

Mutah (Temporary Marriage)

(Published in 'Al-Jawwad', March 1957 A.D., April 1957 A.D., February 1958 A.D.)

Regarding Mutah, the editor of Rizwan writes:

Mutah

According to the Shias it is a very good deed to use women after giving them some pennies, without performing Nikah with them. It is even that, God forbid, it is permissible even with Sayyid women after giving them some money. This is so because they believe that performing Mutah gives them the rank of Husain, Ali and even the Holy Prophet (S). It is mentioned on page 50 of *Burhanul Mutah*: "One who performs Mutah once gets the rank of Hasan. One who performs twice gets the rank of Husain. One who performs thrice gets the rank of Ali and one who performs Mutah four times gets the rank of the Holy Prophet (S)."

I have estimated from a later writing that either the Rizwan editor is unaware of the meaning of Mutah or he intentionally wants to deceive the common people. Since he has tried to answer the questions of 'Razakar' regarding Mutah in December 1954 A.D. issue and has used about three pages for it. I present his statements that tell us about his knowledge regarding Mutah.

1) "The method of performing Mutah is to catch a woman and say, "I want you for one night or a definite period for five rupees." If the woman agrees, everything is permissible. If Mutah is correct, what is the difference between this and going to a brothel?"^{[1](#)}

2) "However, they should know that there is a vast difference between Mutah and Nikah. This is the reason why we find two different chapters in the books as Kitabul Mutah and Kitab Al-Nikah. In brief, Mutah is a temporary contract, which is a way of passing ones time just like a temporary contract with a prostitute. And just a little amount is fixed for it, it is done similarly in Mutah."^{[2](#)}

3) "As an amount is fixed with a prostitute and a deal is made for one or two nights, similarly it is done in Mutah. As if the wine is same and the label has changed."^{[3](#)}

In such a condition, first I would like to describe the rules and regulations and the actual nature of Mutah so that there would not be any possibility of misunderstanding.

It appears from the writings of the Rizwan editor that maybe Mutah is another name for adultery and there is no difference between the two. Hence, first of all, I would like to ask what is the difference between a permanent Nikah and adultery?

The natural urges are fulfilled in Nikah as well as adultery. Hence if an atheist says, “The method of Nikah is to catch a woman and say that one wants her in exchange of a definite amount. If the woman agrees, everything is permissible. Nikah is correct. Then what is the difference between this and going to a brothel?” What reply would the Rizwan editor give?

Perhaps, he would say that there is a ‘proposal’ and ‘consent’ therein, but this purpose is present in adultery also.

Probably, he would suggest ‘dower’, but then people going to brothels also fix an amount and pay it.

May be he would mention the open declaration of Nikah but then many a times lustful rich people keep prostitutes after open declaration of ‘proposal and consents’ (in their own words) and giving them money.

Possibly he would present the issue that after Nikah a woman is confined to a single man only. However, there are many such prostitutes who are confined to a rich man after signing a contract with him.

Maybe he would say that both spouses inherit each other in Nikah. Nevertheless, this rule is not general and absolute because if the wife kills her husband she does not inherit. Similarly, if she is from among the People of the Book⁴ she cannot inherit. Thus, if all these wives cannot inherit, what is the problem in keeping a prostitute who would not inherit? What is the difference?

Actually, the difference between Nikah and adultery is that Nikah is under the command of God while adultery is against it. No other strong reason of excellence can be presented. As it would be discussed later, both permanent and temporary marriages performed on the command of God are equal. Thus, although many acts are similar to fornication, yet they are appreciable in permanent marriage because they are carried out according to Divine commands. Similarly, Mutah is also appreciable because it is in accordance to Divine commands.

Let us now make a comparison between permanent and temporary marriage.

We should first know that Islamic jurisprudence and Quran have fixed two types of Nikahs. First, the permanent Nikah, in which no time limit is fixed, while proposal and consent are required. Naturally, this contract lasts for an unlimited period of time. Once a person is bound by this contract he would have to take a particular step in order to terminate it, which is called ‘divorce’. If divorce were not given this

contract would last life long.

The second type is called 'limited Nikah' (also called as Mutah) whose matrimonial proposal and consent also has a time limit. Naturally, such a contract automatically ends after the stipulated period of time.

Now let us compare the rules and regulations of the two.

(1) It is an important condition in both types of Nikah that the wife should not be from the prohibited degree (Mahrams). That is, she must not be among the women whom the Holy Quran has prohibited to marry. She must not be already married to someone or in the waiting period (Iddah) of some other man. In brief, temporary marriage is prohibited with those women who are prohibited for permanent marriage also because both are kinds of Nikah only. And as it is permissible but detestable to marry a prostitute in every Islamic sect, it is also detestable to do Mutah with her.

(2) Dower (Mehr), matrimonial proposal and consent are obligatory in permanent marriage; they are obligatory in Mutah also. As the amount of Dower is fixed through mutual agreement between man and woman in the first kind, it is done in the second kind also.

(3) As it is necessary for a woman to observe Iddah⁵ after divorce is given to her i.e. she could not marry for a fixed period of time, similarly it is obligatory on a woman to observe Iddah for a fixed period of time after the period of Mutah is over i.e. she cannot marry another man for a fixed period.

(4) Similarly, a woman has to observe 'Iddah of death' for a fixed period of time after the death of her husband in both the cases. It may be permanent or temporary marriage (Mutah).

(5) As the man and woman become husband and wife of each other after permanent marriage and the woman cannot even think of anyone else, they become husband and wife of each other after temporary marriage also and the woman cannot even think of anyone else.

(6) As the permanent marriage is not an evil deed due to it being in accordance with divine command, Mutah is also not an evil deed due to its performance in accordance with divine command.

(7) As the offspring of a permanent wife is a lawful inheritor of its father, it is a lawful inheritor in Mutah also and there is no difference between them.

These were laws, which are obligatory and marriage cannot even be imagined without them. And you might have seen that Nikah and Mutah are almost same in these obligatory conditions and specialties.

Once again I emphasize that obligatory conditions and specialties of Nikah are only those, which are discussed above. They are same for permanent marriage and Mutah (temporary marriage).

There are some more laws, which change according to circumstances. It does not mean that a woman is not the wife if any of these conditions are not fulfilled.

For instance,

- If a person (Sunni) performs permanent marriage with a Jew or Christian woman, then also, the wife cannot inherit her Muslim husband. Similarly, if a wife kills her husband, she cannot inherit him. Nevertheless, not becoming an inheritor does not end her wifeness, while fulfillment of other obligatory conditions like Iddah are obligatory and she would be considered wife in all conditions.

Similarly, if according to some Shia scholars, if the woman taken in Mutah marriage cannot inherit her husband, how can it be proved that ‘since she cannot inherit, how can she be a wife’?

I have purposely used the phrase ‘some Shia scholars’ because a group of Shia scholars are of the opinion that a wife inherits the husband in Mutah also. Alamul Huda Syed Murtada (a.r.) writes in *Kitabul Intesar*:[6](#)

“Not receiving inheritance is not a proof that a woman is not a wife of a man because ‘dhimmiyyah wife’[7](#), ‘slave wife’ and husband’s murderer–wife are neither his inheritors nor is the husband their inheritor. However, they are wives without any doubt. Apart from this, according to our religion, inheritance is given in Mutah also provided that there is no condition of non–inheritance among the special conditions decided at the time of marriage.”

- If a wife is disobedient to her husband, her maintenance is not obligatory on the husband even though she may be a permanent wife. This is a uniform verdict among all the Muslims. However, non–obligation of maintenance does not affect her wifeness because inheritance and maintenance, both are not the essential elements of marriage. Similarly, if the maintenance of wife in Mutah is not necessary on the husband what effect does it have on her wifeness?

- There is no divorce in ‘limited marriage’ i.e. Mutah. The reason for this is already discussed above. As this marriage is dissolved automatically after a stipulated period, there is no need to quote some formula again to end it. While permanent marriage is for the whole life. Hence it is necessary to quote the formula of divorce in order to end it (if it needs be ended before death).

Except divorce, all issues applicable for the permanent wife like ‘Zihar’[8](#), ‘Liaan’[9](#) Eelaa[10](#) etc. are also applicable to the Mutah wife. There is no difference between them.

If the readers permit I would quote some paragraphs of our scholars, which would shed light on the terms and conditions described by me and those who are really involved in a misunderstanding about Mutah would be reassured. As for people like the Rizwan editor who purposely remain ignorant, their solution was not with even the Holy Prophet (S).

- The Mutah of woman is that a woman marries one provided that there is no prohibited act in marriage according to the religion of Islam. That is, she must not be among the prohibited degree of relational prohibition as well as causal. She must not be in prohibited degree due to breast–feeding. She must not

be already having a husband and not be in the Iddah of previous one and other religious prohibitions should not be present. For instance, she must not be the ex-wife of ones father or sister of a present wife etc. She must marry one in such a state for a fixed dower and period through recitation of marriage formula, which is based on Islamic law. After mutual agreement she must recite the formula of Mutah like in Nikah. Then mention the fixed dower and time (e.g. a day, a month, a year or some years etc.). One should immediately reply: 'Qabiltu' (I accept). It is permissible to have a representative (to pronounce the formula of Mutah) like it is done in other marriages. After this, the woman is one's wife and he her husband till the stipulated period of time comes to an end. [11](#)

- A woman with whom Mutah is performed is also a lawful wife and a legal marriage is performed with her. As for sustenance, inheritance and distribution of nights, in which she does not have a share, all these are based on particular factors due to which a wife in Mutah is exempted from these general rules. [12](#)

- All the signs of wifehood are applied to a woman with whom Mutah is performed. All the rules are valid on her except some of those orders, which with definite evidences do not include a Mutah wife. [13](#)

- When the mutually fixed time ends, it is permissible for the husband to immediately tie a knot with her once again, and not wait for completion of Iddah (as it is permitted in permanent marriage to return during the Iddah of revocable divorce). However, no other man except her husband can marry her till the period of Iddah ends. [14](#)

- If conjugal relations were established, the woman would have to observe Iddah for two menstrual cycles after the Mutah ends. According to a narration, it could be observed for only one menstrual cycle, but it is not a reliable report. If a woman does not have menses and she has not reached menopause she must observe Iddah for 45 days. If the husband dies during the period of Mutah she would have to observe Iddah of death for four months and ten days even if conjugal relations were not established and she is not pregnant. If she is pregnant she has to observe Iddah till the childbirth or four months and ten days, whichever is longer.

- It is narrated from Ibn Bazigh that a person asked Imam Reza (as), "If a person performs Mutah with a woman and puts forth a condition that if a boy is born it would not be his. What if a male child is born to her after this?" Imam (as) strictly opposed this denial and considered the rejection of the father a great sin, he said, "What? Would he reject that boy?" [15](#)

- Zihar is valid occurs with Mutah wife also (due to more correct saying) because the verse of Zihar is general and the Mutah wife is also a wife and there is no restriction of a permanent wife in the verse. [16](#)

- Shaykh al-Mufeed and Syed Murtada (a.r.) have said that 'Liaan' is applicable with the Mutah wife because she is a wife and hence, she is also included in the generality of the verse. [17](#)

- Scholars have a difference of opinion about the right to inheritance in Mutah. There are a number of

opinions in this. The first is that both husband and wife become mutual inheritors of each other through this marriage as in the case of permanent marriage. This is a saying of Ibn Barrajj and he gives the evidence that the verse of inheritance in marriage is general. The Mutah wife is also a wife and she also inherits like other wives.

The second opinion is exactly opposed to the first. None of the spouses inherit each other. Its proof is that inheritance is a religious command and its right is based on some religious proofs. And merely being a wife is not a proof enough of being rightful to inheritance because there are many wives who inherit and many who cannot. Thus, how can inheritance be given on the basis of just wifeness, without any other legal commandment? [18](#)

This is Mutah, whose dreadful picture is drawn by the Rizwan editor. You have seen that there is no difference between Mutah and Nikah except that there is no period fixed in permanent marriage while a period is fixed in Mutah.

All the supposed evils of Mutah can also be found in permanent marriage after which, divorce may be given. Rather the evils become ten-fold due to divorce after permanent marriage. An example of this is, suppose you want to travel somewhere and you hire a vehicle for this purpose and start your journey. On the way, you reach a deserted area where there is no place to stay at night or hire some other vehicle and the vehicle owner leaves stranded there and returns. What hell would befall you? Just imagine!

On the contrary, if the vehicle owner tells you beforehand that he would drop you at so and so place and not go ahead, you would have the option to travel with him and plan your future course of action or find some other way if you do not like his terms and conditions.

Which is the better option between the two? Indeed, every sensible person would denounce the vehicle owner in the first case. However, no accusation can be laid on him in the second case because he had already stated the terms beforehand.

The same corollary is found in 'divorce after Nikah' and 'Mutah'. A man performing Mutah tells the woman beforehand that he would keep her as a wife, say for five years. After that, she is free, after completing the Iddah period. If a woman considers this condition acceptable, she can perform Mutah or the discussion would end; but in any case there would be no deceit.

On the contrary, if the man does not reveal any of his such plans and a permanent marriage is performed, then if he divorces the wife after two, four or ten days, you can imagine the condition of the poor woman due to the shipwreck of her life, in the middle of the high seas.

It is clear from this example that those hypothetical defects (none of which has happened till date) described about Mutah are ten-fold in divorce after Nikah. Keeping in mind this example, is the Rizwan editor still prepared to ridicule divorce and permanent marriage also?

In any case, it has become as clear as daylight from the above discourse that there is no difference between the importance and conditions of the elements, conditions and nature of Mutah and permanent marriage from the point of view of reason and jurisprudence. Now a possible question is whether Mutah is permissible and in accordance with the command of God or not? Hence I consider it important to describe the history of Mutah and some related issues so that its historical background is revealed.

[Mutah was in vogue since the beginning of Islam](#)

No sect doubts that Mutah was permissible from the beginning of Islam. It was not only permissible but also in vogue. Imam Razi writes in the commentary of the verse of Mutah:

“Everybody is unanimous that Mutah was permissible in the beginning of Islam.”^{[19](#)}

These wordings are found in *Tafsir Gharaaibul Quran*.^{[20](#)} Imam Fakhruddin Razi writes in *Tafsir Al-Kabir*:^{[21](#)}

“Muslims are unanimous that Mutah was permissible in Islam and no one has a difference of opinion in it.”

Similarly, Allamah Khazin Baghdadi, a Sunni scholar writes:

“Nikah of Mutah is to perform Nikah with a woman for a fixed period and Dower. When the stipulated period ends, the marriage ends automatically without divorce. The woman should observe Iddah and husband and wife would not inherit each other. This type of marriage was present in the beginning of Islam.”^{[22](#)}

Where is the space to quote the testimonies of all the Ahlul Sunnat scholars? I can just state the references here so that if Rizwan editor desires he can ask someone to read those books and easily understand that Mutah was permissible in the beginning of Islam:

(1) *Tafsir Malimut Tanzil* by Allamah Baghavi^{[23](#)}

(2) *Sharh Sahih Muslim* by Muhiuddin Abu Zakaria Noori^{[24](#)}

(3) *Neelul Maram min Tafsir Ayatul Ahkam* by Nawab Siddiq Hasan Khan of Bhopal^{[25](#)}

(4) *Ifadatush Shuyukh Bamiqdarul Nasikh wal mansookh* by Nawab Siddiq Hasan Khan Bhopal^{[26](#)}

(5) *Tafsir Quran* by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan^{[27](#)}

(6) *Zaadul Maad* by Allamah Shamsuddin Ibn Qayyim Jawzi Hanbali^{[28](#)}

Permission of Mutah in Quran

The issue that Mutah was in vogue in the beginning of Islam is clearly mentioned in the above references. But it should not be thought that it is an invention of the time of ignorance, which continued till the time of Islam because the existence of Mutah is not found in any history, tradition or narration. It clearly proves that it was a new law promulgated by Islam and its method is also the invention of Islam. The custom of Mutah remained from the beginning of Islam till the last days of the Holy Prophet (S) without any hindrance. Till the time Mecca was conquered and the battle of Autaas or Hunain was also won. Read the later events from the book of Hafiz Jalaluddin Suyuti, *Qaule Khuda wal Muhsanaat*:

“Muslim, Abu Dawood, Tirmidhi and Nasai have narrated from Abu Saeed Khudri; ‘We Muslims arrested some married women in Autaas. We considered it abominable to be intimate with married women. Thus, we asked about it from the Messenger of Allah (S) and this verse was revealed at that time:

“And all married women except those whom your right hands possess (this is) Allah’s ordinance to you...”[29](#)

That is the women one gets as war–booty are permissible for him. Thus, we considered them lawful.”

Tibrani has narrated from Ibn Abbas that after the victory of the battle of Hunain, Muslims got some women of People of the Book as war–booty who were already married. When a person tried to go near a woman, she would talk of her marital status. At last, the Messenger of Allah (S) was asked regarding this. This verse was revealed at that time that married women are prohibited except those who become your slave–girls...[30](#)

Now read the whole verse and consider it in the light of the above–mentioned circumstances of revelation. Enumerating the prohibited women, it is said at last:

“...And all married women except those whom your right hands possess (this is) Allah’s ordinance to you, and lawful for you are (all women) besides those, provided that you seek (them) with your property, taking (them) in marriage not committing fornication. Then as to those whom you profit by, give them their dowries as appointed; and there is no blame on you about what you mutually agree after what is appointed.”[31](#)

The method of description in this verse clearly shows that the order of permission of Mutah is not given here for the first time but the actual purpose of command is that so and so are prohibited women and married women are included in it. However, those married women who become one’s slave–girls are lawful.

Incidentally a special order is given regarding Mutah that when one performs Mutah with permitted women, he should immediately give the dower to her. It is possible to give dower later on if the wife agrees in permanent marriage. It is called ‘Mehr–e–Mojal’ (delayed dower). However, there is no such

option in Mutah. Later on, however it is commanded that if both agree, the dower and period of Mutah can be increased or decreased.

By the way, this verse verifies the command of Mutah and all scholars and commentators, Shia or Sunni, and all followers of companions consider this verse to be related to Mutah. The following excerpts from the books of Ahlul Sunnat support my claim:

(1) Nawab Siddiq Hasan Khan says:

Scholars have a difference of opinion regarding the meaning of this verse. Hasan and Mujahid have said that it means one should pay the dower to women with whom one has fulfilled his physical desires after Nikah. People (majority of them) say that this verse only implies Mutah.[32](#)

After this, he writes in the commentary of:

“There is no blame on you if you divorce women when you have not touched them or appointed for them a portion...”[33](#)

“According to the majority of scholars who believe this verse to be related to Mutah, it means that if a husband and wife agree there is no harm in increase or decrease in the period of Mutah or dower.”[34](#)

(2) He also writes in one of his other works about the same topic:

According to a majority, this verse implies Mutah.[35](#)

(3) Qazi Thanauallah Panipati writes in the commentary of this verse:

A group believes that ‘Itimnaa’ in this verse means Mutah.[36](#)

(4) The writer of *Tafsir Khazin* says:

A community has said that the command of Mutah is stated in this verse.[37](#)

Allamah Baghavi writes in Tafsir Malimut Tanzil

Allamah Baghavi writes in Tafsir Malimut Tanzil:[38](#)

Scholars have a difference of opinion about the meaning of this verse. Hasan and Mujahid say that it means that one should pay the dower to women with whom one has fulfilled his physical desires after Nikah, as their compensation. Other scholars believe that it implies Mutah.[39](#)

Incidentally, make a note that in all writings of Ahlul Sunnat scholars, Mutah is called as ‘Nikah of Mutah’ or ‘marriage of Mutah’ and compare it to the statement of the Rizwan editor that ‘Mutah means to use women after giving some money without Nikah’, and recite a Fatihah (say farewell) to his knowledge and

wisdom.

(5) Sir Syed Ahmad Khan writes in his commentary about this verse:

This verse is also among verses in whose commentary I have a difference of opinion with other scholars and commentators. All commentators call this as the verse of Mutah i.e. the permission of Mutah is given in this verse.

(6) Imam Fakhruddin Razi has given considerable explanation in the commentary of this verse. He writes:

“Those who consider Mutah permissible argue through this verse in many ways. First evidence is this verse itself:

“...provided that you seek (them) with your property, taking (them) in marriage not committing fornication. Then as to those whom you profit by, give them their dowries...”⁴⁰

There are two ways of argument through this verse:

First, we can say that both permanent Nikah and Mutah are included in this verse because it is a saying of God, ‘Seek women through your wealth.’ Both the aspects are included in it. One can either keep the woman for an unlimited period of time or for a limited period. If both these aspects are included in it, the saying of God that, ‘All women are permissible for you except those in the prohibited degree that you seek them through your wealth’, is a proof of lawfulness of both kinds (permanent Nikah and Mutah) i.e. Mutah is also lawful like permanent marriage.

Second, we can say that this verse is revealed for Mutah only and it has no relation with permanent marriage. There are a number of reasons for it as follows:

The first reason is the narration that Ubayy Ibn Kaab (who was the chief of the reciters of Quran and an elite scribe) used to add ‘Ila ajalim musammah’ (for a stipulated period) to this verse i.e. ‘Pay the dower of the woman immediately, with whom you have performed Mutah for a fixed period of time’. Abdullah Ibn Abbas also used to read this verse similarly and the people of Islam did not consider their recitation wrong. As if they were united over the correctness of this recitation. When the correctness of this recitation is proved through unanimity the permission of Mutah is also evident.”

This is an open support of the belief of distortion of Quran by Allamah Fakhruddin Razi. The editor of Rizwan should be ashamed of his own misdeeds and keep aloof from accusing the Shias of distortion.

The second reason is that it is only mentioned in the verse that, ‘It is permissible for you that you seek them through your wealth’. And after that God has commanded to pay their dower. This shows that seeking them just through wealth makes the relationship lawful. Such a condition is found in Mutah only. Thus, Nikah of Mutah is permissible.

After these arguments, let me present the reply of those who do not consider it permissible:

“The reply to the first argument is that Allah has discussed about those women with whom Nikah is prohibited that, ‘Your mothers are unlawful of you...(and so forth)’ and it is said in the end, ‘Except them all women are permissible for you’. The same act is permitted here, which was prohibited with those women in the prohibited degree. As only Nikah with mahrams was prohibited, only Nikah is permitted with other women (and not Mutah).

Secondly, God has commanded it along with piety and piety is found in the proper Nikah only.

Thirdly, God has commanded it without evil deeds. God has called ‘adultery’ as ‘Safah’ because it implies ‘Safh-e-Maa’ (wasting of semen) in it while other aims of Nikah are not fulfilled. As there is no other purpose than satisfying one’s desires in Mutah, it is also a ‘Safah’ (an evil deed).”

Abu Bakr Razi has made these statements as arguments against the supporters of Mutah.[41](#)

However, these three answers are unacceptable to Imam Fakhruddin Razi himself. Thus, he writes after that:

“But the first point presented by Abu Bakr Razi is that at first, God has discussed about those women with whom not only permanent marriage but also intimate relations are prohibited. Then it is said that except those, other women are permissible. That is, one can maintain intimate relations with other women (be it through permanent marriage, Nikah of Mutah or by keeping as a slave-girl etc.). Then defect is there in this explanation of the supporter of Mutah?

The second point stated by Abu Bakr Razi is that piety is not found without a correct Nikah (that is permanent marriage). He has not presented any proof of this fact.

Thirdly, he says that fornication is called ‘safah’ because it implies just ‘Safh-e-maa’ (fulfilling the desire). Actually, it is not so in Mutah because the desire is fulfilled in Mutah in such a way that it is within the circle of Islamic law and there is permission from God. Thus, how can it be called adultery? How can a person considering Mutah prohibited be in the circle of Islamic law? We would say that the real debate is that whether Mutah is prohibited or not. Hence, how did you, in the beginning itself, say that Mutah is prohibited (it is as if one presents just his claim as proof)? Hence, it is proved that the opinion of Abu Bakr Razi is weak and unacceptable.”

After these answers, Imam Razi has written his last decision based on comparative study as follows:

“And, the only thing to be relied upon in this debate is that we say that we do not deny that Mutah was legal. We can only say that it was abrogated. On this basis, if a proof of lawfulness of Mutah is found in this verse, it does not affect our aim in any way.”[42](#)

It is clear that the proof of Mutah through this verse is such an established fact that Imam Razi had to

believe in it at last. As for its abrogation, I will shed light on it later on.

The recitation of 'Ila ajalim musammaa' (for a stated period)

We have discussed above that scholars of 'recitation and commentary' like Ubayy bin Kaab and Abdullah bin Abbas used to read the verse of Mutah along with 'Ila ajalim musammaa' (i.e. pay the dower immediately to one with whom you perform Mutah for a stated period'). Maybe, this saying will put the Rizwan editor in palpitation. Hence, let me inform that this sentence 'Ila ajalim musammaa' was not present in the Quran according to Shias.

At the most, we can consider it as a 'marginal commentary' written by those companions as an explanatory note. However, according to Imam Razi, Ahlul Sunnat were not deniers of this recitation nor are they now. I have presented innumerable proofs of their belief in distortion of Quran in a previous chapter.

According to Razi, they are unanimous over this. Hence, they consider those sentences to be part of Quran. Hafiz Ibn Jurair Tabari has calculated the list of those narrators, in detail, who considered the words, 'Ila ajalim musammaa' part of Quran in his book, *Jameul Bayan*. After congratulating the Rizwan editor for the belief in distortion of Quran, I mention the names of those narrators in brief as follows:

- 1) Imam Suda read this verse as: 'Then as to those whom you profit by *for a prescribed time*'. Then he mentions all the laws of Mutah. This tradition is narrated from Hafiz Tabarsi from Muhammad bin Al-Husain from Ahmad bin Mufazzal from Ibaat from al-Suda.
- 2) Mujahid (whom some people mistakenly consider a denier of Mutah) after reading this verse, said that this verse implies the Nikah of Mutah. This is narrated from Muhammad bin Umar from Abi Asim from Isa from Ibn Ubayy Bakheeh from Mujahid.
- 3) Abdullah bin Abbas (who is called as the rabbi of the Islamic nation, Jurist of Quran and the Divine Scholar) used to read this verse along with 'Ila ajalim musammaa' (for a stipulated period) and he supported the lawfulness of Mutah strongly.

Narrators who narrate differing traditions of Ibn Abbas on this topic are: Abu Kuraib, Yahya bin Isa, Naseer bin Abil Ashath, Habib bin Abi Thabit, Abu Thabit, Hamid bin Musa'dah, Bushr bin Mufazzal, Dawood, Abu Nazarah, Ibn Muthanna, Abdul A'ala, Muhammad bin Ja'far, Shayba, Abu Salmah, Abu Dawood, Abu Ishaq bin Umar, Ibn Abil Adi, Khilad bin Aslam and Nazr.

Hafiz Suyuti has given the reference of following writers in *Tafsir Itqan* in addition to those mentioned above:

Abd bin Hamid, Ibn Ambaari and Imam Hakim in *Mustadrak*. They have agreed that those narrations of Ibn Abbas are true.

In many of these narrations there is an emphasizing arrangement and declaration: i.e. he said thrice, “By Allah! He has revealed this verse in this way only.”

4) Both Qatadah and Abdullah bin Abbas say that they have seen this verse along with the words ‘Ila ajalim musammaa’ (till a stated term) in the copy of a famous reciter companion like Ubayy bin Kaab. The narrators of Ibn Abbas are already mentioned while following narrators have narrated this tradition from Qatadah:

5) Ibn Bashir, Abdul A’ala and Saeed. It is also narrated by Abd bin Hamid. Refer *Tafsir Jameul Bayan* of Imam Jurair Tabari⁴³ and *Tafsir Gharaibul Quran*.⁴⁴ Saeed bin Jubair, a famous follower of companion himself also used to read this verse along with ‘Ila ajalim musammaa’ (till a stated term). The chain of this narration is: Hafiz Tabari, Muthanna, Abu Naeem, Isa bin Imrul Qaariyul Asadee, Amr bin Marah, Saeed bin Jubair. All these references and narrations are taken from *Jameul Bayan*.⁴⁵

6) Shaykhul Islam Shaukani writes in *Neel Al-Autaar*⁴⁶ about Abdullah bin Masud that his recitation included ‘Ila ajalim musammaa’ (till a stated term). Imam Nawawi writes in *Sharh Muslim* that he recited with ‘Ila ajalim musammaa’ (till a stated term). It should be clear that a saying of the Messenger of Allah (S) regarding Ubayy bin Kaab and Ibn Masud is present in *Tafsir Itqan* that: “Learn the Quran from four people viz. Abdullah bin Masud, Saalim, Maaz and Ubayy bin Kaab.”

I emphasize that the recitation of ‘Ila ajalim musammaa’ (till a stated term) is not rare, rather the Ahlul Sunnat themselves are unanimous on it, according to Razi. Many obedient companions, reciters of Quran and narrators of traditions used to read the verse in the same way. It seems from the narration of Tibrani and Baihaqi from Ibn Abbas that this verse was commonly read in the same way during the time of the Prophet (S). It was said, “People used to read this verse with a limited period of time and ‘Ila ajalim musammaa’ (till a stated term) was also read.”

If Ahlul Sunnat obey the commandments of rare recitations it is obligatory for them to obey this famous and unanimous recitation. A note on obeying rare recitation is present in *Tafsir Itqan*:

“Qazi Abu Tayyab, Qazi Husain, Allamah Roobani and Allamah Rafai have said that rare recitation will be given the rank of solitary report and acted upon. Allamah Ibn Sabaki has regarded this saying correct in *Jameul Jawama* and *Sharh Mukhtasar*. The companions protested the cutting off of the hands of thief through this recitation of Ibn Masud and Imam Abu Hanifah also believes the same.”

If a rare recitation of Ibn Masud was followed, why is it not obligatory to obey this when apart from Ibn Masud, loyal companions like Ubayy bin Kaab, Abdullah bin Abbas, Qatadah, Saeed bin Jubair and Suda and according to Ibn Abbas, all the companions of Prophet (S) and according to Imam Razi whole community is unanimous on this recitation (‘Ila ajalim musammaa’)? Why is it considered prohibited? The Rizwan editor should provide the answer keeping the narrations, commentaries and principles of jurisprudence in his mind.

Now we come to the point.

I was describing the history of Mutah. The discussion of the revelation of the verse of Mutah started and the debate of its recitation began. Anyway, Mutah was in vogue peacefully during the time of Prophet (S) and the holy companions used to act on it during the time of the first caliph. Remarkably, the daughter of the caliph, mother of faithfulness, A'isha's elder sister, Asma binte Abi Bakr had established Mutah with Zubair at a simple dower of two Yemeni chadors.[47](#)

Even during the period of Umar considerable time passed while Mutah was commonly practiced. Suddenly an incident occurred as a result of which the second caliph developed a dislike of Mutah in his heart. The incident is as follows:

1) Abdur Razzaq has narrated the incident of Amr bin Hareeth from Jubair in his book. Jubair states that the companion, Amr bin Hareeth went to Kufa and performed Mutah with a slave-girl and she became pregnant. When caliph Umar asked Amr bin Hareeth regarding this, the latter confessed and the former prohibited Mutah immediately.[48](#)

2) Abdur Razzaq has narrated from Ibn Abbas through a correct chain that nothing except Umme Arakah made the caliph Umar hostile to Mutah. She became pregnant and when Umar asked, "From where did this come?" She said, "Salmah bin Umayyah performed Mutah with me". According to the narration of Abu Al-Zubair, it was Mabad bin Umayyah instead of Salmah bin Umayyah in this incident.[49](#)

3) Umar bin Shabah states that Salmah bin Umayyah performed Mutah with the slave-girl of Hakim bin Umayyah bin Auqas, Aslama. A child was born to her but Salmah rejected him. After saying this, Ibn Kabi has also said that when caliph Umar came to know about this incident, he prohibited Mutah.[50](#)

4) It is narrated from Urwah bin Zubair that Khawla binte Hakim came to caliph Umar and said that Rabia bin Umayyah performed Mutah with a minor girl and she became pregnant. Caliph Umar became surly and came out pulling at his cloak and saying, "Is this Mutah? If I would have prohibited it before I could have stoned them now."[51](#)

The compiler of *Tafsirul Ayaat* has baselessly derived from the above narration of *Muwatta* in his book *Madhkur*,[52](#) that Rabia bin Umayyah had performed Mutah with a lady from the family of the second caliph and hence, the caliph was infuriated. According to me, this conclusion is not justified. It is already discussed above that the daughter of the first caliph had performed Mutah with Zubair out of which, Abdullah bin Zubair was born. This shows that women of reputed families used to perform Mutah freely during those times. There are no apparent conditions, which prove that caliph Abu Bakr disliked this act of his daughter. Then why should caliph Umar, who is regarded subordinate in rank to him, hate this permissible act for the ladies of his house?

Anyway, I do not want to argue as to which of the above incidents is true. The fact is that caliph Umar

got angry over a displeasing incident and he stopped the practice of Mutah after half the period of his caliphate had passed. Allamah Qaushiji, an Ahlul Sunnat scholar writes in *Sharh Tajwid*:

Caliph Umar ascended the pulpit and said:

“O people! Three things were in vogue during the time of the Prophet (S) but I abolish them and consider them unlawful. I would punish one who commits them. They are performing Mutah with women, Mutah of Hajj and saying ‘Hayya alaa khairil amal’[53](#) in the prayer–call (Azaan).”

Imam Razi writes: It is narrated from caliph Umar that he said in a sermon that Mutah of Hajj and Mutah with women was in vogue during the time of the Prophet (S) but he was prohibiting them and would punish anyone who performs them.[54](#)

The books of Ahlul Sunnat are full of innumerable narrations of such incidents on this topic. Here are some more references:

(1) *Kanzul Ummal*[55](#)

The narrations in this book are taken from the following sources:

- a) Abu Salih scribe of Laith Samarqandi
- b) Tahawi
- c) Ibn Jurair Tabari
- d) Ibn Asakir
- e) *Zaad Al-Maad* by Allamah Ibn Qayyim[56](#)

These are historical events, which cannot be denied by any Islamic sect. I have presented them in a chronological order. It is as clear as daylight that there was no proof of prohibition of Mutah till the first half of the period of caliphate of the second caliph. The prohibition of Mutah was same as other new laws declared by him from the pulpit. When objected, he used to say, “Everybody including women behind veil are more aware of Islamic laws than Umar.”

There were people who knew that acts permitted by Muhammad are permitted till the Day of Judgment and those prohibited by Muhammad are prohibited till the Day of Judgment. They knew that no one, be it a common man or a caliph, has any right to amend the Islamic laws. They were not ready to respect this declaration of caliph Umar. Even Abdullah bin Umar, his own son, did not consider this saying worthy of attention: “I prohibit Mutah with women and Mutah of Hajj.” Read this narration of *Sahih Tirmidhi* which is certified ‘correct’ by Hafiz Tirmidhi:

Salim bin Abdullah said to Ibn Shahab, “I heard that a Syrian asked Abdullah bin Umar about Mutah of

Hajj. Abdullah bin Umar said that it was permissible. The Syrian said that the latter's father had prohibited it. Abdullah bin Umar said, 'My father prohibited it but the Messenger of Allah (S) used to practice it. Then, should one obey my father or the Messenger of Allah (S)? What is your opinion?' The Syrian said that one should obey the command of the Messenger of Allah (S)." Imam Tirmidhi says that this tradition is 'good' and 'correct'.[57](#)

Similarly, Urwah bin Zubair objected to Abdullah bin Abbas regarding Mutah of Hajj that the latter considered it permissible while Abu Bakr and Umar did not. The conversation of that time is quoted in *Kanzul Ummal*,[58](#) in brief. However, Allamah Ibn Qayyim has quoted it in detail in *Zaadul Maad*[59](#) and also expressed some of his views:

"Urwah said, 'But Abu Bakr and Umar did not permit it.' Ibn Abbas said, 'By Allah, you will not stop from waywardness till Allah sends chastisement on you. I am informing you about the command of the Messenger of Allah (S) and you are talking about Abu Bakr and Umar!' Urwah said, 'Abu Bakr and Umar knew the Sunnah (practice) of the Messenger of Allah (S) better than you and they were more obedient.'"

After quoting this conversation, the Allamah writes:

"And we can tell Urwah that Ibn Abbas knew the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah (S) more than him and was better than him. Ibn Abbas was better than him in the matter of the Messenger of Allah (S), Abu Bakr and Umar and no Muslim can doubt it."

It is quoted on Pg. 215 of the book, *Madhkur* after this conversation, 'This is the opinion of scholars'. Then, he further argues and writes:

"After all, why did Ibn Abbas and Abdullah bin Umar not say that Abu Bakr and Umar knew the Holy Prophet (S) better than they did (so that it is necessary to follow them)? Actually, no obedient companion can agree to oppose the Nass (explicit order) of the Holy Prophet (S) through this answer. They knew the commands of Allah and His Prophet (S) better. They feared Allah and hence, did not subordinate the saying of an infallible (Prophet) to the sayings of non-infallibles."

This was the reason that companions like Imam Ali (as), Abdullah bin Abbas, Imran bin Hasin, Ubayy Ibn Kaab, Abdullah bin Masud, Jabir bin Abdullah Ansari, Abu Saeed Khudri, Amir Muawiyah, Abu Saeed, Salmah Ibn Umayyah bin Khalaf, Mabad bin Umayyah bin Khalaf, Amr bin Hareeth, Asma binte Abi Bakr and followers of companions like Tawus, Saeed bin Jubair, Ataa, all the jurists of Mecca, people of Yemen and Ibn Juraih considered Mutah lawful in spite of the prohibition of caliph Umar. They did not respect the saying of caliph Umar against the Divine command and order of the Prophet (S). Please read the following:

A) Allamah Ibn Jazm states that the following companions considered Mutah permissible even after the passing away of the Messenger of Allah (S):

Ibn Masud, Muawiyah, Abu Saeed, Ibn Abbas, Salmah bin Umayyah, Jabir bin Abdullah, Amr bin Hareeth. It is narrated from Jabir that during the whole life of the Messenger of Allah (S) and Abu Bakr and in half the period of the caliphate of Umar, all companions practiced Mutah.[60](#)

B) Ibn Jazm has narrated from companions other than Ibn Abbas in *Muhli* and said that after the Prophet (S), a large group of senior companions was formed over the lawfulness of Mutah. They include and the following companions:

Asma binte Abi Bakr, Jabir bin Abdullah, Ibn Masud, Ibn Abbas, Muawiyah, Amr bin Hareeth, Abu Saeed, Salmah bin Umayyah bin Khalaf, Mabad bin Umayyah bin Khalaf. Jabir states that all the companions considered Mutah lawful during the time of the Messenger of Allah (S).[61](#)

C) Imam Ali (as) said, "If Umar had not prevented people from Mutah, except an unfortunate evil one, none would have committed fornication."[62](#)

D) Companion Imran bin Hasin says that the verse of Mutah was revealed in the Book of Allah. No such verse was revealed after that which could have abrogated it. The Messenger of Allah (S) permitted us and we performed Mutah accordingly. The Messenger of Allah (S) passed away but did not prohibit us from it. After that, a person (i.e. Caliph Umar) said whatever he pleased.[63](#)

E) Jabir bin Abdullah says that during the time of the Messenger of Allah (S) and the first caliph they used to perform Mutah for as many days as they wanted by giving a handful of dates or flour. Later on, caliph Umar prohibited Mutah due to the incident of Amr bin Hareeth.[64](#)

F) Companion Abu Saeed says that anyone among them could perform Mutah by giving a cup of parched barley meal (sattu).

Abu Saeed also says, "We used to perform Mutah by giving a piece of cloth during the time of the Messenger of Allah (S)."[65](#)

G) Allamah Ibnul Barr says, "People of Mecca and Yemen are having a similar ideology as that of Ibn Abbas regarding the lawfulness of Mutah." Ibn Jazm has also said that followers (Tabi'in) like Tawus, Saeed bin Jubair, Ataa and all the jurists of Mecca considered Mutah lawful.[66](#)

H) Followers of companions like Tawus, Ataa, Saeed bin Jubair and all the jurists of Mecca considered Mutah lawful. Ibn Juraih, a jurist of Mecca was among those famous persons who considered Mutah lawful.[67](#)

This was the condition of scholars who had the knowledge of truth and the secrets of Islamic law. They were masters in jurisprudence, traditions, commentary and recitation. But even such people are not rare who went all the way to justify the acts of their leaders

A large group tried their best to find a way out of the prohibition of Mutah by the second caliph. While the

caliph himself had given this explanation at the time of his declaration:

“Two Mutas (Mubah of Hajj and Mubah with women) were in vogue during the time of Prophet (S). I prohibit them and would punish one who commits them.”⁶⁸

However, some scholars and excellent personalities say that Mubah was abrogated during the time of Prophet (S) itself and caliph Umar declared it openly. Before abrogating a command of Quran, following questions naturally come to one’s mind:

- (1) Was this order abrogated through a verse or a tradition?
- (2) Was the abrogating verse revealed before or after its revelation?
- (3) Whether the abrogating verse is really contradicting the command or not?
- (4) Can a tradition abrogate the command of a Quranic verse?
- (5) Was the abrogating tradition revealed before that command or after it?
- (6) Is the abrogating tradition really opposed to the command of that Quranic verse or not?
- (7) If the tradition is contradicting the command, does it have enough authenticity that the command of a verse be considered abrogated?

Come let us hear the replies to these questions from people who support the abrogation of the command of Mubah.

First Question

That is, what is the abrogator of this verse? There is a vast difference of opinion in it.

Many people say that this verse was abrogated by a saying of the Prophet (S) (the sayings will be discussed later). While Imam Shafei and others believe that this order was abrogated only by another verse. However there is a difference of opinion in the selection of this verse.

1) Imam Shafei says:

“The abrogator of the verse of Mubah is this verse of Surah Momin: ***‘And who guard their private parts, Except before their mates or those whom their right hands possess, for they surely are not blamable.***”⁶⁹ because a woman with whom Mubah is performed is neither a wife nor a slave-girl.

2) It is narrated from Ataa Khorasani that: The verse of Mubah was abrogated by this saying: “O Prophet! When you divorce women, divorce them with Iddah.” (i.e. they should observe Iddah).

3) Caliph Umar said: “Mubah was abrogated by Nikah, divorce, Iddah and inheritance.”

All three sayings are quoted in *Tafsir Lubaabut Tawil*⁷⁰ by Allamah Khazin Baghdadi. The fourth saying is of Allamah Ibn Jazm, which he has quoted in his book, *Marefatun Nasikh wal Mansookh*:

“The abrogators of Mutah are those verses in which a wife is entitled to an eighth or fourth part of inheritance because the Mutah wife is not entitled to inheritance.”

It would be better to describe the conditions of abrogation before writing my opinions on these sayings.

Allamah Ibn Qayyim Jawzi says: The abrogation of a command depends on four conditions and those who consider that Mutah of Hajj is abrogated cannot fulfill even a single condition. Firstly, a Nass (text) or explicit order should be present for abrogation. Secondly, that another Nass or explicit order should be contradictory to the former command. Thirdly, that Nass should be strong enough to stand against the proofs of the first command. Fourthly, that contradictory order should have been issued after the first one.⁷¹

He further explains:

“When we see the companions of the Messenger of Allah (S) that they have a difference of opinion regarding an issue about which it is proved that the Holy Prophet (S) himself did it or ordered it and some companions say that it was abrogated later on or it was not general but a restricted one while other companions say that the order is not abrogated but still present; then a saying of one who supports or considers it restricted will not be accepted if it is against Islamic law and without a proof. At the most, both the sayings will contradict each other and the decision of their dispute would rest on ‘proof’.

When a dispute arises, it is obligatory to turn towards Allah and His Messenger (S) according to the command of Quran (and it should be taken according to the saying and practice of Messenger only and not due to trust others’ sayings. Thus, if Abu Dharr or Uthman say that Mutah of Hajj is abrogated or it is restricted while Abu Musa and Abdullah bin Abbas say that it is permissible and its command is general, the responsibility of presenting a proof falls on one who claims it to be abrogated.”⁷²

It shows that it is the responsibility of Ahlul Sunnat to present a proof, since it is they who believe in the abrogation of Mutah. Also that proof should fulfill all the conditions. We Shias know that it was in vogue in the time of the Holy Prophet (S) and is present even today. The purpose is that the liability of proving the prohibition of Mutah is on Ahlul Sunnat. None of the verses presented by them as proofs of abrogation fulfill the required conditions as would become clear later on.

Second and Third Questions

It is necessary to discuss both these questions together in order to maintain sequence. The first verse, which is alleged to be the verse of abrogation of Mutah is:

“And who guard their private parts, except before their mates or those whom their right hands possess,

for they surely are not blamable”[73](#)

Firstly, this verse was revealed long before the verse of Mutah. As Surah Mominoon was revealed in Mecca while verse of Mutah was revealed approximately eight years after Hijrat. How can a verse revealed in Mecca be an abrogator of a verse revealed a number of years later?

Secondly, according to all those who support the lawfulness of Mutah, the Mutah wife is a spouse. Then how can the argument of Shafei and Allamah Ibn Jawzi: “As a woman of Mutah is neither a wife nor a slave-girl while relations with only wife and slave-girl are permitted in this verse. Hence, relations with a woman of Mutah are prohibited” be considered correct? Everybody can understand it because we consider the woman of Mutah, a wife. A detailed debate is already over in the forgone pages. According to the partisans of Mutah, a woman of Mutah is a wife just as is she is in a permanent marriage.

Thus, it is proved that neither this verse (which is called abrogator) was revealed after the verse of Mutah nor does it oppose the order of Mutah. Due to this, it is impossible to call it abrogator. Hence, Allamah Zamakhshari of Ahlul Sunnat has quoted in the exegesis of this verse in his *Tafsir Kashaf*:

“If you ask me whether there is any proof of prohibition of Mutah in this verse or not, I would reply in the negative. Since a woman who has performed the Nikah of Mutah (if Mutah is permissible), is also included in marriage.”[74](#)

The second verse is:

“O Prophet! When you divorce women, divorce them for their prescribed time...”[75](#)

That is, the women should observe Iddah.

Firstly, the Ahlul Sunnat do not present an evidence that this verse was revealed after the command of Mutah even though its responsibility rests on them alone while it is known that the practice of divorce was in vogue from the beginning of Islam. It did not start after the battle of Hunain that somebody could say that this verse was revealed after the order of Mutah.

Secondly, implying prohibition of Mutah through this verse is just like shooting ‘arrows’ in the dark. It is neither commanded in this verse that divorce is compulsory for all marriages so that one can present a proof that as there is no divorce in Mutah, it is not lawful nor anyone says that Iddah is not necessary after the completion of the period of Mutah so that it could be claimed that since there is no Iddah in Mutah, it is unlawful.

The only command in this verse is: “It is obligatory for a woman to observe Iddah after divorce.” Where is the explanation in this verse that to which women and when, a divorce be given? Hence a pair of questions arises against the Ahlul Sunnat in this verse also.

Similarly, according to the fourth saying, the verse of inheritance is an abrogator of the command of

Mutah because there is no inheritance in Mutah. Firstly, thinking that the verses of inheritance were revealed after the verse of Mutah is the best example of ignorance of Islamic History. Since the verses of inheritance were revealed during the early times of Hijrat⁷⁶ while the command of Mutah was issued after the battle of Hunain or Autaas.

Secondly, there is a difference of opinion about the inheritance of a Mutah wife. Scholars who grant the right to inheritance to a Mutah wife would consider this proof of Allamah Ibn Hazm absolutely invalid.

Also, even those who do not support the inheritance of the Mutah wife do not say that she is not a spouse, and hence, she would not receive inheritance but they say that the verse of inheritance is only about a permanent wife.

Since their proofs show that the verse of inheritance indicates the order of a special category just as the verse of divorce is revealed for a permanent wife only and has no connection with the Mutah wife. So, can anyone raise an objection to it? This objection can surely be raised only when a category of permanent wives is deprived of the right to inheritance. For example, a killer of husband is deprived of the right to inheritance. However, Ahlul Sunnat scholars do not object at that time and peacefully accept it. Since it is definitely proved from traditions that even though a killer wife is considered a spouse, she is not entitled to inheritance.

To conclude, when every wife, in spite of being a spouse does not get inheritance how can this argument be correct that since a Mutah wife does not inherit, she is not a spouse at all?

Thus, both questions regarding this verse fall against the sense taken by Ahlul Sunnat. As for the saying of caliph Umar that Nikah, divorce, Iddah and inheritance together abrogate Mutah, firstly, I have a doubt in this matter. How can a person who says, "I prohibit these acts even though they both were in vogue during the time of Prophet (S)," say that this command is abrogated by so and so verses? Since belief in both these things would imply that verses of prohibition of Mutah were revealed continuously but, God forbid, the Holy Prophet (S) did not pay any attention to them and a sin remained in vogue.

Secondly, a long discussion is already over regarding the abrogation by the verse of divorce, verse of Iddah and verse of inheritance. While the thought of abrogation of the command of Mutah through the verse of Nikah is very amusing because just as Nikah includes the permanent marriage, it also includes Mutah, as Allamah Zamakhshari has said. With a word that imagines the prohibition of permanent and temporary marriage, it shows the knowledge of the narrator.

In addition to this, the revelation of the verse of Nikah before battle of Hunain or Autaas is established because the issue of Nikah was clarified in the beginning of Islam itself. That is why Sir Syed Ahmad Khan says:

"Majority of Muslims say that there is permission for Mutah in this verse without a doubt, but this command was abrogated. However, the objection is weak according to me because of the verses

selected for the abrogation of this order.”[77](#)

Since it was not possible to prove the abrogation of the command of Mutah through Quranic verses, the Ahlul Sunnat tried to abrogate it through traditions. Nevertheless, the condition is same here too. No two people agree over a saying. The wonder of this divine saying is evident:

“Do they not then meditate on the Quran? And if it were from any other than Allah, they would have found in it many a discrepancy.”[78](#)

Fourth Question

Before presenting these narrations, one should know that according to the majority of Ahlul Sunnat scholars, the abrogation of the verses of Quran is not possible through traditions. The sect of Imam Shafei says:

“According to Shafei religion, Sunnah (traditions) cannot abrogate verses of Quran.”[79](#)

Thus, after it is proved that the verse of Mutah is not abrogated by any other verse, we can at least consider the followers of Imam Shafei believers in lawfulness of Mutah. As for Hanafi and other such people, who believe that a tradition can abrogate the Quran, our discussion would be aimed them only. The decision of remaining three questions associated with traditions will be easily finalized by the discoveries of Ahlul Sunnat only.

The discussion would become very lengthy if all the traditions are presented separately. Hence, I present their summary in the form of discussions of Ahlul Sunnat scholars.

(1) Allamah Nawawi has quoted the following paragraphs of Qazi Ayaz in *Sharh Sahih Muslim*:

“Imam Muslim has narrated from Salmah bin Akoo that Mutah was legalized in the battle of Autaas. It is narrated from Sabrah that it was legalized on the day of the Meccan conquest. Autaas and conquest of Mecca have the same meaning. Then it was made unlawful on the same day. According to a tradition from Imam Ali (as), Mutah was made unlawful in the battle of Khyber and this battle was fought before the conquest of Mecca.

Apart from Imam Muslim, others have narrated from Imam Ali (as) that the Holy Prophet (S) prohibited Mutah in the battle of Tabuk. The chain of this narration is: Ishaq bin Rashid, Zuhri, Abdullah bin Muhammad Hanafiyyah, Muhammad Hanafiyyah, Imam Ali (as). However, no one has obeyed this narration and Ishaq bin Rashid has made a mistake in it. Since this same narration is quoted by Imam Malik in *Muwatta* from the chain of Zuhri. It is also quoted by Sufyan bin Uyinnah, Amri, Yunus etc. There is a mention of Khyber in it. Even Imam Muslim has quoted this narration from the chain of Imam Zuhri about the prohibition in Khyber only and it is true.

Abu Dawood has narrated from Sabrah Jehni that Mutah was prohibited in the Farewell Hajj⁸⁰. According to Abu Dawood, it is the most correct saying among all the narrations. It is also narrated from Sabrah that Mutah was legalized at the time of the Farewell Hajj. Then the Messenger of Allah (S) immediately prohibited it till the Day of Judgment.

Fifth saying: And it is narrated from Hasan Basri that Mutah was never legalized except at the time of Umratul Qaza⁸¹. It is worthy of discussion that this narration is also from Sabrah only. However, Imam Muslim has not discussed the limitation of time in any narration of Sabrah except in the narration of Muhammad bin Saeed, Ishaq bin Ibrahim, Yahya bin Yahya in which, he has mentioned that prohibition of Mutah was done at the time of the conquest of Mecca.

According to the saying of the scholars of traditions, a narration, which says that Mutah was legalized at the time of the Farewell Hajj is a mistake of the narrator because there was no need to make it lawful on that day nor were the companions alone and away from women. Most of the companions had come to Hajj along with their spouses hence what was the need to legalize Mutah? The fact is that only prohibition was made at the time of the Farewell Hajj as found in many narrations. The revival of prohibition was because the people had gathered in large numbers and the religion was reaching completion. Islamic law was becoming perfect (so that those present there may inform the absentees about these laws). Apart from the prohibition of Mutah, he had once again explained the permissible and prohibited acts on that day. He made the absolute prohibition on Mutah evident by saying, "Now this order is prohibited till the Day of Judgment."

However Qazi Ayaz said, that "the mention of different venues in different traditions, like the battle of Khyber, 'Umrah Qaza', conquest of Mecca or Autaas, shows the possibility that the Messenger of Allah (S) prohibited Mutah on all these occasions because the report of prohibition of Mutah at the time of the battle of Khyber is correct and there is no scope of doubt in it, rather that tradition is from reliable and trustworthy narrators.

But according to a narration from Sufyan: "The Holy Prophet (S) prohibited Mutah and donkey meat on the day of Khyber." Some people say regarding this narration that there are two separate parts in it. It means that the narrator said, "The Messenger of Allah (S) prohibited Mutah" (and did not specify a time of prohibition of Mutah). Then he said, "and donkey meat on the day of Khyber". If it is read like this then the specification of time as the day of Khyber will be for prohibition of donkey meat only. The time of prohibition of Mutah will not be understood. The need of reading it like this is so that the meaning of various narrations will become harmonious and concordant.

I think that the only credible possibility is that Mutah was prohibited at the time of the conquest of Mecca. As for donkey meat, it was doubtlessly banned at the time of Khyber only."

Qazi Ayaz says that the best saying is what we have stated previously that the Messenger of Allah (S) prohibited Mutah on a number of occasions. Then also, those narrations, which say that Mutah was

legalized at the time of Umratul Qaza, conquest of Mecca and battle of Autaas. It seems that even after prohibition, the Messenger of Allah (S) might have permitted it according to the need of that time. In such a condition, one has to believe that Mutah was prohibited forever in the battle of Khyber and Umratul Qaza, but at the time of the conquest of Mecca it was legalized for the time being due to the need, and then again it was prohibited forever.

As for the narration, which considers it to be legalized at the time of the Farewell Hajj, it will be annulled because it is narrated from Sabrah Jehni and reliable narrators have also narrated from Sabrah Jehni that Mutah was legalized at the time of conquest of Mecca and banned at the time of the Farewell Hajj. Thus, the narration of Sabrah over which most companions are unanimous, will be accepted. That is, the narration that Mutah was prohibited at the time of the conquest of Mecca and the repetition of its prohibition at the time of the Farewell Hajj was to emphasize the former order.

As for the saying of Hasan, Mutah was permitted only at the time of Umratul Qaza and not before or after that; it is rejected by those traditions, which say that Mutah was prohibited in the battle of Khyber (because the incident of Khyber occurred before Umratul Qaza). Those narrations reject it which say that Mutah was legalized at the time of the 'conquest of Mecca' or battle of Autaas. Apart from this, the narration on which the saying of Hasan is based is also narrated from Sabrah Jehni. The narrations of permission and prohibition on other times are also narrated from him only and those narrations are more correct. Hence this narration, which is against the correct narration, will be rejected.

Some scholars believe that Mutah was legalized many times and banned twice and abrogated. Allah knows best.”[82](#)

After this, Imam Nawawi writes about his sect as follows:

“It is a correct belief that (Mutah) was prohibited and permitted twice viz. it was permissible before the battle of Khyber but prohibited after it and again it was permitted on the day of conquest of Mecca and it is also the day of Autaas because both are same. Then it was again prohibited in that period only after three days till the Day of Judgment and this prohibition would remain till then. It is not permissible to say that legalization of Mutah was confined to the period of Khyber and the prohibition on the Day of Khyber is forever. The order on the day of conquest of Mecca was just an emphasis on prohibition. The command of permission was not prior to the conquest of Mecca (hence, the order of prohibition was given once again) as understood by Mazri and Qazi. Thus, those narrations which Muslim has mentioned about legalization of Mutah on the day of Khyber are clear. Hence it is unlawful to annul them and there is no hindrance in prohibition of this legalization twice.”

Even Imam Shafei and Imam Muslim believe that Mutah was legalized and prohibited a number of times. Imam Muslim has titled the chapter of Mutah as follows:

“Chapter of Mutah and discussion that Mutah was legalized then abrogated, again legalized and again abrogated and that its abrogation will continue till the Day of Judgment.”

Imam Shafei says:

“I do not know any act in Islam which was legalized and then prohibited, again it was permitted and again prohibited except Mutah. Some even say that Mutah was abrogated thrice and even more than that.”[83](#)

The wordings discussed above are taken from *Sharh Sahih Muslim*. Now let us take a stroll through *Sahih Bukhari* to understand how diligent a search those poor scholars had to make due to various types of narrations and how much they are struggling. They are trapped in the whirlpool of narrations in such a way that there is no way of salvation. Hafiz Ibn Hajar Asqalani writes:

“Sohaili says that there is a difference of opinion about the time of prohibition of Mutah. The poorest narration is that in which it is said that it (was prohibited) in the battle of Tabuk. It is narrated from Hasan that the prohibition was issued at the time of Umratul Qaza. While it is famous that the prohibition was issued at the time of the conquest of Mecca, as narrated by Muslim from Rabi bin Sabrah. According to a narration of Abu Dawood from Rabi, it was prohibited at the time of the Farewell Hajj. Narrators who say that it was prohibited in the battle of Autaas are like those who say that it was done in ‘Aamul Fath’.”[84](#)

Considering all these, six occasions are found, viz. Khyber, Umratul Qaza, conquest of Mecca, Autaas, Tabuk and the farewell Hajj. The addition of Hunain is imminent because it is also present in a narration, which I had stated earlier thus either Sohaili was unaware or he purposely left it because its narrators were unreliable. Or because the battles of Autaas and Hunain are same. As for the narration of Tabuk, it is recorded by Ishaq bin Rahuyah and Ibn Habaan by their own chains from the tradition of Abu Huraira. As for the narration of Hasan Basri, it is recorded in their own way by Abdullah and he adds ‘Maa kaanat qablaha wa laa baadiha’ (There was nothing before it and after it).

This addition is a favorite deed of its narrator, Amr bin Ubaid and he is ‘The eliminator of tradition’. Saeed Ibn Mansur has recorded from Hasan (Basri) in a correct way without any addition. The proof of the conquest of Mecca is found in *Sahih Muslim* as said by Sohaili. Even Autaas is proved in *Sahih Muslim* through the tradition of Salmah bin Akoo. The farewell Hajj is also proved by Abu Dawood from the narration of Rabi. When this is made clear, (keep it in mind) that except the conquest of Mecca, no other narration is correct without a cause even if the channel of the tradition of the battle of Khyber is correct but the descriptions of scholars have already been discussed.

The news of Umratul Qaza is not correct because it is among those narrations of Hasan in which a link in chain of narrators is missing and it becomes weak. Since he used to narrate traditions from everyone. Even if we consider it correct, it is possible that he meant the day of Khyber by Umratul Qaza because both occurred in the same year itself just as the conquest of Mecca and Autaas are same. However, the incident of Tabuk does not explain it in the tradition of Abu Huraira that Muslims did Mutah with women in that condition only. It seems that Mutah might have occurred long before and releasing might have

been done to those women.

Or prohibition was done long before but some Muslims were unaware and they continued to act on the former permission and hence, the prohibition was related to anger as the ban was imposed earlier. Also the tradition of Abu Huraira is in the situation of the statement. Since it is a narration of Mumil bin Ismail from Akramah bin Ammar Yasir and there is scope for discussion regarding both. However, the tradition of Jabir from the channel of Ibad bin Kathir is incorrect and forsaken. This difference of opinion about the Farewell Hajj is due to Rabi bin Sabrah while his narration of the conquest of Mecca is correct and famous...Among all those events the most correct one is conquest of Mecca.”[85](#)

The conclusion of the discussion so far is that if the Ahlul Sunnat say that the verse of Mutah was abrogated by traditions, a question arises naturally, ‘Can a verse be abrogated by a tradition?’ We have discussed the saying of Imam Shafei, that “a tradition cannot abrogate Quran.” The arguments of Imam Nawawi, commentator of *Sahih Muslim* and Hafiz Ibn Hajar Asqalani, commentator of *Sahih Bukhari* are presented for people who believe in the abrogation of Quran by traditions. It is proved from them that seven different occasions of prohibition are present in the traditions. They are: battle of Khyber, Umratul Qaza, conquest of Mecca, battle of Autaas, battle of Tabuk, the Farewell Hajj and battle of Hunain.

Fifth and seventh Question

Now I am going to discuss about the questions that: Did the abrogating tradition arrive before or after the revelation of the verse? And if that tradition is contradicting, does it have enough credibility to abrogate the command of Quran?

The weight of those traditions can be understood by their being a practical exegesis of:

“Do they not then meditate on the Quran? And if it were from any other than Allah, they would have found in it many a discrepancy.”[86](#)

There is such a severe difference of opinion in them that poor the Ahlul Sunnat scholars are not able to decide at all whether Mutah was really prohibited and when was it prohibited?

It is not surprising that every sycophant expert wrote each tradition according to his or her keen intelligence. This problem befell on scholars who came later on to darn those mistakes and prove them right. Thus, Imam Muslim and Imam Shafei had to say that Mutah was legalized and banned twice. Imam Shafei had the feeling while saying so that the Islamic law is not a child’s game that it is made and broken again and again, but to prove the prohibition of Mutah it was necessary to accept all these traditions and he accepted them after saying:

“I do not know any act in Islam which was legalized and then prohibited, again it was permitted and again prohibited, except Mutah.”

However, all seven traditions can be true due to the saying of permission and prohibition twice. Hence, some people believe that it was permitted and prohibited thrice. Some have said even more than that. The meaning of accepting the sayings of the Ahlul Sunnat is as if their God is very weak in taking decisions. At times, He makes Mutah lawful and then becomes aware of its defects and prohibits it. Then again He finds good qualities in Mutah and he makes it lawful. Once more He comes to know such faults, which were hidden from Him till now, and He bans it. This cycle goes on for as many as seven times.

By the way, the ideology adopted by Imam Nawawi after cross-examination of all these narrations is discussed above. He believes that all other narrations are wrong and only the narrations of prohibition at the time of Khyber and conquest of Mecca are correct. As he says, “The correct view is that Mutah was prohibited and legalized twice, viz. it was permissible before the battle of Khyber and banned in the battle and it was legalized on the day of the conquest of Mecca and the narration of the day of Autaas also implies conquest of Mecca because both the events are closely related. It was prohibited three days after that.”

Thus according to the saying of Imam Nawawi, Mutah was absolutely prohibited at the time of the conquest of Mecca.

Allamah Hafiz Ibn Hajar Asqalani writes in *Fathul Bari Sahih Bukhari* after analyzing all the narrations: “(Among the occasions of prohibition of Mutah) the most explicit one, as said by me, is conquest of Mecca.”

That is, even Allamah says that Mutah was prohibited forever on the occasion of the conquest of Mecca and all other narrations are wrong and doubtful.

After the final decision of both these Imams and Allamahs, recollect the time of the revelation of the verse of Mutah from past discussions. Consider this saying of Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti:

“All four writers of *Sihah* books, i.e. Imam Muslim, Imam Abu Dawood, Tirmidhi and Nasai have narrated from Abu Saeed Khudri that the verse of Mutah was revealed after the battle of Hunain. Allamah Tibrani has also narrated from Ibn Abbas that this verse was revealed after the battle of Hunain.”[87](#)

All know that the battle of Hunain was fought after the conquest of Mecca. Where have those narrations gone that Mutah was banned at the time of the conquest of Mecca forever? Here, the verse of Quran says that Mutah was legalized in the battle of Hunain after the conquest of Mecca. While Imam Nawawi and Allamah Asqalani, according to their correct narrations, give a verdict of prohibition of Mutah till the Day of Judgment on the occasion of conquest of Mecca.

Even if we disregard the numerous differences of opinions and accept the saying of Ahlul Sunnat that Mutah was prohibited through a tradition of the Messenger of Allah (S) on the day of the conquest of Mecca then also we would have to believe that this tradition was abrogated by a verse of Quran during

the battle of Hunain through its revelation and now Mutah will remain lawful till the Day of Judgment.

So, these two points also prove to be against the Ahlul Sunnat.

Sixth Question

Are the abrogating traditions really against the command of this verse or not?

There is no need for writing much in this matter because even if all those narrations really prove the prohibition of Mutah then also their weakness and occurrence before the verse of Mutah are discussed above. But there is a condition after the acceptance of which, the stain of lie and treachery to the Prophet (S) is removed from the skirts of those narrators (whom the Rizwan editor considers 'all of them are just') and those narrations do not remain contrary to the Divine verses. The command of the verse also remains in its place.

If the Rizwan editor shows thankfulness, I can tell him about a remote possibility about "the compilers of traditions and Quran", that the words of those narrations are not contradictory when you consider the possibility that the companions of the Prophet (S) who were traveling with him and had performed Mutah due to necessity at Khyber, Umratul Qaza or the Farewell Hajj and various other places. When it was time to return the Prophet (S) came to know that some companions have performed Mutah, so he advised them to leave those women in a proper manner.

That is, to free them by forgiving the remaining time because they were returning home and the necessity of these Mutah wives was getting over. The Messenger of Allah (S) was a Prophet and a guide of the people. He was more affectionate to the Muslims than their own parents. He was watchful of their affairs and had the power of discretion on them. Hence, there is no need to be surprised if he guided them in their private matters. These advices were given to different people at different occasions by the Messenger of Allah (S), which the narrators, due to their low understanding or unfair nature, considered that he had prohibited Mutah.

I have presented this possibility only for comfort of the Rizwan editor because a severe stroke was being inflicted on his belief of infallibility of companions when the narrations were proved wrong. It is proved from these compilers of narrations and Quran that even if all these narrations would be true then also each one could have been applied to this condition. None of them could have clearly opposed the order of the lawfulness of the verse of Mutah. Hence, even this Question is against the ideology of Ahlul Sunnat.

In brief, none of the points presented by the Ahlul Sunnat for the abrogation of the verse of Mutah are correct nor they have such a capacity to confront a Quranic verse. Thus, praise be to Allah, it is found through intense explanation that the verse of Mutah was never abrogated.

After that, recollect the saying of Umar, "Two Mutahs were in vogue during the time of the Messenger of

Allah (S).”

Once again read this confession of Imam Razi:

“We do not deny that Mutah was lawful. We only say that it was abrogated.”

The state of abrogation is clear (that it was not abrogated); its lawfulness is stable in its place.

Thus far we have discussed the statement of the Rizwan editor that, “According to Shias it is a very good deed to use women after giving them some money without performing Nikah with them.”

The next sentence is:

“God forbid, it is permissible even with Sayyid women after giving them some money.”

Like Mutah, the literal meaning of Nikah is physical relationship between a man and woman. If there would have been Nikah’ in place of ‘Mutah’ then also its literal translation would have been the same as done by the Rizwan editor. It is possible that the editor, of Rizwan start labeling Nikah also as voluptuousness. Thus, let me say that he distorted this correct translation also according to his habit that he included the wordings “after giving them some money” which is not mentioned anywhere in the actual text.

Maybe the editor who makes fun of the amount of dower by saying “after giving them some money” does not know that the companions used to perform Nikah and Mutah after giving a handful of dates or flour. When the daughter of caliph Abu Bakr, Asma, performed Mutah with Zubair, her dower was only two Yemeni chadors. It can be said in the respectful language of the Rizwan editor as follows:

“Zubair did a great deed by using the daughter of caliph Abu Bakr without performing Nikah after giving two Yemeni chadors. As a result of which Abdullah bin Zubair was born.”

Actually, the Rizwan editor is himself unaware of the affairs of his religion. Otherwise, he would not have made an unsuccessful attempt to find out the point of ‘using women after giving some money without performing Nikah’. Though his great Imam, Abu Hanifah has given a verdict: “There is no harm in establishing physical relations with a woman after giving her compensation because it is given to her for the same purpose. Imam Ghazzali writes in his book, *Mankhool* about this great Imam:

“And, as far as unlawful sex is concerned, Imam Abu Hanifah has opened such venues that the penalty is eliminated. For instance, coition on contract basis and performing Nikah with mothers and establishing sexual relations with them. He thinks that all those acts invalidate the penalty. A person who wants to do the evil act with a believing woman, what difficulty would he have in hiring her for this work? Who can explain the justification of this issue?”

And Imam Malik goes a step ahead and says that if a man were paid remuneration it would be

permissible to even perform the act of the community of Prophet Lut (as) with him. His verdict is as follows:

“Sodomy is permissible with one’s slave or employee.”

Even the Hanafites believe it. Their Allamah Chilpi has remarked on the margin of *Sharh Waqayah* that:

“A person who penetrates the anus of a stranger man or woman. We have kept the condition of ‘stranger man and woman’ because there is a consensus that if someone does this with his slave, wife or a slave-girl there is no penalty and Qazi Khan has clarified this.”⁸⁸

My sincere advice to the Rizwan editor is that if he wants to find a stamp of approval for such good deeds he should not waste his time in searching it among the Shias. All such products are available in his own house. The only condition is sincere search.

Then the Rizwan editor writes:

“This is so because they believe that performing Mutah gives them the rank of Husain, Ali and even the Holy Prophet (S). It is written on page 50 of *Burhanul Mutah*: “One who performs Mutah once gets the rank of Hasan. One who performs twice gets the rank of Husain. One who performs thrice gets the rank of Ali and one who performs Mutah four times gets the rank of the Holy Prophet (S). There is no power and strength except from Allah!”

The Rizwan editor has done a great distortion while copying this narration also according to his old habit. *Burhanul Mutah* is not present with me but I present the detailed explanation of this narration from *Tafsir Minhajus Sadiqeen*. The narration found, is:

“A believer who performs Mutah once, gets the rank of martyrdom. The leader of martyrs is Imam Husain (as). A person, who performs the Nikah of Mutah twice, gets a place among the rank of virtuous. The leader of virtuous is Imam Hasan (as). A person who performs Mutah thrice will get the rank of ‘truthful’. The leader of truthfuls is Amirul Momineen (as). A person who performs Mutah four times will be included among the rank of prophets. The leader of prophets is Prophet Muhammad Mustafa (S).”

Note this honesty! The intention of this narration is that if a person performs Mutah he will get the honor of living under the flag of the leadership of Imam Husain (as), Imam Hasan (as), Amirul Momineen (as) and the Messenger of Allah (S). While the Rizwan editor says that he will get the rank of these Holy personalities.

Moreover, this narration is based on the verse:

“And whoever obeys Allah and the Apostle, these are with those upon whom Allah has bestowed favors from among the prophets and the truthful and the martyrs and the good, and a goodly company are they!”⁸⁹

Obviously, when such is the rank of common obedience, what ranks can be received in a worship act, in which there is an utmost fear of taunts and punishment from the Ahlul Sunnat caliphs? The Ahlul Sunnat forgot their lustful deeds against Shariah and raised objections to an act which was in accordance with it. Hence, those who perform them are worthy of receiving those ranks.

On the contrary, the Ahlul Sunnat bestow those high ranks to every honest trader. However, we do not find any spiritual exertion, hurt, taunt or punishment in any trade, instead there is profit.

Allamah Hafiz Zahabi has quoted this narration from Ibn Umar in *Mizanul Itidal*:

“A truthful, trustworthy Muslim trader would be with the prophets, truthfals and martyrs on the Day of Judgment. This tradition is correct according to its meaning and excellent according to its chain. It is not necessary that he would be of their rank also while accompanying them. This saying is for only those *“who obey Allah and Prophet (S)...till the end of the verse.”*

After this explanation by Allamah Dhahabi who can object to the narration of *Minhajus Sadiqeen*?

- [1.](#) Rizwan, Pg. 14
- [2.](#) Rizwan, Pg. 15
- [3.](#) Rizwan, Pg. 15
- [4.](#) Jew or Christian
- [5.](#) Waiting period before a woman can marry again
- [6.](#) Pg. 63, 64; Iran
- [7.](#) Jew or Christians living in Muslim territories
- [8.](#) Pre-Islamic form of divorce, consisting in the words of repudiation: You are to me like my mother's back. (anti a'layyah ka-zahri ummi).
- [9.](#) Sworn allegation of adultery committed by either husband or wife
- [10.](#) Willful oath that one would not to go to ones wife
- [11.](#) Fusulul Muhimma, Pg. 54, 1347 A.H. Edition
- [12.](#) Kitab-e-Madhkur, Pg. 60
- [13.](#) Aslush Shia wa Usulaha, Pg. 94
- [14.](#) Sarair, Ibn Idris
- [15.](#) Furu al-Kafi, Vol. 2, Pg. 196, Tahzib, Man Laa Yahzaruhul Faqih
- [16.](#) Sharh Lumah, Vol. 2
- [17.](#) Masalikul Afham, Vol. 1
- [18.](#) Hadaifun Nadhrah, Vol. 7, Pg. 165
- [19.](#) Tafsir Kabir, Vol. 3, Pg. 195, Egypt
- [20.](#) Vol. 1, Pg. 421
- [21.](#) Vol. 3, Pg. 196
- [22.](#) Tafsir Labaabut Tawil fi Maaniyut Tanzil, Egypt, Vol. 1, Pg. 423
- [23.](#) Egypt, on the margin of Labaabut Tawil, Vol. 1, Pg. 423
- [24.](#) Delhi, Vol. 1, Pg. 450
- [25.](#) Lucknow, Pg. 75
- [26.](#) Kanpur, Pg. 37
- [27.](#) Aligarh, Vol. 2, Pg. 316
- [28.](#) Egypt, Vol. 1, Pg. 401
- [29.](#) Surah Nisa 4:24

- [30.](#) Lubabun Nuqool fi Asbaabun Nuzul, Egypt, on the margin of Tanwirul Miqyas Pg. 77
- [31.](#) Surah Nisa 4:24
- [32.](#) Neelul Maraam min Tafsir Ayaatil Ahkam, Pg. 75
- [33.](#) Surah Baqarah 2:236
- [34.](#) Pg. 76
- [35.](#) Ifadatush Shuyookh, Pg. 37
- [36.](#) Tafsir Mazhari, Pg. 572
- [37.](#) Tafsir Khazin, Vol. 1, Pg. 423
- [38.](#) Vol. I
- [39.](#) Tafsir Malimut Tanzil, on the margins of Tafsir Khazin, Egypt, Pg. 423
- [40.](#) Surah Nisa 4:24
- [41.](#) Tafsir Madhkoor, Pg. 197
- [42.](#) Tafsir Madhkur, Pg. 197
- [43.](#) Vol. 5, Pg. 9
- [44.](#) Vol. 1, Pg. 22
- [45.](#) Egypt, Vol. 5, Pg. 9
- [46.](#) Vol. 6, Pg. 48
- [47.](#) Covering sheets
- [48.](#) Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 9, Pg. 138
- [49.](#) Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 9, Pg. 138
- [50.](#) Isabah fi Marefatus Sahaba, Vol. 2, Pg. 63, Egypt
- [51.](#) Muwatta Imam Malik Vol. 2, Pg. 30, Egypt
- [52.](#) Pg. 298
- [53.](#) Hasten to the best of the deeds
- [54.](#) Tafsir Kabir, Vol. 3, Pg. 195, Egypt
- [55.](#) Vol. 3
- [56.](#) Vol. 1, Pg. 243
- [57.](#) Sahih Tirmidhi, Pg. 106, Nawal Kishor Press, Zaad Al-Maad, Allamah Ibn Qayyim, Vol. 1, Pg. 215
- [58.](#) Vol. 8, Pg. 293
- [59.](#) Vol. 1, Pg. 219
- [60.](#) Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 9, Pg. 138
- [61.](#) Neelul Autaar, Vol. 6, Pg. 44
- [62.](#) Tafsir Jameul Bayan, by Hafiz Ibn Jurair Tabari Vol. 5, Pg. 9
- [63.](#) Tafsir Kabir, Vol. 3, Pg. 95 and Tafsir Gharaibul Quran, Allamah Nishapuri
- [64.](#) Sahih Muslim, Vol. 1, Pg. 45, Delhi
- [65.](#) Kanzul Ummal, Vol. 7, Pg. 295
- [66.](#) Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 9, Pg. 138
- [67.](#) Neelul Autaar, by Allamah Shaukani Vol. 6, Pg. 44
- [68.](#) Tafsir Kabir, Vol. 3, Pg. 195
- [69.](#) Surah Mominoon 23:5-6
- [70.](#) Vol. 1, Pg. 423
- [71.](#) Zaadul Maad, Vol. 1, Pg. 212
- [72.](#) Zaadul Maad, Vol. 1, Pg. 213
- [73.](#) 23:5-6
- [74.](#) Tafsir Kashaf, Vol. 2, Pg. 287
- [75.](#) Surah Talaq 65:1
- [76.](#) The Prophet's migration to Medina
- [77.](#) Tafsir Quran, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, Vol. 2, Pg. 216

[78.](#) Surah Nisa 4:82

[79.](#) Tafsir Lubaabut Tawil, Allamah Khazin Baghdadi Vol. 1, Pg. 423

[80.](#) Arabic = Hajjatul Wada'

[81.](#) Lapsed Umrah pilgrimage, in the year Treaty of Hudaibiyah was signed.

[82.](#) Sharh Sahih Muslim, Imam Nawawi Vol. 1, Pg. 450, Mujtabai Press, Delhi

[83.](#) Tafsir Mazhari, Qazi Thanauallah Panipati Pg. 72

[84.](#) Year of conquest

[85.](#) Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 9, Pg. 133, Egypt, 1325 A.H.

[86.](#) Surah Nisa 4:82

[87.](#) Lubaabun Nuqool fi Asbaabun Nuzul, on the margin of Tanwirul Qiyas, Pg. 77, Egypt

[88.](#) Margin of Sharh Waqaayah, Kitabul Hudood Pg. 212

[89.](#) Surah Nisa 4:69

Source URL:

<https://www.al-islam.org/completion-argument-sayyid-saeed-akhtar-rizvi/mutah-temporary-marriage#comment-0>