Explanation of

The Introduction to

Sahih Muslim

Abu Zakriyyah Yahya Ibn Sharaf

AN-NAWAWI
Explanatory of
Muqaddimah
of
Sharh Sahih Muslim
by
Abu Zakariyya Yahya Ibn Sharaf
AN-NAWAWI
(D.677 A.H. / 1234 C.E.)
مقدمة
صحح مسلم

بشرح النووي
**Transliteration Table**

**Consonants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>ḍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ط</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ِل</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>ḍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غ</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ه</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vowels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>َ</td>
<td>ََََ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ِ</td>
<td>ُ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُ</td>
<td>ُُ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diphthongs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ِ</td>
<td>ay/ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُ</td>
<td>au</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ạlláhú ʿalayh wa sallam* (May Alláh’s praise & salutations be upon him)

*ʿAlayhis-salám* (Peace be upon him)

*Rádiyalláhu ʿanhu* (May Alláh be pleased with him)

*Rádiyalláhu ʿanha* (May Alláh be pleased with her)

*Rádiyalláhu ʿanhum* (May Alláh be pleased with them)

*Rahimáullah* (May Alláh have mercy on him)
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With the name of Allah, the One with all-encompassing mercy, Who bestows His mercy on whomever He pleases, [I begin].
Preface

All praise is due to Allāh, we thank Him, seek His assistance, and ask for His forgiveness. I bear witness that there is no God worthy of worship but Allāh, and that Muḥammad is His servant and Messenger ﷺ.

Şahîh Muslim is the second most authentic book of Ḥadîth after Şahîh al-Bukhârî. Imām Muslim spent close to fifteen years authoring this book. It was a laborious journey that required perseverance, endurance, tenacious resolve, and a deep sense of trust in Allāh, all of which gave birth to the prestigious scholar that Imām Muslim was, as well as the precious book Şahîh Muslim.

To know the reason he authored this book is evidence alone of the diligence and righteousness of Imām Muslim.

Out of care for the common Muslims’ best interests and in order to filter out unauthentic reports, Imām Muslim acceded to a request to author this book. Taking into consideration how such a task would be strenuous and daunting to carry out, it nevertheless emerged as pure and genuine as one would expect from such a noble scholar. He followed the very aḥādīth he related in his Şahîh, which encourages Muslims to search for knowledge and exert a determined effort in acquiring it, hoping to eventually obtain Allāh’s reward for such a noble lifelong journey.

And Allāh says:
EXPLANATION OF THE INTRODUCTION TO ṢAHIḤ MUSLIM

O you who believe! Endure and be more patient.

[Sūrah ʿĀlī ʿImrān 3:200]

The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said, “Allāh makes the way to Jannah easy for he who treads the path in search of knowledge.”

Certainly, a book of such caliber requires the highest levels of care. This is why this precious book earned worldwide acclaim. This book descended from generation to generation until it reached us as intact as it was first authored. Such preservation is owed to the subject matter of this book, namely, the Sunnah, which Allāh promised to preserve.

Due to the great significance of this book, multiple scholars explained it in order to find the gems therein and to extract the subtleties skillfully woven into the body of the book. One of those most famous explanations is that of Imām an-Nawawi. This explanation has gained wide circulation in the Muslim world because of its brevity and its remarks on the subtleties of the isnād (chain of narration). The explanation is commonly known as Sharḥ an-Nawawi. The full name of the explanation is: al-Minhāj fi Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim bin al-Ḥājjaj.

For all the merits illustrated above, we are truly honored to present to the English reader such a genuine masterpiece of knowledge. Out of our sense of responsibility to deliver on such an honorable task, we felt obligated to pay this book our best efforts throughout the entire process, in order to secure a high quality, accurate, and smooth translation. Therefore, the translation of this book took all the possible and necessary measures to secure that end. Those measures are as follows:

• Two different printed copies of the explanation of Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim by an-Nawawi were used to ensure the consistency and accuracy of the Arabic text itself. One was published by Bayt al-Afkār ad-Dawliyah (International Ideas Home), and the second
was published by Mu'sasah Qurṭubah, second edition.

- The translation strategy followed what is professionally known as "textual equivalence." This strategy is used because "each language has its own patterns to convey the interrelationship of persons and events; in no language may these patterns be ignored, if the translation is to be understood by its readers." (Callow, 1974:30) In other words, both Arabic and English languages have their own unique features. Realizing this fact forces the translator to follow a technique efficient enough to cater to those differences without favoring one at the expense of the other, in order to produce a smooth, readable, and accurate translation, which makes the reader feel comfortable and connected to the work. In short, the aim was to produce a beneficial translation as well as enjoyable reading.

- The translation of Imām Muslim’s words in the introduction has relied largely on the available online translation by ‘Abdul-Ḥamīd Siddiqi. It is worth noting there were few mistakes in that translation (as any human product would have) that have been corrected in this version of the translation.

- Further illustration of points that may be ambiguous to the reader have been provided in the footnotes. They aid in giving the reader the maximum benefit of reading this book.

- After completion, the translation was subject to meticulous copy editing to ensure it was as natural as possible.

At last, it is again our honor to present to the English reader this genuine masterpiece of knowledge, in hopes of spreading the works of Ahlus-Sunnah among those who follow the path of the Salaf. It is always a pleasure to be a part of such an honorable mission. I would like to thank everyone who participated in bringing this book to light. I ask Allah earnestly to bless, accept, and reward them for their efforts. I ask Allah to bless the readers of this book as well as all Muslims. May Allah guide us all to what pleases Him. May Allah grant us sincerity in our sayings and actions.
May Allah's peace and blessings be upon our Messenger Muhammad. And the last of our speech is all praise is due to Allah, the Lord of all that exists.

Abdullah Ibrahim Omran
Imām Muslim said:

All praise is due to Allāh, the Lord of the worlds. The ultimate reward is for the righteous, and may Allāh’s blessings be upon Muḥammad, the Seal of the Prophets, as well as the rest of the prophets and messengers.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

[Imām Muslim] started with praising Allāh due to the hadīth of Abū Hurairah صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم where he narrated that the Messenger of Allāh said, “Any important matter that does not start with praising Allāh is (devoid) of blessings.”

Other narrations with different wording include, “does not start with praising,” “does not start with remembering Allāh,” and “does not start with ‘In the name of Allāh, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful.’” These narrations are all drawn from the book of al-Arba‘in by al-Ḥāfiz ‘Abdul-Qādir ar-Rahāwi, who narrated them orally from his companion, Shaykh Abī Muḥammad ‘Abdur-Rahmān bin Sālim al-Anbāri. In the book, we also related the other narration of the Companion Ka‘b bin Mālik صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم.

However, Abū Hurairah’s narration is the most famous. This hadīth is graded hasan (sound), and is recorded by Abū Dāwūd and Ibn Mājah in their respective Sunan. It is also recorded by Abū Dāwūd in
his book 'Aml al-Yaum wal-Laylā. He narrated it as both mawṣīl\(^1\) with a good chain of narration and mursal\(^2\).

“Lord of the worlds”—The most preferable opinion adopted by tafsir [exegesis of Qur’ān] usūl [Islamic sciences] scholars among others is that “worlds” covers all creation, and Allāh knows best.

“May Allāh’s blessings be upon Muḥammad, the Seal of the Prophets, as well as the rest of the prophets and messengers”—This practice of mentioning the blessings of Allāh after praising Him is a custom of the scholars, may Allāh be pleased with them. We have related, with the famous authentic narration from ash-Shafi’i’s ar-Risālah from the authority of Ibn ‘Uyaina from Ibn Abī Najīḥ from Mujāhid who commented on Allāh’s saying:

\[
\text{وَرَفَعَنَا لِلَّدِينِ دَرْكَكَ}
\]

…and raised high your remembrance

[Sūrah al-Sharḥ 94:4]

That it means, “Never am I (Allāh) mentioned except that you (Muhammad) are mentioned as well (i.e. I bear witness that there is no God worthy of worship but Allāh and that Muḥammad is His Messenger). This interpretation is narrated all the way to the Messenger of Allāh from Jibrīl from Allāh, the Lord of the worlds.”

However, Imām Muslim is considered remiss for mentioning the blessings upon the Prophet without combining it with mentioning ‘peace,’ since we are commanded to combine both of them. Allāh says:

\[
\text{يَا أُيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا صَلُو عَلَيْهِ وَسَلِيمًا}
\]

O you who believe, ask [Allāh to confer] blessing

\(^1\) [Translator’s note] Hadīth mawṣīl: A hadīth with a complete chain of narrators extending to its source. It can be marfu‘ (traced), referring to the Prophet, or mawqif (untraced), ending at a Sahābi.

\(^2\) [Translator’s note] Hadīth mursal: A hadīth with a chain of narrators ending at a Tābi‘i quoting from the Prophet without reference from a Companion.
upon him and ask [Allāh to grant him] peace.

[Sūrah al-Ahzāb 33:56]

He should have said, “May Allāh send His peace and blessings upon Muḥammad.”

If it is argued [in his defense] that blessings upon him was mentioned uncombined with peace in the *tasbih* [end of prayer], the response is that peace is mentioned before blessings in the supplication: “Peace be upon you, O Prophet, and the mercy of Allāh and His blessings.”

[This supplication answers the question] the Companions asked of the Prophet, “We have learned how to supplicate for peace upon you, so how should we supplicate for blessings upon you?”

The scholars (may Allāh be pleased with them) have maintained that it is disliked to only implore Allāh’s blessings upon the Prophet without imploring peace as well; and Allāh knows best.

Another possible criticism of Muslim [regarding this sentence] is his saying “and the rest of the prophets and messengers.” The argument is that since prophets are mentioned, mentioning messengers is unnecessary, as they are included among the prophets. A messenger is a prophet with an additional distinction. However, this criticism is defective and can be dismissed from two angles.

**Firstly:** Something specific can be mentioned after its general category to highlight its significance and stature. There are numerous verses in the Qur’ān that follow this approach. For instance, Allāh’s saying:

---

3 [Translator’s note] The rest of the ḥadīth: “He said, Say, “Allāhubumma ṣallī ‘alā Muḥammadin wa ‘alā ʿili Muḥammadin kamā ṣallīta ʿalā ʿilābīhm, inna kamahā baʿara bi ‘alā ʿilābīhm, inna kamahā baʿara bi majid (O Allāh! Send ṣalāt upon Muhammad and upon Muhammad’s family just as You have sent ṣalāt upon Ibrāhīm. Indeed, You are the Praised, the Majestic. And send blessings upon Muhammad and Muhammad’s family just as You have sent blessings upon Ibrāhīm. Indeed You are the Praised, the Majestic).” Recorded in *Jāmiʿ at-Tirmidhī*. 
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Whoever is an enemy to Allāh, His Angels, His Messengers, Jibrīl (Gabriel) and Mīkā'il (Michael)

[Sūrah al-Baqarah 2:98]

And:

وَأَذَ أَخْلَصُّا مِنَ الْبَيْنِينَ مَيْلَهِمْ وَمَنْ نَفَحْتُهِمْ وَمَنْ نُوحَتْ إِبْرāحِيمَ وَمُوسَى وَعِيسَى

And [mention, O Muhammad], when We took from the prophets their covenant and from you and from Nūḥ (Noah) and Ibrāhīm (Abraham) and Mūsā (Moses) and ʿĪsā (Jesus)...

[Sūrah al-Ahzāb 33:7]

On the same lines, the opposite of this approach is also found [in the Qurʾān], namely, mentioning the general after the specific. Allāh says, reporting Nūḥ as saying:

رَبَّ اغْفِرْ لِي وَلِوَالِدِيْ وَلْمَنْ دَخَّلَ بِنِي مُؤْمِنًا وَلِلمُؤْمِنَاتِ

“My Lord! Forgive me, and my parents, and whoever enters my home as a believer, and all believing men and women.”

[Sūrah Nūḥ 71:28]

Any statement arguing that the word “believing” does not include those mentioned before is unworthy of consideration.

Secondly: His saying “and messengers” could be generalizing in another way. It may include all the messengers of Allāh, both human

4 [Translator's note] In both verses, the specific noun is mentioned after the general category. In the first verse, Allāh mentioned the names of specific angels after mentioning angels in general. Likewise, in the second verse, Allāh mentioned the names of some prophets after mentioning prophets in general.
and angelic. Allāh says:

الله يُصْلِفُ مِنِّمَلَائِكَةَ رَسُولًا وَمِنِّمَلَائِكَةَ

Allāh chooses messengers from angels as well as from humans.

[Sūrah al-Ḥajj 22:75]

And an angel cannot be a prophet.

Thus, the word “messengers” contains meanings that could not be delivered by only the word “prophets,” and Allāh knows best.

He specifically mentioned the name of the Prophet Muḥammad due to his praiseworthy traits, according to Ibn Fāris as well as other linguistic scholars, who maintained that any human with numerous praiseworthy traits is called “Muḥammad” and “Maḥmūd”; and Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

To proceed: You, may Allāh have mercy on you, happened to mention, by the guidance of your Creator, that you planned to track and investigate all the reported narrations from the Messenger of Allāh in relation to the traditions of this religion and its rulings, including [among many other classifications] reward and punishment and encouragement and admonition. You sought to learn all of them with their respective chains of narration the way scholars [i.e. muḥaddithīn—ḥadīth scholars] have reported them in their circles.

Imām an-Nawawī commented:

“Investigate”—Al-Laith and other linguistic scholars maintained that this word implies deep and thorough inspection.

“The traditions of this religion and its rulings”—This follows
the same construct of mentioning the general after the specific, since traditions are part of the rulings of this religion; and Allâh knows best.

Imâm Muslim said:

Thus you wished—may Allâh guide you—to be informed about all of [those transmitted reports] in one body, and you asked me to abridge [it] for you in writing, omitting most repetition. You claimed that [much repetition] would distract you from what you intended in terms of understanding and deriving rulings from [the reports].

Imâm an-Nawawi commented:

The word “claim” has often meant “to assert,” as in the hadîth of the Prophet where he said, “Jibrîl claimed,” as well as in the hadîth of Dimâm bin Tha’labah, “Your Messenger claimed” [both with the meaning “to assert”]. Likewise, in the famous book of Sîbawayh, “Al-Khalîl claims...” The meaning of the word “claim” in these statements is “to assert.”

Imâm Muslim said:

Regarding what you requested, I have carefully considered it and its end result and found that it is a praiseworthy, beneficial one. [Indeed.] I have believed since the time you asked me to undertake this [task] that—if it was determined for me, and preordained that I complete it—the first to benefit from it would be me, before anyone else.

There are a great number of reasons why—too many to enumerate. In short, it is easier to manage a few narrations with accuracy and mastery than to manage many, especially for those among the common people [in this matter] who have an inability to make accurate judgment unless they are informed of it. In this case,
focusing on a few authentic narrations is worthier than seeking an abundance of weak ones.

On the other hand, seeking to learn a large number of narrations and collecting the repetitive ones bears an extra benefit for the elite endowed with considerable awareness and knowledge regarding its [authenticity] and defects. Given their [distinguished] ability, if Allāh wills they will seize [the opportunity] for extra benefit and [delve deeper into] pursuing even more. However, this is specifically for the elite equipped with awareness and knowledge. It does not benefit the common people to pursue memorization of large numbers of narrations, as they are barely able to handle a smaller number.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

"Undertake" means to personally take responsibility for and bear the burden that comes with being involved in something.

"Determine" in "was determined for me" does not refer to the usual mental image triggered by this verb, which is to have a [certain] thought that is not acted upon, because such is impossible to be attributed to Allāh [to Whom this verb is referring]. There is a difference of opinion regarding the intended meaning of this word.

One opinion maintains that it means, "If it is made easy for me to determine, or I was empowered to do so." Another opinion maintains that it means ability, since determination, ability, willingness, and intention are all interrelated and interchangeable meanings. Hence, it could mean, "If Allāh willed for me to do so."

Another opinion maintains that it means, "If I am obliged to do so." It is taken from the hadīth of Umm ʿAjyyah : "We (i.e. women) were prohibited to accompany the funeral procession but we were not obliged to do so."

And in another hadīth: "We were encouraged to observe the
night prayer in Ramaḍān without being obliged to do so.”5

The word has a similar meaning in the jurists’ statement that the leaving off of prayer for the woman during her menstrual period is an obligation; and Allāh knows best.

To summarize Muslim’s statements:

The purpose of the discipline of ḥadīth is to verify the meanings of the texts [of ahādīth], scrutinize the isnād [chain of narration] of each, and unveil [hidden] defects. In context, a defect in a ḥadīth renders it weak despite its appearance of strength. Defects like this are sometimes found in the text of the ḥadīth or isnād.

Thus, the purpose of this discipline is not merely centered on its oral transmission or accurate record, but rather on taking great care to verify it and deeply investigate the hidden meanings of its texts and chains of narrations. This is in addition to consulting those who are knowledgeable of this discipline, and their works.

Furthermore, it is necessary that [a student of ḥadīth] records its gems so that he memorizes them by heart. Then he should review and verify the accuracy of his records, as this will be his source. He should draw from his notes and his memory while studying with those who major in this discipline. He should be with them on his own level, whether they are on a higher or lower level than him. For indeed, group studying helps embed memorized and recorded material in the memory, thus refining, emphasizing, and expanding it.

Note that studying for one hour with an expert in any given discipline is more productive than studying and reviewing alone for hours or even days. The student should remain unbiased in his studies and aim to extract benefit or to benefit others without harboring or expressing any feeling of superiority over any other student in his

5 [Translator’s note] Both of these ahādīth share the same original Arabic word: ‘azyn, which Imām an-Nawawi explains here. It is translated as determine, will, decide, etc.
group.⁶ He should instead address the others with gentle words. This will help him increase his knowledge and refine what he memorized or recorded; and Allāh knows best.

⁶ [Translator's note] The reason Imām an-Nawawi instructed against any kind of arrogance or superiority is not limited to the fact that they are disgusting traits—they also hinder the student from learning. A student who adopts this kind of behavior is bound to discard beneficial knowledge presented before him, which he may even be unaware of, due to his belief that his study-group members are lesser than him in knowledge, analytical skill, and understanding. This eventually renders the whole point of group studying meaningless and useless. Therefore, Imām an-Nawawi made sure to point out and warn against such behavior in studying.
The Methodology of Imām Muslim in His Șahīh

Imām Muslim said:

Then, if Allāh wills, we will begin to extract and compose what you have requested, upon the conditions we shall mention to you [as follows].

We set out to collect and categorize most transmitted reports on the authority of the Messenger of Allāh into three classifications and three classes of transmitters without repetition, except when necessary to repeat a ḥadīth containing an additional meaning or a supporting chain of narration due to a defect found in the original chain. This is because the additional meaning in the [repeated] ḥadīth acts as an independent ḥadīth on its own, making it necessary to repeat the ḥadīth according to its particular requirement.

This additional meaning is to be separated from the rest of the ḥadīth in a summarized form, if possible. However, separating the additional meaning from the rest of the ḥadīth potentially makes it more difficult to understand. Therefore, it is safer to repeat it in its original form if mentioning a portion is proven difficult.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Most transmitted reports” — The majority, but not the entire

---

7 [Translator's note] This subtitle is my own addition.
corpus,\(^8\) of transmitted reports. As we know, he had not recorded the entire corpus or even half of it, saying himself, “I have not mentioned all of the *sahih ahadith*.”

The word *class* in “three classes” refers to people who are similar and live contemporarily. As for the three categories, they are:

1) *Ahadith* narrated by accurate and perfect memorizers.

2) *Ahadith* narrated by considerably less accurate and less perfect memorizers.

3) *Ahadith* narrated by weak and inadmissible reporters.

If the *ahadith* in the first category were not available, he [Muslim] drew from the next category, whereas he did not draw from the third category whatsoever. He would use those categories in the chapters, particularly the *ahadith* of the first category, and use those of the second as a support.

“*To summarize*” — To use fewer words to deliver the full meaning. The [Arabic] word means “to combine.”

“*Separating the additional meaning from the rest of the hadith*” — The scholars have differed regarding the point of partially narrating a *hadith’s* content. Some reject it totally based on their position that disallows narration with its meaning [rather than its exact wording]. Others allow a *hadith* to be narrated without its exact wording as long as its complete narration has been mentioned earlier by the same narrator or by someone else. A [third] opinion allows [partial] narration unconditionally, and al-Qâdi Iyâd attributed it to Muslim.

The correct opinion adopted by the majority of scholars—[including] the top verifiers of *ahadith*, *fiqh* [jurisprudence], and *usul al-fiqh*—is that there must be an element of elaboration [in the

---

\(^8\) *Translator’s note* Corpus: a collection of written texts, especially the entire works of a particular author or a body of writing on a particular subject. In this context, it refers to the complete body of reports.
portion narrated separately]. It is allowed to narrate a portion of a hadith if the omitted portion is independent of the mentioned portion. This is in order to keep the meaning and implications intact.

This [criterion] applies to any [of the mentioned opinions regarding this] scenario, whether narrating the meaning is allowed or otherwise, and whether the complete narration has been narrated earlier or not. All of these scenarios are only applicable if the hadith's authenticity is spotless.

Also concerned is the case of someone who has narrated the complete hadith but fears that reporting the short version might cause criticism with regard to including an addition in the longer version. [Or someone might fear] accusations of forgetfulness due to negligence and inaccuracy if he were to report the short version alone. Summarizing the hadith is not allowed in either case if the hadith must be reported.

However, authors tend to mention short versions of a single hadith [when it is repeated] in different chapters [of the same book]. This is usually allowed, with almost no difference of opinion on the matter. Such has been the custom of the honorable Imāms and memorizers from the muḥaddithin (hadith scholars) and other disciplines.

"If possible" — This applies only if the condition of elaboration explained above is met, which is the position of the majority of scholars.

"However, separating the additional meaning from the rest of the hadith potentially makes it more difficult to understand. Therefore, it is safer to repeat it in its original form if mentioning a portion is proven difficult" — Separation is only applicable as long as both parts are not interrelated. This may be difficult to achieve in some abādith because each hadith is a unit [that cannot be easily separated]; in this case, the hadith must be mentioned in full out of fear of mistakes; and Allāh knows best.
Imām Muslim said:

But where we find that complete repetition is avoidable, we will not do so, if Allāh wills. As for the first category, we aspired to bring forward the reports safer from defects than any others, spotless due to being related by people of high integrity and accuracy in what they relate, with no significant differences in their transmissions [compared to the reports of other thiqāt (trustworthy narrators)], and with no excessive inconsistencies [in their own reports]—[which are often found as issues with] a great number of muḥaddithīn in their transmissions.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

"With no significant differences in their transmissions and with no excessive inconsistencies"—This is a clear statement, consistent with what the prominent scholars of hadīth, usūl, and fiqh maintained: that the accuracy of the reporter is determined when his narrations are mostly consistent with the other narrations of the thiqāt, with rare differences in a few of their narrations. If the difference is insignificant, it does not hurt one’s accuracy, and actually makes him a proven source because such minor differences are unavoidable. In contrast, if the difference is significantly large, his accuracy is decidedly impaired, and consequently he is no longer a proven source. Likewise, if his narrations are consistent for the most part, he is an acceptable source. [If] otherwise, he is not an acceptable source.

Imām Muslim said:

Thus, [our method is to] examine the narrations of the reporters who match this [spotless] description. They are followed by narrations that have some reporters who are not on the same level of memorization and precision as the previous reporters, but are still
reputable, truthful, and knowledgeable. Included among them are ‘Aţā’ bin as-Sā‘ib, and Yazīd bin Abī Ziyād, and Laith bin Abī Sulaim, from among the carriers of aṭhār and the relatess of akhbar.10

Imām an-Nawawī commented:
The verb “examine” refers to all the narrations [of each reporter]. ‘Aţā’ bin as-Sā‘ib, was nicknamed Ibn as-Sā‘ib; however, he had other reported nicknames, including Abū Yazīd, Abū Muḥammad, and Abū Zaid ath-Thaqāfī al-Kūfī. He was a Tābi‘i (Successor).

He was a trustworthy narrator, but there were inconsistencies in his reports before he died. Whoever reported from him before [his last] stage [of life], his reports are authentic, but they are not accepted if they were reported from him at the last stage of his life. Those who reported from him in the earlier stage of his life includes Sufyān ath-Thawri and Shu’bah. Those who reported from him during the last stage of his life includes Jarīr, Khālid bin ‘Abdillāh, Ismā‘īl, and ‘Aṭī bin ‘Āṣim. This information was provided by Ahmad bin Ḥanbal.

Yahyā bin Ma‘īn said, “All of those who reported from ‘Aţā’ did so at his stage of inconsistencies except Shu’bah and Sufyān.” In another narration, Yahyā said, “Abū ‘Awānah reported from ‘Aţā’ in both stages of his life, so this would make [Abū ‘Awānah’s] reports disqualified as proven sources.”

“Yazīd bin Abī Ziyād” was a Qurashi from Damascus. Al-Ḥāfiẓ said, “He is a weak narrator.” Ibn Namir and Yahyā bin Ma‘īn said, “He is nothing.” Abū Ḥātim said, “He is a weak narrator.” An-Nasā‘ī said, “His reports are abandoned.” At-Tirmidhi said, “He is weak in hadith transmission.”

9 [Translator’s note] Aṭhār literally means “remnants.” Technically, it is used for what is narrated from the Prophet, his Companions, their followers, and other early scholars.
10 [Translator’s note] Akhbar: plural of khabar, which literally means “a report, news.” It is used by some hadith scholars as a synonym for hadith. However, others use the word hadith for what is attributed to the Prophet only, and use the word khabar for what is attributed to other than the Prophet.
“Laith bin Abī Sulaim” was labelled weak in his ahādīth by the majority of scholars. They maintained that his narrations are riddled with inconsistencies; however, they are to be taken into consideration. Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal said, “His narrations are filled with inconsistencies, yet people still report from him.” Ad-Dāraquṭni and Ibn ‘Adi said, “His narrations are to be taken into consideration.”

Many others, on the contrary, said his narrations are not to be considered. At any rate, a lot of the early scholars have withheld considering his narrations.

“Abū Sulaim” was named Ayman and he was also called Anas; and Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

Thus, although they possessed what we described of knowledge, steadfastness [in religion], and scholarship, their contemporaries—who we mentioned as precise and sound in transmission, were above them in status and rank because this [the first category] is a high status and a sublime characteristic according to abīl-‘ibn [people of knowledge].

Do you not see that when you weigh the three we mentioned (‘Aṭā’, Yazīd, and Laith) with Manṣūr bin al-Mu’tamir, Sulaimān al-A’mash and Ismā‘il bin Abī Khālid in regard to precision and soundness in hadīth, you will find them distant from them [in rank]? There is no doubt regarding that among the people knowledgeable in hadīth, since the soundness of the memorization of Manṣūr, al-A’mash, and Ismā‘il, and their precision in hadīth was well known among [the people knowledgeable in hadīth] and they were not aware of examples of that from ‘Aṭā’, Yazīd, or Laith.

However, when you compare peers like Ibn ‘Awn and Ayyūb as-Sakhtiyānī with ‘Awf bin Abī Jamīlah and Ash‘āth al-Ḥumrānī—all companions of al-Ḥasan and Ibn Sīrīn—the difference between each pair’s level of virtue, perfection, and authenticity of reporting
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is significant, even though both ‘Awf’s and Ash’ath’s status of truthfulness and honesty is unquestioned by scholars.

This is how scholars weigh the status [of narrators].

Imām an-Nawawī commented:

The above statement may be subject to criticism. The pattern scholars use to list a group of narrators in such context is in the following [order]: the highest ranking, such that they would put forward the Companion before the Successor; the Successor before the one who followed him; and the virtuous one who followed him.

Ismā‘īl bin Abī Khālid was a famous Tābi‘i. He met Anas bin Mālik and Salamah bin al-Akwa’. He also narrated from ‘Abdullāh bin Abī Awfā, ‘Amr bin Ḥārith, Qais bin ‘Ā’idh (Abū Kāhil), and Abū Quḥāfah—all Companions 🌺. He was also known as Hurmuz, Sa’d, or Kuthair.

Al-A‘mash only met Anas bin Mālik, and Manṣūr bin al-Mu’tamir is not a Tābi‘i, but he is from the successors of the Tābi‘īn.

Thus, the proper comparison [‘Aṭā‘, Yazīd, and Laiḥ] should be with Ismā‘īl, al-A‘mash, and Manṣūr, respectively. The point here is not their ranks; rather, following the order mentioned is not conditional.

It is probable that Muslim put Manṣūr first due to his edge over the other two in regard to his piety, although the three of them generally have the edge over others.

‘Alī bin al-Maḍīni said, “If a trustworthy narrator reported a hadīth from the authority of Manṣūr, it will be more than enough for you.” Moreover, ‘Abdur-Raḥmān bin Mahdi said, “Manṣūr is the firmest narrator in al-Kūfah.” Sufyān said, “Whenever I narrated a hadīth reported from narrators of al-Kūfah in front of al-A‘mash, he used to reject it, but when I narrated from Manṣūr, he would say nothing.”

In addition, Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal said, “Manṣūr is firmer than Ismā‘īl
bin Khālid.” Yaḥyā bin Ma’in said, “If al-A‘mash and Maṣūr were mentioned together, Maṣūr should come first.” Abū Ḥātim said, “Maṣūr is more accurate than al-A‘mash; he does not have inconsistencies nor has he ever committed tādīs.”

Ath-Thawri said, “I have not left anyone more trusted with hadīth than Maṣūr, other than Musa‘ir.” Aḥmad bin ‘Abdillāh said, “Maṣūr is the firmest narrator in al-Kūfah.”

There was no disagreement regarding Maṣūr. He fasted sixty years and was committed to the night prayer for the same period. As for his worship, ḥibd, and righteousness, they are unquestioned, besides his aversion to the judicial position he was forced to accept. His reputation is impressive, and Allāh knows best.

It is noteworthy that, for the first time in the book, narrators are mentioned by their nicknames. We shall mention a summarized rule regarding it: prominent hadīth and fiqh scholars, among others, maintained that it is permissible to mention the narrator with a nickname, description, or lineage (including those ancestors) he hates with the aim of identifying him without belittling him.

Such is made permissible in the case of dire need, just as criticizing them was made permissible in the same case. For instance, nicknames like al-A‘mash (cloudy-eyed), al-Ĥdwal (cross-eyed), al-Ĥṣam (deaf), al-Ĥshal (the paralyzed), al-Ahram, az-Zaman, al-Maflūj, Ibn ‘Alyah, and many others. There are well-known books dedicated to this.

“İbn ‘Awn” was named ‘Abdullāh bin ‘Awn bin ʿArṭabān as-Sakhtiyāni. He is reported by Ibn ‘Abdul-Barr in at-Tambīd to have been selling leather in Başrah and therefore he had been nicknamed Ibn ‘Awn.

“‘Awf bin Abī Jamīlah” was known as ‘Awf the Bedouin even though he was not a Bedouin. Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal said, “‘Awf is

[Translator’s note] Tādīs: A term used in the science of hadīth to describe a narration in which the narrator attributes reporting a particular hadīth from someone who hasn’t narrated it, making it appear that he heard it from him.
trustworthy with good narrations.” Yahyā bin Ma‘īn and Muḥammad
bin Sa’d said, “He is trustworthy and his nickname is Abū Sahl.”

“Ash’ath” was Ibn ‘Abdul-Mālik Abū Hāni‘ al- Başri. Abū Bakr
al-Burqānī asked ad-Dāraqūṭni, “Did Ash’ath report from
al-Ḥasan?” He replied, “There are three narrators [named Ash’ath]
who reported from al-Ḥasan. One of them is nicknamed al-Hamrānī
after Hamrān Maulā ‘Uthmān. He is trustworthy. [The second] is
Ash’ath bin ‘Abdillāh al-Ḥīddānī who is from al-Baṣra. He reports
ahādīth from Anas bin Mālik and al-Ḥasan, and his narrations
are reliable. [The last] is named Ash’ath bin Sawār from al-Kūfah; his
narrations are reliable; however, he is the weakest among them. And
Allāh knows best.”

Imām Muslim said:

We only mentioned those examples by way of naming them specif-
ically so that they might be an example for those ignorant of the
scholars’ methodology regarding the ranking of ḥadīth narrators.
[With these examples as guides] men of elevated rank will not be
deprived of any degree of what is due to them, and men inferior
[in] knowledge will not be elevated above their true position. Rather,
each will keep his rights and assume his rightful rank.

It has been mentioned on the authority of ‘Ā’ishah ﷺ that she said,
“The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ ordered us to afford people their (right-
ful) positions according to what the Qur’ān states:

وَفَقَّرَ ٌكُلَّ ذِي عَلْمٍ عَلَّمَ

“And above all who possess knowledge is another
who is knowledgeable.”

[Sūrah Yūsuf 12:76]

Thus, we compiled what you asked for of reports on the author-
ity of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ based on the example mentioned
[regarding the narrators' memorization and accuracy, and narrations that lack excessive inconsistency or strong contradiction].

Imām an-Nawawi commented on the ḥadīth:

"The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ ordered us to afford people their (rightful) positions" — This implies that people have different rights depending on their respective ranks. This applies in most rulings. However, the Lawmaker [i.e. Allāh] made them equal in regard to punishments and the like, and Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

We did not bring forward the narrations of reporters charged [with criticism] by the majority of the scholars, such as ʿAbdullāh bin Miswar Abī Jaʿfar al-Madāʾini, ʿAmr bin Khālid, ʿAbdul-Quddūs ash-Shāmī, Muḥammad bin Saʿīd al-Maṣlūb, Ghiyāth bin Ibrāhīm, Sulaimān bin ʿAmr Abī Dāwūd an-Nakhaʾī, and others accused of fabricating narrations and creating reports.

We also withheld from narrations that are munkar [lacking agreement with another version that is known to be authentic] or filled with mistakes.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

"ʿAbdul-Quddūs ash-Shāmī" was named ʿAbdul-Quddūs bin Ḥabīb al-Kulaʾi ash-Shāmī, Abū Saʿīd. He reported aḥādīth from ʿIkrimah, ʿAṭāʾ, and others. Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, "ʿAmr bin ʿAlī al-Fallās said, 'Scholars have agreed to disregard all the narrations of ʿAbdul-Quddūs.'"

There is another narrator who shares the same first name, but he was trustworthy. His full name was ʿAbdul-Quddūs bin al-Ḥajjāj Abul-Mughirah al-Khawlānī ash-Shāmī al-Ḥimṣī. He heard aḥādīth
from Ṣafwān bin ‘Amr, al-Awzā‘i, and others. A number of narrators reported from him, including Ḩaḍīm bin Ḥanbal, Yaḥyā bin Ma‘īn, Muḥammad bin Yahyā adh-Dhuḥli, ‘Abdullāh bin ‘Abd-Raḥmān ad-Dārimi, and other senior Imāms and memorizers. Ḥaḍīm bin ‘Abdillāh al-‘Ujjali and ad-Dāraquṭnī, among others, said, “He is trustworthy.” Al-Bukhārī and Muslim have related from him in both of their books of Ṣaḥīḥ.

“Muḥammad bin Sa‘īd al-Maṣlūb” was from Damascus. His nicknames were Abū ‘Abdūr-Raḥmān, Abū ‘Abdillāh, and Abū Qais. There is a significant difference of opinion regarding his lineage, as well as his name. He is the only person we know about for whom there is such a large difference. Al-Ḥāfiz ‘Abdūl-Ghānī al-Maqdisī reported from some ḥadīth scholars that the number of opinions regarding this narrator’s name is over a hundred. Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzi said, “His narrations are abandoned.” He was executed and crucified due to his apostasy.

Ḥaḍīm bin Ḥanbal said, “Abū Ja‘far killed him due to his apostasy, and his narrations are fabricated.” Khālid bin Yazīd said, “I heard him saying, ‘If I hear a nice saying, I don’t see any problem with creating a chain of narration for it.’”

“Ghayāth bin Ibrāhīm” was from al-Kūfah. His nickname was Abū ‘Abdūr-Raḥmān. Al-Bukhārī noted in his book at-Tārīkh, “They abandoned him.”

“Sulāimān bin ‘Amr Abī Dāwūd” was nicknamed Abū Dāwuḍ.

A fabricated ḥadīth is the invention of a fabricator who took the speech of others and presented it as a ḥadīth. Sometimes, [these fabricators] simply fabricated ahādīth of their own. In fact, many fabricated narrations—if not most—point themselves out as fabrications due to their poor and weak language.

It is noteworthy that intentional ḥadīth fabrication is harām, as stated by the consensus of Muslims in the field of ḥadīth. The innovating sect of al-Karaẓiyyah, however, were the only exception: they
permitted fabrication in contexts of *targhib wa tarhib* [encouragement and admonition] as well as *az-zuhd*.

Unfortunately, some of the ignorant who falsely claim to be ascetics have followed that sect's position in their erroneous belief that [these false narrations] would help promote good. Such belief is obvious foolishness and utter ignorance. The statement of Allāh's Messenger, "**Whoever lied on me intentionally, let him take his place in Hell,**" is enough to refute them. We shall expand on this *ḥadīth* later when we come to it, if Allāh wills.

All of the narrators mentioned above are accused and abandoned. They are unworthy of attention due to their severe weakness and known *ḥadīth* fabrications.

.................................................................................................................................

*IImām Muslim said:*

*Munkar* in the narration of a *muḥaddith* becomes clear when his narration differs completely from the narrations of a *muḥaddith* known for his memorization and accepted narrations, with not even slight agreement between the two. When the majority of a person's narrations are like this, he is abandoned [*mahjūr*] in *ḥadīth*, and his narrations are not used.

From among this group are ʿAbdullāh bin Muḥarrar, Yaḥyā bin Abī Unaisah, al-Jarrāḥ bin al-Minhāl Abul-ʿĀṭīf, ʿAbdād bin Kathīr, Ḥusain bin ʿAbdillāh bin ʿUmairāh, and ʿUmar bin Ṣuhbān.

We did not consider their narrations due to the ruling of *ablul-ʿilm*. This is because of their position compared to what we know in regard to accepting reports. That is, an accepted *muḥaddith* [must have] reported a number of narrations similar to those narrated by *ablul-ʿilm wul-ḥifẓ* [people of knowledge and memorization], and [the narrations] must be predominantly in agreement with those of

---

12 [Translator's note] *Targhib wa tarhib*: Texts in Qurʾān and Sunnah that promise believers with reward and compensation upon doing good deeds in one portion, and warn them against wrong deeds due to the consequential punishment in the other.
ablul-‘ilm. When a narration like that is found, then if it adds to [the transmission] anything not found with its companions, his addition is accepted.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

Here Muslim mentioned the definition of munkar as defined by hadīth scholars. This definition is incomplete, since hadīth scholars sometimes call a hadīth munkar even though there is an addition by a trustworthy narrator. This hadīth is not rejected as long as the trustworthy narrator is [proven to be] accurate.

“Abdullāh bin Muḥarrar” — This is his name exactly as mentioned by al-Bukhārī in at-Tārikh as well as Abū Naṣr bin Mākūlā and Abū ʿAlī al-Ghasānī, among many other ḥuffāẓ (hadīth memorizers). He was a successor of the Tābi‘īn.

He reported ahādīth from al-Ḥasān, Qatādah, az-Zuhri, Nāfi’ Maulā Ibn ʿUmar, and many other successors. Ath-Thawri and many others narrated from him. However, hadīth memorizers and early scholars agreed to abandon him. Ahmad bin Hanbal said, “People have abandoned his narrations,” and many other scholars made similar statements.

“Abū Unaisah” was the father of Yaḥyā; his name was Zaid.

“Al-Jarrāḥ bin al-Minhāl al-Jazri” reported ahādīth from the successors. He heard from al-Ḥakm bin ʿUtaibah and az-Zuhri. Yazīd bin Hārūn narrated from him. Al-Bukhārī and other scholars said, “His narrations are munkar.”

“ʿUmar bin Ṣuhbān” was from Madīnah. It is agreed that his narrations have been abandoned.

[Imām] Muslim briefly mentioned that the addition brought by a trustworthy narrator is acceptable, whereas the narration of shādb

[Translator’s note] This term refers to ahādīth narrated by a trustworthy narrator that
and munkar [ahādīth] are rejected; this is the correct position, adopted by the majority of the scholars of hadīth, fiqh, and usūl; and Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

[There are some] who resort to [narrators] like az-Zuhri or Hishām bin ‘Urwh, whose narrations are in extensive circulation among abluk-ilm due to their greatness, and due to the great number of their companions being among the hufāẓ [memorizers], who know their narrations and the narrations of those of his level. The companions [of narrators like ‘Urwh and az-Zuhri] related those narrations in agreement with one another [with few having contradictions]. Thus, it is not allowed to accept narrations from those who report a number of narrations from [narrators like ‘Urwh and az-Zuhri] who are not known by any of their companions, and do not share in the sahih narrations [found] among them, and Allāh knows best.

In short, we have explained from the school of hadīth and its people some of what those who wish to traverse the path of [the muḥad-dīthīn] should aim for and be guided towards. We will, if Allāh wills, expand [on the above-mentioned munkar ḥadīth] in another place in this book upon the mention of defective reports [mu‘allalah], and we shall explain and clarify wherever necessary, if Allāh wills.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“We shall explain and clarify wherever necessary, if Allāh wills” — It was said that Muslim died before the full compilation of his book. Another opinion states that he mentioned that what he referred to is spread throughout the chapters of his book in its existing form; and Allāh knows best.

contradict other reports by other trustworthy narrators.
Imām Muslim said:

As to what follows: May Allāh have mercy on you, we have witnessed evil (largely from those who claim to be muddaththin) concerning [neglectfulness toward their] obligation to reject weak and munkar narrations and to investigate famous sahih narrations related by known trustworthy narrators. [This neglect is] despite their knowledge and admission of introducing numerous falsified narrations to the unaware. These falsified narrations are transmitted by narrators whose narrations are denounced by eminent hadith scholars like Mālik bin Anas, Shu'bah bin al-Ḥajjāj, Sufyān bin ‘Uyainah, Yahyā bin Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān, ‘Abdur-Raḥmān bin Mahdi, and many others.

Had it not been for this, it would not have been easy for us to address your request for categorization and collection [of those sahih aḥādīth]. However, on account of those who spread munkar narrations with weak and unknown chains, in addition to bringing them forth among the common people who are not aware of those narrations’ defects, responding to what you asked became lighter upon our hearts.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

The word “heedless” refers to those ignorant of the [reality of the hadith]. Note that this is the first time he mentioned Sufyān bin ‘Uyainah.
Chapter:

The Obligation of Transmitting on the Authority of Trustworthy Narrators, Abandoning the Liars, and Warning Against Lying Upon the Messenger of Allāh

Imām Muslim said:

Know—may Allāh, exalted is He, grant you success—that obligatory upon everyone aware of the distinctions between sahih and weak narrations, and between trustworthy and denounced narrators, is to omit all narrations except what is known to have authentic key narrators and reporters of integrity. [It is thus also necessary to] avoid what may be reported from denounced narrators and staunch innovators.

The proof regarding this obligation is in the verse:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أُصَبِّرْوا وَصَابِرْواِ

Oh you who believe! If a sinful person comes to you with news, verify it lest you afflict people due to ignorance and then you become sorry about what you did.

[Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt 49:6]

And the verse:

مَعْنَى تَرْضَؤُونَ مِنْ الشُّهَدَاءِ
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...from whom you are pleased with from the witnesses

[Sūrah al-Baqarah 2:282]

And the verse:

وَأُشْهِدُوا ذَوَّيْ عَدْلٍ فَسَكُنُوا

And let two who possess integrity among you bear witness.

[Sūrah at-Talāq 65:2]

These proofs demonstrate that the report of the one who is not upright is not accepted, and that the testimony of one who does not possess integrity is rejected. Although the meaning of the word “report” may differ from the meaning of the word “testimony” in some respects, they have the same meaning, since neither the report nor the testimony of the sinful is acceptable according to ʿablul-ʿilm.

The Sunnah demonstrates the prohibition of reporting munkar narrations, just as the Qurʾān prohibits reporting from the sinful. There is a famous atbar (i.e. narration) on the authority of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ that he said, “Whoever relates on my authority a narration knowing it is a lie, then he is one of the liars.”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Everyone aware of the distinction between ṣaḥīḥ and weak narrations, and between trustworthy and denounced narrators...” — Those two phrases are not redundant for [the sake of] emphasis; rather, they each have their own meaning. A narration may be authentic for a particular matan (i.e. text of the ḥadīth) while the reporters of some of its chains of narrations are denounced, disqualifying those particular narrations.\(^\text{14}\)

\(^{14}\) [Translator’s note] Some ḥadīth have several chains of narrations. Their matan (text) could be authentic; however, they fail to qualify as authentic due to a defect found in the
Abū Zakariyyā Yahyā bin Sharaf an-Nawawi

His statement: "[It is thus also necessary to] avoid what may be reported from denounced narrators and staunch innovators" expresses Muslim's position. The scholars of hadīth, fiqh, and usūl unanimously maintained that the narration of an innovator whose innovation renders him a disbeliever is rejected. On the other hand, if the narrator's innovation does not render him a disbeliever, there is a difference regarding his narrations.

Some [scholars] rejected them all due to the plain disobedience of an innovator, maintaining that his belief will not avail him. Others accepted all of those narrations as long as the narrator does not lie in support of his school of thought, whether he calls to his innovation or not. The latter opinion is reported to have been held by our Imām ash-Shāfi’ī. This is based on his statement, "I accept the testimony of the people of desire, except from the Shi’ah sect of al-Khaṭābiyyah, because they allow their followers to deliver false testimony."

Another opinion maintains that the narrations of the innovator are accepted as long as he does not call to his innovation. If he does, they are rejected. This is the position adopted by the majority of scholars and it is the fairest and soundest. Some of ash-Shāfi’ī’s followers said ash-Shāfi’ī’s students disagreed regarding an innovator who does not call to his innovation, but agreed to reject the narrations of the one who does.

Abū Ḥātim bin Ḥibbān said, "There is a unanimous agreement among our Imāms to reject the narrations of the innovator who calls to his innovation, whereas the first position (i.e. rejecting the narrations of one who does not call to his innovation) is very weak, since there are many innovators who do not call to their innovation but whose narrations are found in both books of Sahih as well as the other works of top hadīth scholars. Both the Salaf and khalaf (following generations) have always accepted the narrations of such innovators, using them in their arguments, and narrating from them

chain of narration, since some narrators in those chains were denounced. This is why Imām Muslim addressed both the matan and the chain of narration (ismād).
without raising any objection; and Allāh knows best.”

“Although the meaning of the word ‘report’ may differ from the meaning of the word ‘testimony’ in some respects, they have the same meaning”—This reflects the great status and deep knowledge of Muslim. Know that the words “testimony” and “report” share some characteristics and differ in others. They are both conditional based on one’s Islām, rationality, puberty, truthfulness, integrity, and accuracy in reporting and delivery. On the other hand, they differ depending on one’s freedom, gender, number, and acceptance of the inferior’s [narration] over that of his superior.

Of the reports of a slave, a woman, a single individual, and an inferior [student or person of knowledge] in the presence of his superior [in knowledge]—who is his shāikb—none are acceptable except from a woman under certain circumstances. The testimony of a witness who is [biased], as in the case of one’s testimony against his enemy, or in his own interests or those of his father or son, is rejected.

[The scholars] disagreed regarding the testimony of the blind. Ash-Shāfi‘i and a group of scholars disallowed it. Mālik and other groups of scholars allowed and accepted it.

Note that Islamic law distinguished the testimony from the report in the above respects because testimony is on an individual level, which makes the charge more apparent, whereas a report is on a general level that includes the reporter himself as well as others, and this makes the charge very much out of the picture.

The earlier opinions [regarding the conditions a narrator must meet to have his narration considered] are held by those whose opinions have weight, although some of them did not hold the same position on every condition.

For instance, some scholars of usūl stipulated that the reporter must be an adult at the time of receiving the report; however, the unanimous opinion refutes this. Adulthood is only considered a condition
at the time of reporting a narration, not at the time of receiving the narration. Some of ash-Shāfi‘i’s companions permitted and accepted the report of a child in both hearing and delivering it. However, the famous and prevailing opinion is mentioned above.

As for the condition of the number of reporters, al-Jubâ‘i, the Mu’tazili, as well as some individuals from the Qadariyyah sect, stipulated two [as the minimum number of] reporters of a narration, just as for testimony. One individual who followed al-Qadariyyah stipulated four reporters in every class of the narration and in each narration. These opinions are weak, unacceptable, and discarded. There is an overwhelming number of legislative proofs that openly state the obligation of complying with the actionable report of a single individual, and scholars of fiqh and usul clarified this in their books. Additionally, there are many works authored by scholars of hadith that independently address this particular subject; and Allâh knows best.

As for the conditions of uprightness and integrity, this includes many sub-issues known in the books of fiqh, which require abundant detail.

“*There is a famous athar (i.e. narration) on the authority of the Messenger of Allâh ﷺ*” — This is in compliance with the chosen opinion among the scholars of hadith, among others, which has become a common terminology among the Salaf and the khalaf (i.e. those who came later), which is that the word athar is used to refer to any narration in general, whether reported on the authority of the Messenger of Allâh or from a Companion. The jurists from Khurâsân said al-athar is what is attributed to and ends with a Companion; and Allâh knows best.

“*Whoever relates on my authority a narration knowing it is a lie, then he is one of the liars*” — There are two opinions regarding the word “knowing.” One considers it to mean “know.” The other considers it to mean “think.” A reporter is not held as sinful in this regard unless he narrates something he knows or thinks is a lie. If he neither knows nor thinks his narration is a lie, he is not held
as sinful in this regard, even if someone else knows or thinks that particular narration is a lie.

The overall interpretation is obvious, which accentuates [the dire consequences] of lying and exposing oneself to it. Lying includes reporting a narration with an overwhelming belief that it is a lie, such that it never existed before his report. We shall expand on the issue of lying and everything related to lying upon the Messenger of Allāh.

---------------------------------------------

Imām Muslim said:

Abū Bakr bin Abī Shaibah narrated to us that Wāki’ narrated to us, on the authority of Shu’bah, on the authority of al-Ḥakam, on the authority of ʿAbdur-Raḥmān bin Abī Lailā, on the authority of Samurah bin Jundab:

---------------------------------------------

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Abū Bakr bin Abī Shaibah” — His name was ‘Abdullāh. Muslim has related a large number of narrations from him as well as his brother ‘Uthmān, but he took more from Abū Bakr. Both were also the teachers of al-Bukhārī. Both of their names are attributed to their grandfather. Their father’s name was Muḥammad bin Ibrāhīm bin ‘Uthmān bin Khawāṣṭi.

They had a third brother named al-Qāsim; however, he has no narrations in the Šāhīḥ, as he was a weak narrator. He was the judge of Wāṣīr (a city in ‘Irāq). However, his son Muḥammad was the judge of Fāris, and he was a trustworthy narrator according to Yahyā bin Maʾān and others.

Both Abū Bakr and [his brother] ‘Uthmān were respected memorizers. Abū Bakr, in particular, had almost 30,000 students attending his classes. He was superior to ‘Uthmān in terms of memorization and veneration, despite ‘Uthmān’s seniority over him.
'Uthmān died in 239 AH after Abū Bakr, who died in 235 AH. Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi said, “There are two who narrated ahādīth from Abū Bakr bin Abī Shaibah. Their names are Muḥammad bin Sa‘d, the writer of al-Waqīq, and Yūsuf bin Ya‘qūb Abū ‘Amr an-Naisābūrī.

Oddly, the difference between their dates of death is 107 or 108 years; and Allāh knows best.

“Al-Ḥakam” was Ibn ‘Utaibah. He was one of the most knowledgeable and obedient among the Tābi‘īn.

“‘Abdur-Raḥmān bin Abī Lailā” was one of the most respected of the Tābi‘īn. ‘Abbūlāh bin al-Ḥārith said, “I feel that women [could never again] give birth to one like him.” ‘Abdul-Malik bin ‘Umair said, “I have seen ‘Abdur-Raḥmān bin Abī Lailā in a knowledge circle that included a number of the Companions of the Messenger of Allāh. They were listening to his speech attentively. One of them was al-Barā’ bin ‘Āzib, who died in 83 AH.”

Abī Lailā’s name was Yasār, Bilāl, or Bolīl according to different opinions. Another opinion said he was named Dāwūd, while another opinion maintains that his name was not known. He was a Companion who died along with ‘Alī Ḥ in Siffin.

Note that there was another Ibn Abī Lailā, whose name is very common in fiqh and who has a famous school of thought. His name was Muḥammad, the son of ‘Abdur-Raḥmān [bin Abī Lailā], but scholars of hadīth considered him a weak narrator; and Allāh knows best.

Samurah bin Jundab’s nickname was Abū Sa‘īd, and he was also known as ‘Abdullāh, ‘Abdur-Raḥmān, Abū Muḥammad, or Abū Sulaimān. He died in al-Kūfah at the end of Mu‘āwiyah’s caliphate; may Allāh have mercy on them all.
Imām Muslim said:

And also Abū Bakr bin Abī Shaibah narrated to us that Wākī' narrated to us, on the authority of Shu'bah and Sufyān, on the authority of Ḥabīb, on the authority of Maimūn bin Abī Shābīb, on the authority of al-Mughīrah bin Shu'bah, that they both said that the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said the same thing.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Sufyān” was Sufyān ath-Thawri, Abū ’Abdillāh.

“Ḥabīb” was Ibn Abī Thābit Qais, a respected Tābīʿī. Abū Bakr bin ‘Ayyāsh said, “There were only three notable individuals in al-Kūfah: Ḥabīb bin Abī Thābit, al-Ḥakam, and Ḥammād; they were responsible for issuing fatāwā [Islamic legal rulings]. Everyone was inferior to Ḥabīb [in terms of knowledge].”

“Al-Mughīrah” was al-Mughīrah bin Shu'bah, one of the most knowledgeable people among the Arabs. His nickname was Abū Īsā, Abū ’Abdillāh, or Abū Muḥammad. He died in 50 or 51 AH. He accepted Islām in the year of the Battle of al-Khandaq [The Ditch]. It is reported that he provided for the marriage of 300 Muslim women; another statement brings the number up to 1000.

Muslim cited the matan of the hadīth by mentioning it first, then saying, “Abū Bakr narrated to us on the authority of both Companions, who narrated it on the authority of the Messenger of Allāh.” This manner of citing a hadīth is undoubtedly permissible; and Allāh knows best.

Remarkably, the above two asānid (chains of narration) have two notable characteristics. First, both contain narrators from al-Kūfah, including both Companions, the two shaikhs of Muslim, and every other narrator between the Companions and these two shaikhs, except for Shu'bah, who is from Wāsīṭ and then moved to Baṣrah.
This is notable because there are a great number of narrations [with a similar geographic chain].

Second, in each isnād is a Tābiʿi who narrated from a Tābiʿi, which is very common. [In some asānid] there may be three Tābiʿīn narrating from each other, which is also common but to a lesser degree. The number of Tābiʿīn [within a chain] may reach four, but this is very rare.

This also occurs with the Companions ﷺ. I have personally collected narrations where four Companions as well as Tābiʿīn narrated from each other, which are found in the beginning of my explanation of Sahih Muslim along with their asānid and variations of asānid.
Chapter:

Warning about Lying Upon the Messenger of Allah ﷺ

Imám Muslim said:

Abū Bakr bin Abī Shaibah narrated to us that Ghundar narrated to us on the authority of Shu’bah; and Muḥammad bin al-Muthannā and Ibn Bashār both narrated to us that Muḥammad bin Ja’far narrated that Shu’bah narrated on the authority of Manṣūr, on the authority of Rab’iy bin Ḥirāsh that he heard ‘Alī ﷺ giving a khuṭbah and he said that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said, “Do not lie upon me; indeed, whoever lies upon me will enter the Fire.”

Imám an-Nawawi commented:

“Ghundar” is the most famous name [of this narrator]. Al-Jawhari mentioned that his name could also be pronounced “Ghandar.” His name is Muḥammad bin Ja’far al-Hudhali Maulāhum16 al-Baṣri, Abū ‘Abdillāh.

---

15 Imám an-Nawawi commented: This title includes abādīth where the Prophet said, “Do not lie unto me, for whoever does so, he shall enter Hellfire.” And in another narration, “Whoever intentionally lies unto me, let him take his place in the Hellfire.” And in another narration, “Lying to me is unlike lying to anyone else; so whoever lies unto me, let him take his place in Hellfire.”

16 [Translator's note] Maulāhum has three meanings: The first: A slave of someone, like Nābi, who was 'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb's maulū. Second: The tribe to whom one owes the favor of guidance to Islām, like the grandfather of al-Bukhārī, who was the maulū of al-Ju‘fiyyīn. Third: A pledge of allegiance, as was given to Imám Mālik, the maulū of the Tamimīyyīn. [Tahdīth al-Asmā' wal-'Aqābāt, an-Nawawi: 1/14].
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“Ghundar” was a nickname given to him by Ibn Juraij, which we narrated from ‘Ubaidullāh bin ‘Ā'ishah from Bākr bin Kullūm as-Sulami who said, “Ibn Juraij arrived at al-Baṣrah, and the people gathered around him [to learn]. Once, he reported a hadīth from the authority of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣri, but the people doubted him.” Ibn ‘Ā'ishah said, “Ibn Juraij called him ‘Ghundar’ because he bothered him a lot on that day so he said to him, ‘Shut up, Ghundar!’ because residents of the Ḥijāz used to call anyone bothering them ‘Ghundar.’”

As for Ghundar himself, he made a habit of fasting every other day for 50 straight years. He died in Dhul-Qa’dah 193 or 194 AH.

“Rab‘iy bin Hirāsh” was Abū Maryam Rab‘iy bin Hirāsh al-‘Absi, the brother of Mas‘ūd, who spoke after his death.17 Their brother was Rabī‘.

Rab‘iy was a well-known and respected Tābi‘i who never lied. He swore he would never even smile until he found out where he would eternally reside [i.e. Paradise or Hell]. Thus, he never smiled except after his death. His brother Rabī‘ did the same. The man who washed his body after he died said, “He had a smile on his face on his deathbed throughout the time we were washing his body.”

Rab‘iy died in 101 AH. It is also said that he died in 104, and another statement maintains he died during the caliphate of al-Ḥajjāj, who died in 95 AH.

17 [Translator’s note] Adh-Dhahabi related in the biography of Rab‘iy bin Hirāsh the following: Rab‘iy said, “We were four brothers; one of us died. While we were gathered around [his body], we sent someone to buy a shroud. Suddenly, [our dead brother] uncovered his face and said, ‘Peace be upon you.’ We responded, ‘And peace be upon you, brother of ‘Isā. [Have you spoken] after death?’” He said, ‘Yes. I have met my Lord and He was not angry. He met me with rest and provision. So hurry, since Abul-Qāsim [i.e. the Prophet] is waiting on me to pray.’ The news spread and reached ‘Ā’ishah, who said, ‘I indeed have heard the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ say, “A man from my nation will speak after death.”’” [Siyār ‘Alām an-Nubalā‘: 4/359]. This remarkable incident is backed by major scholars, including al-Mizzi, as mentioned in Tawdīḥ al-Mustahab, authored by Ibn Nāṣir ad-Dīn ad-Dimashqī: 3/156.
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Imām Muslim said:

Zuhair bin Ḥarb narrated to me, Iṣmā‘īl—rather,18 Ibn ‘Ullayah—narrated to us on the authority of ʿAbdul-ʿAzīz bin Ṣuhaib, on the authority of Anas bin Mālik, that he said, “Indeed what prevents me from relating to you a great number of āḥādīth is that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said, ‘Whoever intends to lie upon me, then let him take his seat in the Fire.’”

Imām an-Nawawi commented,

“ʿUllayah” was the mother of Iṣmā‘īl. His father was Ibrāhīm bin Sahm bin Maqṣam al-Asdī. Iṣmā‘īl was from Baṣra, even though his origin was al-Kūfah. His nickname was Abū Bishr. Shuʿbah said, “Iṣmā‘īl bin ʿUllayah is the sweet-smelling basil of jurists and the master of ḥadīth scholars.”

Muḥammad bin Saʿd said, “The mother of Iṣmā‘īl is ʿUllayah bint Ḥasan, who used to work for Bani Shaibān. She was an honorable and rational woman. It is notable that Ṣāliḥ al-Mirri along with other prestigious men and jurists of Baṣra used to visit her to discuss fiqh.”

Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī said about Iṣmā‘īl, “Many people narrated āḥādīth from Iṣmā‘īl bin ʿUllayah, including Ibn Juraij and Mūsā bin Sahl al-Washshāh. There are 127 or 129 years between the death of these two.” He continued, “Ibrāhīm bin Ṭahmān also narrated from Iṣmā‘īl and there are 120 or 125 years between his death and that of al-Washshāh. Furthermore, Shuʿbah narrated from Iṣmā‘īl; there are

---

18 Imām an-Nawawi commented: Using this format [of narration] reflects Muslim’s ultimate precision in relating his narrations and his well-honed skill in the science of ḥadīth. It indicates that when his shaikh reported the ḥadīth to him, he had not mentioned the last name of the narrator. Had Muslim mentioned the narrator’s last name [without using this word], it would have implied that his shaikh reported the ḥadīth with the narrator’s last name [which is not the case]. So, Muslim did not take the liberty of mentioning the last name of the narrator himself only because his shaikh had not reported this ḥadīth to him in this particular form.
118 years between Shu’bah’s death and that of al-Washshā. Likewise, ‘Abdullāh bin Wahb narrated from Ismā’il and there are eighty-two years between Ibn Wahb’s death and that of al-Washshā. Al-Washshā died on Friday, the first day of Dhul-Qa’dah, in 298 AH.

Imām Muslim said:

Muḥammad bin ‘Ubaid al-Ghubari narrated to us, Abū ‘Awānah narrated to us, on the authority of Abū Ḥaṣīn, on the authority of Abū Ṣāliḥ, on the authority of Abū Hurairah that he said the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said, “Whoever lies upon me intentionally, then let him take his seat in the Fire.”

Imām an-Nawawī commented:

“Al-Ghubari” was from Baṣrāh.

“Abū ‘Awānah” was al-Waḍāḥ bin ‘Abdillāh al-Wāṣīṭi.

“Abū Ḥaṣīn” is the only individual in both books of Ṣaḥīḥ with this name. Others with a similar name are spelled “Ḥuṣain,” [and there is one that sounds the same; however it is spelled] “Ḥuḍain bin al-Mundhir.” Abū Ḥaṣīn’s name was ‘Uthmān bin ‘Āṣim al-Asdi. He was a Tābi’i from al-Kūfah.

“Abū Ṣāliḥ” was named Dhakwān, nicknamed “the Oil Man” or “the Butter Man” because he used to bring them to al-Kūfah. He was from Maḍīnah. He died in 101 AH. There is a group of narrators of his caliber, all nicknamed “Abū Ṣāliḥ.”

“Abū Hurairah” was the first to be nicknamed as such. There was a huge difference of opinion—almost thirty differences—about his first name and his father’s name. However, the soundest is that his name is ‘Abdur-Raḥmān bin Ṣakhr.

Abū ‘Amr bin ‘Abdil-Barr said, “Due to the huge difference of
opinion regarding his name, the only sound opinion I consider is ‘Abdollāh and ‘Abdur-Rahmān. This is the only name for him in Islām that I feel comfortable with.”

Muḥammad bin Ishāq said, “His name is ‘Abdur-Rahmān bin Sakhr; many scholars who authored works related to genealogy used this name.” Likewise, al-Ḥākim, Abū ʿAḥmad, said, “The soundest opinion regarding the name is [the one maintaining it was] ‘Abdur-Rahmān bin Sakhr.”

He was nicknamed Abū Hurairah because he used to play with a cat when he was a child.

Abū Hurairah has a very special virtue, which is that he has the most narrations among the Companions from the authority of the Messenger of Allāh. Imam al-Ḥāfiz Baqī bin Mihklad al-Andalusī cited in his Musnad 5,374 ahādīth reported by Abū Hurairah. None of the Companions have approximated this number or even come close to it.

Ash-Shāfiʿī said, “Abū Hurairah was the best memorizer of ahādīth in his time. He used to visit al-Madīnah and he had a house in Dhul-Ḥulaifah. He died in Madīnah during 59 AH when he was 78 years old. He was buried in al-Baqī’. Āʾishah died shortly before him and he attended her funeral prayer. It was said that he died in 57 or 58 AH, but the correct date is 59 AH. He was among the permanent residents of aš-Šūfah.”

Abū Nuʿaim said in Hīyah al-Awliyā’, “Abū Hurairah was the most knowledgeable and famous resident of aš-Šūfah.”

The matan of the ḥadīth carries the ultimate status of authenticity. It was said that it is mutawātir (oft-repeated). Abū Bakr al-Bazzār remarked in his Musnad, “There are almost 40 Companions who narrated this ḥadīth from the Messenger of Allāh.”

[Translator's note] Mutawātir is a type of ḥadīth for which the narrators are so numerous in any given era that it is virtually impossible for it to be a fabrication or an error.
Also, Imām Abū Bakr aṣ-Ṣairafi mentioned in his explanation of ash-Shāfi‘i’s book ar-Risālah (may Allāh have mercy on them both), “This hadith has been narrated by more than sixty Companions who attributed it to the Messenger.”

Abul-Qāsim ‘Abdur-Raḥmān bin Mandah enumerated the number of the Companions who narrated this hadith at up to 87 Companions, and added, “One of the memorizers mentioned that he narrated this hadith from 62 Companions, including the ten promised Paradise. This is the only hadith that every one of the ten Companions promised Paradise reported. Moreover, this is the only hadith with more than 60 Companions reporting it. Others said that the number of Companions reached 200 and even more.”

Both al-Bukhārī and Muslim related this hadith in their respective books of Sahih from the authority of az-Zubair, ‘Alī, Anas, and Abū Hurairah, among others.

Abū ‘Abdīllāh al-Ḥumaidi, the author of al-Jam’ Bān as-Sahihain, cited this hadith under the category of the narrations that Muslim related in his Sahih that al-Bukhārī did not; however, this is incorrect, as they both related it, and Allāh knows best.

“Let him take his seat in the Fire” — The scholars said it is a supplication in an imperative form, meaning, “May Allāh place him in Hell.” It is also said it is a statement in an imperative form, mean that the one guilty of this crime brought [this punishment] on himself and therefore ought to prepare himself for it. This interpretation is proved by a second narration with a different wording: “Do not lie upon me, for whoever does so, he shall enter the Fire.” Another narration states: “A house in Hellfire shall be built for him (i.e. the one who lies upon the Prophet).”

However, although the explicit meaning of the hadith is that such will be his punishment, Allāh may forgive him and then his time in the Fire would not last forever. [This is understood to be] the same for anyone threatened with the Fire due to any major sin less than disbelief. Any major sin has the same ruling of the potential for
either punishment or forgiveness, with any punishment in the Fire a temporary one ending in his being removed from it by Allāh’s mercy and kindness. [This is because] no one who dies upon tawḥīd shall remain in the Fire for eternity. This is unanimously agreed upon among Ahlus-Sunnah; and Allāh knows best.

Lying, as defined by our colleagues of theology, is to say something that is not true, whether intentionally or unintentionally. This is the position of Ahlus-Sunnah. Al-Muʿtazilah, in contrast, stipulate intent for an untrue statement for it to qualify as a lie. However, given those texts’ restriction of lying to intent, this proves that lying can be either intentional or unintentional. The textual proofs from the Qur’ān and Sunnah and the consensus of the scholars all affirm that there is no sin upon the person who forgets or makes a mistake. Thus, had the Prophet meant lying [intentionally or unintentionally], this would [wrongfully] put sin upon the one who forgets. Thus, lying is restricted [according to intent], and the texts on lying are all interpreted in the light of intent; and Allāh knows best.

Know that this hadīth includes many benefits and rules:

- It emphasizes the rule for Ahlus-Sunnah that a lie includes any untrue report, whether made intentionally or unintentionally.

- It magnifies the prohibition of lying upon the Messenger of Allāh and affirming that it is an abominable act and a major sin. Notwithstanding, however, [this type of lying] does not render the culprit a disbeliever unless he deems it permissible, according to the well-known stance of various scholars of different schools of thought.

Shaikh Abū Muḥammad al-Juwayni, the father of Imām al-Ḥaramain Abul-Maʿāli—who is one of our major colleagues—said, “A liar becomes a disbeliever when he lies intentionally upon the Messenger.” Al-Imām al-Ḥaramain related this position of his father and that he used to reiterate in his class that whoever intentionally lied upon the Messenger would be rendered a disbeliever and his blood was violable. However, al-Imām al-Ḥaramain deemed this
position weak and said, he has not found a supporting statement on it from any Companion and it is thus a grave mistake. In the end, the correct opinion is the one adopted by the majority of the scholars as previously mentioned; and Allâh knows best.

Moreover, a person who intentionally lies upon the Prophet in a single hadîth is not only to be judged disobedient, but all of his narrations are discredited and deemed inadmissible for evidence. Even if he repents sincerely, many scholars, including Ahmad bîn Hânbal, Abû Bakr al-Ĥumaidî (the shaîkh of al-Bukhârî and the companion of ash-Shâfî‘î), and Abû Bakr aș-Şairâfî (one of the prestigious and most knowledgeable of the Shâfî‘î jurists), maintained, “His repentance is irrelevant and his narrations are never acceptable. He must be always disparaged.”

Aș-Şairâfî said, “Any narrator whose narrations we disqualified based on the evidence that he was a liar is no longer acceptable to us even with a public repentance, and any narrator whom we labelled weak can never become trustworthy.” He continued, “Upon this point, a report differs from testimony. In addition, I haven’t seen any proof for the other position. This hadîth is interpreted as expressing a strong abhorrence of lying upon the Messenger due to its disastrous consequences, since [if not discredited], it would be enacted as a law until the Day of Judgement. This is unlike lying upon anyone else or providing testimony, because the resulting bad consequences of these are limited.”

I [an-Nawawi] say that the above-mentioned position is weak and goes against the legislative rules. The correct opinion on the matter is the acceptance of the culprit’s repentance. His narration is admissible if his repentance is sincere and fulfills the well-known conditions, which are: cessation of that sin [in this case, lying upon the Messenger], expressions of regret, and resolution to never return to it. This position is consistent with the legislative rules. The scholars have even agreed to accept the narration of a disbeliever who embraced Islâm. Evidently, most of the Companions were as such, and they have also agreed to accept the testimony [of a repentant liar], which renders the difference between the report and the
testimony in this regard nonexistent; and Allah knows best.

- The prohibition of lying upon the Prophet in regard to legal rulings is no different from lying upon him regarding matters that do not involve legal rulings, such as general admonitions, among others.

Lying is prohibited in all cases and is one of the gravest sins, as unanimously agreed by the Muslims. This is opposed to al-Karrāmiyyah, the innovative sect that falsely holds the permissibility of fabricating aḥādīth in contexts of tārīghbīb wa tārīḥīb. Many ignorant people who link themselves to zāhīd and others just as ignorant followed them in this regard.

The basis for their false assumption is the wording of the narration, “Whoever lies upon me intentionally in order to mislead people, let him take his seat in the Fire.” Some of them claimed that such lying is for the sake of the Prophet, not against him. However, such proof openly reflects how ignorant and heedless they are. It also proves how far they are from knowing any of the rules of Islamic law. They have swallowed fallacies suited only to their shallow intellect and corrupt mentality. They have opposed Allah’s saying:

وَلَا تَفْقِرْ مَا لَيْسَ لَكَ بِعِلَمِ إِنَّ السَّمْعَ وَالْبَصُّرَ وَالْفُوَاءَ

And do not pursue that of which you have no knowledge. Indeed, the hearing, the sight and the heart—about all those [one] will be questioned.

[Sūrah al-Isrā’ 17:36]

Their actions oppose the very definition of the recurrent and famous aḥādīth that emphatically warn against false testimony. Moreover, they have opposed the consensus of ablul-hall wa-l’aqd among

20 [Translator’s note] Ablul-hall wa-l’aqd are the elite scholars of the Muslim community who represent them in appointing the Muslim ruler. Taṣḥīḥ at-Tanbih, an-Nawawi: 3/485.
other proofs that unequivocally prohibit lying upon any individual. This is besides lying upon one whose statements are revelation, which would then amount to lying upon Allâh, Who described the Prophet’s statements thus:

\[
\text{Nor does he speak of (his own) desire. It is only a revelation that is revealed.} \quad \text{[Surah an-Najm 53:3-4]}
\]

Strange is the claim that [reporting false narrations] is for his sake. It proves their ignorance of the Arabic tongue and the meanings of the law, because lying can only be against him.

The narration they used as their basis has also been investigated by scholars. The best and briefest response to it is that the phrase, “in order to mislead” is a false addition and all memorizers agree it is such. In addition, Abû Ja’far at-‘Ahâwi answered that if it were true, it would be used for emphasis, as in Allâh’s statement:

\[
\text{“Then who does more wrong than one who invents a lie against Allâh, to lead mankind astray without knowledge.”} \quad \text{[Surah al-An’âm 6:144]}
\]

Also, the phrase “in order to” is not to indicate a reason, but to indicate the eventual [result of his lie], as in Allâh’s statement,

\[
\text{Then the household of Fir’aun (Pharaoh) picked him up, in order that he might become for them an enemy and a (cause of) grief.} \quad \text{[Surah al-Qasas 28:8]}
\]
EXPLANATION OF THE INTRODUCTION TO ŞAHIH MUSLIM

There are many examples like this in the Qur'an. Likewise, the evidence in Arabic literature is too numerous to count. In short, such a person's lying will eventually mislead people.

This position is [in reality] too weak to mention or even take into consideration and stands needless of refutation; and Allah knows best.

- It is prohibited for one who knows or has overwhelming belief that a narration is fabricated to relate it, because whoever does so without exposing the reality of this narration is included under the threat of the Fire and has lied upon the Messenger of Allah.

The proof is the Prophet's statement, "Whoever narrates a hadith on my authority while believing it to be untrue is one of the liars."

Therefore, scholars have maintained that whoever desires to relate a hadith or cite one should investigate its authenticity and soundness. If it is authentic, he should say, "The Prophet said such-and-such" or "did such-and-such" and the likes of direct expressions. If it is weak, he should not use a direct expression. Rather, he should say, "It was narrated," or, "It was reported," or, "It reached us so-and-so"; and Allah knows best.

Significantly, the scholars said that the one who studies hadith should be acquainted with grammar, language, and the names of narrators enough to be steered away from attributing something to the Prophet which he did not say; and if he finds a mistake in a narration he received, the right procedure held by a large number of the Salaf and khalaf is that he should narrate the hadith with its original version without modification, and mention in his notes that there was a mistake in this narration and provide the correct one.

Likewise, when he relates it orally, he should point out any mistake in that version and then state the correct version. This is best because the narrator might think there is a mistake with the original version,
but it might turn out to be correct from a different angle to another person. And if the door for modifying the narration [without pointing out there is a modification] is opened, the unqualified would [certainly] have the audacity to venture through it.

The scholars said the narrator and hadīth student, if they were to doubt a word in a narration, should say immediately after it, “he said something of the sort”; and Allāh knows best.

Along the same lines, scholars have said regarding narrating the hadīth with its meaning that it is recommended for the one who does such to say after he narrates the hadīth, “he said something of the sort,” like the Companions and those who followed them did.

The stance of refraining from narrating too many ahādīth from the Messenger, held by az-Zubair and Anas among other Companions, was due to their fear of inaccuracy and forgetfulness despite the fact that the one who makes a mistake or forgets is not sinful. Still, they [did not wish to] be accused of [even] slight negligence due to inattentiveness or anything like that.


Imām Muslim said:

Muḥammad bin ‘Abdillāh bin Numair narrated to us, that [his] father narrated to [him] that Sa‘īd bin ‘Ubaid narrated to [him] that ‘Alī bin Rabī‘ah narrated to [him] that he said, “I arrived at the masjid and al-Mughirah, the ruler of al-Kūfah said, ‘I heard the Messenger of Allāh [saw] saying, ‘Indeed a lie upon me is not like a lie upon anyone else, for whoever lies upon me intentionally shall take his seat in the Hellfire.’’”

‘Alī bin Ḥujr as-Sa‘di narrated to us that ‘Alī bin Mus‘hir narrated to [him] that Muḥammad bin Qais al-Asadi informed [him] on the authority of ‘Alī bin Rabī‘ah al-Asadi, on the authority of al-Mughirah bin Shu‘bah, on the authority of the Prophet [saw] a similar narration; however, he did not mention the words, “Indeed a lie upon me is not like a lie upon anyone else.”
Chapter:

The Prohibition of Narrating Everything One Hears

Imām Muslim said:

‘Ubadullāh bin Mu‘ādh al-‘Anbari narrated to us that [his] father narrated to [him]; and Muḥammad bin al-Muthannā narrated to [him] that ‘Abdūr-Rahmān bin Mahdi both narrated to [him] that Shu‘bah narrated to [him], on the authority of Khubaib bin ‘Abdir-Raḥmān, on the authority of Ḥaḥīf bin ‘Āṣim, on the authority of Abū Hurairah that he said, “The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said, ‘It is enough of a lie for a man to narrate everything he hears.’”

Abū Bakr bin Abī Shaibah narrated to us that ‘Alī bin Ḥaṣṣ narrated to [him] that Shu‘bah narrated to [him] on the authority of Khubaib bin ‘Abdir-Raḥmān, on the authority of Ḥaḥīf bin ‘Āṣim, on the authority of Abū Hurairah, on the authority of the Prophet ﷺ, the same as that.

Yaḥyā bin Yaḥyā narrated to us that Hushaim informed [him] on the authority of Sulaimān at-Taimi, on the authority of Abū ‘Uthmān an-Nahdi that he said ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb ﷺ said, “It is enough of a lie for a man that he narrates everything he hears.”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Hushaim” was Ibn Bashīr as-Sulami al-Wāṣiṭi. [His] nickname
was Abū Mu‘awiyyah. The people of his generation and those after them unanimously agreed on his piety, abundant memorized narrations, precision, and diligence. However, in this narration he was a mudallīs, since he said that he narrated from Sulaimān at-Tāimi. If a mudallīs uses the word “from,” his narration is invalid for proof unless there is a way to prove that he heard this particular hadīth in another narration. All narrations of this type in both books of Sahīh are considered to be authenticated in another way, including this hadīth.

“Abū ‘Uthmān an-Nahdi” was named for one of his grandfathers, Nahd bin Zaid bin Laith. Abū ‘Uthmān is one of the seniors of the Tābi‘īn and among the best of them. His name is ‘Abdur-Rahmān bin Mal. He embraced Islām when the Prophet was alive, but he had not met him.

He heard from a large number of the Companions. Many Tābi‘īn narrated from him. He was from al-Kūfah, but moved to Baṣrāh after al-Ḥusain was murdered. He said, “I would never live in a place where the son of the Messenger’s daughter was killed.”

We related from Ahmad bin Ḥanbal, “I do not know anyone from the Tābi‘īn better than Abū ‘Uthmān an-Nahdi and Qaḯs bin Ḥāzim.”

We related that Abū ‘Uthmān said about himself, “I have lived almost 130 years. Everything has become unstable around me except my hope, which remains the same.” He died 95 or 100 AH; and Allāh knows best.

The ahādīth in this chapter strongly discourage from repeating everything one hears, which mostly contains both truth and lies. Repeating everything one hears inevitably leads to repeating a baseless lie.

It has been mentioned earlier that lying is saying something that

---

21 [Translator’s note] Mudallīs: a narrator who intentionally overlooks the immediate narrator from which he heard the narration and jumps to the one who is two steps ahead of him in the chain of narration.
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opposes reality, and that intent is not a condition for it be considered a lie. However, intent is a condition for it to be a sin; and Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

Abuṭ-Ṭāhir Āḥmad bin ‘Amr bin Sarḥ narrated to me that Ibn Wahb narrated to [him] that Mālik said to him, “Know that a man who relates everything he hears is not to be trusted, and he can never be an Imām as long as he narrates [everything he hears].”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Ibn Wahb” was ‘Abdullāh bin Wahb bin Muslim, Abū Muḥammad al-Qurashi al-Fihri Maulāhum al-Ḍaṣrī. He was a well known Imām about whom there is unanimous agreement on his exquisite memorization, precision, and character.

“One can never be an Imām as long as he narrates everything he hears” — If a narrator were to relate everything he heard, mistakes would increase in his narration, and thus his narrations would be abandoned.

Imām Muslim said:

Muḥammad bin al-Muthannā narrated to us that ‘Abdur-Rahmān narrated to [him] that Sūfīyān narrated to [him] on the authority of Abū Ishāq, on the authority of Abū Aḥwāṣ, on the authority of ‘Abdullāh that he said, “It is enough of a lie for one to narrate everything one hears.”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“‘Abdur-Rahmān” was Ibn Mahdi, the famous Imām. His
nickname was Abū Sa‘īd al-Baṣrī.

“Sufyān ath-Thawrī” was the well-known Imām. His nickname was Abū ‘Abdillāh al-Kūfī.

“Abū Ishāq” was known as as-Sabī‘i. His full name was ‘Amr bin ‘Abdillāh al-Hamadānī al-Kūfī. He was a respected Tābī‘i. Ahmad bin ‘Abdillāh al-Ujjali said about him, “He heard [ahādīth] from 38 Companions.” ‘Ali bin al-Madīnī said, “He narrated [ahādīth] from 87 Companions and he was the only one to narrate from them.” He was named for one of his grandfathers, as-Sabī‘ bin Sa‘b bin Mu‘āwiyah.

“‘Abdullāh” was ‘Abdullāh bin Mas‘ūd, the respected Companion; his nickname was Abū ‘Abdir-Raḥmān al-Kūfī.

Imām Muslim said:

Mūhammad bin al-Muthannā narrated to us, “I heard ‘Abdur-Raḥmān bin Mahdi saying, ‘A man cannot be an Imām whose example is followed until he witholds from [narrating] some of what he hears.’”

Yahyā bin Yahyā narrated to us that ‘Umar bin ‘Ali bin Muqaddam informed [him] on the authority of Sufyān bin Ḥusain that he said, “Iyās bin Mu‘āwiyah asked me, ‘Indeed, [since] I see that you love knowledge of the Qur‘ān, recite for me a surah and explain it so that I can reflect on what you know.’” [Sufyān] said, “So I did. Then [Iyās] said to me, ‘Remember what I am about to say to you: Beware of abominations in hadīth, for indeed rarely does anyone convey them except that he lowers himself and his hadīth are denied.’”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“I see that you love knowledge of the Qur‘ān” — This means “you have become fond of it and adhere to it.” Az-Zamakhshārī
commented, “To love something means to be wholeheartedly fond of it, which involves exerting effort for the sake of it.”

“Beware of abominations in hadīth” — An “abomination” refers to a distasteful act. In this context, Iyās warned Sufyān against narrating munkar ahādīth whose narrator’s reputation is denounced. Upon narrating such ahādīth, people would doubt him, which would eventually lower his rank; and Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

Abu-Ṭāhir and Ḥarmalah bin Yaḥyā narrated to me that Ibn Wahb narrated to [them] that Yūnus informed [him], on the authority of Ibn Shihāb, on the authority of ‘Ubaidullāh bin ‘Abdillāh bin ‘Utba, that ‘Abdullāh bin Mās‘ūd said, “It is the [honest truth] that you must not relate to people that which they cannot grasp without a fitnāh [entering the minds] of some of them.”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Yūnus” was Yūnus bin Yazīd Abū Yazīd al-Qurashi al-Ummawi Mūlāhum al-Awwāl.

“Ibn Shihāb” was the very famous Imām and respected Tābi‘ī. His name was Muḥammad bin Muḥsin bin ‘Ubaidillāh bin ‘Abdillāh bin Shihāb bin ‘Abdillāh bin al-Ḥārith bin Zuhrah bin Kīlāb bin Murrah bin Ka‘b bin Lu‘ayy Abū Bakr al-Qurashi az-Zuhri al-Madani. He lived in ash-Shām.

He met around ten of the Companions, and narrated much from the Tābi‘īn, who likewise narrated much from him. His status in knowledge, memorization, precision, and diligence in seeking knowledge and embracing patience in seeking it—not to mention his full dedication to knowledge, worship, piety, generosity, and heedlessness of the dunyā among numerous kinds of good—is well known.
'Ubaidullāh bin 'Abdillāh was one of the seven jurists.\textsuperscript{22} He was a respected İmām.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{22} [Translator's note] Seven jurists: Seven major contemporaneous scholars from among the Ṭabā'īn, entrusted with fatāwā in Madinah. [\textit{Al-Mawsī'āt al-Fiqhīyyah} (1/364)]
Chapter:

The Prohibition of Narrating From the Weak and Taking Precaution in Learning Those Narrations

*Imām Muslim* said:

Muḥammad bin ‘Abdillāh bin Numair and Zuhair bin Ḥarb narrated to me that ‘Abdullāh bin Yazīd narrated to [them] that Sa‘īd bin Abī Ayyūb narrated to [him] that Abū Hāni‘ narrated to [him] on the authority of Abū ‘Uthmān Muslim bin Yasār, on the authority of Abū Hurairah, on the authority of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ that he said, *There will be, at the end of my nation, people narrating to you that which neither you nor your fathers heard, so beware of them.*


*Imām an-Nawawi* commented:

Ḥarmalah bin Yaḥyā bin ‘Abdillāh bin Ḥarmalah bin ‘Imrān at-Tujībi narrated to me that Ibn Wahh narrated to [him] that Abū Shurail narrated to [him] that he heard Sharāhīl bin Yazīd saying, “Muslim bin Yasār informed me that he heard Abū Hurairah saying, ‘The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said, *There will be at the end of time charlatans coming to you with narrations that neither you nor your fathers heard, so beware of them lest they misguide you and cause tribulation.*’”

---

23 *Imām an-Nawawi* commented: This chapter revolves around omitting the narrations of unknown narrators and general precautionary measures in narrating *ahādīth* such that they must be taken only from qualified people. In addition, narration from the weak must be avoided; and Allāh knows best.
Haarmalah bin Yahyā at-Tujibī’s nicknames were Abū Ḥafṣ and Abū ‘Abdillāh. He was a companion of Imām ash-Shāfi‘ī who narrated the famous book of ash-Shāfi‘ī’s fiqh; and Allāh knows best.

Shuraiḥ was ‘Abdur-Rahmān bin Shuraiḥ bin ‘Ubaiddillāh, from Alexandria, Egypt. He was known as a committed worshipper and a respected man.

Imām Muslim said:

Abū Sa‘īd al-Ashajj narrated to me that Wākī’ narrated to [him] that al-A‘mash narrated to [him] on the authority of al-Musayyab bin Rāfī’, on the authority of `Āmir bin ‘Abdah that ‘Abdullāh [bin Mas‘ūd] said, “Indeed Satan will appear in the form of a man and he will come to the people, narrating to them false aḥādīth, and they will then depart. Then a man among them will say, ‘I heard a man whose face I recognize but whose name I do not know narrating [such-and-such]...’”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

The isnād of this hadith has two interesting characteristics. The first is that all of its narrators are from al-Kūfah. The second is that three Tābi‘īn narrate from each other: al-A‘mash, al-Mussayyab, and `Āmir. This is a very precious benefit since it is very rare to find two such characteristics in a single isnād.

“Abū Sa‘īd al-Ashajj” was Muslim’s shaikh. His name was ‘Abdullāh bin Sa‘īd bin Ḥusain al-Kindi from al-Kūfah. Abū Ḥātim said, “Abū Sa‘īd al-Ashajj is the Imām of his time.”

“Al-Mussayyab bin Rāfī’” was not the same person as Sa‘īd bin al-Musayyib, as will be discussed later, if Allāh wills.

“`Āmir bin ‘Abdah” has two opinions regarding his last name. It was either ‘Abadah, which is more often used and is the correct one, or ‘Abdah.
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Al-Qādi ʿIyād said, “We narrated that his last name is ʿAbadah from ʿAlī bin al-Madīnī, Yaḥyā bin Maʿīn, and Abū Muslim al-Mustamli.” He added, “We narrated the version ʿAbdah from Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal and others.” Al-Qādi also said, “Most narrators mention his last name without the letter ‘ḥ’; however, it is correct to mention it, as maintained by memorizers like Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal, ʿAlī bin al-Madīnī, Yaḥyā bin Maʿīn, ad-Dāraqūṭnī, ʿAbdul-Ghānī bin Saʿīd, and others; and Allāh knows best.”

Imām Muslim said:

Muḥammad bin Rāfīʿ narrated to me that ʿAbdur-Razzāq narrated to [him] that Maʾmar informed [him] on the authority of Ibn Tawus, on the authority of his father, on the authority of ʿAbdullāh bin ʿAmr bin al-ʿĀṣ that he said, “Indeed in the sea are devils chained up, whom Sulaimān shackled, about to emerge. [When they do], they will recite Qurʾān to the people.”

Imām an-Nawawī commented:

“Ibn Tawus” is ʿAbdullāh az-Zāhīd aṣ-Ṣāliḥ bin az-Zāhīd aṣ-Ṣāliḥ.

An interesting fact about ʿAbdullāh bin ʿAmr bin al-ʿĀṣ is that his father was only 11 or 12 years older than him.

“...about to emerge. [When they do], they will recite Qurʾān to the people” — They will read something other than Qurʾān while claiming it is Qurʾān, in order to mislead the laymen, but the laymen will not believe them.

---

24 [Translator’s note] Someone might ask: Why are many opinions over a narrator’s last name mentioned here? Does it really matter? The answer is yes. There is an independent field of research dedicated exclusively to the names of narrators, their nicknames, their families’ names, and everything related to their lineage. This is obviously due to the importance of protecting this religion. Everyone who narrates hadith must be investigated and scrutinized in order to assure the degree of authenticity of any given narration.
Imām Muslim said:

Muḥammad bin ‘Abbād and Saʻīd bin ‘Amr al-Ash‘athi narrated to me on the authority of Ibn ‘Uyainah. Saʻīd said Sufyān informed us on the authority of Hishām bin ʻUjair, on the authority of Tāwus that (Bushair bin Ka‘b) came to Ibn ʻAbbās and began narrating to him. Ibn ʻAbbās said to him, “Go back to such-and-such narration.” [Bushair] repeated it. So [Ibn ʻAbbās] said to him, “Go back to such-and-such narration.” [Bushair] repeated it. Then [Bushair] said to him, “[Is it that] you know all of my ahādīth and you reject the rest, or that you reject all of my ahādīth and know the rest?” Ibn ʻAbbās said to him, “Indeed we used to listen [to any narration that started with] ‘on the authority of the Messenger of Allāh,’ ؛ at a time when no one would lie upon him. However, when the people took the difficult and the facile, we abandoned listening to ahādīth from them.”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

Saʻīd bin ‘Amr al-Ash‘athi’s last name comes from his grandfather, Saʻīd bin Sahl bin Ishāq bin Muḥammad bin Ash‘ath bin Qais al-Kindī, Abū ʻUmar al-Kūfī.

“Hishām bin ʻUjair” was from Makkah.

The word “difficult” in “when the people took the difficult and the facile” refers to things that are difficult to attain but desirable, while the word “facile” refers to easy, enjoyable, and desirable things. In brief, [the phrase describes the way] people took every path, whether praiseworthy or blameworthy.

Imām Muslim said:

Muḥammad bin Rāfi’ narrated to me that ‘Abdur-Razzāq narrated to [him] Ma‘mar informed [him] on the authority of Ibn Tāwus, on
the authority of his father, on the authority of Ibn ‘Abbās that he said, “Indeed we would take and be taken from on the authority of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ. However, if you take every difficult and facile [narration], how far that is [from integrity]!”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

The phrase “how far that is” means “how far from integrity,” or, “it is unlikely that we will accept the narrations [from one such as this].” This expression is used to indicate that something has absolutely no hope of achieving its aim. It also expresses the speaker’s own belief that what he is referring to is hopeless.

Imām Muslim said:

Abū Ayyūb Sulaimān bin ‘Ubaidillāh al-Ghailānī narrated to us, Abū ‘Āmir (al-Aqādi) narrated to [him] that Rabāḥ narrated to [him] on the authority of Qais bin Sa’d, on the authority of Mujāhid that he said Bushair al-‘Adawi came to Ibn ‘Abbās and began narrating to him, “The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said [such-and-such],” and, “The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said [such-and-such].” However, it seemed that Ibn ‘Abbās was not listening to or considering his [narrations], so [Bushair] said, “Oh Ibn ‘Abbās, why is it that I see you being inattentive to my ahadīth? I narrate to you on the authority of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ; however, you are not listening.” Ibn ‘Abbās said, “Indeed, at one time we would listen to [anyone] who said, ‘The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said [such-and-such],’ rushing towards him with our eyes and hearkening towards him with our ears. But when the people took the difficult and the facile, we no longer took from people except what we knew.”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Abū ‘Āmir al-Aqādi” was from a famous tribe called ‘Aqād.
“Rabāḥ” was named Rabāḥ bin Abī Ma'rūf. Notably, this name is mentioned in both books of Sahih with this spelling except [one instance where it is listed as] Ziyād bin Rayāḥ Abū Qais who narrated from Abū Hurairah ḥadīth of signs of the Hour (Day of Judgment). However, al-Bukhārī mentioned that his name is spelled both ways: Rabāḥ and Rayāḥ.

“At one time” refers to the period before lying [upon the Prophet] became widespread.

Imām Muslim said:

Dāwūd bin ‘Amr aḍ-Ḍabbi narrated to us that Nāfi’ bin ‘Umar narrated to [him] on the authority of Ibn Abī Mulaikah that he said, “I wrote to Ibn ‘Abbās asking him to write something [pertaining to knowledge] for me. [However], he withheld from me quite a bit, [saying to himself], ‘I will write for him something especially suited to his status and withhold from him that which will not benefit him, as [if he were] an innocent child.’” [Ibn Abī Mulaikah] said, “So [Ibn ‘Abbās] called for the judgment of ‘Ali [bin Abī Ṭālib] and began to write from it [with respect to the request of Ibn Abī Mulaikah]. [While writing], he came upon something [inconsistent with the standards of ‘Ali regarding the science of verdicts], and said: ‘By Allāh, ‘Ali did not judge according to this unless he was astray.’”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Nāfi’ bin ‘Umar,” who narrated from Ibn Abī Mulaikah, was al-Qurashi al-Jumaḥi al-Makki.

“Ibn Abī Mulaikah” was named ‘Abdullāh bin ‘Ubaidillāh bin Abī Mulaikah. Abī Mulaikah’s name was Zuhair bin ‘Abdillāh bin Jud‘ān bin ‘Amr bin Ka’b bin Sa’d bin Taim bin Murrah at-Taimi al-Makki,

[Translator’s note] The “judgment” of ‘Alī was a book with which ‘Alī would pass verdicts in al-Kūfah.
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Abū Bakr. He was a judge and used to be the mu‘adhibin [caller to prayer] for Ibn az-Zubair.

"Withheld" means refrained from divulging. Imām Abū ʿAmr bin aṣ-Ṣalāḥ said, "Ibn ʿAbbās did not put in writing [certain things in his letter to his addressee] because they contained things that would provoke the different sects, and people who added fuel to the fire [of discontent] would hold them against him." He added, "It was unnecessary for Ibn Abī Mulaikah to know them. If it were necessary, he would have delivered his words orally rather than in writing. In addition, the phrase 'an innocent child' signifies what I mentioned. The sentence 'I will write for him something especially suited to his status and withhold from him that which will not benefit him' implies that he acceded to his request."

"By Allāh, ‘Alī did not judge according to this unless he was astray" means nobody would judge as such except a misguided person, and ‘Alī would never judge as such without knowing he had erred; but [Ibn ʿAbbās] knew [‘Alī] had not gone astray, and thus that he never judged in that manner; and Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

‘Amr an-Nāqid narrated to us that Sufyān bin ʿUyainah narrated to [him] on the authority of Hishām bin Ḥujair, on the authority of Tāwus that he said, "A book was brought to Ibn ʿAbbās containing the verdicts of ‘Alī and he effaced it all except a small amount," and Sufyān bin ʿUyainah indicated the amount with his arm.26

Ḥasan bin ‘Alī al-Ḥulwānī narrated to us that Yahyā bin Ādam narrated to [him] that Ibn Idrīs narrated to [him] on the authority of al-A’mah, on the authority of Abū Ishāq who said, "When they innovated [certain] things after ‘Alī, a man from the companions of ‘Alī said, 'May Allāh curse them. Did they corrupt every [type of] knowledge?"

26 [Translator’s note] Imām an-Nawawi commented: It means that the distance of the erased part was equal to an arm’s length. It appears that book was a rectangular scroll; and Allāh knows best.
Imām an-Nawawī commented:

Ali the narrators of the [second] narration’s isnād were from al-Kūfah except al-Ḥulwānī.

“Ibn Idrīs,” who narrated from al-A’mash, was named ʿAbdullāh bin Idrīs bin Yazīd al-Ūdī al-Kūfī, Abū Muḥammad. There is unanimous agreement that he was a prestigious, respected, precise, virtuous, pious, and obedient Imām. We have related that he told his daughter on his deathbed when she was crying, “Don’t cry! I have finished reciting the Qur’ān in this house 4,000 times.” ʿAbd Allāh bin Ḥanbal said, “Ibn Idrīs was peerless.”

“Al-A’mash Sulaimān bin Mahrān,” Abū Muḥammad was a Tābi’ī, as was ʿAmr bin ʿAbdillāh as-Sabī’. Both were mentioned earlier.

The word “knowledge” refers to ʿAlī’s knowledge and narrations, into which the Shi‘ah incorporated their ideas, falsely attributing them to him. Besides fabricating statements and narrations, they mixed them with the truth, which resulted in obscuring the reality from falsehood. Therefore, they brought the curse upon themselves due to the appalling wrongdoing many of them perpetrated. However, generally speaking, cursing a Muslim is unlawful.

Imām Muslim said:

ʿAlī bin Khashram narrated to us that Abū Bakr (bin ʿAyyāsh) informed [him], “I heard al-Mughīrah saying, ‘There are no ahādīth on the authority of ʿAlī confirmed to be true except from the companions of ʿAbdullāh bin Masʿūd.’”

Imām an-Nawawī commented:

“ʿAlī bin Khashram” was nicknamed Abul-Ḥasan Mirwazi. He
was the nephew of Bishr bin al-Ḥārith al-Ḥāfi ٓ.

As for Abū Bakr bin ʿAyyāsh, he was an Imām about whom there is unanimous agreement regarding his virtue. There was differing regarding his name. Scholars maintained that his name was identical to his nickname and he had no other names; however, his name [has also been listed as] Muḥammad, ʿAbdullāh, Sālim, Shuʿbah, Ruʿbah, Muslim, Khaddāsh, Muṭarrīf, Ḥammād, and Ḥābīb.

We related from his son Ibrāhīm, “My father told me that he had never committed an indecent act, and that he recited the whole Qurʾān once a day for 30 straight years.”

In addition, we related that he told his son, “Son, do not disobey Allāh in this room, for I have finished the recitation of the whole Qurʾān 12,000 times [here].” He also said to his daughter when he was about to die, “Don’t cry, my daughter! Are you afraid Allāh would punish me after I have recited the whole Qurʾān 24,000 times in that corner?”

This is as far as people of this caliber are concerned. The reader should not, by any means, deny the deeds of these irreplaceable people because of whom mercy descends. Such denial is a sign of one’s own doom. May Allāh guide us to His obedience by His grace.

“Al-Mughirah” was named ʿIbn Miqṣam aḍ-Ḍabī ʿAbŪ Hishām.
Chapter:

That Which is Related to Statements Regarding Protection of This Religion Through Its Trustworthy Narrators

Imām Muslim said:

Ḥasan bin ar-Rabi’ narrated to us that Ḥammād bin Zaid narrated to [him] on the authority of Ayyūb and Hishām [bin Ḥassān], on the authority of Muḥammad [bin Sīrīn] that Fuṣail [bin ‘Iyād] narrated to [him] on the authority of Hishām [bin Ḥassān] that he said Mukhlad bin Ḥusain narrated to [him] on the authority of Hishām [bin Ḥassān], on the authority of Muḥammad bin Sīrīn that he said, “Indeed this knowledge is religion, so carefully consider from whom you take your religion.”

Abū Ja’far Muḥammad bin aṣ-Ṣabbāḥ narrated to us that Ismā‘īl bin Zakariyya’ narrated to [him] on the authority of ‘Āṣim al-Aḥwal, on the authority of Ibn Sīrīn that he said, “[The people] did not used to ask about the chains of narration, but when the fitnah occurred, they started to say, ‘Name your narrators.’ Thus, narrators of Ahlus-Sunnah would be considered, and their ahādīth were accepted, while those of abdul-bid’ah would be considered, but their ahādīth were not taken.”  

Iṣḥāq bin Ibrāhīm al-Ḥanẓali narrated to us that ‘Īsā (bin Yūnus) informed him that al-Awzā‘i narrated to him on the authority of Sulaimān bin Mūsā that he said, “I met Tāwus and said, ‘So-and-so

27 Imām an-Nawawi commented: The issue of taking ahādīth from innovators has been discussed earlier and we have explained the different positions regarding it.
narrated to me such-and-such.’ He replied, ‘If your companion is trustworthy, accept [his narrations].’”

ʿAbdullāh bin ʿAbdīr-Raḥmān ad-Dārīmī narrated to us that Marwān [bin Muḥammad ad-Dimashqī] informed [him] that Saʿīd bin ʿAbdīl-ʿAzīz narrated to [him] on the authority of Sulaimān bin Mūsā that he said, “I said to Tāwūs, ‘So-and-so narrated to me such-and-such.’ He said, ‘If your companion is trustworthy, accept [his narrations].’”

Imām an-Nawawī commented:

“Īsḥāq bin Ibrāhīm al-Ḥanẓālī” was the famous Imām Ibn Rāḥwayḥ, the top memorizer of his time.

“Al-Awzāʾī” was named Abū ʿAmr ʿAbdūr-Raḥmān bin ʿAmr bin Yuḥmīd ad-Dimashqī. He was the unrivaled and uncontested Imām of ash-Shām in his time. He lived in Damascus but moved to Beirut, where he lived for the rest of his life.

There is consensus that he was an Imām and a highly respected, prestigious scholar at the peak of virtue. The statements of the Salaf regarding his leadership, piety, ḥusn, zeal for the truth, unlimited narrations, outstanding perception, eloquence, and adherence to the Sunnah are countless. The elite scholars of his time from all over the ʾummah respected him and acknowledged how exceptional he was.

We related from various sources that he gave fatāwā on 70,000 issues. He narrated aḥādīth from the seniors among the Tābīʿīn. Interestingly, Qatādah, az-Zuhrī, and Yahyā bin Kathīr (among the Tābīʿīn) narrated aḥādīth from him, although he was not a Tābīʿī. This type of narration is classified as one where a senior narrates from his juniors.

There is a difference of opinion over the origin of his nickname, al-Awzāʾī. It was said that it was a tribe from Yemen or a village in Damascus. Abū Zurʿah ad-Dimashqī said, “His name was originally
‘Abdul-Azīz, but later he changed his name to ‘Abdur-Raḥmān. He frequently visited al-Awzā’, and hence the name.” And Allāh knows best.

“Trustworthy” refers to someone precise and whose belief and knowledge are sound, as when you trust someone with money because you trust his word.

“‘Abdullāh bin ‘Abdir-Raḥmān ad-Dārīmi” refers to ad-Dārīmi, who is known to have a hadith compilation (musnad) of his own. His nickname was Abū Muḥammad as-Samarqandi. His surname was taken from Dārim bin Mālik bin Ḥanẓalah bin Zaid Manāh bin Tamīm.

He was one of the memorizers of his time; there were very few people who could come close to his rank, virtue, and memorization. Raja’ bin Marji said, “I don’t know anyone more knowledgeable in the aḥādīth of the Messenger of Allāh than ad-Dārīmi.”

Abū Ḥātim said, “He is the Imām of his time.” Abū Ḥāmid bin ash-Sharqi said, “Khurāsān was the birthplace of five Imāms of hadith: Muḥammad bin Yahyā, Muḥammad bin Ismāʿīl [al-Bukhārī], ‘Abdullāh bin ‘Abdir-Raḥmān [ad-Dārīmi], Muslim bin al-Ḥajjāj, and Ibrāhīm bin Abī Ṭālib.”

Muḥammad bin ‘Abdillāh said, “Ad-Dārīmi came ahead of us by means of his memorization and piety.”

Ad-Dārīmi was born in 181 AH and died in 255 AH 185.

Imām Muslim said:

Naṣr bin ‘Alī al-Jahdāmi narrated to us that al-ʿAsmaʿi narrated to him on the authority of Ibn Abiz-Zinād, on the authority of his father that he said, “I met 100 [transmitters] in al-Madīnah, each of whom were reliable. Narrations were not taken from anyone about whom it was said, ‘He is not from its people [meaning he was unqualified].’”
Imām an-Nawawī commented:

“Al-Jahdi” is a surname taken from the name of a village in Baṣrah, as maintained by Imām al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Sa’d ‘Abdul-Karīm bin Muḥammad bin Manṣūr as-Samā‘ī in his book Genealogy. He added, “Naṣr bin ‘Alī was the senior judge of Baṣrah, a meticulous scholar. The head of the Muslim state once called him in order to offer him a judiciary post. He told him, ‘I shall go back home and make istikbārah.’ He returned home in the middle of the day, prayed two rakā‘āt, and said, ‘O Allāh, if you have something good for me [with you], then take my life up to you.’ He then fell asleep, but when his family came to wake him, they found him dead. This was in Rabī’ al-Awwal 250 AH.”

“Al-Aṣma‘ī” was one of the most famous linguists, and highly reliable. His name was ‘Abdul-Mālik bin Quraib bin ‘Abdul-Mālik bin Aṣma‘ al-Baṣrī, Abū Sa‘īd. He was known by his grandfather’s name. Al-Aṣma‘ī was a trustworthy and accurate narrator. He was an encyclopedia of language, grammar, rare words, reports, and verses.

Ash-Shāfi‘ī said, “I have never seen anyone more truthful than al-Aṣma‘ī.” He added, “There is not a single Arab more eloquent than al-Aṣma‘ī.” Remarkably, we related that he said he memorized 16,000 poems.

“Ibn Abiz-Zinād” was named ‘Abdur-Rahmān. He had three children who narrated from him: ‘Abdur-Rahmān, Qāsim, and Abul-Qāsim. His father’s name was ‘Abdullāh bin Dhakwān. His nickname was Abū ‘Abdīr-Rahmān. He hated the nickname “Abuz-Zinād” but was known by it anyway.

He was Qurashi Maulāhum Madani. Notably, ath-Thawri used to call him “the head of believers” in the science of hadith. Al-Bukhārī said, “The most authentic reports of Abū Hurairah are those narrated by Abuz-Zinād from al-‘Araj from Abū Hurairah.” Muṣ‘ab said, “Abuz-Zinād was the highest faqīḥ (authoritative scholar) of Madīnah.”
Imām Muslim said:

Muḥammad bin Abī Umar al-Makki narrated to us that Sufyān narrated to [him]—and also Abū Bakr bin Khallād al-Bahili narrated to us (and the wording is his)—the following: “I heard Sufyān bin ‘Uyainah on the authority of ‘Umar that he said, ‘I heard Sa’d bin Ibrāhīm saying, ‘There is no narrating on the authority of the Messenger of Allāh  except by thiqāt [trustworthy narrators].’””

Muḥammad bin ‘Abdillāh bin Quhzādḥ from the people of Marw narrated to us, “I heard ‘Abdān bin ‘Uthmān saying, ‘I heard ‘Abdullāh bin al-Mubārak saying, “The isnād is from the religion, and were it not for the isnād, whoever wished could say whatever he wanted.””

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

All the narrators of this isnād are from Khūrāsān from our shaikh Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm bin ‘Amr bin Muṣar to the end of the isnād.

I have mentioned [elsewhere] that the narrators in this isnād from our shaikh to Muslim were all from Naisābūr, in Khūrāsān. However, Muḥammad, ‘Abdān, and Ibn al-Mubārak were from Mirwaz, [although this is also] in Khūrāsān. Such a chain of narrators [in close geographical proximity to each other] is extremely rare in these times.

“Quhzādḥ” was famous by this name. Ibn Mākullā said, “Muḥammad bin ‘Abdillāh bin Quhzādḥ died on the tenth of Muḥarram, 262 AH.” Thus, Muslim Ḥ died five and a half months before his shaikh.

“‘Abdān” was the nickname of ‘Abdullāh bin ‘Uthmān bin Jibblah al-‘Atki Maulāhum Abū ‘Abdīr-Raḥmān al-Mirwazi. Al-Bukhārī said

28 [Translator's note] This city was extremely famous due to the countless scholars born there. It is located in ’Irān.
in his book *al-Tārīkh*, “‘Abdān died in 221 or 222 AH.”

*Ibn al-Mubārak* was a respected man, embodying all virtues. His name was Abū ‘Abdīr-Raḥmān ‘Abdullāh bin al-Mubārak bin Wādīh al-Ḥanẓali Maulāhum. He heard [narrations] from many Tābī‘īn. Many scholars, including his own teachers and top scholars of his time like Sufyān ath-Thawri and Fuḍail bin ʻIyād, have narrated from him. They have unanimously agreed on his respectability, prominence, prestige, and high rank.

We related from al-Ḥasan bin ʻĪsā, “A group of Ibn al-Mubārak’s companions, including al-Faḍl bin Mūsā, Mīkhīl bin Ḥusayn, and Muḥammad bin an-Naḍr met once. They said about Ibn al-Mubārak, ‘He was fully equipped with knowledge, *fiqh*, literature, grammar, language, *ṣubḥ*, poetry, eloquence, piety, fairness, worship, firmness of opinion, minding his own business, and being easygoing with his companions.’”

Al-ʻAbbās bin Muṣʿab said, “Ibn al-Mubārak was fully equipped with the knowledge of *hadīth*, *fiqh*, Arabic language, tribal politics, and trade. He embodied [noble traits] like courage, generosity, and the love of all the differing sects for him.”

In addition, Muḥammad bin Sa’d said, “Ibn al-Mubārak authored a lot of books in different disciplines and his status is widely known.”

His town, Marw, is a big city in Khurāsān. There are four main cities in Khurāsān: Naisābūr, Marw, Balkh, and Hirāh; and Allāh knows best.

............................................................................................................................

*Imām Muslim said:*

Muḥammad bin ʻAbdillāh said, “Al-ʻAbbās bin Abī Rizmah narrated to me, ‘I heard ‘Abdullāh [bin al-Mubārak] saying, “Between us and the people are ‘the legs’ (meaning the chain of narration, i.e. if a *hadīth* could be a creature).’””
Imām an-Nawawī commented:

This narration means that whoever brings out an authentic istrād, will have it accepted. Otherwise, it will not be accepted. He compared ḥadīth, which cannot be accepted except with istrād, to a creature that cannot stand without legs.

The narrator, al-ʿAbbās bin Abī Rizmah, is found with a different name in some of the major books: al-ʿAbbās bin Rizmah, which can cause confusion given that neither of these names are provided by either al-Bukhārī in at-Tārīkh or in books concerned with listing narrators’ names. The only given name listed for him is ʿAbdul-ʿAzīz bin Abī Rizmah, Abū Muḥammad al-Mirwazi.

He heard narrations from ʿAbdullāh bin al-Mubārak, and he died in al-Muḥarram 260 AH. Abū Rizmah’s name was Ghazwān; and Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

Muḥammad said, “I heard Abā Ishāq Ibrāhīm bin ʿĪsā at-Ṭalaqānī say, ‘I said to ʿAbdullāh bin al-Mubārak, ‘Oh Abā ʿAbdir-Rahmān, [what is the status of] the ḥadīth, ‘Indeed from great kindness is that you pray for your parents after you pray for yourself and you fast for them both after you fast for yourself?”

“[Ibn al-Mubārak] replied, “Oh Abā Ishāq, on whose authority is this?” I said to him, “This is a ḥadīth from Shihāb bin Khirāsh.” [Ibn al-Mubārak] said, ‘[He is] trustworthy. On whose authority [did he transmit]?” I said, “On the authority of al-Ḥajjāj bin Dīnār.” [Ibn al-Mubārak] said, “[He is] trustworthy. On whose authority [did he transmit]?” I said, “[Al-Ḥajjāj said] the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said [so].” [Ibn al-Mubārak] said, “Oh Abā Ishāq, indeed between al-Ḥajjāj bin Dīnār and the Prophet ﷺ is a wilderness in the midst of which the necks of riding beasts are severed [because the journey is too long]. However, there is no difference of opinion regarding charity [offered on behalf of one’s parents].’’’
Imâm an-Nawawi commented:

“Shihâb bin Khirâsh” was the only “Khirâsh” mentioned in the two books of Ṣaḥîh, and he was Abû Rib‘î.

“Wilderness” refers to a desolate place far from civilization and void of provision. This word creates a vivid metaphor because al-Ḥajjâj bin Dînâr succeeded the Tâbi‘în, so the least number of narrators there could be between him and the Prophet is two: a Tâbi‘î and a Companion. Therefore, he used the word “wilderness” to indicate the huge gap.

“There is no difference of opinion regarding charity [offered on behalf of one’s parents]” — This narration was not inserted for the purpose of contextual argument; [however, it shall be expounded upon here].

Whoever desires to express his gratitude for his parents should give charity on their behalf, because the [reward] of charity reaches the deceased person, who benefits from it. This is subject to different opinions; however, that is the right position.

Abul-Ḥasan al-Mâward al- Başrî, a Shâﬁ‘î jurist, quoted theologians in his book al-Ḥâwi who maintained that the deceased is not rewarded at all after death; however, this is an obvious mistake that goes against the textual proofs of the Qur‘ân, Sunnah, and the consensus of Imâms, and it is to be disregarded.

The reward for praying and fasting, according to the school of ash-Shâﬁ‘î and the majority of scholars, does not reach the deceased unless the fasting offered as charity would have been obligatory upon him or her. And in this case, the deceased’s guardian or the person assigned by him or her should be the one to fast on his or her behalf.

Ash-Shâﬁ‘î has two positions regarding this situation. The popular one maintains it is not permissible; however, the verifiers among the
latter Shāfi‘i adopters hold that it is permissible.

As for reciting Qur‘ān, the popular opinion in the Shāfi‘i school is that its reward does not reach the deceased, although some of his school’s adopters say that it does. Moreover, a group of scholars maintain that the reward of all acts of worship reaches the deceased including prayer, fasting, Qur‘ān recitation, and so on.

In ِṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī’s chapter titled “A person who died with an unfulfilled vow,” Ibn ‘Umar instructed a daughter whose mother died having missed a prayer to pray on her behalf. Also, it is mentioned in al-Ĥāfīz that ‘Aṭā’ bin Abī Rabāḥ and Ishāq bin Rāhwayh said it is permissible to pray on behalf of the deceased.

Shaikh Abū Sa‘d ‘Abdullāh bin Muḥammad bin Hibatullāh bin Abī ‘Aṣrūn, one of our latter Shāfi‘i school adopters, supported the earlier opinion in his book al-İniṣār. Additionally, Imām Abū Muḥammad al-Baghawi, a fellow Shāfi‘i, maintained in his book al-Tahdhib that one could give out portions of food for charity to make up for each prayer.

However, all of these opinions are weak and their proof relies on analogies between prayer and supplication, charity, and Ḥaḍj, whose reward is unanimously held to reach the deceased. The proof of ash-Shāfi‘i and those who agree with him is Allāh’s statement:

وَإِنَّ لَوَلِّيَتْ لِلْإِنسَانِ إِلَّا مَا سَعَى

And man can have nothing but what he does (good or bad).

[Sūrah an-Najm 53:39]

In addition, [proof is found in] the Prophet’s statement, “When a man dies, his deeds come to an end except for three things: ṣadāqah jā‘rīyah (continuous charity), beneficial knowledge, and a virtuous descendant who prays for him (the deceased).”

Some of the followers of ash-Shāfi‘i differed regarding the reward of the two raka‘āt of ṭawīf performed during the Ḥaḍj, if performed
for one person on behalf of someone he has assigned. And Allâh knows best.

However, the dialogue reported between Abû Ishâq and Ibn al-Mubârak was included by Muslim to support the argument that no narration is acceptable unless it is provided with an authentic isnâd.


Imâm Muslim said:

Muḥammad said, “I heard ‘Alî bin Shaqîq saying, ‘I heard ‘Abdullâh bin al-Mubârak saying publicly, “Abandon the narrations of ‘Amr bin Thâbit, for indeed he would curse the Salaf [i.e. the Companions 🕌].’’”

Abû Bakr bin an-Naḍr bin Abû-Naḍr narrated to me that Abû Nu‘aym Hasîm bin al-Qâsim narrated to [him] that Abû ‘Aqîl, the companion of Buhâyrah, said, “I was sitting near al-Qâsim bin ‘Ubâdillâh and Yaḥyâ bin Sa‘îd [bin Qais al-Madani al-Qâdîl], when Yaḥyâ said to al-Qâsim, ‘Oh Abâ Muḥammad! Indeed, it would be gravely inappropriate for someone like you to be asked about this religion, and no knowledge or relief [in the form of an answer] is found with you’ (or he said, ‘no knowledge or information’). So al-Qâsim said [to Yaḥyâ bin Sa‘îd], ‘From where did [this idea about me] come?’ [Yaḥyâ] said, ‘It is because you are the son of two Imâms of guidance: a descendant of Abû Bakr and ‘Umar’ [Al-Qâsim] said to him, ‘More inappropriate than that—according to anyone who reflects about Allâh—is to speak without knowledge or to take [narrations] from someone who is not trustworthy.’” [Abû ‘Aqîl] said, “So [Yaḥyâ bin Sa‘îd] was quiet.”

Bishr bin al-Ḥâkam al-‘Abdî narrated to me, “I heard Sufyân bin ‘Uyainah saying, they informed me on the authority of Abû ‘Aqîl, the companion of Buhâyrah, that a descendant of ‘Abdullâh bin ‘Umar was asked about something that he did not have knowledge about, so Yaḥyâ bin Sa‘îd said to him, ‘By Allâh, indeed it is a grave matter that the likes of you, a descendant of two Imâms
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of guidance (‘Umar and Ibn ‘Umar), is asked about a matter and you have no knowledge of it.’ So [al-Qāsim] said, ‘By Allāh, more grave than that according to Allāh, and to anyone who reflects about Allāh, is to speak without knowledge or to report on the authority of one who is not trustworthy.’ [Ibn ‘Uyainah] said that Abū ‘Aqīl Yahyā bin al-Mutawakkil witnessed their dialogue.”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Abū Bakr bin an-Nadr bin Abin-Nadr” is mentioned by this name in the available original versions of Sahih Muslim. His more popular name was Abū Bakr bin an-Nadr bin Abin-Nadr. Abun-Nadr was his grandfather, whose name was Ḥāshim bin al-Qāsim, and was nicknamed Qaṣr.

Abū Bakr, however, was known by his name and not his nickname. ‘Abdullāh bin Aḥmad ad-Dawraqi said his name was Aḥmad, while al-Ḥāfiz Abul-Qāsim bin ‘Asākir said that his name was Muḥammad.

“Abū ‘Aqīl, the companion of Buhayyah,” refers to Buhayyah, a woman who narrated ahadith from ‘Ā’ishah, the Mother of Believersﷺ. ‘Ā’ishah called her Buhayyah, as mentioned by Abū ‘Alī al-Ghasṣāni in Taqyid al-Muhmal.

Abū ‘Aqīl, Buhayyah’s master, narrated from her. His name was Yahyā bin al-Mutawakkil ad-Ḍarīr from Madīnah or al-Kūfah. Yahyā bin Ma’in considered him a weak narrator, as well as ‘Alī bin al-Madani, ‘Amr bin ‘Alī, Uthmān bin Sa’īd ad-Dārīmi, Ibn ‘Ammār, and an-Nasā’i. This is mentioned by al-Khaṣīb al-Baghdādi in Tārikh Baghdād, and he provided the isnād for their opinions.

One may ask why Muslim reported from him if he was a weak narrator. The answer is from two angles: First, the criticism of this narrator was not detailed, and Muslim only accepted detailed criticism. The second is that this narration was merely used to support the previous one.
“Al-Qāsim bin ‘Ubaidillāh” was described in two ways: “the son of two Imāms of guidance: a descendant of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar,” and “the son of two Imāms of guidance: a descendant of ‘Umar and Ibn ‘Umar.” There is no difference because his name was al-Qāsim bin ‘Ubaidillāh bin ‘Abdillāh bin ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭāb, which made him the son of both ‘Umar and Ibn ‘Umar. In addition, his mother was Umm ‘Abdillāh, the daughter of al-Qāsim bin Muhammad, the son of Abū Bakr as-Ṣiddiq. So this makes his mother’s great-grandfather Abū Bakr, and his father’s great-grandfather ‘Umar. Ibn ‘Umar was his immediate paternal grandfather.

“They informed me on the authority of Abū ‘Aqīl’ — This statement of Sufyān might be criticized for reporting from unknown narrators; however, as mentioned above, this narration is merely used to support the narration before it. Narrations used for support [may be] marred by weak narrators because reliance for proof is centered on those narrations they support.

Imām Muslim said:

‘Amr bin ‘Alī, Abū Ḥafṣ, narrated, “I heard Yahyā bin Sa‘īd say, ‘I asked Sufyān ath-Thawri, Shu‘bah, Mālik, and Ibn ‘Uyainah [what to say] about a man who is not reliable (thabt) in hadith if someone comes and asks me about him, and they said, “Inform [others] against his unreliability.””’

‘Ubaidullāh bin Sa‘īd narrated to us, “I heard an-Naḍr saying, ‘Ibn ‘Awn was asked about the ḥadīth of Shahr while standing at the threshold of the door, and [Ibn ‘Awn] replied, “Indeed they criticized Shahr...indeed they criticized Shahr.”’” (Muslim said, “He meant the tongues of men were busy criticizing him.”)

Ḥajjāj bin ash-Shā‘ir narrated to me, Shabābāh narrated to [him] that Shu‘bah said, “I met Shahr but I abandoned transmitting from him.”
Imãm an-Nawawi commented:

“İbn ‘Awn” was a respected Imãm about whose piety there is a consensus. His name was ‘Abdullãh bin ‘Awn bin Arifbãn Abû ‘Awn al-Bašri. He was called “the master of scholars.” His virtues are beyond number.

“Criticized him” means they spoke ill of him and disparaged him [as a narrator]. This narration is more popular than the one al-Qãdi ‘Iyãd refers to, which is reported by Sahih Muslim’s narrators and says, “They abandoned him.” Al-Qãdi considered [that one] weak. Scholars other than al-Qãdi maintained that the second narration was incorrect and the explanation provided by Muslim disproves that second narration.

However, the narrator discussed in the narration (Shahr) was not abandoned. Actually, he was deemed trustworthy by the majority of scholars, including Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal and Yahyã bin Ma’in. Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal said, “How wonderful his narrations are,” and he deemed him trustworthy. Further, Aḥmad bin ‘Abdillãh al-‘Ujjali said, “He is a trustworthy Tãbi‘i.” Ibn Abî Khaithamah reported Yahyã bin Ma’in to have said, “He is trustworthy,” without adding anything else.

Abû Zur‘ah said, “He is okay.” At-Tirmidhi said, “Muhammad (i.e. referring to al-Bukhãri) said, “Shahr’s narrations are sound (hasan) and he is a reliable narrator. Only Ibn ‘Awn criticized him, but he also narrated from Hilal bin Abî Zainab, who narrated from Shahr.”

Furthermore, Ya’qub bin Shaibah said, “Shahr is trustworthy.” Salih bin Muhammad said, “There are many from al-Kufah, Basrah, and Shãm who narrated from Shahr. No one has ever witnessed him lying. He was a committed worshipper. The only concern was that he reported ahãdîth he was the only known reporter of.” The previous statements reflect the scholars’ praise of him.

Incidentally, he was criticized for taking a map from the Muslim
state treasury. The verifying scholars gave this incident the benefit of the doubt. The statement of Abū Ḥātim bin Ḥayyān that [Shahr] stole from his friend during Ḥajj is not only deemed inappropriate by the verifiers, but is also denied by them; and Allāh knows best.

As for Shahr’s name, he is Shahr bin Ḥawshab. There are many nicknames mentioned for him, including Abū Sa‘īd, Abū Abdillāh, Abū ‘Abdir-Raḥmān, and Abul-Ja‘d al-Ash‘ari. He was from Ḥimṣ in ash-Shām or Damascus.

“Ḥajjāj bin Yūsuf bin Ḥajjāj ath-Thaqafi, Abū Muḥammad” was from Baghdad. His father was a poet and accompanied Abū Nuwās. This narrator shared the first name, father’s name, nickname, and last name of al-Ḥajjāj bin Yūsuf bin al-Ḥakm ath-Thaqafi, Abū Muḥammad, the well-known oppressing tyrant and blood-shedding ruler. He differed from him in his grandfather’s name, era, uprightness, and gentleness.

As for Shabābah, his name was Shabābah bin Suwār Abū ‘Amr al-Fazāri Maulāhum al-Madani. It was said that his name was Marwān and his nickname was Shabābah.

Imām Muslim said:

Muḥammad bin ʿAbdillāh bin Quhzādh, from the people of Marw, narrated to me that ʿAlī bin Ḥusain bin Wāqīd informed [him] that ʿAbdullāh bin al-Mubārak said, “I said to Sufyān ath-Thawri, ‘Indeed, ʿAbbād bin Kathīr—about whose condition you are aware—introduced a grave matter when he narrated. Do you think I should advise the people not to take from him?’ Sufyān said, ‘Indeed!’” ʿAbdullāh [bin al-Mubārak] said, “So every time I was in an assembly and ʿAbbād was mentioned there, I would praise him regarding his religion but advise [the people] not to take [narrations] from him.”

[Translator’s note] This is the name of a tribe, not to be confused with the sect of al-Ash‘ariyyah.

Imām an-Nawawī commented: He is referring to his knowledge of that narrator’s weakness in narration.
Muḥammad said, “‘Abdullāh bin ‘Uthmān narrated to us [his] father said, ‘Abdullāh bin al-Mubārak said, “I attended an assembly of Shu‘bah, and he said, ‘This is ‘Abbād bin Kathīr, so be warned against him.’””

Al-Faḍl bin Sahl narrated to me, “I asked Mu‘allā ar-Rāzi about Muḥammad bin Sa‘īd, whom ‘Abbād transmitted from, so he informed me that ‘Īsā bin Yūnus said, ‘I was at Muḥammad bin Sa‘īd’s door and Sufyān was with him. When he came out, I asked [Sufyān] about him, and he informed me that he was a liar.’”

Muḥammad bin Abī ‘Attāb narrated to me that ‘Affān narrated to [him] on the authority of Muḥammad bin Yaḥyā bin Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān on the authority of his father who said, “We do not see the righteous more false in anything other than aḥādīth.” Ibn Abī ‘Attāb said, “So when Muḥammad bin Yaḥyā bin Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān and I met, I asked him about it and he said on the authority of his father, ‘You will not see the people of good (ahlul-khāir) more false in anything other than aḥādīth.’” Muslim said, “He was saying that falsehood flows upon their tongues although they do not intend to lie.”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“We do not see the righteous more false in anything other than aḥādīth” — This means that lying [strictly in ḥadīth transmission] is common among them, but not because they intentionally do it. Mistakes frequently occur in their narrations without their realizing it. They utter lies they are unable to recognize as such. We have mentioned above that lying is defined as telling something opposite to the truth, be it intentionally, unintentionally, or out of forgetfulness.

Imām Muslim said:

Al-Faḍl bin Sahl narrated to me that Yazīd bin Hārūn narrated to [him] that Khalīfah bin Mūsā informed [him], “I entered upon
Ghālib bin ʿUbaidillāh, and he began dictating to me [from a notebook], ‘Makḥūl narrated to me such-and-such and so-and-so.’ Then he stood up to go and answer the call of nature. When I looked in his notebook, in it was written, ‘Abān narrated to me, on the authority of Anas and Abān on the authority of so-and-so.’ So I abandoned [listening to his āhādīth] and stood up [to leave].’’’

I heard al-Ḥasan bin ʿAlī al-Ḥulwānī saying, “I saw in one of the books of ‘Affān a hadīth of Hishām Abūl-Miqdām (about ʿUmar bin ʿAbdil-ʿAzīz). [It read], ‘Hishām said, “A man said to me Yahyā bin so-and-so narrated to me, on the authority of Muḥammad bin Kaʿb…”’ I said to ‘Affān, ‘They say Hishām heard this [directly] from Muḥammad bin Kaʿb.’ So [‘Affān] said, ‘Indeed, Hishām was stricken [with accusations of lying] in regard to this hadīth, for he would say, “Yahyā narrated to me on the authority of Muḥammad,” but later he claimed that he heard it from Muḥammad [directly].’’’

-----------------------------------------------

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Hishām” was Hishām bin Ziyād al-Ummawī Maulāhumm al-Baṣrī. The major scholars have considered him a weak narrator.

This hadīth contains a rule we should pay attention to in order to use it later, if Allāh wills. ‘Affān ￼ said that Hishām was regarded as a weak narrator due to this particular hadīth, because he reported that Yahyā narrated to him on the authority of Muḥammad [and later said he heard it from Muḥammad directly]. This particular accusation is questionable because it does not contain any lie due to the possibility that he might have heard it from Muḥammad himself, and forgot he did. So he narrated it with Yahyā’s [name between him and] Muḥammad at first. He may have remembered some time after he reported this narration that he heard it directly from Muḥammad, and hence reported the narration accordingly.

However, there are other likely factors that led the preeminent and meticulous scholars of this discipline, who know the slightest detail about narrators, to judge that he had not heard the narration from
Muhammad directly, and therefore they passed their judgment due to the available evidence. Soon to come are many similar reports from the scholars using this manner of criticism in similar incidents and the comment on them will be the same as here; and Allah knows best.

Imam Muslim said:


Ibn Quhzadh said, “I heard Wahb bin Zam’ah saying Sufyan bin ‘Abdil-Malik said, ‘Abdullah (bin al-Mubarak) said, ‘I saw Rawh bin Ghuṭaif, the one with ‘blood amounts to a dirham,’ and I took a seat in one of his audiences. Then I began to become ashamed that my companions might see me sitting with him while his ahadith are disapproved of.”’

Imam an-Nawawi commented:

“The day of Fitr is the day of prizes” — The hadith [in its entirety is as follows]:

“When the day of Fitr comes, angels stand along the road and call out, ‘O believers, come to a merciful Lord, Who commands with good and abundantly rewards the observance of it. He commanded you to fast and you did fast in obedience to Him,”

---

31 Imam an-Nawawi commented: He is the aforementioned narrator who holds the nickname ‘Abdah.

32 Imam an-Nawawi quoted al-Bukhari to have said about him, “His narrations are muqtar.”
so accept your prizes.’ And after they pray ‘Id prayer, a caller from heaven calls out, ‘Return safely to your houses, as your sins have been entirely forgiven. And this day will be called the Day of Prizes.’”

We related this hadith in the book al-Mustaqṣā fi Fadā’il al-Masjid al-Aqṣā authored by al-Ḥāfiz Abū Muḥammad bin ‘Asākir ad-Di-mashqi. The word “prize” here refers to a reward.

“The one with ‘blood amounts to a dirham’” — This sentence identifies the narrator [whose circle Ibn al-Mubārak joined, as the same narrator of] the following hadith, which he [Rawḥ] narrated from az-Zuhri from Abū Salamah from Abū Hurairah, who elevated it to the Prophet, which says, “Prayer is to be re-performed [if there is impurity] the size of a dirham,” meaning a spot the size of a dirham.

This hadith is mentioned by al-Bukhāri in his book at-Tarīkh as a false hadith with no source whatsoever; and Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

Ibn Quhzādḥ narrated to me, “I heard Wahb [bin Zam’ah] saying on the authority of Sufyān [bin ‘Abdil-Mālik], on the authority of Ibn al-Mubārak, Baqiyyah [bin al-Walîd] is a truthful person; however, he transmits [ahādīth] from those who are trustworthy and those who are weak.”

Qutaibah bin Saʿīd narrated to us that Jaṭīr narrated to [him] on the authority of Mughirah on the authority of ash-Sha’bi that he said, “Al-Ḥārith al-Awar al-Hamdāni narrated to me, and he is a liar.”

Imām an-Nawawī commented:

“Ash-Sha’bi” was named ʿĀmir bin Shurāhīl or Shurāhbi; however, the first is more often used. He was born six years after ʿUmar’s caliphate began. He was a great and respected Imām. He had
in-depth knowledge of *tafsir*, *hadith*, *fiqh*, *al-maghazi* [battles], and worship.

Al-Ḥasan said, “By Allāh, ash-Sha’bi was very knowledgeable, with infinite patience and a long [glowing] history in Islām.”

“*Al-Ḥārith al-A’war*” was al-Ḥārith bin ‘Abdillāh or bin ‘Ubaidillāh, Abū Zuhair al-Kūfi. His weakness as a narrator is agreed upon.

Imām Muslim said:

Abū ‘Āmir ‘Abdullāh bin Barrād al-Ash‘ari narrated to us, Abū Usāmah narrated to [him] on the authority of Mufaḍḍal, on the authority of Mughīrah, who said, “I heard ash-Sha’bi saying, ‘Al-Ḥārith al-A’war narrated to me,’ and he [ash-Sha’bi] was testifying that he was one of the liars.”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

The narrators of this *ḥadith* are all from al-Kūfah. Their names are as follows:

“*Barrād*” was ‘Abdullāh bin Barrād bin Yūsuf bin Abī Bardah bin Abī Mūsā al-Ash‘ari al-Kūfi.

“*Abū Usāmah*” was Ḥammād bin Usāmah bin Yazīd al-Qurashi Maulāhum al-Kūfi. He was a *ḥāfiz* and a meticulous, accomplished, and committed worshipper.

“*Mufaḍḍal*” was Ibn Muhāhil Abū ‘Abdir-Rahmān as-Sa’di al-Kūfi. He was a *ḥāfiz* meticulous, accomplished, and a committed worshipper.

“*Mughīrah*” was Ibn Miqṣam Abū Hishām ad-Ḍabbī al-Kūfi.
Imām Muslim said:

Qutaibah bin Sa'id narrated to us that Jarir narrated to us on the authority of Mughîrah, on the authority of Ibrâhîm [bin Yazid an-Nakha'i] that he said, ‘Alqamah said, ‘I memorized the Qur'ân in two years.’ Then al-Hârith said, ‘The Qur'ân is easy; the wahî [i.e. the secret revelation to 'Ali in the belief of the Shi'ah] is more difficult.’

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

The statement of al-Hârith is included under the munkar narrations Imām Muslim held against al-Hârith, for which he was criticized and disparaged due to his abhorrent and extreme sectarian affiliation as a Shi'i, not to mention his lying.

Al-Qâdi 'Iyâd said, “I hope this report is the least severe of his narrations, because it may be interpreted positively. It is suggested that the word wahî refers to writing and knowing calligraphy; this statement is maintained by al-Khaṭṭābi. Based on this interpretation, al-Hârith is disparaged for reasons other than this narration in particular.” Al-Qâdi added, “However, the ugly reality of his affiliation and extreme sectarianism have been revealed, in addition to his claim of ‘Ali's unique status and that the Prophet entrusted him solely with the secret of revelation and knowledge of the unseen. Combined, they compromised the credibility of al-Hârîth’s narration. Still, it is also possible that the narrator here understood something inappropriate from what al-Hârîth insinuated; and Allâh knows best.”

Imām Muslim said:

Hâjjâj bin ash-Shâ'îr narrated to me that Aḥmad (bin Yûnus) narrated to [him] that Zâ'idah narrated to [him] on the authority of al-A'mash, on the authority of Ibrâhim that al-Hârîth said, “I studied
the Qur'ān for three years and wāḥī for two years,” or he said, “… wāḥī for three years and the Qur'ān for two years.”

Ḥājjāj narrated to me that ʿAḥmad (bin Yūnus) narrated to [him] that Zāʿīdah narrated to [him] on the authority of Maṣṭūr and al-Mughirah, on the authority of ʿIbrāhīm that al-Ḥārith was discredited.

Qutaibah bin Saʿīd narrated to us that Jarīr narrated to [him] on the authority of Ḥamzah az-Zayyāt who said, “Murrah al-Hamdānī heard something from al-Ḥārith and said to him, “Sit by the door.” [Ḥamzah] said, “So Murrah went inside and got his sword, and al-Ḥārith sensed [his intent] and left.”

ʿUbaidullāh bin Saʿīd narrated to me that ʿAbdur-Raḥmān (bin Mahdī) narrated to [him] that Ḥammād bin Zaid narrated to [him] on the authority of Ibn ʿAwn that ʿIbrāhīm said, “Beware of al-Mughirah bin Saʿīd and Abū ʿAbdur-Raḥīm for they are both liars.”

Imām an-Nawawī commented:

“Al-Mughirah bin Saʿīd” was pointed out in an-Nasā’ī’s book aḥ-Ḍuʿāfā’ [with the following statement]: “He was an impostor from al-Kūfah. He was burned during the time of an-Nakhaʿī due to his claim that he was a prophet.”

“Abū ʿAbdir-Raḥīm” was Shaqīq aḥ-Dabī al-Kūfī, the storyteller. He was also known as Salamah bin ʿAbdur-Raḥmān an-Nakhaʿī. His nickname [for both names] was Abū ʿAbdir-Raḥīm.

Both were weak and further details about them will follow shortly, if Allāh wills.

Imām Muslim said:

Abū Kāmil al-Jahdari narrated to us that Ḥammād (bin Zaid) narrated to us that ʿĀṣim (bin Bahdalah) narrated to [him], “We
would meet with Abū ʿAbdir-Raḥmān as-Sulami when we were young men. He would say to us, ‘Do not sit with storytellers other than Abul-Aḥwaṣ and beware of Shaqīq [Abū ʿAbdir-Raḥīm].’”

(Muslim said, “Shaqīq held the belief of the Khawārij and he was not Abū Wāʾil.”)

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Abū Kāmil al-Jahdari” was named Fuḍail bin Ḥusain bin Tālḥah al-Baṣṭri. Abū Saʿīd as-Ṣamʿāni said, “He got his name from someone whose name was Jaḥdar.”

“Abū ‘Abdir-Raḥmān as-Sulami” was ‘Abdullāh bin Ḥabīb bin Rubayʿah. He was a respected Tābiʿi from al-Kūfah.

“Young men” here refers to children between infancy and puberty.

“Storyteller” is a person who tells stories. The word “story” describes a report, and when combined as the word “storyteller,” it means to tell something as it happened.

“Shaqīq” was warned against. Al-Qāḍi ʿIyāḍ said “His name was Shaqīq ad-Ḍabbī al-Kūfī, the storyteller. An-Nasāʿī held him to be a weak narrator. His nickname was Abū ʿAbdir-Raḥīm. Some scholars said he is the same person warned against earlier by Ibrāhīm. It was also said that Abū ‘Abdir-Raḥīm, whom Ibrāhīm warned against, is Salamah bin ‘Abdir-Raḥmān an-Nakhaʿī, according to Ibn al-Madani as mentioned by Ibn Abī Ḥātim ar-Rāzī in his book. The statement of Muslim, ‘and he is not Abū Wāʾil,’ does not refer to Shaqīq bin Salamah Abū Wāʾīl al-Asdi, who is popularly held as one of the seniors of the Tābiʿīn.”

This is the end of al-Qāḍi’s words.
Imām Muslim said:


Al-Hasan al-Ḥulwānī narrated to us that Yahyā bin Ādam narrated to [him] that Mis‘ar narrated to [him], “Jābir bin Yazīd narrated to us before he engaged in innovation.”

Salamah bin Shabīb narrated to me that al-Ḥumaidī narrated to [him] that Sufyān said, “The people would transmit from Jābir before he publicized his innovation, but ever since, people distrusted his ahādīth and some of the people abandoned him.” [Sufyān] was asked, “What did he publicize?” [Sufyān] said, “His belief in ar-Raj‘ah.”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Abū Ghassān” was known by the nickname Zunajī.

Jābir al-Ju’fī’s belief in ‘Alī’s return after death refers to a Shi‘ah belief that ‘Alī is in Heaven and they will not be resurrected until he calls them from the heavens. This is an outright falsehood that proves their total ignorance, which fits their shallow mentalities and ill minds.

“Al-Ḥumaidī” was ‘Abdullāh bin az-Zubair bin Īsā bin ‘Abdillāh bin az-Zubair bin Ubaidillāh bin Ḥamīd Abū Bakr al-Qurashi al-Asdi al-Makki.

“Sufyān” was Sufyān bin ‘Uyainah, the widely known Imām.

Imām Muslim said:

Ḥasan al-Ḥulwānī narrated to us that Abū Yahyā al-Ḥimmānī
narrated to [him] that Qabīsah and his brother [Suṭān bin ‘Uqba] narrated to us that they heard al-Jarrāḥ bin Malīḥ saying, “I heard Jābir saying, ‘I have 70,000 aḥādīth, all of which are on the authority of Abū Ja’far on the authority of the Prophet ﷺ.’”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Abū Yahyā al-Ḥimmānī” was ‘Abdul-Ḥamīd bin ‘Abdur-Rahmān al-Kūfī. His last name was taken from Ḥimmān, a clan from Hamadān.

“Al-Jarrāḥ bin Malīḥ” was the father of Waki’.33 He was a weak narrator as deemed by hadīth scholars; however, his narration is mentioned here as a supporting one.

“Abū Ja’far” was Muḥammad bin ‘Alī bin al-Ḥusayn bin ‘Alī bin Abī Ta‘līb ﷺ. He was known as al-Bāqir, loosely translated as “the Cleaver of Knowledge,” because he broke it down into its elements, becoming knowledgeable about its origins and perfectly mastering it.

Imām Muslim said:

Huṣayn bin ash-Shā‘ir narrated to me that ʿAḥmad bin Yūnus narrated to [him], “I heard Zuhair saying that Jābir said (or, “I heard Jābir saying”), ‘Indeed, I have 50,000 aḥādīth that I have never narrated.’ [Zuhair] added, ‘That day he related a hadīth and said, “This is from the 50,000.’”

Ibrāhīm bin Khālid al-Yashkuri narrated to me, “I heard Abul-Walīd saying [he] heard Sallām bin Abī Muṭṭir saying [he] heard Jābir al-Ju’fī saying, ‘I have 50,000 aḥādīth on the authority of the Prophet ﷺ.’”

---

33 [Translator’s note] He is the teacher of ‘Abdur-Rahmān bin Mahdi, Yahyā bin Maṭīn, and Yahyā bin Adam, among many others. [Ṣiyāṣah al-ʿĀlam an-Nubalā’; 9/141].
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Imām an-Nawawi commented:

"Abul-Walid" was Hishām bin ʻAbdīl-Mālik, known as at-Ţayālisi.

"Ibn Abī Muṭṭī" was named Sa’d.

Imām Muslim said:

Salamah bin Shabīb narrated to me that al-Ţumaidi narrated to [him] that Sufyān narrated to [him], “I heard a man ask Jābir about the verse:

"Thus I will never depart from the land until my father permits me or Allāh decides for me, and He is the best of judges."

[Surah Yūsuf 12:80]

"Jābir replied, ‘An interpretation has not come to me about these [verses].’” Sufyān said, “He lied.” We asked Sufyān, “What did Jābir mean by this [why did he say he had no interpretation of the verse]?” Sufyān said, “Indeed, the Rāfiḍah say, ‘‘Ali is in the clouds and we will not [be resurrected] and [neither will] he [‘Ali, nor] his children until [‘Ali] calls from the heaven, “Ride out along with so-and-so [meaning the promised Mahdī].’” Jābir said that is the interpretation for these verses, but he lied because they [the verses] are meant to refer to the brothers of Yūsuf ʿa.s.”34

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

They were called Rāfiḍah, which is derived in Arabic from the word

34 [Translator’s note] Jābir, a Shī‘ī, interpreted the verse in accordance with his sectarian affiliation, which misrepresented the intended meaning of the verse. Therefore, Sufyān uncovered the truth and provided the correct interpretation of the verse.
rafaḍ [to refuse]. They were so called because they refused to accept Zaid bin ʿAlī [as their ruler].

Imām Muslim said:

Salamah narrated to me, al-Ḥumaidi narrated to [him] that Ṣafyān narrated, “I heard Jābir mention about 30,000 aḥādīth [that] I did not regard permissible to mention, and that to me were [similar to other aḥādīth].”

I heard Abū Ghassān Muḥammad bin ‘Amr ar-Rāzī say, “I asked Jarīr bin Ḥabīl b. Ḥāmid, ‘Did you meet al-Ḥārith bin Ḥaṣīrah?’ He said, ‘Yes, [he is a] shai kh of lengthy silence who persists in the pursuit of grave matters.’”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

Abū ʿAlī al-Ghassānī al-Jiyānī said, “The name of Salamah bin Shabīb bin Maslam and al-Ḥumaidi were not mentioned in the version of Ibn Māhān. The correct version was related by al-Jalūdī, who mentioned those narrators in his version, because Muslim had never met al-Ḥumaidi.”

Abū ‘Abdillāh bin al-Ḥidhā’, one of those who related the book of Muslim, said, “I asked ʿAbdul-Ghanī bin Saʿd, ‘Did Muslim narrate from al-Ḥumaidi?’ He replied, ‘I never witnessed it except in this narration.’” However, this is unlikely. There was probably a narrator who was overlooked between Muslim and al-Ḥumaidi.

Al-Qādī ʿIyāḍ said, “ʿAbdul-Ghanī has only seen Ibn Māhān’s version of Muslim’s book, which Muslim showed him, and hence he said the aforementioned. However, al-Jalūdī’s version is not available in Egypt.” He added, “Muslim once related in another narration, ‘Salamah narrated to us that al-Jalūdī narrated to us.’ This is how it is found in all other versions, which makes this narration correct, if Allāh wills.”
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“Al-Ḥārith bin Ḥaṣṭrah” belonged to the tribe of Azd from al-Kūfah. He related narrations from Zaid bin Wahb, as maintained by al-Bukhāri.

Imām Muslim said:

Ahmad bin Ibrāhīm ad-Dawraqi narrated to me that ‘Abdur-Rahmān bin Mahdi narrated to [him] on the authority of Ḥammād bin Zaid that he said, “Ayyūb mentioned a man one day and said [about him], ‘He is not upright in speech [i.e. he lies].’ Then he mentioned another [person] and said [about him], ‘He adds to records [i.e. he lies].’”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Ad-Dawraqi” [as a name] has a difference of opinion regarding its meaning. It was said that his father was [nearly] a hermit and, at that time, they used to give such people that name. This is related to have been said by Ḥammād ad-Dawraqi, who was mentioned, and it is a widely known statement. It was also said that it is taken from a town of that name in ‘Irān or elsewhere.

“Ayyūb” was Ayyūb as-Sakhtiyāni, who was mentioned earlier.

Imām Muslim said:

Ḥajjāj bin ash-Shā‘ir narrated to me that Sulaimān bin Ḥarb narrated to [him] that Ḥammād bin Zaid narrated to [him] that Ayyūb said, “Indeed I have a neighbor,” and after mentioning some of his virtues [he continued], “even if he testified to me about two dates, I would not see his testimony as permissible.”

Muḥammad bin Rāfi’ and Ḥajjāj bin ash-Shā‘ir narrated to me that ‘Abdur-Razzāq narrated to [them] that Ma’mar said, “I never heard Ayyūb backbiting anyone except ‘Abdul-Karīm Abū Umayyah. When he mentioned him he said, ‘May Allāh have mercy on him,
he is not trustworthy. He asked me about a hadith of ‘Ikrimah, [and later] said, “I heard from ‘Ikrimah” [without putting Ayyūb’s name between his and ‘Ikrimah’s when relating the hadith].”'

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

The above statement about ‘Abdul-Karīm accuses him of lying; however, there is a likely scenario that he heard the narration directly from ‘Ikrimah but forgot he did, then remembered it later and reported it. Still, the context here judges him to be a liar and I have explained this earlier.

Moreover, this narrator, ‘Abdul-Karīm, has been deemed weak by Sufyān bin ‘Uyainah, ‘Abdur-Rahmān bin Mahdī, Yahyā bin Sa’īd al-Qaṭṭān, Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal, and Ibn ‘Adi. ‘Abdul-Karīm was among the finest fiqh scholars of Baṣrāh; and Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

Al-Faḍl bin Sahl narrated to me that ‘Affān bin Muslim narrated to [him] that Hammām narrated, “Abū Dāwūd al-A’mā came to us and began saying, ‘Al-Barā’ [bin ‘Āzib, the Companion] narrated to us that Zaid bin Arqam narrated to [him]…” mentioning [these chains of narrators] to Qatādah. [Qatādah] said, ‘He lied; he did not hear from them. He would beg the people [for ahādīth] during the Devastating Plague.”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Abū Dāwūd” was Nufai’ bin al-Ḥārith, the blind storyteller. His weakness is agreed upon. ‘Amr bin ‘Alī said, “He was abandoned.” Yahyā bin Ma‘īn and Abū Zur‘ah said, “He is nothing [in terms of narration].” Abū Ḥātim said, “His narrations are munkar.” This is among others who deemed him a weak narrator.
“He did not hear from them” — This refers to al-Bara’ and Zaid, besides others from whom he claimed to have narrated. He claimed to have seen 18 Companions who fought in the Battle of Badr, as he stated in his other narration in this book.

“The Devastating Plague” — It was called “devastating” because of the huge number of people who died because of it. The plague is a famous infectious disease. Its symptoms are excruciatingly painful blistering accompanied by high fever. It blackens the surrounding flesh, or makes it green or purplish. The victim also experiences vomiting and a rapid heart rate.


Likewise, al-Kalābādhi mentioned in his book Rijāl al-Bukhārī that Ayyūb as-Sakhtiyānī was born in 66 AH, and it was said that he was born one year before the plague occurred. Al-Qāḍi ‘Iyāḍ said, “The [Devastating] Plague occurred in 119 AH.”

Al-Ḥāfiz ‘Abdul-Ghanī al-Maqdisi mentioned in the biography of ‘Abdullāh bin Mutarrif, who narrated from Yaḥyā al-Qaṭṭān, “Muṭarrif died after the plague, which was in 87 AH.” Al-Ḥāfiz also mentioned in the biography of Yūnus bin ‘Ubaid that Yūnus saw Anas bin Mālik because he [Yūnus] was born after the plague and died in 137 AH.

These are radically different statements; however, it is possible to reconcile them by maintaining that all of those plagues were equally deadly because they all shared the same description and plagues occurred frequently.
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Ibn Qutaibah reported in al-Ma‘ārif from al-‘Aṣma‘i who said that the first plague in Islam was in ‘Amwās, which was located in ash-Shām, during the caliphate of ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb. Abū ‘Ubaidah bin al-Jarrāḥ as well as Mu‘ādh bin Jabal and his two wives and son died from it.

The next plague occurred during the time of Ibn az-Zubair. [It was followed by] the Women’s Plague, [so called] because it was first contracted by maidens in Baṣrah, Wāsiṭ, ash-Shām, and al-Kūfah.

Coincidentally, al-Ḥajjāj was the ruler of Wāsiṭ during the caliphate of ‘Abdul-Mālik bin Marwān. That plague was called the Plague of the Prestigious because a large number of statesmen died from it.

Next was the Plague of ‘Adi bin Arţāh in 127 AH, followed by the plague called Gharīb Rjīl. The one that followed it in 130 AH was called Muslim bin Qutaibah. It spread during the months of Sha‘bān and Ramaḍān and abated in Shawwāl. Ayyūb as-Sakhtiyānī died during that plague.

Remarkably, there has never been a plague in Makkah or al-Madīnah. These records are all from Ibn Qutaibah’s book.

Abul-Ḥasan al-Madā‘ini said, “There were major plagues in Islam. [The first was] the Plague of Shīrawiyah in al-Madā‘in during the life of the Prophet in 6 AH. The second was during the caliphate of ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb. It was in ash-Shām and resulted in 25,000 casualties.

“The third was the Devastating Plague, which occurred during the time of Ibn az-Zubair in Shawwāl, 69 AH. It lasted three days and took 70,000 casualties each day. Anas bin Mālik alone lost 83 sons, and some said 73. ‘Abdur-Raḥmān bin Abī Bakr lost 40 sons.

“The fourth was the Women’s Plague in Shawwāl, 87 AH. The last

35 [Translator’s note] This town is located in the southeast of Baghdad.
36 [Translator’s note] Don’t be alarmed by the large number of his sons, because the Prophet supplicated to Allāh for him to “increase his wealth and children, and bless (for him) whatever you give him.” [Ṣahih Muslim]
was in Rajab, 130 AH. It spread so rampanty in Ramaḍān that the
death count in [a town called] Sikah al-Murīd was 1,000 per day for a
few days. Near the end of Shawwāl, its intensity decreased.

“There was also a plague in al-Kūfah, by which al-Mughīrah bin
Shu’bah died. It occurred in 50 AH.”

This is what al-Madā‘īnī mentioned about the history of plagues.

About the plague of ‘Amwās, Abū Zur‘ah ad-Dimashqī said,
“It took place either in 17 or 18 AH. ‘Amwās is a village located
between ar-Ramlah and Jerusalem. The plague was named after
that village because it started there. It was also so called because the
plague covered a wide area and it infected most of the people in that
village. Both explanations were mentioned by al-Ḥāfiz ʿAbdul-Ghanī
in the biography of Abū ‘Ubaidah bin al-Jarrāḥ.”

This [summary about the history of] the plague renders the interpre-
tation of the Devastating Plague made by al-Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ incorrect.
This leaves only two choices: the plague meant here is either the one
that occurred in 67 AH, when Qatādah was six years old, or 87 AH,
which is likely to be the correct one; and Allāh knows best.

.................................................................

Imām Muslim said:

Ḥasan bin ‘Alī al-Ḥulwānī narrated to me that Yazīd bin Hārūn
narrated to [him] that Hammām informed [him] that Abū Dāwūd
al-A’mā came to visit Qatādah, and when he stood [to greet him],
he was told, “Indeed this [man] alleges he has met 18 of the soldiers
of the Battle of Badr.” Qatādah said, “He never [sought aḥādīth]
before the plague and he did not speak [to any scholars] regarding
it. By Allāh, al-Ḥasan has never narrated to us from a warrior who
participated in the Battle of Badr without an intermediary, and Sa‘īd
bin al-Musayyib did not narrate to us from a witness of the Battle of
Badr without an intermediary except from Sa‘īd bin Mālik.”
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Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“He never [sought ahādīth] before the plague” — He was not interested in ahādīth.

“Al-Musayyib,” the father of Sa‘īd, was a famous Companion. As for Sa‘īd, he was the Imām of the Tabi‘īn and their most prominent leader in ḥadīth, fiqh, dream interpretation, piety, and zubd among countless well-known virtues. He was from Madīnah, nicknamed Abū Muḥammad; and Allāh knows best.

The point of this narration is to invalidate the statement of Abū Dāwūd al-ʿAmā, who claimed to have met 18 soldiers of Badr. Qatādah said, “Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and Sa‘īd bin al-Musayyib are senior to Abū Dāwūd and surpass him in terms of giving due attention [to ahādīth] in addition to seeking out its people and learning from the Companions. Yet not one of them has ever narrated a single [ḥadīth] from any soldier of Badr. So how could Abū Dāwūd al-ʿAmā claim to have met 18 of them? This, indeed, is a serious lie.”

“Saʿd bin Mālik” refers to Saʿd bin Abī Waqqāṣ. Waqqāṣ’s name was Mālik bin ʿUhaib.

Imām Muslim said:

‘Uthmān bin Abī Shaibah narrated to us that Jarīr narrated to [him] on the authority of Raqabah, who said, “Abū Jaʿfar al-Ḥāshimi al-Madani was reporting words of wisdom on the authority of the Prophet ﷺ that were not among the narrations of the Prophet ﷺ.”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Raqabah” was Raqabah bin Musqalah bin ‘Abdillāh al-ʿAbdī al-Kūfī, Abū ʿAbdillāh. He was a prestigious and respected narrator.
“Abū Ja’far” was named ‘Abdullāh bin Miswar al-Madā’ini Abū Ja’far, one of the weak fabricators. Al-Bukhārī mentioned in his book at-Tārikh, “His name is ‘Abdullāh bin Miswar bin ‘Awn bin Ja’far bin Abī Ṭālib, Abū Ja’far al-Qurashi al-Hāshimi.” After that, he mentioned the words of the above-mentioned Raqabah about him.

Some sources mentioned that his last name was al-Madani and others al-Madīni. I have not seen al-Madā’ini in any of them. The names al-Madani and al-Madīni are both derived from the Madīnah of the Prophet. Note that Madīni refers to a resident of Madīnah who never left it, whereas Madani refers to someone who lived there, but left, as maintained by Abū ‘Abdillāh al-Bukhārī, which was mentioned by Imām al-Ḥāfiz Abul-Faḍl Muḥammad bin Ṭāhir al-Maqdisi in his book al-Ansāb.

“Words of wisdom” — They were wise words, but were still lies attributed to the Prophet, who never said them.

.............................................

Imām Muslim said:

Al-Ḥasan al-Ḥulwānī narrated to us that Nu‘aim bin Ḥammād narrated to [him] that Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm bin Muḥammad bin Sufyān said that Muḥammad bin Yāḥyā narrated to [him] that Nu‘aim bin Ḥammād narrated to [him] that Abū Dāwūd at-Ṭayālīsī narrated to [him] on the authority of Shu‘bah, on the authority of Yūnus bin ‘Ubaid, who said, “‘Amr bin ‘Ubaid always lied regarding ahādīth.”

.............................................

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Abū Ishāq said” — The above narration is found to have been related by Abū Ishāq in verified records, whereas in others it is not found. Abū Ishāq was a companion of Muslim and a reporter of the book of Muslim. Based on this, he has equaled Muslim in the number of narrators of this narration, but outclassed him [in regard
to the quality of the narration] by the inclusion of a single additional narrator.

"Abū Dāwūd at-Ṭayālisi" was named Sulaimān bin Dāwūd, mentioned earlier.

Imām Muslim said:

‘Amr bin ‘Alī Abū Ḥaŷṣ narrated to me, “I heard Mu‘ādh bin Mu‘ādh saying, ‘I said to ‘Afw bin Abī Jamīlah, ‘Indeed ‘Amr bin ‘Ubaid narrated to us on the authority of al-Ḥasan that the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said, ‘Whoever carries arms against us is not from us.’

“‘[Afw bin Abī Jamīlah] said, “‘Amr lied, by Allāh. Rather, he intended it as a way to promote his filthy opinion.”’”

Imām an-Nawawī commented:

“‘Afw” was mentioned earlier.

“‘Amr bin ‘Ubaid” was affiliated with the Qadariyyah and Mu’tazilah sects. He was a former companion of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī.

"Whoever carries arms against us is not from us" — This statement is authentic and has been narrated from various chains of narration, a number of which Muslim will mention later on. Its meaning, according to the scholars, is that a person who would do this has not followed [the Prophet’s] guidance or taken heed of [his] ways and actions. It is the same as a father telling a son who did something inappropriate, “You are not from me.” This interpretation is the same for all ahādīth worded [this way], as in the Prophet’s statement, “Whoever cheats us is not from us,” and the likes of it.

Muslim inserted this hadīth in this context to highlight ‘Afw’s disparaging comment about ‘Amr bin ‘Ubaid despite the fact that this particular narration is authentic. ‘Afw was one of the senior
companions of al-Hasan who was knowledgeable of his narrations. Hence, he disparaged his attribution of the narration to al-Hasan, because ‘Amr either hadn’t truly narrated it or didn’t hear it from al-Hasan.

“Rather, he intended it as a way to promote his filthy opinion” — He lied in order to promote his corrupt affiliation with al-Mu’tazilah. They believe that committing sins expels the doer from Islam and into the Fire for eternity. Although they do not call him a disbeliever, they consider him a sinner who will abide in Hell for eternity. A refutation of their belief shall come in the explanation of the chapter of Faith, if Allah wills.

Imam Muslim said:

‘Ubaidullah bin ‘Umar al-Qawariri narrated to us that Hammad bin Zaid narrated, “A man kept company with Ayyub and listened [to ahadith] from him [for a period of time], but then Ayyub [no longer saw him]. [When Ayyub asked, the people] said, ‘Oh Abu Bakr, indeed he keeps company with ‘Amr bin ‘Ubaid [now].’” Hammad [then] said, “One day we were with Ayyub at the market early in the morning. A man came to meet Ayyub, so [Ayyub] greeted him with salam, asked how he was doing, then said to him, ‘It reached me that you kept company with that man [meaning ‘Amr].’ [The man] said, ‘Yes, oh Abu Bakr. Indeed, he tells us strange things [i.e. reports].’ Ayyub said to him, ‘Indeed we flee…’ or ‘…we fear these strange things [transmissions].’”

Imam an-Nawawi commented:

“Indeed we flee…” or “…we fear these strange things [transmissions]” conveys concern about the narrations ‘Amr bin ‘Ubaid introduced for fear of them being lies, since they would then be lies upon the Messenger of Allah if they were introduced as ahadith. And if they were mentioned as opinions or doctrines, [there is also]
the fear of falling into innovation or disagreeing with the majority of scholars.

The conjunction “or” indicates that the narrator was not certain whether he said “flee” or “fear.”

Imām Muslim said:

Ḥājjāj bin ash-Shā‘ir narrated to me that Sulaimān bin Ḥarb narrated to [him] that Ibn Zaid—rather Ḥammād—narrated that it was said to Ayyūb, “Indeed ‘Amr bin ‘Ubaid transmitted on the authority of al-Ḥasan that he said, ‘There is no flogging the one who gets drunk from nabīd (wine).’” [Ayyūb] said, “He lied, for I heard al-Ḥasan say, ‘Flog the one who gets drunk from nabīd.’”

Ḥājjāj narrated to me that Sulaimān bin Ḥarb narrated, “I heard Sallām bin Abī Muṭṭi’ saying, ‘[When] it reached Ayyūb that I [listened] to ‘Amr, he turned to me and asked, ‘Do you see this man whose religion you do not trust? How do you trust him regarding ahādīth?’”

Salamah bin Shaḥib narrated to me that al-Ḥumaidī narrated to [him] that Sufyān narrated to [him], “I heard Abū Mūsā [Iṣrā‘īl bin Mūsā al-Baṣrī] saying, ‘‘Amr bin ‘Ubaid narrated to us before he turned to innovation.’”37

‘Ubaidullāh bin Mu‘ādh al-‘Anbari narrated to me that [his] father narrated to [him], “I wrote to Shu’bah asking him about Abū Shaibah, a judge of Wāsit, so he wrote to me, ‘Do not write anything from him [of ahādīth] and tear up [this] letter.’”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Abū Shaibah” was the grandfather of the brothers Abū Bakr, ‘Uthmān, and al-Qāsim, who were the children of Muḥammad bin

37 ʻIrām an-Nawawi commented: This refers to the period before he joined the Qadārīyyah sect.
Ibrāhīm Abū Shaibah. That Abū Shaibah was a weak narrator, as mentioned earlier.

“Wāsit” is a city built by al-Hajjāj bin Yūsuf.

“Tear up [this] letter” — He requested [that Muʿādh al-ʿAnbari] tear up the letter for fear of it reaching Abū Shaibah, so that he wouldn’t read something about himself he disliked. This request was to prevent any harm from [reaching al-ʿAnbari] from Abū Shaibah, or any other harm.

Imām Muslim said:

Al-Juhwān narrated to us, “I heard ʿAffān [bin Muslim] say, ‘I narrated to Ḥammād bin Salamah [bin Dīnār al-Īṣārī], on the authority of Ṣāliḥ al-Murri, a hadīth on the authority of Thābit [bin Aslam al-Banānî]. [Ḥammād] said, “[Ṣāliḥ] lied.” I also narrated a hadīth to Hammām on the authority of Ṣāliḥ al-Murri, and [Ḥammām] also said, “[Ṣāliḥ] lied.””

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Ṣāliḥ al-Murri” was among the most religious, obedient ascetics. His name was Ṣāliḥ bin Bashīr, Abū Bashīr al-Īṣārī al-Qādi. He was called al-Murri because a woman from the tribe of Murrah freed him [from slavery]. His father was a free Arab and his mother was freed by the same woman from Murrah.

Ṣāliḥ had such a sweet voice while reciting Qurān that some people actually died from [its effect upon them]. He was very pious and cried a lot. ʿAffān bin Muslim said, “Ṣāliḥ used to be like a frightened man whenever he told his stories. You would feel disturbed by his sadness, and his tears were like those of a weeping widow.”

As for his being a liar, this is in the same way as the statement we mentioned earlier, that we do not see the righteous more false in
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anything than they are regarding ḥadīth. These lies come from their mouths while they are unaware because they are not knowledgeable of the discipline of ḥadīth. Thus, they report everything they hear, some of which certainly contain lies, rendering them liars in this inadvertent manner. As we mentioned before, lying involves reporting something that is not true, whether unintentionally or intentionally.

Imām Muslim said:

Maḥmūd bin Ghailān narrated to us that Abū Dāwūd narrated, “Shu’bah said to me, ‘Go to Jarīr bin Ḥāzim and tell him, ‘It is not allowed for you to transmit from al-Ḥasan bin ‘Umārah, for indeed he lies.’’ I asked Shu’bah, ‘How do you know that?’ [Shu’bah] said, ‘He narrated to us on the authority of al-Ḥakam things that were not found to have any basis.’ I asked, ‘What things?’


Imām an-Nawawī commented:

“Al-Ḥasan bin ‘Umārah” is agreed to be a weak and abandoned narrator.

“Yahyā bin al-Jazzār” is the only one with this name in both books
of Ṣaḥīḥ and al-Muwatta’, as maintained by the author of Maṭāli’ al-Amwār. Similar names end either with Khazzār or Kharrāz.

The point of this narration is that al-Ḥasan bin ‘Umārah lied in narrating this hadīth from al-Ḥakam on the authority of Yahyā on the authority of ‘Alī. It was actually narrated on the authority of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. Even though this narration could possibly be narrated by both al-Ḥasan and ‘Alī, the well-versed scholars of this discipline have the skill to recognize lies using proofs and sometimes those proofs are decisive. Their opinion is to be accepted in all cases.

İmām Muslim said:

Al-Ḥasan al-Ḥulwānī narrated to us, “I heard Yazīd bin Hārūn mention Ziyād bin Maimūn, and he said, ‘I swore that I would not transmit anything from him or Khālid bin Maḥdūj.’ [Yazīd] continued, ‘I met Ziyād bin Maimūn and asked him about a hadīth, so he narrated it to me on the authority of Bakr al-Muzani. Then I returned to him and he narrated [the same hadīth] to me on the authority of Muwarrij. I returned to him [yet again] and he narrated it to me on the authority of al-Ḥasan.’ [Yazīd] accused both of them of lying [Ziyād bin Maimūn and Khālid bin Maḥdūj]. I heard [ahādīth] from ‘Abduṣ-Ṣamad, and when I mentioned Ziyād bin Maimūn in his presence, he accused him of lying.”

İmām an-Nawawi commented:

“Ziyād bin Maimūn” was from Baṣrah. His nickname was Abū ‘Ammār. He was a weak narrator. Al-Bukhārī said in at-Tārīkh, “The [people of hadīth] abandoned him.”

“I swore that I would not transmit anything from him or Khālid bin Maḥdūj” — He took this measure in order to drive people away from both of those narrators, to prevent anyone from falling victim to their lies, since narrating from them would be narrating lies
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upon the Messenger of Allah. And had it not been for his warning, their ḥadīth could have become widely used as proofs.

“Khalīd bin Mahdūj” was from Wāsīṭ. He was a weak narrator, considered as such by an-Nasā‘i. His nickname was Abū Rawḥ. He saw Anas bin Mālik.

“Bakr al-Muzani” was Bakr ʿAbdillāh al-Muzani, Abū ʿAbdillāh al- Başri. He was a respected Tābi‘i and scholar of fiqh.

“Muwarraq” was named Muwarraq bin al-Mushamrij al-‘Ujjali al-Kūfi, Abul-Mu‘tamir. He was a respected and pious Tābi‘i.

“He accused both of them of lying” — Al-Ḥulwānī was the narrator, the accuser was Yazid, and the accused were Ziyād bin Maimūn and Khalīd bin Mahdūj. Maimūn was accused because he reported to him a single narration from three different narrators on three different occasions. This is related to the contextual proofs that prove lying as we mentioned before; and Allah knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

Mahmūd bin Ghailān narrated to us, “I said to Abū Dāwūd at-Ṭayālisi, ‘You narrate a great deal on the authority of ʿAbbād bin Mansūr. How is it that you did not hear the ḥadīth of the woman named ʿAṭfārah from him, which an-Naḍr bin Shumail transmitted to us?’ [Abū Dāwūd] replied, ‘Be quiet, for ʿAbdur-Rahmān bin Mahdi and I met Ziyād bin Maimūn and asked him, ‘Are these ḥadīth you transmit on the authority of Anas?’ [Ziyād] said, ‘Have you seen that when a man sins and then repents that Allah turns to him?’ We said, ‘Yes.’ [Ziyād] said, ‘I did not hear from Anas at all; if the people did not know, then you two would not know that I did not meet Anas.” It reached us afterwards that he was transmitting [from Anas], but when ʿAbdur-Rahmān and I went to him he said, “I repented.” Then afterwards he was narrating [again in the same fashion], so we abandoned him.’’
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Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“The hadīth of the woman named ‘Āṭṭārah” — Al-Qādī ‘Iyāḍ said, “That hadīth was reported by Maimūn from Anas, that a woman named al-Ḥawlā’ ‘Āṭṭārah in Madīnah entered upon ‘Ā’ishah and informed her of something that happened between her and her husband and that the Prophet mentioned to her the virtue of the husband. This hadīth is a lengthy and weak narration; it is mentioned in full by Ibn Waḍḍāḥ. This lady was elsewhere called al-Ḥawlā’ bint Tuwait.”

Imām Muslim said:

Ḥasan al-Ḥulwānī narrated to us, “I heard Shabābah say, “‘Abdul-Quddūs was narrating to us, “Suwaid bin ‘Aqalah said…”” [instead of bin Ghafalah]. Shabābah also said, ‘I heard ‘Abdul-Quddūs saying, “The Messenger of Allāh prohibited taking a rawḥ by accident.”’ [Shabābah] said, ‘So he was asked, “What does this mean?” [‘Abdul-Quddūs] said, “It means to make an opening in a wall [thus letting] a breeze enter [by accident].’”

I heard ‘Ubaidullāḥ bin ‘Umar al-Qawārī saying, “I heard Ḥammād bin Zaid saying to a man after he sat with Mahdī bin Hilāl for days, ‘What is this salty well [i.e. useless or harmful] which has sprung up in your direction?’ He said, ‘Yes, oh Abā Ismā‘īl [in agreement].’”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

This narration is meant to highlight the misspelling, foolishness, and inaccuracy of ‘Abdul-Quddūs and the fact that there is misinformation in both the isnād and the matan of his narration. In the isnād, he said “Suwaid bin ‘Aqalah” which is an obvious misspelling and a clear mistake, since the correct name of the narrator was Suwaid bin Ghafalah.
As for the *matan*, there is an egregious misspelling and obvious mistake in switching the original word “rūḥ” meaning “soul” to “rawḥ” or “breeze,” and the word “gharada” meaning “as a target” to “arda” or “accidentally.” The *ḥadīth* was a prohibition of taking live animals as training targets for archery. Further illustration of this *ḥadīth* will be mentioned later on, if Allāh wills.

“Mahdi bin Hilāl” was a weak narrator according to the consensus. An-Nasā’ī said, “He is from Baṣrāh and he is abandoned; he narrated *ahādīth* from Dāwūd bin Abī Hind and Yūnus bin ‘Ubaid.”

“What is this salty well” — This is a metaphor indicating his weakness and blameworthiness. And the response of Abū Ismā‘īl, whose name is Ḥammād bin Zaid, is apparently in agreement with that assessment.

*Imām Muslim* said:

Al-Ḥasan al-Ḥulwānī narrated to us, “I heard ‘Affān say, ‘I heard Abū ‘Awānah say, “Never did a *ḥadīth* reach me on the authority of al-Ḥasan except that I presented it to Abān bin Abī ‘Ayyāsh, who read it to me.”’”

*Imām an-Nawawi* commented:

“Abū ‘Awānah” was named al-Waddāḥ bin ‘Abdillāh. This narration illustrates how [Abān] used to insert al-Ḥasan in his chain of narration anytime he was asked for one.

*Imām Muslim* said:

Suwaid bin Sa‘īd narrated to us that ‘Alī bin Muṣ‘hir narrated, “Ḥaṃzah az-Zayyāt and I heard from Abān bin Abī ‘Ayyāsh about one thousand *ahādīth*. One day I met Ḥaṃzah and he informed me that he saw the Prophet ﷺ [in a dream], and Ḥaṃzah repeated to
him [all the ahādīth] he had heard from Abān. However, he [the Prophet] didn’t recognize any except around five or six [of those ahādīth].”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

Al-Qādī ʿIyād said, “This narration and the likes of it are used to support the earlier affirmation of Abān’s weakness. It does not mean, however, that what happens in the dream is definitive or that, by means of a dream, an established act of Sunnah can be made invalid or an act of Sunnah can be established that had no prior basis; and this opinion is a matter of consensus among scholars.”

Al-Qādī’s position has been adopted by many of our fellow adopters of the Shāfiʿi school and others who collectively reported the consensus on the nullification of anything one sees in a dream that involves changing an established rule in the Islamic law. Still, this does not entail an opposition to the Prophet’s statement, “Whoever sees me in his dream, it is truly me.” This hadīth merely asserts that the person’s sight of the Prophet in the dream is a true one and not a phantom of one’s imagination nor from the devil’s deception.

The point is that dreams cannot establish a legal ruling because sleep is not a state during which one has full awareness [and understanding] of what he sees [in dreams]. Notably, scholars have agreed that no one’s narration or testimony is acceptable unless provided while the narrator is fully coherent. It is not accepted from a poor memorizer, a person who makes many mistakes, or an inaccurate reporter. Therefore, the sleeping person’s report [of a dream] is not acceptable due to the inaccuracies [inherent in dreams]. This is as far as legal rulings are concerned.

As for sighting the Prophet in a dream where he instructs him to do something recommended, prohibits him from something, or guides him to do something to his benefit, acting accordingly is agreed upon because these instructions [from the Prophet] are not estab-
lished by the dream but by an original legal ruling; and Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

‘Abdullāh bin ‘Abdīr-Raḥmān ad-Dārimi narrated to us that Zakariyyā‘ bin ‘Adī informed us, “Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī said to me, ‘Record from Baqīyyah what he transmitted on the authority of those who are well known, and do not record from him what he transmitted on the authority of those who are not. [But] do not write from Ismā‘īl bin ‘Ayyāsh what he transmitted, whether on the authority of those who are wellknown or otherwise.’”

Imām an-Nawawī commented:

“‘Abdur-Raḥmān ad-Dārimi” has been discussed earlier.

“Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī” was Ibrāhīm bin Muḥammad bin al-Hasan bin Asmā‘ bin Jārīḥah al-Kūfī. He was a respected Imām. His prominence in knowledge, prestige, and virtue are unanimously agreed upon; and Allāh knows best.

As for what he said regarding Ismā‘īl, it stands in opposition to the position of the majority of the scholars. ‘Abbās said, “I heard Yaḥyā bin Ma‘īn saying, ‘Ismā‘īl bin ‘Ayyāsh is trustworthy, and he was more beloved to the residents of ash-Shām than Baqīyyah.’”

Ibn Abī Khaiṭamah said, “I heard Yaḥyā bin Ma‘īn saying, ‘He is trustworthy, but ‘Irāqī [ḥadīth scholars] dislike his narrations.’” Al-Bukhārī said, “His narrations from the people of ash-Shām are more authentic [than the rest of his other narrations].”

‘Amr bin ‘Alī said, “When he narrates ḥadīth from the people of his hometown, he is trustworthy, but when he narrates from the people of Madinah, like Hishām bin ‘Urwh, Yaḥyā bin Sa‘īd, and Suhail bin Abī Ṣāliḥ, he is [inaccurate].”
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Ya’qūb bin Sufyān said, “I used to hear my companions saying that the knowledge available in ash-Shām is found in Ismā’īl bin ‘Ayyāsh and al-Walīd bin Muslim.” Ya’qūb said, “People have criticized Ismā’īl but he is trustworthy and upright. He is the most knowledgeable of the narrations transmitted by the people of ash-Shām and he is unrivaled in this particular area. The criticism against him is mostly regarding his strange narrations from the people of Makkah and Madīnah.”

Yahyā bin Ma’in said, “Ismā’īl’s narrations from the people of ash-Shām are trustworthy, but his hadīth notebook was lost, which weakened his memory of narrations from the people of al-Ḥijāz.”

Furthermore, Abū Ḥātim said, “He is okay and his narrations qualify for consideration. I know nobody who advised against taking his narrations except for Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī.”

At-Tirmidhi said, “Aḥmad said, ‘He is better than Baqiyyah since the latter has some munkar narrations.’” Aḥmad bin Abī al-Ḥawārī said, “Wakī asked me, ‘Who narrates ahādīth from Ismā’īl bin ‘Ayyāsh?’ I answered, ‘Al-Walīd and Marwān narrate from him, whereas al-Haitham bin Khārijah and Muḥammad bin Iyās do not.’ He responded, ‘Who are al-Haitham and Muḥammad bin Iyās? Indeed, al-Walīd and Marwān know better [than they do about narrators].’” And Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

Iṣḥāq bin Ibrāhīm al-Ḥanẓali [bin Rāhwayh] narrated to us, “I heard

---

38 [Translator’s note] Okay: According to scholars of ahādīth, this word is used to describe a narrator whose weakness is not serious. In other words, his narrations may be used as support for stronger narrations. Al-Khaṭīb said, “Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, ‘I have noticed that the language of criticism in ahādīth is of different levels: if a narrator is criticized with “okay,” then his narrations are taken into consideration where support for another narration is required.’” (Al-Kifāyah: 35) He also said, “I heard as-Sahmi saying, ‘I asked ad-Dāraquṭnī, “What do you mean when you describe a narrator as ‘okay?’” He answered, “It means that he is not too weak and his narrations are not abandoned, yet there is a small concern about him that does not disqualify his uprightness.”” (Al-Kifāyah: 34).
one of the companions of ‘Abdullāh [bin al-Mubārak] say that Ibn al-Mubārak said, ‘What an excellent man is Baqīyyah, if it were not for the fact that he would provide a nickname for [those better known by] their first names, and provide a first name for [those better known by] a nickname. For a long time, he had been narrating to us on the authority of Abū Sa‘īd al-Wuhāzī, then when we investigated [we were surprised to realize] he was ‘Abdul-Quddūs.’”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Heard one of the companions” refers to an unknown source and is therefore inadmissible as proof. Muslim included it for support only. This issue has been mentioned earlier and we have explained the reason for this procedure.

“Provide a nickname for [those better known by] their first names, and provide a first name for [those better known by] a nickname” — He would narrate from someone best known by his first name using his nickname, and narrate from someone best known by his nickname using his first name. This is considered a type of ʿadlīs, which is ugly and blameworthy, since it confuses the audience and leads them to believe that the reporter narrated from is someone other than a person known to be weak under his more famous name.

It also changes the status of that reporter who is known to be weak among scholars to merely unknown, which is generally passable by a group of scholars, who sometimes even use that narration as proof. The rest of the scholars are forced to make an inconclusive decision regarding the authenticity of such a narration. In some cases, the narration in question may be supported and is thus admissible as proof, or confirmed if another similar narration is found.

The worst kind of ʿadlīs is to replace a weak narrator’s first name with the nickname of a trustworthy narrator or to replace a weak narrator’s nickname with the first name of a trustworthy narrator because they share the same first name or nickname. This is mislead-
ing, since the weak reporter’s narration will often be used as proof, and we have mentioned the ruling on *tadlis* earlier. And Allâh knows best.

“Al-Wuḥāzi” belonged to a clan from Ḥimyar. His first name was ‘Abdul-Quddūs, whose weakness and misrepresentation of *ahādīth* is agreed upon.

*Imām Muslim* said:


*Imām an-Nawawī* commented:

“*Abū Nuʿaim*” was al-Faḍl bin Dukkīn (a nickname). His name was ʿAmr bin Ḥammād bin Zuhair. He was from al-Kūfah. He was one of the most respected people of his time 🗼.

“*Al-Muʿālā*” was from the tribe of Asad from al-Kūfah. He was weak. Al-Bukhārī 🗼 mentioned in al-Tārīkh, “His narrations are *munkar*.” An-Nasāʾī and others considered him weak. ʿUrfān is the popular spelling of his father’s name. Al-Ḥāfiz Abū Ṭāmir al-ʿAbdārī spelled his name ʿIrfān.

The Battle of Sīffin was the battle between the Syrians, headed by Muʿāwiyyah, and the Iraqis, headed by ʿAlī 🗼.
EXPLANATION OF THE INTRODUCTION TO ṢAḤĪḤ MUSLIM

The point of this narration is that al-Mu‘allā lied to Abū Wā'il, because Ibn Mas‘ūd died in 32 AH, which is maintained by the majority, or 33 AH. This was three years before the end of ‘Uthmān’s caliphate. The Battle of Ṣiffīn took place two years after ‘Alī took the office of the caliphate. Thus, the only way Ibn Mas‘ūd could have attacked them is if he were to have risen after death; and in fact, he did not.

The high status, virtue, and integrity of Abū Wā'il makes it obvious he would never say an attack occurred that didn’t. This leaves us with no option but to lay the lie at the feet of al-Mu‘allā bin ‘Urfān, besides his [known] weakness.

Imām Muslim said:

‘Amr bin ‘Alī and Ḥasan al-Ḥulwānī both narrated to me on the authority of ‘Affān bin Muslim, “We were near Ismā‘il bin ‘Ulayyah, and a man narrated on the authority of another man, so I said, ‘Indeed, this is not reliable.’ So the man asked, ‘Are you backbiting him?’ Ismā‘il said, ‘He is not backbiting him; rather, he is judging him as unreliable.’”

Abū Ja‘far ad-Dārimi narrated to us that Bishr bin ‘Umar narrated, “I asked Mālik bin Anas about Muḥammad bin ‘Abdīr-Raḥmān, who transmits on the authority of Sa‘īd bin al-Musayyib, and he said, ‘He is not trustworthy.’ I asked him about Ṣāliḥ, a freed slave of at-Taw‘amah, and he said, ‘He is not trustworthy.’ I asked him about Shu‘bāh, on whose authority Ibn Abī Dhi‘b transmitted, and he said, ‘He is not trustworthy.’ I asked him about Abul-Huwairīth, and he said, ‘He is not trustworthy.’ I asked him about Shu‘bāh, on whose authority Ibn Abī Dhi‘b transmitted, and he said, ‘He is not trustworthy.’ I asked him about Ḥarām bin ‘Uthmān, and he said, ‘He is not trustworthy.’ I asked Mālik [what the concern was] about these five and he said, ‘They are not trustworthy in terms of their ahādīth.’ I asked him about another man whose name I forgot, and he said, ‘Did you see him in my book?’ I said, ‘No.’ He said, ‘If he was trustworthy, you would have seen him in my book.’”
Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Abū Ja'far ad-Dārīmī” was named Aḥmad bin Sa’īd bin Ṣakhr an-Naisābūrī. He was a trustworthy, meticulous, established scholar, among the memorizers of aḥādīth. He spent most of his lifetime journeying to seek knowledge of aḥādīth.

“At-Taw'amah” was, according to al-Qāḍī ‘Īyād, “… the daughter of Umayyah bin Khalaf al-Jumāhī as maintained by al-Bukhārī and others. Al-Wāqīḍī said she had a twin sister, hence the nickname. She was the maid of Abū Ṣālīḥ, whose name was Nabhān.”

Moreover, Mālik judged Şālīḥ, at-Taw'amah’s master, to be weak; he said, “He is not trustworthy.” Yaḥyā bin Maʿīn disagreed with him, saying, “Şālīḥ is a trustworthy authority.” Someone mentioned to him, “But Mālik left narrating from him.” He replied, “Mālik met him when he became old and senile. The same for ath-Thawrī, who met him after he became senile and heard from him some munkar aḥādīth. Before that, he was trustworthy."

Abū Aḥmad bin ‘Adi said, “There is no harm in hearing from him before he became senile, just as in the case of Ibn Abī Dhi'b, Ibn Juraiḥ, and Ziyād bin Sa’d, among others.”

Abū Zu'rāḥ said, “Şālīḥ is weak.” Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzi said, “He is not a strong narrator.” Abū Ḥātim bin Ḥībbān said, “Şālīḥ, the master of at-Taw'amah, changed in 125 AH; his earlier narrations became mixed up with his later ones [after the change] and no one could tell the old from the new; thus, he was abandoned”; and Allāh knows best.

“Abul-Ḥuwairith,” whom Mālik judged to be untrustworthy, was named ‘Abdur-Rahmān bin Mu‘āwiyyah bin Ḥuwairith al-Anṣārī, az-Zurqī al-Madāni. Al-Ḥākim Abū Aḥmad said, “He is not considered a strong narrator by hadīth scholars.” However, Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal opposed Mālik’s judgment of him, saying, “Shu’bah narrated aḥādīth from him.”
Al-Bukhārī included him in his book *at-Tārikh*, and made no criticism of him. He even said about him, “Shu’bāh called him Abul-Juwairiyah.” Al-Ḥākim Abū ʿAbdāllah related that statement [of Shu’bāh] and commented, “This is untrue.”

“Shu’bāh bin Abī Dhi‘b,” according to Mālik, was “trustworthy.” He was Shu’bāh al-Qurshi al-Hāshimi al-Madani. He was nicknamed Abū ʿAbdillāh and Abū Yahyā, and he was a servant of Ibn ʿAbbās ﷺ, who heard *ahādīth* from him.

Many, including Mālik, considered him weak. However, both Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal and Yahyā bin Ma‘īn said, “He is okay.” Ibn ʿAdi said, “I have not seen any *munkar ahādīth* from him.”

“Ibn Abī Dhi‘b” was the respected gentleman Muḥammad bin ‘Abdir-Raḥmān bin al-Mughirah bin al-Ḥārith bin Abī Dhi‘b. The name of Abū Dhi‘b is Hishām bin Shu’bāh bin ‘Abdillāh al-Qurshi al-ʿĀmīrī al-Madani. His last name was taken from his great-grandfather.

“Ḥārām bin ʿUthmān,” whom Mālik judged untrustworthy, was according to al-Bukhārī, “Anṣārī Salami, and his narrations are *munkar*.” Az-Zubair said, “He was affiliated with the Shi‘ah. He narrated *ahādīth* from Ibn Jābir bin ‘Abdillāh.” An-Nāsāʾī said, “He is a weak narrator from Madīnah.”

As for Mālik’s statement judging every narrator mentioned in his book trustworthy, this is the judgment of Mālik; but not everyone has the same opinion about all the people in his book.

Scholars of *ahādīth* have differed regarding an upright person’s narration from an unknown source: Does it necessitate that the status of the source is elevated? Some said yes, whereas the majority believe it does not. The latter is the right opinion, since an upright person may narrate from an untrustworthy narrator not for purpose of evidence, but merely for consideration, supporting evidence, or other purposes.

There are two [acceptable] ways [to narrate from an untrustworthy
narrator]. The first is to maintain the same opinion as Mālik; that whomever is mentioned in his book is upright [despite being unknown to others].

The second is to say, “I have been told by a trustworthy source.” This statement is enough to assert the uprightness of the source, according to those who share the same methodology of criticism with the speaker of that statement, and is correct. However, those who do not share the same methodology or do not know the status of the source cannot use that statement as a sufficient judgment of the uprightness of the source, because there could be criticism of this source that the person reporting the hadīth may not consider worthwhile, but that others do. For indeed, the causes of criticism are subtle and subject to disagreement, such that if the name of the source was mentioned, [someone] might be able to find some criticism about the source.

Imām Muslim said:

Al-Faḍḥ bin Sahl narrated to me, “Yaḥyā bin Maʿīn narrated to me that Ḥajjāj narrated to [him] that Ibn Abī Dhīʾb narrated to [him] on the authority of Shuraḥbīl bin Saʿd, and he was discredited [with lying regarding aḥādīth near the end of his life].”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Shuraḥbīl” was one of the leading scholars of maghāizi (i.e. the military campaigns of the Prophet). Sufyān bin ʿUyainah said, “There was none more knowledgeable than him in regard to maghāizi. People were afraid that if he asked them for something and they didn’t grant it to him, he would say, ‘Your father did not attend the Battle of Badr.’”

People other than Sufyān said, “Shuraḥbīl was a servant of the Anṣār. He was from Madīnah, nicknamed Abū Saʿd.” Muhammad
bin Sa’d said, “He was a senior shaikh. He narrated hadith from Zaid bin Thabit and the majority of the Companions of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ. When he got older, he became senile and needy. He is not an authority when it comes to proofs.”

Imām Muslim said:

Muḥammad bin ‘Abdillāh bin Quhzādh narrated to me, “I heard Abū Ishāq at-Ṭālaqāni saying, ‘I heard Ibn al-Mubārak saying, “[At one time], if I had to choose between entering Paradise and meeting ‘Abdullāh bin Muḥarrar, I would have chosen to meet him, then enter Paradise. When I did meet him, dung was more preferred to me than him.””

Al-Faḍl bin Sahl narrated to me that Walīd bin Šalīḥ narrated to [him], “‘Ubadullāh bin ‘Amr said, ‘Zaid (bin Abī Unaisah) said, “Do not take [ahādīth] from my brother!””

Imām an-Nawawī commented:

“Abū Unaisah” was named Zaid. His brother was Yahyā, the person mentioned in the first narration. He was Jazrī, and narrated from az-Zuhri and ‘Amr bin Shu’āib. He was a weak narrator. Al-Bukhārī said, “He is not that trustworthy.” An-Nasā’ī said, “He is weak and his narrations were abandoned.”

His brother Zaid was trustworthy, and al-Bukhārī and Muslim referred to him as an authority. Muḥammad bin Sa’d said, “He was trustworthy, narrated many hadith, was a scholar of fiqh, and a well of knowledge.”

Imām Muslim said:

Ahmad bin Ibrāhīm ad-Dawraqi narrated to me that ‘Abdus-Salām al-Wābiṣi narrated to [him] that ‘Abdullāh bin Ja’far ar-Raqqi
narrated to him on the authority of ‘Ubaidullāh bin ‘Amr, “Yahyā bin Abī Unaisah was a liar.”

Āḥmad bin Ibrāhīm narrated to me that Sulaimān bin Ḥarb narrated to [him] on the authority of Ḥammād bin Zaid that he said, “Farqād was mentioned near Ayyūb, so he said, ‘Indeed, Farqād is not a qualified ḥadīth narrator.’”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Ad-Dawraqi” was mentioned earlier.

“Al-Wābiṣī” was ‘Abdus-Salām bin ‘Abdir-Raḥmān bin Ṣakhr bin ‘Abdir-Raḥmān bin Wābiṣah bin Ma‘bad al-Asdi, Abul-Faḍl. He was the judge of ar-Raqqah, Ḥarrān, and Ḥalab. He died in Baghdaḏ.

“Farqād” was Farqād bin Ya‘qūb as-Sabakhi from Baṣra. He was a faithful Tābi‘i. The scholars of aḥādīth, however, do not consider his narration to be admissible because ḥadīth was not his field of study. Just as we mentioned earlier, we do not see the righteous more false in anything than they are regarding aḥādīth. Nevertheless, there is a report that Yahyā bin Ma‘īn considered him trustworthy.

Imām Muslim said:

‘Abdur-Raḥmān bin Bishr al-‘Abdi narrated to me, “I heard Muḥammad bin ‘Abdillāh bin ‘Ubaid bin ‘Umair al-Laithi mentioned in the presence of Yahyā bin Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān, and he criticized him severely. Then he was asked, ‘[Is he] weaker than Ya‘qūb bin ‘Aṭā?’ He said, ‘Yes,’ then said, ‘I never saw anyone transmitting on the authority of Muḥammad bin ‘Abdillāh bin ‘Ubaid bin ‘Umair.’”

Bishr bin al-Ḥakam narrated to me, “I heard Yahyā bin Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān criticize Ḥakīm bin Jubair and ‘Abdul-‘Alā; and he deemed Yahyā bin Mūsā bin Dīnār weak, [saying about him], ‘His aḥādīth are rīḥ [wind, i.e., weak and not established].’ [Yahyā also] discredited
Mūsā bin Dihqān and Ḥūṣayn bin Ḥūṣayn bin Abī Ḥāliba bin Abī Ḥāliba al-Madani.”

I heard al-Ḥasan bin Ḥūṣayn saying, “Ibn al-Mubārak said to me, ‘When you go to Jarīr, write down all of his knowledge except the aḥādīth of the three [people]; do not write the aḥādīth of ‘Ubadah bin Mu‘attib, as-Sarī bin Ismā‘īl, or Muḥammad bin Sālim.’”

Imām an-Nawawī commented:

“Ḥakīm bin Jubair” was Asdi, a Shī‘ī from al-Kūfah. Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzi said, “He was an extreme Shī‘ī.” ‘Abdur-Rahmān bin Mahdi and Shu‘bah were asked, “Why did you abandon Ḥakīm’s narrations?” They answered, “We are afraid of the Fire.”

“‘Abdul-A‘lā” was Ibn ‘Āmir ath-Tha‘libi from al-Kūfah.

“Yahyā bin Mūsā bin Dīnār” has been found spelled this way in all the available versions of Sahih Muslim, with the word ‘bin’ between Yahyā and Mūsā. It is undoubtedly a mistake, and the correct name is without it; this is maintained by memorizers of aḥādīth like Abū ‘Alī al-Ghassānī al-Jiyānī, among others. This mistake was made by the narrators of the book of Sahih Muslim, but not by Muslim himself.

In this narration, Yahyā bin Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān discredited Ḥakīm bin Jubair, ‘Abdul-A‘lā, Mūsā bin Dīnār, Mūsā bin Dihqān, and Ḥūṣayn. There is a unanimous agreement on the weakness of those narrators, and the statements of the scholars of hadīth [about them] are well known.

“Mūsā bin Dīnār” was from Makkah. He narrated from Sālim as maintained by an-Nasā‘ī.

“Mūsā bin Dihqān” was from Başrah. He narrated from Ibn Ka‘b bin Mālik.

39 [Translator’s note] They were afraid to get involved with a person whose narrations were potential lies. Had they narrated those lies from him, they would have been transmitting lies upon the Prophet, which would certainly have led them straight to Hell.
“İsā bin Abī ‘İsā” was ‘İsā bin Maisarah, Abū Mūsā. It is said his name was Abū Muḥammad al-Ghifārī. He was from Madīnah, but was originally from al-Kūfah. He worked as a tailor, a wheat dealer, and a khabbāṭ [seller of a kind of fish called al-khabbāṭ]. Yahyā bin Maʾın said, “He worked as a tailor, then as a wheat dealer, and finally as a khabbāṭ seller.”

“‘Ubaidah bin Muʿattib, as-Sarī bin Ismāʿīl, or Muḥammad bin Sālim” — These three are known to be weak and abandoned. This is the correct and widely known opinion [about them], as found in the books of al-Muʿtaṣif, al-Mukhtalif, and others. ‘Ubaidah was a child from al-Kūfah. His nickname was Abū ‘Abdil-Karīm. As-Sarī was from the tribe of Hamadān from al-Kūfah, as was Muḥammad bin Sālim. All three were weak narrators from al-Kūfah; and Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

Similar instances of what we mentioned from the words of abdul-‘īhm regarding those [three] transmitters associated with aḥādīth, and reports about their defects, are great in number. It would lengthen this book to mention all of them, and what we [already] mentioned should be sufficient for whoever reflects upon and understands the way of the people [muḥādīthin].

Indeed, [the muḥādīthin] undertook the task of unveiling the defects of narrators of aḥādīth and reporters; they delivered verdicts when they were asked due to the great danger involved in [the transmission of aḥādīth], considering that the reports regarded affairs of the din, whether permitting or discouraging, commanding or prohibiting, encouraging or admonishing.

If a hadīth narrator is not proven truthful or reliable, those knowledgeable [of the weakness of] his condition who transmitted on his authority while hiding [his weakness] from others ignorant of his [state] are sinful for deceiving the common Muslims, since it was possible that some of those who heard these reports would act on
[at least some of] them.

Authentic reports from trustworthy and satisfactory\(^{40}\) narrators are too great in number to [leave any excuse] to relate from untrustworthy, unsatisfactory sources. Thus, I believe the appearance of having memorized countless narrations before the laymen is the sole reason to consider narrating from those weak narrations and unknown asānid even after full knowledge of their weaknesses. Or they may aspire to the layman’s praise, [finding pride in their saying], “How great is the number of \(ahādīth\) that so-and-so has gathered!” Regretfully, those who chose this path in seeking knowledge have no share in it. They are more deserving of being deemed ignorant than knowledgeable.

.................................................................

\textit{Imām an-Nawawi commented:}

This chapter comprises the following points and rules:

\textbf{1)} Know that criticizing narrators is not only permissible but obligatory as unanimously agreed, due to the absolute need to protect the honorable Islamic law. It is not considered prohibited backbiting. It is rather considered advice for the sake of Allāh and His Messenger and the believers. The elite and the pious of this nation have observed this practice, as stated by Muslim, and a number of people embrace this. Personally speaking, I have mentioned a decent number of quotations from the scholars in this regard at the beginning of my explanation of \textit{Sahih al-Bukhārī}.

Note that the criticizer must fear Allāh in this regard and carefully examine what he says, to avoid criticizing someone far from such criticism or lowering someone who is actually of a high status. For certainly, unjustifiable criticism has very harmful ramifications, as it forever stigmatizes \(ahādīth\) and can subsequently ban a \textit{sunnah} of the Prophet or invalidate a legal ruling. Criticism must only be done by those most eligible and knowledge-

\(^{40}\) Imām an-Nawawi commented: This refers to those whose memorization, accuracy, and integrity are perfect. Hence, their narrations are satisfactory.
able of it, whose speech is received with acceptance. Those whose speech is met with rejection are not allowed to criticize anyone, and if they were to do so, they would be backbiting. This is mentioned by al-Qādi ʿIyāḍ, who added, “This is exactly like a witness against whom criticism is allowable by those specializing in criticism. But if anyone else were to speak ill of him—[even] with the exact same criticism—he would be backbiting and should be disciplined accordingly.”

2) Criticism is only acceptable from an unbiased person who is knowledgeable of its requirements.

Is it necessary that a person have more than one criticizer [to have his narrations abandoned]? There is a disagreement among scholars about this; however, the correct view is that the number is unconditional. A person may be judged either criticized or praised by the statement of a single criticizer, because that statement is considered a report in which a [fair] person’s word is acceptable.

Is it conditional to provide the reason for criticism? There is a disagreement about this point [as well]. Ash-Shāfiʿi, along with many others, stipulated this condition because someone may be criticized for something trivial, and because causes of criticism are subtle and a matter of disagreement among scholars. On the other hand, al-Qādi Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī, along with others, maintained that it is not a condition.

Others hold the opinion that it is not necessary for preeminent scholars knowledgeable of the requirements of criticism, but is necessary for anyone else. Based on this opinion, criticism that lacks a reason is not in effect until its reason is made apparent. Those criticized by some of the early scholars yet found in the two books of ʿaḥīb [are found there because the criticism of them is unexplained].

On another note, whenever there is conflicting praise and disparagement of a person, disparagement takes precedence; this is

---

41 [Translator's note] The intended meaning of criticism in this context is to express judgment about the good or bad qualities of someone [in terms of hadith].
the chosen opinion adopted by the verifiers and a large numbers of scholars. It makes no difference if the number of those who praise that particular individual is large or small. Nevertheless, some scholars maintained that if the number of those who praise is large enough, the praise takes precedence. Still, the correct view is the first one, because the one who disparages a narrator knows something about him that the one who praised him has no knowledge of [or else he would not have praised him].

3) Muslim mentioned in this chapter that ash-Sha'bi narrated from al-Ḥārith al-A'war and stated that he (al-Ḥārith) was a liar. Another [Imām] reported from a narrator and stated that he was accused. Yet another [Imām] reported from weak and abandoned narrators. So the question may be asked, why have these leading scholars reported from such narrators despite their being discredited?

There are several answers. First, they may have reported from them in order to unveil their weakness so that they (i.e. reports) wouldn’t confuse them or confuse others later, or that they might question its authenticity.

Second, a weak narrator’s narration is recorded for purposes of support or consideration. Still, it does not individually constitute a proof.

Third, when the narrations of the weak narrator include authentic, weak, and false narrations, they are recorded and then the muḥaddithin and meticulous scholars filter and distinguish them. This task is easy and a known practice among them. For this reason, Sufyān ath-Thawri relied on it when he advised against narrating from al-Kalbi. He was asked, “Don’t you narrate from him?!” He answered, “I know the truth from the lies in his narrations.”

Fourth, the [muḥaddithin] may narrate from them aḥādīth of encouragement and admonition, the virtues of good deeds, stories, żuhd, and upright morals, among others, as long as they are not related to rulings that involve permissibility or prohibition [Islamic rulings and
laws]. *Ahādīth* covering those topics are met with less reservation from the *muhaddithin* and others, in addition to narrating and acting upon reports pertaining to them, as long as they are not fabricated. This is because the origin of those *ahādīth* are already established in Islamic law and known to those who studied it.

In any case, the preeminent scholars do not narrate from weak narrators anything for the purpose of major proof in relation to legal rulings. Such would never be done by any Imam of the preeminent *hadith* scholars nor any of the verifying scholars.

The fact that most jurists depend on weak narrations is incorrect and very inappropriate. If a jurist knows the weakness of a narration, he shouldn’t use it as a proof, and there is agreement that weak narrations are inadmissible as sole proof of legal rulings. However, if its weakness is unknown, he shouldn’t rush to use it until he researches its authenticity, if he knows how. Otherwise he should ask those knowledgeable of its status; and Allāh knows best.

4) With respect to the types of liars in *ahādīth*, al-Qādi ʿIyāḍ clarified them. He said, “Liars are of two types. The first are known to have lied pertaining to the *ahādīth* of the Messenger of Allāh, and they are of different kinds. Some of them fabricate out of ridicule, like the heretics and their ilk who are disrespectful to this religion, while others lie out of their belief it is a religious duty and claim it earns rewards for them, like the ignorant among the worshippers who fabricated *ahādīth* in relation to the virtues of good deeds.

“Another group lies in search of fame, like the sinners among the *muhaddithin*. Yet others lie out of fanaticism, like the advocates of innovations and extremism. Others lie to justify their desires.

“Some of these [liars] do not necessarily fabricate a *matan*, but they use an authentic and famous *isnād* for a weak *matan*. Some mix up chains of narration or interpolate them intentionally in order to make it difficult for others to follow or to convince people they are not ignorant. Others lie by reporting what they did not hear or [saying they] met someone they did not meet, and report authentic
ahādīth from them as if they heard directly from them. Others elevate the statements of the Companions and pieces of Arab wisdom into ahādīth of the Messenger.

“All are liars whose narrations are abandoned. Likewise, those who dare to take ahādīth without verification or precision or being careful about its authenticity should not narrate from the earlier kinds of narrators or accept what they reported, even if they only lied once.

“Just like the perjurer whose testimony is inadmissible if he did it on purpose, there is disagreement about whether such a person’s testimony is to be accepted in the future if he were to repent.

“I say it is correct to accept his repentance, just like any other sinner. The opinion that does not accept his testimony even if his repentance was sincere asserts that his punishment should be intensified due to the lying involved and as an example for others, since the Prophet said, ‘Lying upon me is unlike lying upon anyone else.’”

Al-Qāḍī added, “The second type of liars are those who do not deem any of the above permissible in ahādīth, but they are known as habitual liars [among the people]. The testimony and narration [of this person] is rejected, but sincere repentance serves to benefit him so that his reports [after his repentance] may become accepted again.

“Regarding those who lie very occasionally and are not known to be liars, there should be no decisive disparagement in this case because it is possible they were mistakes (i.e. the lies in question), and if they were to admit they lied intentionally, they are not to be disparaged as long as they hurt nobody, because even though this is considered a sin, it is a single case. It is not considered a major sin because the majority of people could hardly ever avoid making a mistake.

“Also, exaggeration, despite appearing to be a lie, is not compelling enough to consider a person a liar, since the speaker does not mean to report the opposite of the truth. The Prophet said, ‘Abū
Jahm hardly ever leaves his stick (i.e. meaning he is so hard on women)."

"Also, [Prophet] Ibrāhīm al-Kalīl said about Hājar that she is his sister."

This is the end of al-Qādi’s words and he handled this topic masterfully ﷺ; and Allāh knows best.
Chapter:

What is Considered Correct Regarding the Transmission of Some Narrators On the Authority of Others and Warning Against Those Who Err in This Respect

Imām Muslim said:

Some pretenders to knowledge of hadith from the people of our time made statements regarding authentication and weakening of chains. Ignoring them and their evil is truly the wisest approach, since it is the most effective means for them to die away, and better suited to draw the attention of the ignorant away from them.

We have seen fit to unveil the invalidity of [certain] evil statements and to provide a comprehensive refutation of statements deemed erroneous by scholars, as we fear their evil consequences and the dangers brought about by allowing the ignorant to be tempted by innovation and hasten to believe mistakes and rejected statements.

In the beginning of the book, we introduced an opinion and the reports of the evil of its promoter's thinking. He alleged that every chain of hadith that begins, "So-and-so narrated on the authority of so-and-so" [mu'an'an] who were known to be contemporaries, with the probability that the hadith was exchanged verbally between those two face to face, [has a verification issue]. [That is to say, according to him,] we do not know [for certain] that the narrator who related the hadith ever heard from the one who [was said to have] reported the hadith to him unless we have some report that they ever met and spoke face to face for the purpose of hadith.
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That proof is not established, according to him, in any report that comes in this manner until he has knowledge of both transmitters meeting in their era one or more times and speaking face to face for the purpose of narration, or at least one [separate] report [is obtained] in which they clearly met during their era. If he does not have [this type of report, or knowledge of it], [there] is no [proof] he related the report on whose authority he transmitted.

Thus, the authenticity of ahādith like that which we described [muʾānʾan: transmitters being contemporaries with the possibility they met] is unresolved [according to him] until there are [transmitters] who heard from that source an amount of ahādith equal to what the source narrated [with muʾānʾan].
Chapter:

The Permissibility of Relying on Aḥādīth Related via Mu’ān’ān ["On the Authority of"]

Imām Muslim said:

This statement, may Allāh have mercy on you, of accusation regarding the [mu’ān’ān] chain is an invented one, produced without precedent, and unsupported by scholars. The following is the widespread opinion agreed upon among ablīl-‘ilm who know both early and recent reports and transmissions.

The narration from any trustworthy narrator who reports a hadīth from someone equally trustworthy, with the feasible probability that [the narrator] met [his source] and heard from him due to their living in the same era—even if there is no [separate] report that they met or spoke face to face—is affirmed, and [may be used as a] proof. This is in all cases, unless there is clear evidence that this transmitter did not meet or hear from the one he transmitted from.

When the matter is ambiguous regarding the possibility [of the reporter having met or heard from his source], the transmission is always [accepted] as coming by way of “hearing”—[again], until there is evidence [otherwise].

...............................................................

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

Chapter Overview: Muslim claimed that scholars, both in the
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early and present times, are unanimous that a hadīth mu’ān’ān is generally judged muttaṣil [a hadīth with a continuous chain of narration to a Companion of the Prophet or a Tābi‘ī, which was exchanged face to face on condition that a possibility exists that they met each other and that those narrators are free from tādlīq]. However, Muslim reported some of his contemporary scholars as saying that a hadīth mu’ān’ān is unreliable and cannot be judged muttaṣil unless the narrators are proven to have met at least once in their lifetime—that the possibility that they might have met is not enough.

Muslim discredited the holders of such a view at length, while maintaining that scholars believe hadīth mu’ān’ān are judged muttaṣil whether the narrators are proven to have met or there is a possibility they met.

However, verifying scholars deem Muslim’s opinion weak. On the contrary, they consider the view he refuted to be more reliably accredited by scholars of this discipline, including ‘Alī bin al-Madīnī and al-Bukhārī, among others. Moreover, some late scholars added even more conditions.

Al-Qābisi, for example, stipulated there must be a clear proof that the narrators were contemporaries of each other. Moreover, Abul-Muṭaffar as-Sam‘ānī, a Shāfi‘ī scholar, stipulated that companionship between them should have lasted a considerable period.

Abū ‘Amr ad-Dānī al-Muẓaff added the condition that the narrator of such a hadīth should be a well-known reporter of the former narrator. This view was held by Ibn al-Madīnī, al-Bukhārī, and their proponents, supported by the following argument.

If a meeting between the two narrators is proven, it is hadīth mu’ān’ān muttaṣil, because it is assumed that a narrator who is not mudallīs uses this narrative format only to indicate direct hearing. Moreover, inference also proves it, since all narrators other than mudallīs narrators use this narrative format for what they directly heard. The narration of a mudallīs is unreliable. Thus, if meeting is proven, the hadīth is most likely muttaṣil.
However, this argument relies on probability, which cannot be applied to the case where meeting is possible but not proven. In this case, a hadith cannot be judged mutaṣal; rather, it is judged majhūl [a hadith in whose chain of narrators there is an unknown narrator]. Thus, judging such a narration unreliable is not based on whether the narrator is known to be a liar or untrustworthy; rather, it is based on doubting his status; and Allāh knows best.

We have so far mentioned the ruling on a hadith muʾanʾan with a narrator who is not mudallis. As for one whose narrator is mudallis, an explanation of the preponderant view held by earlier and later generations of hadith, fiqh, and usūl scholars has been mentioned. That is, muʾanʾan is judged mutaṣal if the conditions we cited above—whose number is subject to disagreement—are met.

Some scholars hold that hadith muʾanʾan is by no means reliable because it is likely a hadith munqatiʿ [a hadith with a missing link after the Tābiʿī]. However, this is an invalid view, taking into consideration the above-mentioned consensus of the Salaf (righteous predecessors).

We have already stated above that their proofs are strong probability and induction, and Allāh knows best. However, if the narrator says, “So-and-so told me that so-and-so said such-and-such”—for example, “Az-Zuhri told me that Saʿīd bin al-Musayyib said such-and-such”—or such phrases, the majority of scholars hold that the particle anna (א) is equivalent to ‘an (א) in this regard. Thus, such a narrative format is judged mutaṣal if the above-mentioned condition is met.

Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal, Yaʿqūb bin Shaibah, and Abū Bakr al-Bardījī adopt the view that the format in which the particle anna is used should not be judged mutaṣal even if ‘an is used to indicate a hadith mutaṣal. However, the former is the preponderant view. By the same token, using such verbs as ḥaddatba (told), qāla (said), ḏakara (mentioned), and the like should all be understood in the context of hadith mutaṣal and to indicate direct hearing.
Imām Muslim said:

To both the inventors and proponents of the view we detailed above, we say: Your view in the broad sense admits that a narration reported by one trustworthy narrator from another trustworthy narrator is authentic and enforceable. However, you later added the condition that they should be known to have met at least once or have been reported that the former heard from the latter. Is such a qualification introduced by any of the prominent scholars whose opinions are enforceable? Otherwise, bring forth a proof for your claim.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“To both inventors and proponents of the view we detailed above, we say: Your view in the broad sense admits that a narration reported by one trustworthy narrator from another trustworthy narrator is authentic and enforceable...” — Muslim’s statement refers to the great rule upon which most Islamic rulings are based (i.e. the reliability and enforceability of a hadith reported on the authority of one trustworthy narrator). Thus, a special care and investigation should be given to this rule.

Scholars dealt at length with providing support for and explanation of this rule. Moreover, some of the Salāf singled out compilations specifically for it, and the prominent scholars of hadith and usūl gave it special attention. The first scholar we know to have compiled a work particularly about this rule was Imām ash-Shāfi’ī. Moreover, its traditional and rational proofs are cited in the books of usūl. Therefore, we briefly shed light on this issue, including the various opinions pertaining to it.

Scholars divide reports into two types: mutawātir [recurring] and āhād [unique]. Mutawātir refers to a hadith reported by a significant enough number of narrators throughout the chain of narration
to rule out any possibility of conspiracy to forge a lie. Moreover, a *mutawātir* narration is known by the sizable number of its report-
ers equally in the beginning, middle, and end. A further stipulation
is that narrations must be in decisive—not speculative—language,
and that their statement should convey certainty (in terms of rulings
and knowledge). The majority of the verifying scholars are of the
view that the required number of narrators is unspecified and that
it is not a prerequisite that narrators be Muslims or upright persons.
However, there are other weak views on this point and many other
sub-issues dealt with in detail in the books of *hadith* principles.

An *aḥād hadīth* does not meet the prerequisites of a *mutawātir hadīth,*
regardless of the number of narrators. Scholars hold different
views regarding it. However, the majority of Muslims, including the
Companions, Tābi‘īn, and later generations of *hadith,* *fiqh,* and *usūl*
scholars, are of the opinion that *aḥād aḥādīth* are one of the main
sources of Islamic law, and that acting upon them is obligatory.
However, they convey presumptive rather than definitive knowl-
dge. Moreover, their enforceable effect is based on the texts of
Islamic law rather than rational evidence.

However, the Rāfi‘ī, Qadariyyah, and some of the Zāhiriyah
[literalists] hold that it is not obligatory to act upon them. Some of
them claim that this view is based on rational evidence, while others
claim that it is based on traditional evidence.

There is still another group of scholars who view that it is obliga-
tory to act upon it based on rational evidence. Al-Jubā‘i, a Mu‘tazili
partner, held it to be obligatory to act only on a *hadīth* narrated by at
least two at each level of the chain of narrators. Others view that it
is only obligatory to act upon a *hadīth* that is narrated by at least four
at each level of the chain of narrators.

Still others view that it has the effect of conceptual rather than
crude knowledge. Other *hadīth* scholars hold that only *aḥād aḥādīth*
in *Sahih al-Bukhari* and *Sahih Muslim* have the effect of definitive
knowledge, unlike any other *aḥād aḥādīth*. We have already refuted
this view.
All these views, with the exception of the view of the majority of the scholars, are unfounded. The view that claims ḥadīth are unreliable is obviously erroneous. All the Prophet’s letters were delivered by a single messenger, and the Prophet would enjoin that they be enforced. This continued during the time of the Rightly-Guided Caliphs and later generations.

To clarify, the Rightly-Guided Caliphs, all other Companions, and later generations adhered to conforming with ḥadīth if they confirmed existing Sunnah. Moreover, they deemed them a reliable resource for jurisprudence, annulling rulings previously issued that ran counter to them. In addition, they would request ḥadīth as evidence. In controversial issues, they were accepted as preponderant evidence. These are established facts.

Thus, ḥadīth are acted upon with the full power of Islamic law behind them. The view that it conveys definitive knowledge goes against sound logic, since it cannot convey definitive knowledge while it carries the possibility of mistakes, uncertainty, lies, and so on; and Allāh knows best.

-----------------------------------------------

Imām Muslim said:

If he ascribes such a claim [i.e. that ḥadīth narration must meet some qualification to be reliable] to any of the Salaf, we require that he prove this. In fact, neither he nor anyone else will find such a proof. If he claims there is substantial evidence supporting his opinion, we ask him to provide them.

[He might say in support of his claim], “I found narrators, early and recent, transmitting ḥadīth from each other when [the reporter] never saw or heard anything from [the one he transmitted from], and mursal reports are not reliable. In this regard, it should be taken into account that mursal narrations are not reliable, according to their view and the view of prominent ḥadīth scholars. Thus, on account of this weakness, I rely on researching the reporting of the transmitter in each report on the authority of [the one from whom he
transmits]. Thus, when I unexpectedly come upon his hearing from [a source he is not known to frequently report from], all of what he transmitted on that persons authority is judged the same to me from then on. And if knowledge of [his actually hearing from whom he transmits from] is elusive, I refrain from reporting it; it is no longer reliable in my opinion due to the possibility of *irsāl*.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“In this regard, it should be taken into account that *mursal* narrations are not reliable, according to their view and the view of prominent hadith scholars” — This is the preponderant view of hadith scholars. As for fiqh scholars, it is the opinion adopted by ash-Shāfi‘i, among others. However, Mālik, Aḥmad, Abū Ḥanīfah, and the majority of scholars are of the view that *ahādīth* in the *mursal* form can be reliable. We have summarized above at length all the opinions regarding *mursal* rulings; and Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

To refute this, we say: If the reason for judging such a *hadith* unreliable is the possibility that it might have been *mursal*, then all *mu‘ān‘an* *ahādīth* must be judged unreliable unless direct transmission is proven throughout the chain of narrators.

An example is any *hadith* narrated by Hishām bin ‘Urwh from his father from ‘Ā'ishah. In this case, we certainly know that Hishām heard from his father, who heard from ‘Ā'ishah, and that ‘Ā'ishah in turn heard from the Prophet ﷺ.

If Hishām does not say in a narration he narrated from his father, “I heard my father or my father told me,” it is possible that there is a missing narrator between Hishām and his father. In other words, it is possible that Hishām heard from someone else, who heard it from his father. Thus, Hishām would use the *mursal* form if he did not want to ascribe the narration to the person he heard from. The
same can also be possible in the case of his father’s narrating from ‘Ā’ishah. The same applies to every case where the narrators do not state that they heard from one another.

Generally speaking, if those narrators are known to have narrated from each other a significant number of ḥadīth, it is also possible that in some occasions either of them indirectly heard some narrations from the original reporter, but reported in them in the mursal form without naming the person heard from. In some other cases, the mursal form is not used and the name of the source is stated.

This custom is commonly and widely practiced in ḥadīth narrations by trustworthy narrators and preeminent scholars.

Below, we will give as many examples of this practice as may be enough to support its validity (if Allāh so wills).

Abū Ayyūb as-Sakhtiyānī, Ibn al-Mubārak, Waki’, and Ibn Numair (among other narrators) reported from Hishām bin ‘Urwah from his father from ‘Ā’ishah that she said, “I used to put perfume on the Messenger of Allāh when he entered or ended the state of ḫirām [state of purity for Ḥajj and ‘Umrah], using the best perfume I could find.”

The very same narration was also reported by al-Laith bin Sa’d, Dāwūd al-‘Aṭṭār, Ḥumaid bin al-Aswad, Wuhaib bin Khālid, and Abū Usāmah from Hishām, who said, “Uthmān bin ‘Urwah told me from ‘Urwah on the authority of ‘Ā’ishah that she related the ḥadīth.”

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“I used to put perfume on the Messenger of Allāh when he entered or ended the state of ḫirām, using the best perfume I could find” — The ḥadīth denotes that it is recommended to apply perfume upon entering the state of ḫirām. Although a controversial issue among scholars both in the past and present times, ash-Shāfi’ī
and many other scholars hold that it is recommended. On the other hand, Mālik, among others, held that it is disliked. We will address the issue in detail in the chapter on Ḥajj, if Allāh so wills.

Imām Muslim said:

In another example, Ḥishām reported from his father from ‘Ā’ishah that she said, “When the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ was in i’tikāf [seclusion in the masjid during Ramaḍān], he would incline his head towards me and I would comb his hair during my monthly periods.”

The very same narration was also reported by Mālik bin Anas from az-Zuhri from ‘Urwah from ‘Amrāh on the authority of ‘Ā’ishah that she related the ḥadīth.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“When the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ was in i’tikāf (seclusion in the masjid during Ramaḍān), he would incline his head towards me and I would comb his hair during my monthly periods” — The ḥadīth has many indications. First, the body parts of a woman during her menses are pure. Thus, the view of Abū Yūsuf that her hand is impure is unsound. Second, the ḥadīth indicates that it is permissible for a mu’takif [a person in seclusion in the masjid] to comb his hair. It is also permissible for such a person to look at and touch his wife, without lust. Scholars belonging to our school of fiqh cited the ḥadīth as a support for the view that a menstruating woman may not enter the masjid and that i’tikāf can take place only in a masjid. The ḥadīth does not actually lend support to any of these two indications. It merely suggests that they are recommended. However, fiqh books depend on other textual evidence to support these rulings.

Al-Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ used this ḥadīth to support his view that slightly touching a woman does not invalidate wudu’ (ablution) and used it to refute ash-Shāfi‘i’s view in this regard. However, it is strange to
seek support from this hadith that gives no indication whatsoever to this effect. The hadith does not suggest that the Prophet directly touched 'Ā'ishah’s skin while in a state of wudu’ or that he performed salah [afterward]. It is possible that he was not in a state of ritual purification. Supposing even that he was, there is no indication in the hadith that he did not renew it.

[However, it is accepted that] the wudu’ of the one touched (in this case, the Prophet) is not invalidated, according to one of two views attributed to ash-Shāfi‘i. Also according to ash-Shāfi‘i, touching the hair of one’s spouse does not invalidate wudu’, as stated in his books. [And this] hadith suggests no more than that she touched the hair of the Prophet. And Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

Moreover, az-Zuhri and Şāliḥ bin Abī Ḥassān reported from Abū Salamah from ‘Ā’ishah that the Messenger of Allāh used to kiss her while he was fasting.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“Moreover, az-Zuhri and Şāliḥ bin Abī Ḥassān...” — The hadith is narrated as such in the original manuscripts we have in our country. Al-Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ also confirmed that the hadith is narrated as such in the original manuscripts they have in his country. However, Abū ‘Alī al-Ghassāni said that, in the manuscript of ar-Rāzi, he came across Şāliḥ bin Kīsān as one of the narrators of the hadith. Abū ‘Alī said that it is a mistake and the correct name of the narrator is Şāliḥ bin Abī Ḥassān.

Furthermore, the hadith is related by an-Nasā‘i and others from Ibn Wahb from Ibn Abī Dhī’b from Şāliḥ bin Abī Ḥassān on the authority of Abū Salamah. Here, I report at-Tirmidhī as reporting al-Bukhārī to have said, “Şāliḥ bin Abī Ḥassān is a trustworthy narrator.” Moreover, he is judged by other scholars to be trustworthy.
EXPLANATION OF THE INTRODUCTION TO ŞÂHÎH MUSLîM

This is mentioned here to avoid confusion between this narrator and Şâlih bin Ḥassân Abūl-Ḥarth al-Baṣrî al-Madînî (some scholars refer to him as al-Madînî). Actually, he was in the same class as Şâlih bin Abî Ḥassân, and both of them narrated from Abû Salamah bin ‘Abdîr-Raḥmân.

In addition, Ibn Abû Dhi‘b narrates from both of them. However, scholars are unanimous that Şâlih bin Ḥassân is a weak narrator, and their statements in this regard are commonly known. Al-Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdi, in his book al-Kifâyah, said, “Hâdîth criticizers are unanimous that Şâlih bin Ḥassân is an unreliable narrator since he has a bad and inaccurate memory.” And Allâh knows best.

Imâm Muslim said:

Regarding the narration of the kiss, Yahyâ bin Abî Kathîr said, “Abû Salamah bin ‘Abdîr-Raḥmân told me that ‘Umar bin ‘Abdîl-‘Azîz told him that ‘Urwah told him that ‘Â’ishah told him that the Prophet ﷺ used to kiss her while he was fasting.”

Imâm an-Nawawî commented:

The above chain of narrators includes four Tâbî‘în narrating from one another, the first of whom is Yahyâ bin Abî Kathîr. This is very rare in a chain of narrators, and is one of a very few like it [in terms of ismâd], a small number of which will appear in this book. I collected as many of them as I could in the introduction of my book on the explanation of Şâhîh al-Bukhârî, and I have already referred to this above.

This chain of narrators contains another rare characteristic: the seniors relating from their juniors. Abû Salamah was a senior Tâbî‘î and ‘Umar bin ‘Abdîl-‘Azîz was a junior in both age and class, although he was highly regarded in knowledge, piety, devotion, and ḥudâ.
The name of Abū Salamah was ʿAbdullāh bin ʿAbdīr-Rahmān bin ʿAwf, as is widely known. Others say that his name was Ismāʿīl, while still others say that his name was unknown. Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal says his nickname was the same as his name. All these views regarding his name are reported by al-Ḥāfiz Abū Muḥammad ʿAbdul-Ghānī al-Maqdisī.

Abū Salamah was one of the prominent and knowledgeable Tābiʿīn and, according to one view, is one of the renowned Seven Jurists.

Yahyā bin Abī Kathīr was a young Tābiʿī nicknamed Abū Naṣr. He saw Anas bin Mālik, heard ʿaḥādīth from ʿas-Sāʿib bin Yazīd, and was highly esteemed. His father, Abū Kathīr, was named Ṣāliḥ, Sayyār, Nashīt, or Dinār based on differing reports.

Imām Muslim said:

Ibn ʿUyainah and others reported from ʿAmr bin Dinār from Jābir that he said, "The Messenger of Allāh allowed us to eat the flesh of horses but he forbade the flesh of donkeys."

This ḥadīth is also narrated by Ḥammād bin Zaid from ʿAmr from Muḥammad bin ʿAlī from Jābir from the Prophet ﷺ. In fact, this form of ʿismāʿ is too recurrent to be enumerated. What I have quoted so far is enough for those of sound reasoning.

And since those whom we discussed above consider the reason for the weakness of ʿaḥādīth the possibility of ʿirṣāl, where there is no record proving that both narrators heard anything from each other, they are bound to doubt the reliability of ʿaḥādīth where a direct hearing between the narrators is proven except in a report where there is explicit admission of hearing. This is based on the fact that ḥadīth scholars, as we stated above, on some occasions used the ʿumsāl form and did not mention the person they directly heard from. In some other cases, they report the narration exactly how they heard it. If they heard it from a junior, they say so, and if they heard it from a senior, they say so, as we explained above.
As far as we know, none of the Imāms of the Salaf who are experts in examining the authenticity of the chains of narrators—such as Ayyūb as-Sakhtiyānī, Ibn ‘Awn, Mālik bin Anas, Shu‘bāh bin al-Ḥajjāj, Yaḥyā bin Sa‘īd al-Qaṭān, ‘Abdur-Raḥmān bin Māḥdī, and later generations of ḥadīth scholars—examined the matter of directly hearing or not, as claimed by the proponents of that view.

They only investigated a direct hearing when the narrator was known to be mudallīs, so as to eliminate any chance of taddīs.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“When the narrator was known to be mudallīs” — We have already discussed taddīs at length above; there is no need to repeat it here.

Imām Muslim said:

Investigating the status of a narrator who is not mudallīs, in the manner assumed by the holders of the view we are discussing, was never the custom of any of the scholars we mentioned above or any other scholar.

For instance, ‘Abdullāh bin Yazīd al-Anṣārī narrated from both Ḥudhaifah and Abū Mas‘ūd al-Anṣārī a hadīth he attributed to the Prophet ﷺ. In doing so, he did not state explicitly that he heard from them. Moreover, there is no report to the effect that ‘Abdullāh bin Yazīd met Ḥudhaifah and Abū Mas‘ūd face to face to transmit aḥādīth from them. Furthermore, there is no single specific report whatsoever to the effect that he saw them.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

“‘Abdullāh bin Yazīd al-Anṣārī narrated from both Ḥudhaifah and Abū Mas‘ūd al-Anṣārī a hadīth he attributed to the Prophet ﷺ. In doing so, he did not state explicitly that he heard from them. Moreover, there is no report to the effect that ‘Abdullāh bin Yazīd met Ḥudhaifah and Abū Mas‘ūd face to face to transmit aḥādīth from them. Furthermore, there is no single specific report whatsoever to the effect that he saw them.

152
— The hadith narrated from Abū Mas‘ūd addresses a husband providing for his family. It is related by al-Bukhārī and Muslim in their books of Sahih. The hadith narrated from Ḥudhaiyah reads, “Allah’s Messenger informed me of what is going to happen...” related by Muslim.

The name of Abū Mas‘ūd was ‘Uqbah bin ‘Amr al-Anṣārī al-Badrī. The majority of scholars stated that he was called al-Badrī because he lived in Badr, not because he participated in the Battle of Badr. However, az-Zuhri, al-Ḥakam, and Muḥammad bin Ishāq from among the Tābī‘īn, along with al-Bukhārī, held that he participated in it.

Imām Muslim said:

In fact, we know no scholars past or present to have ever criti-
cized the authenticity and reliability of the two ahādīth narrated by ‘Abdullāh bin Yazīd from Ḥudhaiyah and Abū Mas‘ūd. Rather, they and similar chains of narrators are considered by our contemporary hadīth scholars to be at the highest levels of reliability and enforce-
ability as far as their purport and the rulings they provide.

However, according to the holders of the opposing view, these ahādīth are very weak and unreliable unless the narrator was proven to have heard from the immediate source.

Imām an-Nawawī commented:

The use of “very weak and unreliable” above is out of place and it would have been more appropriate to use just “weak” instead. In reality, the holders of the opposing view do not claim that they are weak to a great extent; rather, they merely judge them weak and thus unreliable.
Imam Muslim said:

As a result, if we were to count the authentic *ahadith* judged so by expert scholars that are considered weak pursuant to the claim made earlier, it would be impossible to fully investigate and enumerate every single one of them. Therefore, we cited just a few of them to represent many other *ahadith*.

In this regard, Abu ‘Uthmnan an-Nahdi and Abu Rafi’ as-Sa‘igh lived through both *jahiliyyah* [pre-Islamic ignorance] and Islam. They accompanied the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ, including the participants of the Battle of Badr and others, and narrated *ahadith* from them. They used to narrate *ahadith* from younger generations of Companions to the extent that they narrated from Abu Hurairah and Ibn ‘Umar, among others. Moreover, each of them narrated a *hadith* from Ubayy bin Ka‘b from the Prophet ﷺ, while there is not a single narration to the effect that they ever met Ubayy or heard a single *hadith* directly from him.

Imam an-Nawawi commented:

“Abu ‘Uthmnan an-Nahdi” was named ‘Abdur-Rahman bin Mal; his biography is mentioned above.

“Abu Rafi” was named Nufai’ al-Madani. Thabit said, “When Abu Rafi’ was set free, he cried. People asked him, ‘Why are you crying?’ He said, ‘I used to receive two rewards from Allah. Now one of them is gone.’”

“Lived through *jahiliyyah*” — They reached puberty before the mission of the Prophet ﷺ started. *Jahiliyyah* is the period before the mission of the Prophet ﷺ. It was so called because there were many manifestations of [the people’s] ignorance [during this time].

The *hadith* narrated by Abu ‘Uthmnan from Ubayy is the one that reads, “A man whose house is the farthest from the masjid...”
The hadith includes the statement, "Allāh gave you the reward that you sought." It was related by Muslim.

The hadith narrated by Abū Rāfī' from him states that the Prophet ﷺ used to spend the last ten days of Ramadaṇ in i'tikāf. One year he was traveling, so the following year he spent twenty days in i'tikāf. Related by Abū Dāwūd, an-Nasā'i, and Ibn Mājah in their Sunan compilations in addition to a group of the compilers of musnad.

Imām Muslim said:

By the same token, Abū 'Amr ash-Shaibānī, who lived through jāhilīyyah and Islām, and Abū Ma'mar Ţabdullāh bin Sakhbarah narrated a hadith from Abū Mas'ūd al-Anṣārī from the Prophet ﷺ.

Imām an-Nawawī commented:

“Abū ‘Amr ash-Shaibānī” was named Sa’d bin Iyās. We have already mentioned his biography.

The first of the two aḥādīth narrated by ash-Shaibānī states that a man came to the Prophet ﷺ and said, “My camel has become exhausted.” The other hadith states that a man came to the Prophet ﷺ with a she-camel wearing a nose-string and said, “This is (a gift) in the cause of Allāh.” The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ replied, “You will have in return for it on the Day of Resurrection 700 she-camels, and every one of them will be wearing a nose-string.”

Both were related by Muslim. Abū ‘Amr ash-Shaibānī also narrated from Abū Mas‘ūd the hadith, “He who is consulted is trustworthy,” related by Ibn Mājah and ‘Abd bin Ḥumaid in his musnad.

The first of the two aḥādīth narrated by Abū Ma'mar reads, “The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ would place his hands upon our shoulders...” and was related by Muslim. The other hadith reads, “The prayer is not valid if a man does not bring his backbone to rest
while bowing and prostrating,” related by Abū Dāwūd, an-Nasā’ī, and Ibn Mājah in their Sunan compilations, in addition to several other compilers of musnad and sunan.

Imām Muslim said:

Furthermore, ‘Ubayd bin ‘Umar narrated a hadith from Umm Salamah, the Prophet’s wife, from the Prophet ﷺ, taking into account that ‘Ubayd bin ‘Umar was born during the time of the Prophet ﷺ.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

This hadith is the one in which she said, “When Abū Salamah died, I said, ‘I am a stranger in a strange land. I shall weep for him in a manner that will be the talk of the town,’” related by Muslim.

Umm Salamah was named Hind bint Abī Umayyah, whose name was Ḥudhaifah or Suhail bin al-Mughirah al-Makhzumiyyah. The Prophet ﷺ married her in 3 AH. It is also claimed that her name was Ramlah, but that is unfounded.

Imām Muslim said:

In addition, Qais bin Abī Ḥāzim, who lived during the time of the Prophet ﷺ, narrated three aḥādith from Abū Mas‘ūd al-Anṣāri from the Prophet ﷺ.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

These are the aḥādith: “True belief is [found in the] Yemeni yonder (i.e. the Yemeni had true belief and embraced Islām
readily), but sternness and mercilessness are the qualities of those who are busy with their camels and pay no attention to the religion,” and, “The sun and the moon do not eclipse because of the death of someone among the people,” and, “I may not attend the (compulsory congregational) prayer because so-and-so (the imām) prolongs the prayer when he leads us for it.”

All of them are related by al-Bukhārī and Muslim in their books of Sahih.

“Abū Ḥaẓim” was ‘Abd ‘Awf or, according to some scholars, ‘Awf bin ‘Abdur-Rahmān al-Bajili, a Companion.

Imām Muslim said:

Besides, ‘Abdur-Rahmān bin Abī Lailā, who reported from ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb and accompanied ‘Alī bin Abī Ṭālib, narrated a hadith from Anas bin Mālik from the Prophet ﷺ.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

This hadith reads, “Abū Ṭalḥah ordered Umm Sulaim to make food for the Prophet ﷺ.” Related by Muslim. We have already spoken about the difference of opinion regarding the name of Abū Lailā and his son and grandson.

Imām Muslim said:

Moreover, Ribā bin Ḥirāsh narrated two abādith from ‘Imrān bin Ḥuṣain and a hadith from Abū Bakrah from the Prophet ﷺ, bearing in mind that Ribā heard and narrated from ‘Alī bin Abī Ṭālib.
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Imām an-Nawawi commented:

The first of [Ribā'ī's] two ḥadīths from ʿImrān is concerning the story of ʿImrān's father Ḥuṣain's acceptance of Islām. It includes, "ʿAbdul-Muṭṭalib was better for his people than you are." It was related by ʿAbd bin Ḥumaid in his Musnad and an-Nasāʾī in his book ʿAml al-Yaum wal-Lailah, through two trustworthy chains of narrators.

The other ḥadīth reads, "I will give the flag tomorrow to [or tomorrow the flag will be taken by] a man who is loved by Allāh and His Messenger." It was related by an-Nasāʾī in his Sunan. The ḥadīth he narrated from Abū Bakrah is the one that states, "When two Muslims (confront each other) and one attacks his brother with a weapon, both of them are at the brink of the Hellfire." It was related by Muslim, and al-Bukhāri made reference to it.

The name of Abū Bakrah is Nufāʾ bin al-Ḥārith bin Kildah ath-Thaqafi. He was nicknamed Abū Bakrah as he descended from the fort of at-Ṭa'īf on a bakrah [roll]. He was one of the Companions who remained neutral during the Battle of the Camel, not siding with either of the two fighting parties.

Ribā'ī's biography was mentioned earlier.

Imām Muslim said:

Furthermore, Nāfiʿ bin Jubair bin Muʿāṭim narrated a ḥadīth from Abū Shurayḥ al-Khuzāʾī from the Prophet ﷺ.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

The ḥadīth reads, "He who believes in Allāh and the Last Day should treat his neighbor well." It was related by Muslim under the chapter of Belief through the narration of Nāfiʿ bin Jubair. It
was also related by al-Bukhārī through the narration of Sa‘īd bin Abī Sa‘īd al-Maqbari.

Abū Shuraiḥ was named Khuwailid bin ‘Amr, ‘Abdur-Rahmān bin ‘Amr, ‘Amr bin Khuwailid, Hāni’ bin ‘Amr, or Ka’b, according to differing reports. He was called Abū Shuraiḥ al-Khuzā‘i, al-‘Adawi, and al-Ka‘bi.

Imām Muslim said:

To the same effect, an-Nu’mān bin ‘Ayyāsh narrated three hadīth from Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudri from the Prophet ﷺ.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

The first hadīth reads, “Whoever fasts one day for the sake of Allāh, the Mighty and Sublime, Allāh will separate his face from the Fire by (a distance of) 70 years.” The second reads, “In Paradise, there is a tree under the shadow of which a rider can travel...” Both are related by al-Bukhārī and Muslim.

The third states, “Among the inhabitants of Paradise, the lowest in rank will be the person whose face Allāh will turn away from the Fire...” related by Muslim.

“Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudri” was named Sa‘īd bin Mālik bin Sinān. His lineage is traced back to Khidrah bin ‘Awf bin al-Ḥarth bin al-Khazraj. He died in al-Madinah in 64 or 74 AH, according to differing reports, at 74 years old.

Abū ‘Ayyāsh, the father of an-Nu’mān, was named Zaid bin aṣ-Ṣāmit, Zaid bin an-Nu’mān, ‘Ubayd bin Mu‘āwiyyah bin aṣ-Ṣāmit, or ‘Abdur-Rahmān, according to different views.
Imâm Muslim said:

Also, ‘Aṭâ’ bin Yazîd al-Laithi narrated a hadîth from Tamîm ad-Dârî from the Prophet ﷺ.

Imâm an-Nawawi commented:

The hadîth states, "Religion is sincerity."

"Tamîm ad-Dârî" is named as such in Šâhîh Muslim. However, his name is subject to differing reports among the narrators of al-Muwatta’. According to the narration of Yahyâ and Ibn Bakîr, among others, his name is ad-Dîrî, while it is ad-Dârî in most narrations, including that of al-Qa’nabî and Ibn al-Qâsim.

Scholars differ as to where his last name came from. Some stated he was named after his grandfather, ad-Dâr bin Hâni’, since his full name is Tamîm bin Aws bin Khârijah bin Sîr bin Jadhîmah bin Dhîrâ’ bin ‘Adi bin ad-Dâr bin Hâni’ bin Ḥabîb bin Namârah bin Lakhm, who was Mâlik bin ‘Adî.

Those who reported his name as ad-Dîrî associated him with the dir [monastery] in which Tamîm used to live before embracing Islâm; in fact, he was a Christian [before coming to Islâm], according to Abûl-Husain ar-Râzi in his book, The Merits of Imâm ash-Shâfî’i, through an authentic chain of narrators from ash-Shâfî’i.

These two positions regarding his name are adopted by the majority of scholars. However, some scholars attribute his last name to Dârîn, a place near Bahrain, which is a harbor where perfumes were brought from India. This is why the perfumer is called a dârî. Still other scholars attribute him to the Dârî tribe, but this view is unfounded.

The latter views are reported by the author of the book at-Tali’, who said, "Some scholars considered ad-Dîrî to be his correct name."
However, both of them are correct: ad-Dāri if attribution is made to the tribe and ad-Dīrī if attribution is traced to the monastery.” The same author added, “There is no narrator in the two books of Ṣaḥīḥ or the Muwatta' called ad-Dāri or ad-Dīrī except Tamīm. His nickname is Abū Ruqayyah. He embraced Islām in 9 AH. He lived in al-Madīnah, then moved to ash-Shām, where he lived in Jerusalem. The Prophet ﷺ narrated from him the story of the Jassāsah [a woman whose skin and head are covered in hair]. This puts Tamīm at a high status, and this particular narration is considered from that of the seniors narrating from juniors.” And Allāh knows best.

Imām Muslim said:

Likewise, Sulaimān bin Yasār narrated a hadīth from Rāfī’ bin Khudaij from the Prophet ﷺ.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

He is referring to the hadīth of muḥāqalah (renting land in exchange for wheat), related by Muslim.

Imām Muslim said:

Similarly, Ḥumaid bin ‘Abdīr-Rahmān al-Ḥimyari narrated ahādīth from Abū Hurairah from the Prophet ﷺ.

Imām an-Nawawi commented:

Among these ahādīth is the one that reads, “The best month for observing saum [fasting] after Ramaḍān is Muḥarram, and the best salāh after the prescribed salāh is salāh at night.” It was related by Muslim and not al-Bukhārī.

Abū ‘Abdillāh al-Ḥumaidi ⌠said at the end of the Mumad of
Abū Hurairah in his book, *al-Jamʿ Bāin as-Sahihayn*, “This is the only hadith narrated by Ḥumaid bin 'Abdir-Raḥmān al-Ḥimyari in Sahih al-Bukhārī.” This is correct. In fact, Ḥumaid bin 'Abdir-Raḥmān al-Ḥimyari may be confused with Ḥumaid bin ‘Abdir-Raḥmān bin ‘Awf az-Zuhri, who also narrated from Abū Hurairah. Both narrated many ahādīth on the authority of Abū Hurairah in the two books of Sahih. Thus, those who lack experience might reject al-Ḥumaidi’s comment if they confuse the two Ḥumaidins, which would be an egregious mistake indicating the ignorance of the reader.

Moreover, this is the only hadith narrated by al-Ḥumaidi on the authority of Abū Hurairah in the three books worthy of being considered complete references regarding the five fundamentals of Islam, i.e. the *Sunan* of Abū Dāwūd, at-Tirmidhi, and an-Nasā’ī.


Imām Muslim said:

None of these Tābi’īn, whose transmissions are on the authority of Companions, are recorded in separate transmissions to have heard directly from them, to our knowledge. Nor are they recorded to have met them in the course of the actual report. According to prominent isnād critics, all of these asānīd are considered among the most trustworthy. They are not known to have been judged unreliable or to have drawn the stipulation that the narrators must have heard from each other.

No doubt, there is always the possibility that direct hearing took place, since they were all contemporaries.

In fact, judging ahādīth to be unreliable based on the disadvantage described by its holders is too trivial to be tackled or discussed. It is an innovated view by present-day scholars never adopted by any scholar of the Salaf or succeeding generations. Thus, the refutations we stated above are enough in this regard.

Allāh is the One with Whom aid is sought in repelling what differs from the school of the scholars, and in Him alone complete trust is placed.