muslim to say: ‘Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said so. (He may say so only) if he has that statement by narration.....’*

Iraaqi did not follow with any comment. However Az-Zarkashi commented where I have read in his own writing: “The narration of Ijma’ is astonishing. That (Ijma’) has been narrated from some Muhadditheen. This, however, according to the narration of Ibn Burhaan, is in conflict with the Ijma’ of the Fuqaha on permissibility. Thus, he said in Al-Ausat: *“According to all the Fuqaha amal with Hadith is not reliant on it having been heard. On the contrary, if the nuskah (kitaab) is authentic according to him, it will be permissible for him to act according to it (the Hadith) even if he had not heard it.’* Al-Ustaadh Abu Ishaq Al-Isfiraayini narrated Ijma’ of the permissibility of narrating from the reliable (authoritative) Kutub, and

linking of the sanad (Ittisaal-e-Sanad) to the author is not a condition (for the permissibility). And that includes the Kutub of Hadith and Fiqh.

Ilkiya Tabari said in his Ta'leeq: 'One who finds a Hadith in an authentic Kitaab, it is permissible for him to narrate it and make ihtijaaj with it. A group of the Ashaab-e-Hadith said that it not permissible for him to narrate it because he did not hear it. And, this is erroneous.

Similarly, Imaamul Haramain narrated (this) in *Al-Burhaan* from (the narratives) of some Muhadditheen, and he (Imaamul Haramain) said: 'They are a group who ignored the nature of the Principles (*Haqaaqul Usool*), i.e. (they are) those who are reliant only on simaa'. (They are) not Aimmah of Hadith.'

Ash-Shaikh Izzuddeen Bin Abdus Salaam (died 660 Hijri) said in response to a question posed to him by Abu Muhammad Bin Abdul Hameed: *"Regarding I'timaad (Reliance) on the authentic Kutub of Fiqh on which reliance is reposed, verily, there is consensus of the Ulama of this age (7th century) on the permissibility of I'timaad on them and to ascribe Isnaad to them, for verily, authenticity is acquired with them (these Kutub) just as it is acquired by way of Riwaayat, hence people place reliance on the Mash-hoor Kutub.....Whoever believes that the people are unanimous in error in this regard, he himself is in greater error....."* (End of As-Shaikh Izzuddeen's discourse).

“ He said: “This applies more to the Kutub of the Hadith than to Kutub of Fiqh, etc. on account of their (i.e. the

Muhadditheen's) care and diligence in recording and writing. Thus, whoever contends that the condition (*shart*) of *Takhreej* (examination of the Narrations) is reliant on the *Ittisaal of the Sanad*, verily he has violated *Ijma'*. The objective is to ensure that the Hadith is narrated from a *Kitaab* whose authenticity is confirmed."

"He said: "The narrator of *Ijma'* (on the opposite view) is not well-known for Knowledge such as these *Aimmah*."

"In fact, *Shaafi'* has stated explicitly in *Ar-Risaalah* that it is permissible to narrate a narration even if it is not known that he (the recorder of the Hadith) has heard it." Oh! I wish I knew despite this what *Ijma'* is there?" (*In other words, the claim of Ijma' made by the likes of Alaa'i' and others, is baseless.*) – *Tadreebur Raawi*

The morons have stumbled on *Al-Alaa'i's* erroneous '*Ijma'* claim, and latched on to it without realizing claims of *Ijma'* to the contrary - that there is *Ijma'* of the authorities on narrating from an authority and from authoritative Kutub.

In fact, there is Consensus on narrating from Authorities and Authoritative Kutub regardless of *Isnaad*. In *Tadreebur Raawi Sharh Taqreebun Nawawi* Abu Ishaq Al-Isfiraayeeni has narrated *Ijma'* on the validity of narrating from the reliable and authoritative Kutub without need of *Ittisaal of the Sanad* to the Author. The Kutub of the Fuqaha which are authoritative, fabulous and famous in the Ummah are thus the *Saheeh Asaaneed* of Ahaadith which constitute the *Mustadallaat* for the *Ahkaam* stated in the *Mu'tamad and Mutadaawil* Kutub of the illustrious

Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and the Fuqaha-e-Kiraam who were Giants of Uloom who strode the firmament of Shar'i Uloom and Taqwa. Kutub such as the Works of Imaam Muhammad Shaibaani, Al-Mabsoot, Badaaius Sanaai', Al-Hidaayah, etc. are the *final* word of authenticity relevant to the *Isnaad*, be this chagrin to the Salafis and neo-Salafis.

Takhreejaat of the Ahaadith in these authoritative Kutub, which comment adversely on some of the *Riwaayaat*, should be discarded as waste matter regardless of the personality who presents the *khuraafaat* and *ghutha* (stupid drivel and nonsense).

Allaamah Lucknowi says in *Al-Ajwibatul Faadhilah*, Vol.4, page 63:

“At-Tabari said in His *Ta'leeq*: “One who finds a Hadith in a Saheeh Kitaab, it is permissible for him to narrate it and to make *ih-tijaaj* with it (cite it as proof). A group from among the Ashaab of Hadith say that it is not permissible for him to narrate it because he had not heard it. This is erroneous. Similarly, Imaamul Haramain, in Al-Burhaan narrated it from some Muhadditheen, and said: ‘They (the aforementioned group) are a group who showed no consideration for the reality of Usool.’”

“Izzuddeen Bin Abdus Salaam said: ‘Regarding reliance on the authentic, authoritative Kutub of Fiqh, verily there is Consensus of the Ulama of this era on the permissibility of reliance on these Kutub and and to ascribe *Sanad* to them, for verily, authenticity is acquired from these Kutub just as it is acquired by narration. Hence, people rely on the well-known Kutub.....He who claims that the

shart of takhreej of a Kitaab depends on *Ittisaal of the Sanad*, verily, he has violated *Ijma'.*”

Shaikh Abu Ghuddah says in the footnotes of *Qawaaid fi Uloomil Hadith* of Allaamah Zafar Ahmad Uthmaani:

“Our Shaikh Imaam Al-Kauthari (Rahimahullaah Ta’ala) said: ‘.....Shaikhain and the Ashaabus Sunan were contemporaries among the Huffaaz (of Hadith). They appeared after the formulation of Islamic Fiqh. They presented Hadith classification. The Aimmah Mujtahideen before them had greater material and more Hadith. With them they had Marfoo’, Mauqoof, Mursal and the Fataawa of the Sahaabah and the Taabi’een.

“The gaze of the Mujtahid regarding classification of Hadith is not deficient.....The Ashaab of the Jawaami’ before the Six were Huffaz who were the Ashaab of these Mujtahideen and of their Ashaab. Expertise on the Asaaneed of the Ahaadith was for them a simple matter because of the loftiness of their category (i.e. they were closest to the Sahaabah). *Thus the Istidlaal of the Mujtahid with a Hadith is in fact authentication for it.* (On the other hand) Ihtijaaj by means of the Six is in relation to those who came after them (i.e. after the Aimmah Mujtahideen of the first century).”

Thus, those who deny the authority of the Kutub of the Fuqaha and the authenticity of their Hadith Mustadallaat are in reality morons dwelling in *Jahl Murakkab (Compound Ignorance akin to the villainy of compound interest).*

Continued in part 2