Al-Islam.org
Ahlul Bayt Digital Islamic Library Project
Published on *Al-Islam.org* (https://www.al-islam.org)

Part 1: A Critical Assessment of Sahih Bukhari

Chapter 1: Bukhari as a Narrator

It has to be mentioned right in the beginning that Abu Zar'ah Razi and Abu Hatam Razi have abandoned citing traditions from Bukhari, prohibiting others as well to quote traditions from Bukhari.

Abu Zar'ah and Abu Hatam on Bukhari

In his Al-Tabaqat Al-Shafi'ayya Al-Kubra, Subki quotes Taqi Al-Din Bin Daqiq Al-'Aeed as saying: The honor of Muslims is one of the pitfalls of Hell. Two groups of people stand around it: narrators and rulers. Subki goes on saying: In my point of view, the opinion mentioned by some that Abu Zar'ah and Abu Hatam shunned citing Bukhari's traditions because of Bukhari's belief in Qur'an as being created is an instance of the above-mentioned word. May Allah help Muslims! Is it permissible for some to abandon Bukhari who is considered as a forerunner in hadith science and an Imam of Sunnis?![1]

Shams Al-Din Al-Dahabi has mentioned the name of Bukhari among the weak and rejected. Regretting this, Manawi says: Bukhari is the ornament of Islamic community, honor of the Imams, author of the most authentic book after the Holy Quran and owner of perpetual excellence. Commenting on him, Ibn Khazima says: Bukhari is a divine sign that walks on land.

In his Al-Kashif, Dahabi says: Bukhari was a religious minded, pious person with utmost dignity.

In his Al-Du'afa Wa Al-Matrukin, he, nevertheless, ignoring his being a Sunni, says:

ماسلم من الكلام لاجل مسأله اللفظ تركه لاجلها الرازيان

Because of his belief in the Holy Qur'an as being created, people spoke ill of him and that was why Abu Zar'ah Razi and Abu Hatam Razi refrained from narrating his traditions.

Dahabi goes on saying: I have only quoted his words. I ask Allah to forgive him and to grant us good health. I feel lonely and take refuge to Him.2

In his Mizan Al-Itidal, Dahabi, commenting on Ali Madini, says: Ali Bin Abdullah Bin Ja'afar Bin Hassan is a memorizer of tradition and an outstanding figure of his time. One of the objections concerning Aqili is that he has mentioned the name of Ali Bin Abdullah in his Al-Du'afa, saying: He was a supporter of Ibn Abi Dawood and was a member of Jahmiyya, but, Allah willing, his traditions are (good) unaffected by these objections.

Abdullah, son of Ahmad Bin Hanbal told me: My father used to narrate us traditions from Ali Bin Abdullah, but he would never mention his name, saying: "Somebody told me". He eventually gave up narrating from him.

It needs however to be said that the traditions of Ali Bin Madini are mentioned in Ahmad's Musnad.

Ibrahim Harbi has also left aside the traditions transmitted by Ali Madini, for he was inclined towards Ahmad Bin Abi Dawood, doing favor to him.

It was similarly on account of this that he avoided mentioning his traditions in his Sahih, just as Abu Zar'ah and Abu Hatam avoided mentioning the traditions reported by his disciple, Muhammad (Bukhari), due to his belief that Qur'an was created.

Abd Al-Rahman Bin Abu Hatam says that Abu Zar'ah did not narrate Bukhari's traditions because of what happened to Bukhari during the time of 'tribulation 3'.4

A glance at the biography of Abu Zar'ah Radi

Abu Zar'ah Razi (d. 264 AH) is a great Sunni Imam. Comparing him to Muslim, Tirmidhi, Nisaee and Ibn Maja, Dahabi says: Ubaidullah Bin Abd Al-Karim (known as) Abu Zar'ah Radi, a memorizer of tradition is a great scholar. He has narrated from Abu Naeem Isfahani, Qa'anabi, Qabisa and other scholars of their category here and there. On the other hand, Muslim, Tirmidhi, Nisaee, Ibn Maja, Abu 'Awana, Muhammad Bin Hussain, Qatan etc. have narrated traditions from him.

Ibn Rahwaih says: Any tradition that is not recognized by Abu Zar'ah is worth nothing.

Commenting on him Dahabi says that his merits are too many.5

Ibn Hajar has also placed the above-mentioned four names beside his name, saying: Ubadullah Bin Abd Al-Karim Bin Yazid Bin Farrukh, Abu Zar'ah Razi was an Imam, memorizer (Hafiz), reliable, well-known and one of the eleven Imamss.6

Commenting on him, Yafiee says: Abu Zar'ah is a memorizer of tradition and a great scholar …

Speaking about him, Abu Hatam says: No doubt, there is no one that can replace him scientifically, jurisprudentially and in matters of preservation and honesty. I know no one in the world, who can reach him (in terms of knowledge and excellence). Ishaq Bin Rahwaih says: Any tradition Abu Zar'ah does not know by heart is not credible.[7]

Khatib Baghdadi says: Ubaidullah Bin Abd Al-Karim Bin Yazid Bin Farrukh, Abu Zar'ah Razi was a divine Imam, an outstanding memorizer of tradition, truthful and a narrator of numerous traditions. Several times he visited Baghdad, held dialogues with Ahmad Bin Hanbal and narrated traditions. Among the people of Baghdad, Ibrahim Bin Ishaq Harbi, Abdullah Bin Ahmad Bin Hanbal and Qasim Bin Zakariya Mutarraz have narrated traditions from him …[8]

A glance at biography of Abu Hatam Radi

Let's now have a look at the biography of Abu Hatam Razi who died in the year 227 AH. Commenting on him Dahabi says:

Muhammad Bin Idris Abu Hatam Razi was a memorizer of tradition. He heard traditions from Ansari and Ubaidullah Bin Musa. His son, Abd Al-Rahman Bin Abu Hatam, Abu Dawood, Nisaee and Muhamili have narrated his traditions.

Regarding him, Musa Bin Ishaq Ansari says: I saw no one who was as good as Abu Hatam in terms of memorizing tradition. He died in Sha'aban 277 AH.[9]

Speaking about him Sam'ani says: Abu Hatam was an Imam of his time. The scholars used to refer to him to find a solution to the problems related to tradition. He was full of virtues. He was a memorizer of tradition and a great well-known scholar. He used to travel and visit scholars.[10]

Placing the names of Abu Dawood, Nisaee and Maja beside his name, Ibn Hajar says: Muhammad Bin Idris Bin Munzir, Bin Dawood Bin Mehran Hanzali, Abu Hatam Razi was a great memorizer (of tradition) and an Imam… In their commentaries on the Holy Qur'an, Abu Dawood, Nisaee and Ibn Maja have narrated his traditions… In his Al-Kuna, Hakim Abu Ahmad says: Abu Hatam Bin Idris [is such a great scholar] that Muhammad Bin Ismael Ja'afi, his son Abd Al-Rahman, his friend Abu Zar'ah etc. have narrated traditions from him.

Abu Bakr Khallal says: Abu Hatam was a leading figure in tradition. He narrated many things from Ahmad, which are available to us in a scattered form and are unusual.

Ibn Kharsh, commenting on him, says: he was trustable and a person of high understanding.

Nisaee, regarding him says: He was a credible person.

Lalkaee, talking about him, says: Abu Hatam was an Imams, memorizer of tradition, outstanding and a professional researcher.

Commenting on him, Khatib Baghdadi says: Abu Hatam was a leading figure and a memorizer who was credible. He was known for his knowledge and virtues. He died in 277 in Ray.[11]

Duhli and his criticism of Bukhari

One of the great Sunni Imamss who have criticized Bukhari is Muhammad Bin Yahya Zuhli. He questioned the reputation and credibility of Bukhari, accusing him of introducing innovation in religion.

Elaborating on his life, Subki quotes Abu Hamid Bin Sharqi as saying: I saw Bukhari in the funeral ceremony of Sa'aid Bin Marwan. This is while Bukhari used to avoid answering any question by Duhli about his name, surname and weakness.

After one month had hardly passed ever since the occurrence of this event, Duhli said: Those who attend Bukhari's lectures are not allowed to attend my lectures. This is because it is written to me from Baghdad that Bukhari has talked about the crestedness of the Holy Qur'an. Though I told him not to accept this view, he continued to believe in it. So do not approach him!

After relating the words of Abu Hamid Sharqi, Subki says: Based on what he is reported to have said (with which we will deal later), Bukhari is a person who believes that Qur'an is created. This is while Muhammad Bin Yahya Duhli says: Anyone who thinks that Qur'an is created is an innovator and thus it is not allowed to associate with or talk to him. Anyone who thinks that Qur'an is created is a disbeliever.

Mentioning the same thing, Ibn Hajar Asqalani quotes Abu Hamid Sharqi as saying: I heard Muhammad Yahya Duhli say: Qur'an is Allah's words and is not created. Anyone who considers it as created, is an innovator and it is not allowed to associate with or talk to him. From now onward, anyone who visits Muhammad Bin Ismael Bukhari, must be accused of having such a belief. This is because those who attend Bukhari's lectures, advocate his school of thought.[12]

A glance at Duhli's life

Duhli was one of the professors of Bukhari, Abu Dawood, Tirmidhi, Nisaee and other great scholars of tradition. Ibn Abi Dawood called him 'commander of the faithful in hadith sciences'.

Commenting on him, Dahabi says: Bukhari, four of the authors of Sihah Sitta, Ibn Khazima, Abu 'Awana and Abu Ali Maydani narrated traditions from him. This is while Bukhari, due to a dispute he had with him, does not mention his name. Ibn Dawood says: Muhammad Bin Yahya narrated us traditions and was an Imams in hadith sciences.

Concerning him, Abu Hatam, says: He was an Imams of his time. He died at the age of 86 in the year

258 AH.[13]

Speaking about him, Sam'ani says: In his era, Duhli was the Imams of the people of Naishabur, and a leading scholar.[14]

Safdi says: Imam Duhli Naishaburi was the master of narrators and the memorizer of traditions. He listened to the traditions of various narrators and all narrators, except Muslim have narrated his traditions. Duhli himself says: To obtain knowledge and acquire traditions, I travelled three times, for which I spent as much as one hundred fifty thousand (Dinars).

Regarding him, Nisaee says: Duhli is a credible and reliable person.

Talking about him, Abu Amr Ahmad Bin Nasr Khaffaf says: I saw Muhammad Bin Yahya in a dream. I asked him as to what Allah had done to him. He said that Allah had forgiven him. "What did He do with your traditions?, I asked. "They wrote my traditions with gold and put them on a lofty place." He answered.[15]

Bukhari and his deviation from the path of Ahl Al-Bayt

Ibn Dihya's opinion

The great Sunni scholars such as Abu Zar'ah, Abu Hatam, Duhli and other professors of Bukhari have treated him with contempt, considering him as misled.

Their mistreatment of Bukhari was the worldly consequence of his deviation from the path of Ali, the commander of the faithful and the Holy Prophet's progeny (a.s), his treatment of them with contempt and his concealment of their virtues and merits. In his Sharh Asma Al-Nabi, Allama Zu Al-Nasabain, Ibn Dihya says: In his Sahih, in a chapter on Al-Maghazi, Bukhari relates the following story:

Before Farewell Hajj, Ali Bin Abi Talib (a.s) and Khalid Bin Walid were dispatched to Yemen. Ahmad Bin Uthman narrates from Shuraih Bin Muslima, from Ibrahim Bin Yusuf Bin Ishaq Bin Ibu Ishaq, from his father, from Abu Ishaq who quotes Barra as saying: The Holy Prophet (S) [16] sent me along with Khalid Bin Walid to Yemen. Thereupon he sent Ali (a.s) as Khalid's successor to Yemen!

The Holy Prophet (S) addressing Ali (a.s) said: Tell Khalid's companions that they can stay with you or come back to Medina. I was among those who stayed with Ali (a.s). I received several Awqiya[17] (a quantity of gold) from war booties.

Muhammad Bin Bashar narrated from Rowh Bin Ibada, from Ali Bin Suaid Bin Manjuq, from Abdullah Bin Barida who quoted his father as saying: The Holy Prophet (S) dispatched Ali (a.s) (to Yemen) to take Khums from Khalid. I deemed Ali an enemy. As he (Ali) (chose himself a female slave from the war booties and) took bath I told Khalid: Do you not see this?

When we came back, I related the story to the Prophet (S). The Holy Prophet (S) said:

يا بريده أتبغض عليا؟

O' Barida! Do you hate Ali? I said: Yes.

He said:

لا نبغضه فإن له فى الخمس أكثر من ذلك

Do not hate him for his share of khums is more than this.

After quoting these two traditions, Zu Al-Nasabain says: As you see Bukhari has narrated this tradition incompletely. To narrate such traditions incompletely is the habit of Bukhari. His deviation from the right course is the outcome of his mismanagement and lack of prudence.

Imam Ahmad Hanbal has related the above-mentioned story fully and correctly. Qazi Adil, the remainder of great scholars of Iraq, Taj Al-Din Abu A-Fath Muhammad Bin Ahmad Bin Mandaee who heard this tradition in Wasit, a city in Iraq has narrated this story from Raees Abu Al-Qasim Bin Hasin, a reliable person, from Waez Abu Ali Hussain Bin Mazhab, a credible person, from Abu Bakr Ahmad Bin Ja'afar Bin Hamdan Qati'aee, another reliable person, from Imam Abd Al-Rahman Abdullah, from his father Abdullah Ahmad Bin Hanbal a Sunni Imams who said: Yahya Bin Saeed quoted Abd Al-Jalil as saying: I attended a meeting that was attended by Abu Majliz and Barida's two sons.

Abdullah Bin Barida said: I did not hate anyone as much as I hated Ali. I befriended that person –though I did not like him before – just because he was an enemy of Ali. That person was dispatched along a group of horsemen to Yemen. I accompanied him as well. I accompanied him just because he considered Ali as his enemy.

In this military expedition, we took some people as captives. The person in question, reporting this to the Holy Prophet (S), said: Send someone to determine the Khums of the booties.

The Holy Prophet (S) sent us Ali (a.s). Among the captives, there was a slave woman who was the best. Ali specified Khums and divided the war booties. Thereupon Ali got out of his tent, with the drops of water dripping from his head.

We said: O Aba Al-Hassan, why did you do like this?

He said: Did you not see the slave woman among the captives? While dividing war booties and specifying Khums, I allocated her as Khums. Thus she was possessed by the Prophet's progeny and me as a member of the Prophet's progeny. That is why I made intercourse with her.

Ibn Barida says: The person in question (Khalid) wrote another report to the Holy Prophet (S) and I asked him to send me as confirmer of the courier!

He sent me as a witness. When the letter was read to the Holy Prophet (S) I confirmed it. It was at this moment that the Holy Prophet (S) took my hand saying:

أتبغض عليا؟

Do you make enmity towards Ali?

I said: Yes.

He said:

فلا تبغضه وان كنت تحبه فازدد له حبا فو الذى نفس محمد بيده لنصيب آل على فى الخمس افضل من وصيفه

Do not make enmity towards him. If you befriend him improve your friendship. By Allah in whose hand is Muhammad's life the share of Ali's descendants is more than a female slave.

Ibn Barida continues: After I heard this from the Holy Prophet (S) I liked no one as much as I like Ali (a.s).

He further said: By Allah who has no associate there was intermediary between me and the Holy Prophet (S) except my father.[18]

Elsewhere in his Sharh Asma Al-Nabi, after narrating a tradition from Muslim, he says: I commenced my discussion with a tradition from Muslim, because he has related this story completely. This is while Bukhari has related it incompletely and as you see he has, based on his own methodology, omitted certain parts of it. He has been criticized on account of his relating stories incompletely especially stories related to Ali (a.s).

A glance at Ibn Dihya's life

It is worth noting that Abu Al-Khattab Bin Dihya was one of the greatest and most well-known Sunni scholars and memorizers. Elaborating on his life, Ibn Khallakan says:

Abu Al-Khattab Umar Bin Hassan Bin Ali Bin Muhammad Bin Jameel Bin Farrukh Bin Khalaf Bin Qums Bin Mazlan Bin Malal Bin Badr Bin Dihya Bin Fruh Kalbi, known as Zu Al-Nasabain was from Blanes, Spain. He was a memorizer of tradition. That was how he describes himself through his own notes.

Ibn Dihya said: His mother is Amat Al-Rahman, daughter of Abdullah Bin Abu Al-Bassam Musa Bin

Abdullah Bin Hussain Bin Ja'afar Bin Ali Bin Muhammad Bin Ali Bin Musa Bin Ja'afar Bin Muhammad Bin Ali Bin Hussain Bin Ali Bin Abi Talib (a.s). That is why he said he had two lineages with one ending to Dihya and the other to Hussain (a.s).

Ibn Dihya introduces himself as the grandchild of Abu Al-Bassam. He was a great celebrated scholar. He knew very well prophetic traditions and the sciences related to them. He knew about Arabic syntax, etymology and poems. He also knew about Arab wars. In order to acquire traditions, he several times travelled across Spain, meeting scholars and masters. He went to Barr Al-'AdWa in Morocco and met the scholars over there.

He went to Egypt in Africa and then to Syria and Iraq. In Baghdad he listened to the traditions of some of the companions of Ibn Hasin whereas in Wasit, he gave his ear to the traditions of Abu Al-Fath Muhammad Bin Ahmad Bin Mandaee.

He also travelled to Iraq 'Ajam (present Iran), Khurasan and Mazindaran. He made all these trips in order to meet tradition scholars and to learn traditions from them. Meanwhile, other narrators would also benefit from him.

In Isfahan, he listened to the traditions of Abu Ja'afar Saidalani whereas in Naishabur he gave his ear to the traditions of Mansur Bin Abd Al-Mun'aeem Farawi.[19]

Commenting on Ibn Dihya, Jala Al-Din Suyuti, in his Bughya Al-W'at says: Abu Al-Khattab, Umar Bin Hassan Bin Ali Bin Muhammad Bin Jameel Bin Farrukh Bin Dihya Kalbi Andulusi was a memorizer of tradition and a reputed man of knowledge and virtue.

He knew the science of tradition and the issues related to it. He knew Arabic syntax, etymology and poems. He was aware of the history of Arab wars. He travelled and listened to traditions. Malik Kamil, the king of his time, founded Kamiliyya Dar Al-Hadith in Cairo. He appointed him as the Sheikh of this establishment.

Ibn Salah and others narrated traditions from him. He died on Rabi'a Al-Awal the fourteenth in the year 633 AH.[20]

In his Husn Al-Muhazira as well, Suyuti deals with his life, saying: Abu Al-Khattab Ibn Dihya, Umar Bin Hassan Andulusi was an Imam, scholar, great memorizer. He was in possession of profound knowledge of tradition. He also knew about Arabic etymology and language. He wrote many books and chose Egypt as his settlement.

He took upon himself to train Malik Kamil, the king of his time. He taught in Kamilia Dar Al-Hadith. He died in on Rabi'a Al-Awal the fourteenth in the year 633 AH.[21]

Bukhari and Ghadir tradition

It is on account of his extreme prejudice (towards Shiism) that he criticizes the successively narrated Ghadir tradition. Ghadir tradition is narrated by more than one hundred companions of the Holy Prophet (S). The standard of Ghadir tradition is far above the standards of a successively reported tradition. Great Sunni scholars who know traditions admit that Ghadir tradition is a successively reported tradition. This is what the books compiled by Sunni scholars tell us.

For example, in order to find it, one can refer to Jala Al-Din Suyuti's Al-Azhar Al-Mutanathira Fi Al-Akhbar Al-Mutawatira Wa Al-Fawaeed Al-Mutakathira Fi Al-Akhbar Al-Mutawatira, Noor Al- Din Azizi's Sharh Al-Jamee'a Al-Saghir, Manawi's Sharh Al- Jamee'a Al-Saghir, Ali Qari's Al-Mirqat, Jamal Al-Din Muhaddith Shirazi's Al-Arbaeenfi Manaqib Amir Al-Mu'amineen, Al-Sayf Al- Maslul by Shah Waliullah's student, father of the author of Tuhfa Ithna'ashariyya, Ibn Jawzi's Asna Al-Matalib etc.

Commenting on Ghadir tradition, Ibn Taymiyya says: It is said that the Holy Prophet (S) said: Of whomsoever I am a master, Ali is his master.

This tradition is not in Sihah, but scholars have narrated it and people have differed on it. It is said that Bukhari, Ibrahim Harbi and a group of scholars have criticized it.22

It has to be noted that Bukhari criticized some of the chains of this tradition but Ibn Taymiyya attributed the criticism to the tradition itself.

Major Sunni scholars and Ghadir tradition

If Bukhari criticizes Ghadir tradition itself then in response it can be said that a number of major Sunni scholars have explicitly rejected the views of those who are skeptic about

Ghadir tradition no matter who they are. Badakhshi, for example, says:

> هذا حديث مشهور و لم تكلم فى صحته الا متعصب جاحد لا اعتبار بقوله فلن الحديث كثير الطرق جدا و قد استوعبها ابن عقده فى كتاب مفرد و قد نص الذهبى على كثير من طرقه بالصحه ورواه من الصحابه عدد كثير

This is an authentic and famous tradition23. Those who cast doubt about its authenticity, are prejudiced and deny the truth. Their words are not reliable, because this tradition is narrated via numerous ways. In his Al-Mufrad, Ibn Uqda has assessed it utterly. Dahabi has also mentioned that many of its chains are authentic. A Great number of the Holy Prophet's companions have reported it.

Ibn Jazer and Ghadir tradition

Hafiz Bin Jazeri has also accused those who deny Ghadir tradition of being ignorant and prejudiced. 24

Let's now have a cursory look at Ibn Jazeri's life. Ibn Jazeri Shaf'aee is a famous memorizer of tradition. He has written many books. Scholars have praised him and his works.

Ibn Hajar 'Asqalani has dealt with Ibn Jazeri's life, calling him as 'memorizer' and 'Imams'. He says: He was a master of the science of recitation all over the Islamic world. He was the first one who wrote a comprehensive book on supplication titled Al-Hisn Al-Hasin min Kalam Sayyid Al-Mursalin. He was well-known in Yemen and was praised a lot ...

He gave importance to recitation. That is why he wrote an invaluable appendix to Dahabi's Al-Tabaqat Al-Qurra and composed an ode on three recitations. He also wrote Al-Nashr bi Al-Qira'at Al-'Ashr... He was called a great Imam and ... On the whole, he was a unique and well-known person.

People benefited from his writings. He was like a sun shining in the sky.25

Another scholar who has treated his life in detail is Sakhawi. Enumerating his professors in different sciences, he said that he had many licenses for giving fatwa, teaching, and recitation. He presided over the board of reciters at 'Adiliyya Madrasa in Damascus.

Sakhawi has also dealt with his trips to different countries and his interesting accounts. He has shed light on his works and described all of them as useful. Among his works is Asna Al-Matalib Fi Manaqib Ali Bin Abi Talib.

He says: Commenting on Jazeri, Tawoosi says: He was unique in narrating and memorizing traditions, Jarh and Ta'adeel (the science of praising and criticizing) and knowing early and later narrators.

Thereupon Sakhawi the words of Ibn Hajar concerning him...26 Ibn Jazeri died in the year 833 AH.

Bukhari and his skepticism about Imam Sadiq's traditions

It is one of the signs of Bukhari's animosity towards the Holy Prophet's progeny and his deviation from their conduct, that he did not mention Imam Sadiq's traditions in his book and above all he cast doubts on some of his traditions!!

With all insolence, commenting on Imam Sadiq, Bukhari says: No one from among the four Imams has taken juristic rules from Ja'afar [Sadiq (a.s)], but they have narrated his tradition along with the traditions of others, with the difference that the traditions of others are much more in number than those of his. The traditions by Zahri cannot be thus compared to those of Ja'afar [Sadiq (a.s)] in terms of strength and number.

When some of his traditions were narrated to him by Yahya Bin Sa'ee Qattan, he objected to them and cast doubt about them. It was because of this that he refrained from narrating his traditions. The ability of Ja'afar [Sadiq (a.s)] in memorizing traditions is far less than the memorization abilities of those referred to by Bukhari!![27]

Sunni scholars and issue of loving Prophet's progeny

Look! How this arch enemy of the Prophet's progeny has cast doubt on this Holy Imam on the basis of Qattan's words.

This is while great Sunni scholars – whether in the past or in the present – have said that it is necessary to love, respect and follow the Holy Prophet's progeny (a.s) to the extent that they distance Sunnis from making enmity towards the Holy Prophet's progeny and acquit those who objected the Prophet's progeny, put their credibility to question or turned away from them.

They consider the attribution of such matters to Sunnis as something that originates from Shiite prejudices. Kabuli consider the following as the nineteenth prejudices of Shiites (against Sunnis), saying: Sunnis have gone to extremes in making enmity towards the Holy Prophet's progeny. Ibn Shar Ashub and most Shiite scholars, mentioning such topic, have regarded Sunnis as the enemies of the Holy Prophet's progeny. But this is a big lie!

This is because it is one of the undisputed conditions of faith that one should love the Holy Prophet's progeny more than one loves oneself. One of the traditions that one can mention here is the tradition narrated by Bayhaqi, Abu Al-Sheikh and Daylami. The Holy Prophet (S) says:

لایومن احد حتی اکون احب اله من نفسه و یکون عتی احب الیه من نفسه

No one is a believer unless he loves me and my progeny more than himself.

Tirmidhi and Hakim have also narrated from Ibn Abas that he has quoted the Holy Prophet (S) as saying:

احبوا اهل بیتی بحبی

Love my progeny on account of loving me.

Sunni scholars are of the view that anyone who does not love the Holy Prophet's progeny betrays him, whereas the Holy Qur'an says:

لَا تَخُونُوا اللَّـهَ وَالرَّسُولَ

Do not betray Allah and the Apostle. 28

Likewise, anyone who makes enmity towards the Hoy Prophet's progeny, makes enmity, in fact, towards the Apostle of Allah. A poet has beautifully described this, composing:

فلا تعدل باهل البيت خلقا ـــــ فأهل البيت هم آهل السعاده

فبغضهم من الإنسان خسر ـــــ حقيقى و حبهم عباده

Do not consider anyone as equal to Prophet's progeny

This is because it is only the Prophet's progeny who attain happiness

Making enmity towards them is a real loss and loving them is worship

Sunni scholars deem it necessary to say Salawat (peace be upon the Holy Prophet's progeny) in prayers. Sheik Farid Al-Din Ahmad Bin Muhammad Naishaburi says: Anyone who believes in Muhammad (S) and does not believe in his progeny is not a believer. All scholars and mystics are of the same opinion on this issue with no one denying it.29

Are they truthful in making this claim?

As a matter of fact, Sunni scholars claim that "anyone who believes in Muhammad (S) and does not believe in his progeny is not a believer". On the other hand, all scholars and mystics are unanimous on this issue with no one denying it.

Let's now ask them this question: if you are truthful in making this claim, what do you say Qattan, Bukhari, Ibn Taymiyya and their likes?

Commenting on Safina tradition (my progeny is Noah's ship. Anyone who gets on it will be saved and anyone who leaves it will be drowned) he says: This tradition shows that salvation and guidance is the result of loving and following the Holy Prophet's progeny. Any deviation from this path will bring about one's perdition.

As the discussion proceeds, Shah Abd Al-Aziz Dehlavi considers affection towards and obedience to the Prophet's progeny as a peculiarity of Sunnis!!30

If Shah Abd Al-Aziz is truthful in his claim he must comment on those who put to question the reputation of Imam Sadiq (a.s).

One must not think that Qattan, Bukhari and their advocates criticized Imam Sadiq (a.s) not because of

their animosity towards him but because of scientific studies and religious precautions. Such a view is wrong. This is because if Ibn Taymiyya's words (concerning Imam Sadiq) are not deviation and animosity, then what are they?

Can we find any other example for deviation and animosity? If Ibn Taymiyya is not an enemy of the Prophet's progeny then who is their enemy who is deviated and prejudiced? Was it the intensity of religious precaution and piety that caused Bukhari to leave aside the traditions of Imam Sadiq (a.s) and other Imams and to give space in his Sahih to traditions by misled and corrupt individuals like Akrama who had deep hatred towards the Holy Prophet's progeny? How can thus one excuse Bukhari and justify his deed?

Buhkari and Duhli have questioned the credibility of one another in a manner that tells us they were lewd. Bukhari avoids mentioning Duhli's name explicitly. Despite all this animosity, he relates Duhli's tradition but refrains from mentioning Imam Sadiq's traditions!!

Qattan and his criticism of Imam Sadiq (a.s)

Qattan has also put to question the reputation and credibility of Imam Sadiq (a.s). This has appeared in Sunnis' Rijal books. In two sentences he criticizes Imam Sadiq (a.s). He says: "I do not accept him" and "I like Mujalid more than him".

Elaborating on Imam Sadiq's life, Dahabi says: Abu Abdullah Ja'afar Bin Muhammad Sadiq's mother is Umm-e-Farwa, daughter of Qasim Bin Muhammad. His maternal grandmother is Asma, daughter of Abd Al-Rahman Bin Abu Bakr. Ja'afar Sadiq said: Abu Bakr has brought me to this world twice.

He listened to the traditions of Qasim, 'Ata and his father (Muhammad Baqir (a.s)), Shu'aba and Qattan have narrated his traditions. Qattan says: I do not accept him....[31]

Elsewhere Dahabi mentions: Ja'afar Bin Muhammad Bin Ali is a reliable person, though Bukhari has not mentioned his traditions. Yahya Bin Mu'aeen and Ibn Udai consider his traditions as credible, though Qattan says that he likes Mujalid more than him.[32]

Who is Mujalid Bin Sa'eed?

Given the preceding discussion, most Sunni scholars have questioned the credibility and reputation of Mujalid Bin Sa'eed. Commenting on him, Dahabi says: Mujalid Bin Sa'eed Bin Umair Hamadani is a popular figure with traditions though weak. He narrated traditions from Qabas Bin Abu Hazim and Sha'abi. Yahaya Qattan, Abu Usama and others have narrated traditions from him.

Speaking about him Ibn Mu'aeen and others says: One cannot rely on Mujalid's traditions.

Talking about him, Ahmad says: No one has reported as many Marfu'a (chainless) traditions as Mujalid

has done. One must not pay attention to his traditions.

Nisaee says that Mujalid is not strong in terms of transmitting traditions. Ashaj says that Mujalid is a Shiite. Dar Qutni says that Mujalid is weak in terms of narrating traditions. Bukhari says: Yahya Bin Sa'eed has always criticized Mujalid whereas Ibn Mahdi has refrained from narrating his traditions.

Falas says: I heard Yaya Bin Sa'eed say: If I asked Mujalid to begin all his traditions with the phrase "from Sha'bi, from Masruq, from Abdullah" he would do it.

When Takhan, Mujalid's maternal uncle was asked as to why he did not record Mujalid's traditions when he was in Kufa he said: because Mujalid keeps long beard.

In my point of view, some scholars have rejected Mujalid's tradition that "If I willed, Allah would give me mountains of gold and silver" as false. Mujalid has narrated this tradition in Marfu'a format from Sha'abi, from Masruq, from 'Aisha.33

This is a part of the views of biographers concerning Mujalid Bin Sa'eed whom Qattan preferred to Imam Sadiq (a.s). You can now judge yourself about the characters of Qattan, Bukhari and their co-thinkers on the basis of justice and religious standards.

Dahabi and Imam Sadiq (a.s)

Albeit Dahabi has considered Imam Sadiq (a.s) as reliable, he has made no objection to Qattan and Bukhari's prejudice against Imam Sadiq (a.s). On the contrary, in his Al-Mizan, he has mentioned the criticism made by Qattan and Bukhari against Imam Sadiq (a.s), saying:

Ja'afar Bin Muhammad Bin Ali Bin Hussain Hashimi, Abu Abdullah is among great, benevolent and truthful Imams. Bukhari has refrained from narrating from him. Yahya Bin Sa'aeed says that he likes Mujalid more than him.

Mus'ab Bin Abdullah quotes Darawardi as saying: Malik refrained from narrating from Ja'afar (Imam Sadiq (a.s)) before the dominance of Bani Abbas. If he narrated anything from him he would add the name of another narrator to his name.

Ahmad Bin Sa'eed Bin Abu Maryam quotes Yahya as saying: I did not ask Yahya Bin Sa'aeed anything about the traditions of Ja'afar (Imam Sadiq (a.s). It was because of this that he asked: Why do you not ask him about the traditions' of Ja'afar. 34

I said: I do not like his traditions.

Yahya Bin Sa'eed said: If Ja'afar is a memorizer he can narrate authentic traditions from his father.35

In his preface to this book, Dahabi, on the other hand, points out that he does not intend to mention the

names of those great scholars of jurisprudence whom Bukhari and Ibn Udai have criticized.

Is the position of Imam Sadiq (a.s) lower than that of some of the lewd companions (of the Holy Prophet (S)) such as 'Amr Bin 'As, Busr Bin Arta'a and their likes? Were Shafi'aee and others better off than Imam Sadiq (a.s)?

No doubt, they were not. Thus it is prejudice against and animosity towards the Holy Prophet's progeny that make one to commits such a grieve sin. One must take refuge to Allah from such sins.

Who is Qattan?

Let's now see how Sunni scholars have exaggerated in praising Qattan while elaborating on his life. Sam'ani says: Qattan is a person who sells cotton. Qattan was called Qattan for he was as seller of cotton. His full name is Abu Sa'eed, Yahya Bin Sa'eed Bin Farrukh Ahwal Qattan. He was among the slaves of Bani Tamim and the Imams of Basra.

He narrated traditions from Yahya Bin Sa'eed Ansari and Hisham Bin Urwa and the people of narrated his traditions.

Qattan died on Sunday in the year 198 AH. When a person asked Allah to cure his illness when he was ill, he would say: I like that which Allah likes.

He was among the top figures of his time in memorizing traditions, piety, reason, understanding, virtue, religion and knowledge. It was he who taught Iraqis how to record traditions.

He spent most of his time in learning about reliable narrators and leaving weak narrators. Ahmad Bin Hanbal, Yahya Bin Mu'aeen and Ali Bin Madini have learnt the science of hadith from him.

Talking about him, Amr Bin Ali Falas says: Yahya Bin Sa'eed Qattan used to recite the entire Qur'an in every twenty four hours. He used to pray for as many as one thousand people. In the final hours of afternoon, he would go out of his house in order to relate traditions for people.

He narrated traditions from Yahya Bin Sa'eed Ansari, his homonym, Hisham Bin Urwa, 'Amash Bin Jarih, Thawri, Shu'aba, Malik etc. He said that he had accompanied Shu'aba for twenty years during which time he had learnt as many as three to ten traditions from him.

Yahya Bin Mu'aeen says: He used to recite the entire Quran every night for twenty consecutive years. He used to offer his noon prayers in mosque for forty year in succession, though he was never seen in congregational prayer.[36]

Speaking about Qattan, he says: His full name is Yahya Bin Saeed Qattan, Abu Saeed Bin Farrukh Tamimi. He was the Imam of Basra narrators and was among the followers of the followers. He listened to the traditions of Yahya Bin Saeed Ansari, Hanzala Bin Abu Sufyan, Bin 'Ajlan, Sayf Bin Sulaiman,

Hisham Bin Hassan, Bin Jarih, Saeed Bin ‘Aruba, Bin Abu Zaeb, Noori, Bin ‘Aenae, Malik, Mush’aeer, Shu’aba and others.

Noori, Ibn ‘Aeena, Shu’ab, Ibn Mahdi, ‘Affan, Ahmad Bin Hanbal, Yahya Bin Mu’een, Ali Bin Madini, Ishaq Bin Rahwiyya, Abu Abdi Qasim Bin Salam, Abu Khtima, Abu Bakr Bin Abu Shayba, Musaddid, Ubaydullah Bin Umar Qawariri, Amr, Bin Ali, Ibn Muthana, Ibn Bashar etc. have narrated traditions from him.

All scholars have admitted his Imamate, greatness, memorization and his immense knowledge.

Commenting on him, Dahabi says: Yahya Bin Sa’eed Bin Farrukh, Abu Sa’eed Tamimi, Qattan, a great memorizer was the Imam of Basra narrators. He narrated traditions from Urwa, Hamid and Amash. Ahmad, Ali and Yahya narrated traditions from him.

Ahmad says: Qattan is a unique personality. Bandar says: Yahya Qattan was the Imam of his time. I was in touch with him for twenty years. I think he did not commit even a single sin!

Qattan was top in terms of knowledge and good deeds. He was born in 120 AH and died in Safar 198 AH.37

Speaking about Qattan, Yafi’aee said: Imam Abu Sa’eed Yahya Bin Sa’eed Qattan was from Basra. He was memorizer of tradition and a great scholar. Bandar says: I was in touch with him for twenty years. I think he did not commit even a single sin!

Ahmad Bin Hanbal said: Qattan was a unique personality. Ibn Mu’aeen said: He used to recite the entire Quran every night for twenty consecutive years and pray in mosque for forty years without any cessation.38

Incredible claims

The above-mentioned scholars were aware of Qattan’s words concerning Imam Sadiq (a.s), but despite that they praised him. Theses praises determine Sunnis’ attitude towards the Holy Prophet’s progeny (a.s).

Thus we cannot agree with some Sunni scholars who say that Sunnis respect the Holy Prophet’s progeny and appealed to them. It cannot be accepted that someone loves the Holy Prophet’s progeny and praises their enemies!

The story of Ibn Madini’s Al-Ilal

One of the objections that target Bukhari’s piety and credibility is his way of approaching Al-Ilal written by Ibn Madini, his teacher.

In his Al-T'arikh, Muslima Bin Qasim (based on what is narrated)[39] says: Bukhari wrote his Sahih in order to compete Ali Bin Madini who had written Al-Ilal and were not willing to publish it.

Considering his book as very great and useful, he did not narrate its traditions to anyone. One day Ali Bin Madini went somewhere to do something. [Utilizing the opportunity], Bukhari visited one his children. He proposed to him to lend him Al-Ilal to study for three days in return for one hundred Dinars.

Being attracted by the charms of Dinars, Ibn Madini's family lent it to him and asked him to return it after three days.

Bukhari got the book that was consisting of one hundred volumes and distributed it among one hundred writers asking each one to transcribe and edit his portion within twenty four hours.

As expected, the writers in question completed its transcription and editing within twenty four hours.

After accomplishing the task, Bukhari returned Al-Ilal back to Ali Bin Madini's son, saying that he could study only parts of it.

Not knowing about what had happened, Ali Bin Madini arrived home. Bukhari now studied the book and memorized its content. He had good relations with Ibn Madini. Ibn Madini used to devote one day to the people of tradition, elaborating on the weakness and chains of traditions.

After some times, Bukhari visited Ibn Madini. "Where are you? I have not seen you for a long time?", Ibn Madini said. "I was busy doing something", replied Bukhari.

Thereupon Ali Bin Madini narrated some traditions and asked the people of traditions to comment on their weaknesses.

Bukhari replied, while mentioning the exact words of Ibn Madini in his Al-Ilal. Ibn Madini was surprised by Bukhari's comment and thus he, addressing him, said: How did you know the answer to this question? I have written it in my book. Presently no one except me knows about such issues.

Saddened and made sorrowful, Ibn Madini came back home. At his home, he learnt that Bukhari had taken the book from his family after giving them some money. His sorrow continued to increase until he died a short while later.

Now that Bukhari had Al-Ilal at his disposal he did not need to attend Madini's lectures anymore. That is why he left for Khurasan where he became a jurist making use of Al-Ilal.

He wrote his Sahih and history books and became popular. He was the first scholar who wrote Sahih in the world of Islam and other scholars followed in his footsteps and wrote their Sahih books.

The afore-mentioned story shows that Bukhari was the main factor behind the death of his teacher, Ali Bin Madini, for it was Bukhari who borrowed Ibn Madini's Al-Ilal from his family through trick and deceit

and introduced changes in it.

1. Al-Tabaqat Al-Shafi'ayya Al-Kubra, vol. 2, p. 230, Siyar 'Alam Al-Nubala, vol. 12, p. 462.
2. Fayz Al-Qadir, vol. 1, p. 24.
3. Mawsu'a Al- Mustaf Wa Al-Itra, p. 594.
4. Mizan Al-Itidal, vol. 5, pp. 167, tradition no, 5880.
5. Al-Kashif, vol. 2, p. 223, tradition no. 3607
6. Taqrib Al-Tahzib, vol. 1, p. 497, tradition no. 4850.
7. Mir'at Al-Junan, vol. 2, p. 131.
8. Tarikh Baghdad, vol. 10, pp. 326 and 337.
9. Al-Kashif, vols. 3 and 6, p. 4761.
10. Al-Ansab, vol. 2, p. 279.
11. Tahzib Al-Tahzib, vol. 9, pp. 27-30.
12. Hady Al-Sari, p. 492.
13. Al-Kashif, vol. 2, p. 88, Narrator no. 5274.
14. Al-Asbab, vol. 3, p. 181.
15. Al-Wafi bi Al-Wafiyat, vol. 5, p. 186, Narrator, no. 2235.
16. Though the name of the Holy Prophet in Sunni sources is followed by (peace be upon him), an imperfect form of salutation, we use the letter (S) after the name of the Holy Prophet in order to refer to (peace be upon him and his progeny), a perfect form of salutation, suggested by the Holy Prophet himself.
17. Awqiya is a unit of measurement. Here it stands for a quantity of gold etc. from war booties.
18. Al-Mustawfi fi Asma Al-Mustafa, manuscript.
19. Wafiyat Al-'Ayan, vol. 3, pp. 448 – 450 and 497.
20. Bughyat Al-Wu'at fi Tabaqat Al-Nufus Wa Al-Nijat, vol. 2, p. 218 and Narrator no. 1832.
21. Hassan Al-Muhadara bi Mahasin Misr Wa Al-Qahira, vol. 1, p. 201.
22. Minhaj Al-Sunna, vol. 4, p. 136.
23. Nazal Al-Abrar be Ma Sahha min Manaqib Ahl Al-Bayt Al-Athar, vol. 21.
24. Asna Al-Matalib fi Manaqib Ali Bin Abi Talib, p. 48.
25. Anba Al-Ghumr be Anba Al-Umr, vol. 3, p. 467.
26. Al-Daw Al-Lami'a li Ahl Al-Qarn Al-Tasi'a, vol. 9, p. 255- 260.
27. Minhaj Al-Sunna, vol. 7, p. 533.
28. Qur'an, Anfal, 27.
29. Al-Sawaeq Al-Mubiqa, Manuscript.
30. Tuhfa Athna Asharia, p. 219.
31. Al-Kashif, vol. 1, pp. 149and 807.
32. Al-Mughni fi Al-Duafa, vo. 1, p. 211 narrator, no. 1156.
33. Mizan Al-Itidal, vol. 6, p. 23, narrator no. 7076.
34. Ibid, vol. 2, p. 143, narrator no. 1521.
35. Ibdi, vol. 1, p. 113.
36. Al-Ansab, vol. 4, p. 519.
37. Al-Kashif, 3, p. 243, Narrator, no. 6258.
38. Mir'at Al-Junan, vol. 1, p. 352.
39. See Lisan Al-Mizan, vol. 6, p. 43 for his life.

Chapter 2: Baseless Traditions in Sahih Bukhari

Now that we have shortly studied Bukhari's life, it is time to study Bukhari's so-called Sahih in the light of the words of great scholars of tradition. Here I will suffice to narrating the objections and criticisms made [by scholars] against some of Bukhari's traditions.

The tradition of '[Prophet's] proposing to 'Aisha

Among the baseless traditions of Bukhari's Sahih is its tradition about the Holy Prophet's proposing to Aisha. According to this tradition, when the Holy Prophet (S) asked for the hand of Aisha in marriage, Abu Bakr (Aisha's father) said: I am your brother. Here is the full text of this tradition:

Urwa says: The Holy Prophet (S) asked for the hand of Aisha in marriage.

Answering him Abu Bakr said: But I am your brother.

The Holy Prophet (S) said: You are my brother in religion and thus it is permissible for me to marry Aisha.[1]

In his Fath Al-Bari, Ibn Hajar 'Asqalani has questioned the authenticity of this tradition. He quotes Hafiz Mughaltai as saying: The authenticity of this tradition is doubtful. This is because the friendship between the Holy Prophet (S) and Abu Bakr happened in Medina whereas proposing to Aisha was made in Mecca. Thus how is it logically possible for Abu Bar to say: "I am your brother"?

Moreover, the Holy Prophet (S) did not personally embark on proposing to Aisha. Ibn Abu 'Asim narrates from Yahya Bin Abd Al-Rahman Bin Hatib, from Aisha who says: The Holy Prophet sent Khula, daughter of Hakim, to propose to me.

Addressing Khula, Abu Bakr said: Aisha is the Holy Prophet's nephew. Can she marry him?

Khula came back and related the story to the Holy Prophet (S).

The Holy Prophet (S) told him: Go back and tell Abu Bakr that you are my brother in Islam and your daughter thus can marry me.

Khula went to Abu Bakr and talked to him about the issue. Abu Bakr said: Invite the Messenger of Allah (S)! Thereupon the Holy Prophet (S) came and Abu Bakr married Aisha to him.[2]

The tradition of 'intercession of Ibrahim for Azer'

Among the false traditions of Bukhari is a tradition according to which Ibrahim (a.s) will intercede for Azer

with Allah on the Day of Judgment. As usual, he repeats this false tradition in many places in his Sahih. As those who are aware of Islamic doctrines know, this tradition puts to question the reputation and credibility of Ibrahim. This is because it proves the following points:

1. Ibrahim (a.s) disobeyed Allah's commandments.

2. He insisted on his disobedience and continued interceding for Azer with Allah.

3. He resisted intellectual reasons that proclaim: it is impossible to intercede with Allah for polytheists.

4. He mistakenly thought that the punishment of a disbeliever (like Azer) will bring him the worst of meanness and disgrace.

What is meaner and more disgraceful than this? The stupidest people know that this is wrong not to speak of an infallible Prophet who is appointed to guide people.

5. He did not understand the meaning of Allah's promise that He would protect his dignity and honor.

Here is the text of this tradition from Bukhari's chapter on prophetic commentary.

Ismael narrates from his brother, from Ibn Abu Zaeb, from Sa'eed Maqbari from Abu Huraira who quotes the Holy Prophet as saying: After meeting his father, Ibrahim addressing Allah, says: O my Lord, You promised me that You would not disgrace me on the Day of Judgment.

Addressing him Allah says: I do not allow disbelievers to enter into Paradise.[3]

Another tradition (available in this regard) says: Ibrahim (a.s) says: O my Lord! You promised me that You would not disgrace me, but which disgrace is worse than disgracing of my father?[4]

Fakhr Radi's opinion

The Holy Qur'an says:

وَمَا كَانَ اسْتِغْفَارُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ لِأَبِيهِ إِلَّا عَن مَّوْعِدَةٍ وَعَدَهَا إِيَّاهُ فَلَمَّا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُ أَنَّهُ عَدُوٌّ لِّلَّهِ تَبَرَّأَ مِنْهُ ۚ إِنَّ إِبْرَاهِيمَ لَأَوَّاهٌ حَلِيمٌ

And Ibrahim asking forgiveness for his sire was only owing to a promise which he had made to him; but when it became clear to him that he was an enemy of Allah, he declared himself to be clear of him; most surely Ibrahim was very tender- hearted forbearing. [5]

Commenting on this verse, Fakhr Razi mentions the following points:

One: The relation of this verse to the previous verses can be studied through the following angles:

● This verse intends to say that Prophet Muhammad (S) is permitted to do what Prophet Ibrahim (a.s)

was not allowed to do.

● This verse intends to say that what links this verse to previous verses is the emphasis it lays on detaching oneself from disbelievers whether they are alive or dead. The following verses say that the ordinance of detachment from disbeliever is not confined to the religion of Islam.

Thus the verse mentioned above indicates the ordinance of detaching from disbelievers was available in Ibrahim's religion. That is the reason why the ordinance of detachment from disbelievers is so strong.

● Here Allah, the Exalted, introduces Ibrahim as 'tender hearted' and 'forbearing'. Ibrahim being tender hearted tends profusely to ask Allah's forgiveness for his father, but, despite that, Allah forbids him from asking forgiveness for his father. Others are thus more emphatically told not ask for forgiveness for disbelievers.6

Thus, according to Fakhr Razi Ibrahim was not allowed to ask Allah's forgiveness for his father and hence he abandoned his father. Thus it is clear for every Muslim that Bukhari's tradition is fake and fabricated!

Moreover, intellectual reasons also indicate that it is not permissible to ask for Allah's forgiveness for disbelievers.

Speaking concerning this issue, Fakhr Razi says: Elsewhere in another verse, the Holy Quran mentions:

مَا كَانَ لِلنَّبِيِّ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَن يَسْتَغْفِرُوا لِلْمُشْرِكِينَ

It is not fit for the Prophet and those who believe that they should ask forgiveness for pagans. 7

This verse gives two meanings:

1. It is not fit for the Holy Prophet (S) and those who believe to ask forgiveness for pagans and thus the verse is descriptive in meaning.

2. It is not permissible for the Holy Prophet (S) and believers to ask forgiveness for pagans (and thus the verse is prescriptive in meaning).

According to the first point, prophecy and faith do not allow you to ask forgiveness for pagans whereas according to the second point it is not lawful to ask forgiveness for pagans.

It is, however, noteworthy that both these point are close to one another in terms of meaning. Allah determines the cause of this prohibition in the concluding part of this very verse, as He says:

من بعد ما تبين لهم انهم اصحاب الجحيم

After it has become clear to them that they are the inmates of the flaming fire... 8

Elsewhere the Holy Qur'an mentions:

إِنَّ اللَّـهَ لَا يَغْفِرُ أَن يُشْرَكَ بِهِ وَيَغْفِرُ مَا دُونَ ذَٰلِكَ

Allah does not forgive that anything should be associated with him and forgives what is beside that to whomsoever He pleases. 9

What is the meaning of these verses? Allah has informed (us) that pagans are the inmates of the flaming fire. As a result, to ask forgiveness for pagans is tantamount to asking Allah not to keep His promises – a thing that is not acceptable.

In addition, Allah has made a decisive decision to punish the pagans. Thus to ask forgiveness for them is not only useless but also results in the decline of the position of a prophet.

Allah the Glorious says:

ادعونى اسجب لكم

Call upon Me I will answer you. 10

On the other hand, He says:

انهم اصحاب الجحيم

They are surely the inmates of flaming fire. 11

Thus to ask forgiveness ends up in the rejection of the content of either of the two verses mentioned above– a thing that is impossible. 12

Ibn Hajar Asqalani and justification of this tradition

In short, it must be declared that the tradition of the intercession of Ibrahim for Azer is fabricated and false. One cannot justify it at all. Perhaps it is because of this that some Sunni scholars have altered the words of this tradition, putting in place of 'Ibrahim' the phrase 'a man'.

As an instance, in his Fath Al–Bari, Ibn Hajar 'Asqalani narrates:

Ayyub's tradition reads: On the Day of Judgment a man meets his father and asks: How am I (as a son of you)?

Father says: You are the best (son of mine). Son says: Do you obey me today?

Father says: Yes.

Son says: Now hold fast to my garment! Father does so.

Thereupon the son begins walking towards his Lord…13

Nevertheless, based on what Hafiz Isma'eli, a tradition memorizer and others have said one cannot but admit that the above mentioned tradition is false.

Ibn Hajar 'Asqalani says: Isma'eli has questioned this tradition casting doubt on its authenticity. After narrating this tradition, he says: This is not an authentic tradition. This is because Ibrahim knows that Allah does not break His promise. Knowing this, how can one consider the misery of his father as his own misery?

Another scholar says that the tradition mentioned above is in contradiction with the Allah's words. Allah mentions:

و ما كان استغفار ابراهيم لابية الا عن موعده وعدها اياه فلما تبين له انه عدو لله تأ تبرا منه

And Ibrahim asking forgiveness for his sire was only owing to a promise which he had made to him; but when it became clear to him that he was an enemy of Allah, he declared himself to be clear of him, most surely Ibrahim was very tender- hearted, forbearing. 14 &15

Ibn Hajar tries to justify this tradition and gave it a new interpretation. Thus he says: In reply it must be said that interpreters differ on when Ibrahim declared himself to be clear of his father.

Some have pointed out that Ibrahim declared himself to be clear of Azer when the later died as a pagan.

Tabari has narrated an authentic tradition from Habib Bin Abu Thabit, from Sa'aeed Bin Jabir, from Ibn 'Abass, which confirms this view. A tradition declares that when Azer died Ibrahim (a.s) no longer asked forgiveness for him. It is also narrated from Ali Bin Abu Talha, from Ibn 'Abass that Ibrahim (a.s) was asking forgiveness for Azer as long as he was alive, but when he died he stopped asking forgiveness for him. The same has been narrated from Mujahid, Qatada, and 'Amr Bin Dinar.

Some others have however said that Ibrahim (a.s) will get disappointed from Azer and will declare himself to be clear of him on the Day of Judgment when Azer gets metamorphosed. This has been touched by a tradition reported by Munzir. We mentioned this tradition before.

The same has been narrated by Tabari from Abd Al-Malik Bin Sulayman who says: I heard Sa'aeed Bin Jubair say: On the Day of Judgment, Ibrahim (a.s) will thrice say: O my Lord! My father! As he says this

phrase for the third time, he takes Azer's hand (to go ...) but Azer looks at him angrily. It is at this moment that Ibrahim (a.s) declares himself to be clear of him.

Tabari quotes 'Ubaid Bin 'Umair as saying: Addressing his father, Ibrahim (a.s) says: When you were living in the (physical) world, you did not obey me when I commanded you, but now I will not leave you. Hold fast to my garment. Azer holds fast to somewhere in between Ibrahim's shoulders but it is now that he is changed into a hyena. As soon as Ibrahim sees his metamorphosed face, he declares himself to be clear of him.

Ibn Hajar says: We can accept both of these views. When Azer died as a pagan Ibrahim declared himself to be clear of him and stopped asking forgiveness for him any longer. As Ibrahim sees Azer on the Day of Judgment he takes pity on him and begins asking forgiveness for him. But when he saw the metamorphosed face of Azer he became disappointed and declared himself to be clear of him.

Some scholars have mentioned: Ibrahim (a.s) was not sure that Azer died as a disbeliever, for it was quite possible for Azer to have embraced the faith of Ibrahim without letting him know about it. Thus Ibrahim (a.s), as maintained by the tradition, declares himself to be clear of him when came to know that he died before accepting his religion.

Falsity of Ibn Hajar's view

All rational people not to speak of knowledgeable ones easily understand that Ibn Hajar's view is false. This is because he first deals with the scholars differing on when Ibrahim (a.s) declared himself to be clear of Azer, which is not relevant to the objection in question.

It is, however, possible that Ibn Hajar wanted to solve the inconsistency that exists between the above-mentioned verse and the holy verse (it is not fit ...) through introducing the Day of Judgment as the time when Ibrahim declared himself clear of Azer. It can be, anyhow, said that this argument is weak from different perspectives.

● Based on this justification, the verse (when it was clear to him that he was Allah's enemy, he declared himself clear of him) must be taken to be related to the Day of Judgment. This is while the verse in question has introduced the past as the time when Ibrahim declared himself to be clear of Azer. As we know, it is not permissible to overlook the apparent meaning of a verse without a sound reason.

● Many traditions – some of which are accepted as authentic by Ibn Hajar – indicate that Ibrahim (a.s) declared himself to be clear of Azer in this world. As a result, the verse mentioned above will be in a clear and inevitable contradiction with Ibrahim's asking forgiveness for Azer.

● If we agree supposedly that there is difference in regard with the time of Ibrahim's declaring himself to be clear of Azer, and that the second opinion is preferable to the first one, the objection raised by some scholars will be answered, but the objection raised by Hafiz Isma'eli will remain unanswered.

● The determination of the Day of Judgment as the time of 'clearing' will cause divergence in the context of the verse mentioned above. This is because the Holy Qur'an relates the story of Ibrahim (a.s) in order to tell us that Ibrahim (a.s) was told not to ask forgiveness for pagans and he declared himself to be clear of his father despite being kind-hearted and highly forbearing. Other believers are thus by no means allowed to ask forgiveness for pagans.

Fakhr Razi who also has such an understanding says: The reason why Allah introduces Ibrahim in these verses as kind- hearted and forbearing is that [Allah intends to tell us that though] his deep love and affection for his father and his kind- heartedness towards him required him to be more kind to his father and children, he declared himself to be clear of his father when he came to know that his father was insisting on disbelief.

Thus they must also follow the suit and declare themselves to be clear of pagans. Allah has called Ibrahim as 'forbearing'. This is because tender-heartedness and affection is one of the causes of being 'forbearing'. Being tender-hearted, man becomes more forbearing while getting angry.[16]

Thus if it is meant that Ibrahim (a.s) will declare himself to be clear of his father on the Day of Judgment, how can one conclude that it is more obligatory for Muslims to declare themselves to be clear of pagans?

It seems that Ibn Hajar 'Asqalani has also sensed the weakness of this answer and that is why he feels obliged to say: It is not possible to answer this… He is however not sure about his stance on the issue in question.

Sufficing to this answer, in Al-Tawshih, Jalal Al-Din Suyuti says: Ibrahim's demand for forgiveness of his father has been criticized. This is because he was aware of Allah's promise that disbelievers were the inmates of fire.

It has been said in reply that [Ibrahim (a.s) knew about Allah's promise but] when he saw Azer was overwhelmed by love and affection and thus could not but demand for his forgiveness. [17]

The above-mentioned answer does not seem to solve the problem. It instead solidifies it and accepts it. This is because it shows that the motif behind Ibrahim's action is affection and tender-heartedness. The question however remains as to why Ibrahim shows affection [towards Azer] whereas he knows that it is not permissible for him to ask forgiveness for disbelievers.

One may say that affection and tenderheartedness make it permissible for one to ask forgiveness but it has to be mentioned that such reasoning sounds like a joke, having nothing to do with reality. No one can accept such reasoning.

While presenting his justification, Ibn Hajar said: Some scholars say that Ibrahim (a.s) was not sure that Azer had died as a disbeliever.

If he intends to show the weakness of the quotation made above by his remark, then we do not need to criticize it… But if he intends to reject the criticisms made against Ibrahim by this quotation, his view will be in conflict with many authentic traditions that indicate that Ibrahim (a.s) was aware that Azer had died as a disbeliever. Ibn Hajr himself has narrated some of these traditions. Suyutii has also touched some of these traditions in his Al-Durr Al-Manthur.

Commenting on,

فلما تبيين له…

Qutada as quoted by Ibn Jarir and Ibn Abu Hatam, says: As Azer was dying, Ibrahim (a.s) learnt that it was no longer possible for him to repent.

Abu Bakr Shafi'aee in his Fawaed and Maqdisi in his Al- Mukhtara, Qurbani, Ibn Jarir, Ibn Munzir, Ibn Abu Hatam and Abu Al-Sheikh have quoted Ibn Abbas as saying: Ibrahim (a.s) continued to ask forgiveness for Azer until the later was dead. When Azer died as a disbeliever he declared himself to be clear of him.[18]

The tradition of Prophet's 'praying on the corpse of Ibn Abu Sulul'

One of the baseless traditions of Bukhari and Muslim as well – is the tradition that has appeared in the commentary section of his Sahih. Bukhari has quoted Umar as saying: After Abdullah Bin Ubai died his son, named Abdullah, met the Holy Prophet (S) and asked him to give [him] his shirt to shroud [his father] Abullah Bin Ubai.

The Apostle of Allah gave his shirt to him. Thereupon he asked the Holy Prophet (a.s) to pray on his corpse as well.

The Apostle of Allah got ready to pray on the corpse of Abdullah Bin Ubai.[Now] Umar stood up and snatched the Holy Prophet's shirt [from the hand of Abdullah] saying: O Apostle of Allah! Do you want to pray on his corpse while Allah has forbidden you from doing it?

The Holy Prophet (S) said:

انما اخبرنى الله فقال: "استغفر لهم او لا تستغفر لهم سبعين مره " و سأزيده على السبعين

Allah has allowed me to do or not to do it saying: "Ask forgiveness for them or do not ask forgiveness for them. Even if you ask forgiveness for them seventy times, Allah will not forgive

them." I will ask forgiveness for him more than seventy times. 19

Umar said: But Abdullah Bin Ubai is a hypocrite!

Ibn Umar says that despite all these the Holy Prophet (S) prayed on the corpse of Abdullah Bin Ubai and thus the following verse was revealed:

ولاتصل على احد منهم مات ابدا ولا تقم على قبره

And never offer prayer for anyone of them who dies and do not stand by his grave...20

Why this tradition was fabricated?

This tradition is fabricated in order to forge excellences for Umar Bin Khattab. It is totally forged and fabricated. Many Sunni Imams, thanks to Allah, have pointed that it is a fabricated tradition. For example, Ghazzali, after quoting some traditions, points out: This is a false tradition. This is because such reports do not bring us certainty. It is not a match for numerous traditions enumerating the excellences of Hatam (Taei) and Ali (a.s).

No doubt, the story related about the verse pertaining to asking forgiveness is false. This is because Allah wants to show that Ibrahim is utterly disappointed from receiving forgiveness (from Allah for his father). Thus one must not think that the Apostle has forgotten all about it.21

As mentioned by the commentators of Sahih Bukhari, Baqilani and Imam Al-Haramain have also touched this issue. Qastalani says: Many have faced problems in understanding the liberty (given to Ibrahim) in this verse. We mentioned previously the answer Zamakhshari has given to this objection.

The author of Al-Intisaf states: Scholars have erred in understating this verse to the extent that Baqilani questions the authenticity of this tradition saying: We cannot confirm the authenticity of this tradition and say that the Holy Prophet said it.

In his Al-Mukhtasar, Imam Al-Haramain says: This tradition is not an authentic tradition. In his Al-Burhan, he again says that scholars of traditions do not confirm the authenticity of this tradition. In his Al-Mustasfa, Ghazali says: It is highly probable that this tradition is not an authentic tradition. Commenting on his words, Dawudi says: Strangely enough, scholars of tradition have not memorized this tradition.22

Concerning this issue, Ibn Hajar 'Asqalani says: Ibn Munir is of the view that scholars have erred in understanding this tradition to the extent that Qazi Abu Bakr has refuted the authenticity of this tradition saying: We cannot confirm the authenticity of this tradition and say that the Holy Prophet really said it.

In his Al-Taqrib, Baqilani says: This tradition is among the traditions quoted by single individuals23 the

authenticity of which we cannot verify. In his Al-Mukhtasar, Imam Al- Haramain says: This tradition is not an authentic tradition. In his Al-Burhan, he again says that scholars of traditions do not confirm the authenticity of this tradition.

In his Al-Mustasfa, Ghazali says: It is highly probable that this tradition is not an authentic tradition. Commenting on his words, Dawudi says: This is a strange tradition that needs further investigation.[24]

The tradition of 'three lies told by Prophet Ibrahim'

One of the baseless traditions of Sahih Bukhari and Muslim is the tradition that alludes to the three lies allegedly told by Prophet Ibrahim (a.s).

The author of Al-Jam'a Bayn Al-Sahihain says: Muhammad narrates from Abu Huraira who quotes the Apostle of Allah as saying: Ibrahim lied only three times. He lied two times for the sake of Allah when he said: "I am ill" and "Nay, the chief of them has done it" and once for the sake of Sarah.

Accompanied by Sarah who was the most beautiful woman of her time, Ibrahim (a.s) once went to a land that was ruled by an oppressive ruler. When they reached there, he told Sarah to say that she was his sister on religious bases for if the king came to know that she was his wife he would snatch her from him.[25]

Fakhr Razi rejects this tradition

Fakhr Razi criticizes this tradition and rejects it saying those who have narrated it are advocates of Hashviya school of thought. He says: One of the advocates of Hashviya school of thought quoted for me the Holy Prophet (S) as saying: Ibrahim (a.s) lied three times.

I said: We do not need to accept such traditions.

To reject my opinion he said: if we do not accept this tradition it will imply that we have in fact considered the narrators as liars.

I said: Look! If we accept such traditions [it will imply that] we have considered Prophet Ibrahim (a.s) as a liar and if we do not accept them it will imply that we have regarded narrators as liars. No doubt, to acquit Prophet Ibrahim (a.s) of lying is far better than acquitting a handful of unknown narrators of lying.[26]

It is worth mentioning that Umar Bin 'Adil has recorded Fakhr Razi's words and praised him.[27]

The tradition of 'a prophet setting ant's nest on fire'

Another fabricated tradition narrated by Bukhari is the tradition that says that one of the prophets being

stung by an ant set the entire nest of ants on fire. Bukhari says: Ismael narrates from Malik, from Abu Zinad, from ‘Aaraj, from Abu Huraira who quotes the Holy Prophet as saying: Once the prophet was resting under the shade of a tree when all of a sudden an ant stung him. He got his things collected and then ordered his men to set the entire nest of ants on fire!

Allah said through revelation: Why did you not kill the ant that stung you?!

Fakhr Razi rejects this tradition

To reject this tradition we will suffice to relating again Fakhr Razi’s words. Shah Waliullah Dehlavi narrates Fakhr Razi’s words and then praises him and accepts his words. He says: Here Fakhr Razi has said something which reason accepts. He says: In my point of view, Shias are more feeble-minded and weaker in understanding than the ants in the story of Sulayman. This is because an ant, addressing, its companions said:

ون

قالت نمله يا ايها النمل ادخلوا مساكنكم لا يخطمنكم سليمان و جنوده و هم لا يشعرون

One of the ants said: “O you ants, get into your houses, lest Sulayman and his hosts crush you while they do not know. 28

The ant knew that Sulayman’s hosts are so perfect morally that they do not crush ants knowingly and intentionally and that they are not unjust to the weak. This is whereas Shias do not know that being in the company of the seal of the Prophets who is the most perfect of them leaves an impact on those who always accompany him and thus does not allow them to be disloyal and to do mischievous acts.

Shias accuse the companions of the Holy Prophet (S) of being unjust to his daughter, son-in-law and their children and introducing them as the ones responsible for setting [Imam Ali’s] house on fire, usurping his possessions and treating his family unfairly.29

In response it has to be said that Bukhari and other advocates of the authenticity of this tradition are weaker in understanding than ants. This is because they have, by approving off this tradition, accepted that it is legal for an infallible prophet to be unjust and cruel!

The tradition of ‘eating forbidden meat’

The tradition that endorses eating the meat of an animal slaughtered without mentioning Allah’s name is

another forged tradition narrated by Bukhari in his Sahih (The Book of Slaughtered).

Mu'alla Bin Asad narrates from Abd Al-Azir Bin Mukhtar, from Musa Bin 'Aqaba, from Salim, from Abdullah who says: Before receiving revelation, the Holy Prophet (S) met Zaid Bin 'Amr Bin Nafil somewhere at Baldakh30 and invited him to a meal full of meat.

Zaid Bin 'Amr, rejecting the Holy Prophet's invitation, said: I do not eat the meat of animal slaughtered for an idol. I do not eat the meat of an animal slaughtered without mentioning Allah's name.31

Which Muslim can hesitate that this tradition is false? Does the inventor of this tradition not feel ashamed of himself when he says that the Holy Prophet (S) invited Zaid to a meal made of the meat of an animal slaughtered without mentioning the name of Allah and Zaid rejected the invitation?

If we accept God forbidden this tradition, then we must regard Zaid Bin 'Amr as better and more pious than the Holy Prophet (S)!

How can Sunni scholars believe that such traditions are true about the Holy Prophet (S) whereas they do their best to acquit Abu Bakr of drinking before drinking was forbidden and reject traditions related to his drinking saying: Allah prevents the truthful ones from doing evil deeds even before evil deeds are forbidden!

This has been mentioned in Nawadir Al-Usul by Tirmidhi. We will soon relate it. But it has to be asked now if the Holy Prophet (S) was not a truthful one.

Distortion in a fabricated tradition

Ibn Ruzbehan has added a supplement to this forged tradition, which is nothing but mere accusations and lies about Allama Hilli. In response, to Allama's words, he says: The way he (Allama Hilli) has narrated this tradition shows that he is not credible and thus one cannot rely on the traditions he has narrated from others. In order to attain his goal and put to question the authenticity of the traditions of Sihah Sitta, he has narrated a part of the afore-mentioned tradition and avoided to mention its supplement which is as under:

After hearing the words of Zaid Bin 'Amr Bin Nufail, the Holy Prophet (S) said: We too do not eat the meat of an animal sacrificed by pagans or slaughtered without the name of Allah being mentioned. Thus they both avoided eating the meal.

In order to cast doubt on the authenticity of this tradition, he has omitted its supplement. We ask Allah to save us from prejudice which is a bad habit.32

[In response to this objection], it has to be said that Ibn Ruzbehan's objection can be reversed back to himself and that he himself is not credible. This is because this tradition has appeared as such in the book of slaughtered in Sahih Bukhari and Allama Hilli has thus quoted it exactly. Sahih Bukhari is now

accessible to all. One can refer to it in order to find out whether or not our words are correct.

Bukhari has also mentioned this tradition in his Kitab e Manaqib, but not mentioning again the supplement mentioned by Ibn Ruzbehan. In a chapter on the tradition of Zaid Bin ‘Amr Bin Nufail he says: Muhammad Bin Abu Bakr narrates from Salim Bin Abdullah Bin Umar who said: Before receiving revelation, the Holy Prophet (S) met Zaid Bin ‘Amr Bin Nufail somewhere at Baldakh. They invited the Holy Prophet (S) to a table but he did not accept to attend it.

At this moment, Zaid said: I do not eat the meat of an animal sacrificed for idols. I eat only the meat those animals that are slaughtered with the name of Allah.

Zaid Bin ‘Amr used to object the sacrifices made by Quraish saying: Allah has created the sheep and provided it with water and fodder but you deny it by slaughtering it for the sake of idols without mentioning the name of Allah.33

Thus it is clear that Allama Hilli has not been unfaithful in narrating this tradition. He has not added anything to it nor has he omitted anything from it. It is rather Ibn Ruzbehan who has lied by adding a supplement to it. The addition of a supplement to this tradition is a sign of the incredibility of Ibn Ruzbehan.

One can regard it as a platform for giving him a no-confidence vote. This is because he invented these lies in order to defend Sihah Sitta by rejecting the objections raised against them. We ask Allah to save us from prejudice which is a bad habit.

It also became clear that Sunni scholars attempt to conceal the defects and flaws of their traditions by distorting them whenever they find themselves caught in a difficult situation.

As mentioned, Ibn Ruzbehan distorts this tradition when he claims that this tradition has an additional part.

Muhammad Bin Yusuf Salihi has also distorted this tradition. In his Subul Al-Huda, he writes:

Bukhari and Bayhaqi have narrated from Musa Bin ‘Aqba, from Salim Bin Abdullah Bin Umar who has quoted the Holy Prophet (S) as saying: Before receiving revelation, the Holy Prophet (S) met Zaid Bin ‘Amr somewhere at Baldakh. Here the Holy Prophet (S) was invited to a table full of [cooked] meat.

The Holy Prophet did not, however, accept the invitation and addressing Zaid, he said: I do not eat the meat of an animal sacrificed for the sake of idols. I eat only the meat of those animals that are slaughtered with the name of Allah.

Zaid Bin ‘Amr used to object the sacrifices made by Quraish saying: Allah has created the sheep and provided it with water and fodder but you deny it by slaughtering it for the sake of idols without mentioning the name of Allah.34

Knowing that this tradition contains many repulsive and disgusting words, Muhammad Bin Yusuf Salihi Demishqi has changed the phrase 'Zaid said' in this tradition into 'he said to Zaid'. He considers 'the Apostle of Allah' as the subject of the verb 'said', indicating that it was the Holy Prophet (S) who said "I do not eat".

This is while the tradition in Sahih Bukhari does not agree with this modification. It considers 'Zaid' as the subject of the sentence. Thus according to Bukhari's version of this tradition, 'Zaid' is the subject for 'said' and it is 'Zaid' who said 'I do not eat'.

It can be said that according to the tradition of 'section on excellences' it was the Holy Prophet (S) who refrained from eating, though this cannot be said on the basis of 'section on slaughtered'. This is because the tradition that has appeared in section on slaughtered, and also the tradition that is reported by Jurjani and Ismaeili with which we will deal later, contain the verb 'invited' and thus it is Zaid who refrains from eating not the Holy Prophet (S).

Based on the quotations we will make later, Ahmad Bin Hanbal and other Sunni Imams were of the view that the Holy Prophet (S) ate the meat of the animal sacrificed for idols. Thus the subject for the verb 'refrain / did not eat' in the tradition in section on virtues is Zaid rather than the Holy Prophet (S). This is because similar traditions explain each other.

It is based on such understanding that Ibn Hajar 'Asqali, Zarkashi, Suhaili, Qastalani and other commentators of tradition do not consider the Holy Prophet (S) as the subject of the verb 'refrain / did not eat'.

On the whole, all these constitute one tradition having one subject matter. Thus as the Holy Prophet (S) is not the subject of the verb 'refrain did not eat' in the tradition in section on slaughtered, he is not the subject in the tradition in section on virtues. This is because otherwise the tradition in section on virtues will refute the tradition in section on slaughtered and thus a stronger objection will emerge to face Sunni scholars.

Justification of meaning of tradition

Some Sunni scholars have justified the meaning of the tradition in question. How can one say that the Holy Prophet has refrained from eating the meat of the animal sacrificed for idols whereas the tradition in Sahih Bukhari does not indicate such a thing?

It is based on this objection, that Ibn Hajar 'Asqalani has criticized Ibn Battal who is of the view that the Holy Prophet (S) did not eat the meat of the animal sacrificed for idols, stressing that no version of this tradition contains such a thing.

Commenting on the tradition in section on virtues, Ibn Hajar says:

Most traditions indicate that pagans offered the meat of the animal sacrificed for idols to the Holy Prophet (S). The tradition narrated by Jurjani however indicates that it was the Holy Prophet (S) who placed the meat of the sacrificed animal before Zaid.

'Ayas says: The first tradition is authentic. I am however of the view that the tradition narrated by Ismaeli is in harmony with the tradition narrated by Jurjani. That is the reason why Zubair Bin Bakar, Fakihi and others narrated the tradition narrated by Jurjani.

Ibn Battal says: The table of the meat of the sacrificed animal belonged to Quraish and it was Quraish who placed it before the Holy Prophet (S). The Holy Prophet himself refrained from eating the meat of the sacrificed animal though he invited Zaid Bin 'Amr Bin Nufail to eat it.

Refraining from eating the meat of the sacrificed animal, Zaid, addressing Quraish, said: We do not eat the meat of an animal sacrificed for idols.

Thus it is possible for the opinion of Ibn Battal to be correct, though we do not know for sure how he has made such a conclusion. I did not find any tradition that gives such a meaning.

Ibn Hajar says that Ibn Munir has also endorsed the opinion presented by Ibn Battal.

It is worth mentioning that Ibn Hajar has aptly answered Ibn Battal, though his view that Ibn Battal may be somewhat right is totally wrong. Ibn Hajar, as you will see, quotes prominent Sunni scholars as saying that the Holy Prophet (S) ate the meat of the animal sacrificed for idols and invited Zaid to follow the suit, but Zaid did not do so. Thus, Ibn Battal's view does not seem to be correct in any case.

Ibn Battal's words explicitly mention that the Apostle of Allah after refraining from eating the said meat, asked Zaid to eat it. This is a very embarrassing claim. How is it possible for the Holy Prophet (S) who is the symbol of trusteeship, piety and moral virtues to refrain from doing something and ask another person to do it without any justification, and thus face an embarrassing response? No wise and religious person can accept the possibility of such a happening?

Some Sunni scholars accept this false tradition

Contrary to Ibn Ruzbehan and the author of Subul Al-Huda, most Sunni scholars have accepted this fabricated tradition. Being fond of Bukhari, they have endorsed his lies and accusations and surrendered to his strange and forged traditions.

As an instance, Dawoodi is of the view that the Prophet (S) used to eat the meat of the sacrificed animals of pagans. This is because he did not know that it was forbidden, though Zaid knew about it and therefore he refrained from eating it. Ibn Hajar Asqalani quotes Dawoodi as saying:

Before his prophetic mission, the Holy Prophet (S) did not do the services done by the pagans, though he did not know anything about the rules concerning the sacrifices the pagans were making. This is

while Zaid knew about it, for he had learnt about it from the People of Book [Christians or Jews].35

On this view, the Holy Prophet (S) used to eat the meat of the sacrifices made by pagans because he did not know that it was forbidden. The People of Book were however aware of it and therefore Zaid who had met them before, did not eat it.

Do these words not imply that he is critical of the Holy Prophet (S) and is trying to lower his position?

How can a believer consider the Holy Prophet – who receives support and guidance from Allah – as [ignorant] not knowing about a particular legal ruling and tell that he did forbidden things and asked others as well to do them?

Others are after solution

Some Sunni scholars [agree that] they cannot refute the tradition reported by Bukhari but they are reluctant to endorse the explicit meaning of this tradition. That is why they are faced with a naughty problem and are trying to find a solution for it.

After narrating the tradition that has appeared in Bukhari (in section on slaughtered), Suhaili says:

There is a simple question about this tradition. How did Allah prevent Zaid from eating the meat of the animals sacrificed for idols and the animals slaughtered without the observation of Islamic rituals but did not prevent the Holy Prophet (S) who was infallible and was highly deserving this merit at the time of ignorance?

One can answer this question from two perspectives:

● This tradition does not say that when the Holy Prophet (S) met Zaid at Baldakh and when he was invited to the table he attended it. Instead it says that Zaid said after being invited to the table that he did not eat the meat of the animal killed without the mention of Allah's name.

● Zaid refrained from eating the meat of the animal sacrificed for idols not on the bases of previous religions but on account of his own personal opinion. This is because the religion of Prophet Ibrahim (S) had forbidden the meat of corpse but it did not say anything about the animal killed not for Allah. Islam was the first religion that introduced this ordinance.

Some of the scholars of the science of principles say: Everything is permissible unless it is forbidden. Thus it was permissible for the Holy Prophet(S) to eat the meat of the animal sacrificed for idols just as it was permissible for him not to eat it.

It may be said that eating such a meat is neither permissible nor forbidden. Such a theory seems to be correct, because previous religions had permitted their followers to eat the meat of sacrificed animals including sheep, camel etc. The innovations made by pagans did not affect the lawfulness of eating the

meat such animals – proposed by previous religions until after the advent of Islam the following verse was revealed:

و لا تأكلوا مما لم يذكر اسم الله عليه

And do not eat of that on which Allah's name has not been mentioned. 36

As a result, the permissibility of eating of the meat of animals sacrificed– which was introduced by previous religions – remains unaffected and the innovations made by the People of Book do not have any impact on this ordinance. Thus it was lawful to eat of the meat of the animal sacrificed for idols on the basis of previous religions until the Qur'an pronounced that this was unlawful.

An evacuation of this solution

In my point of view the solution proposed above is very weak and poor. This is because the objection did not focus on eating of the meat of the animals sacrificed for idols. It instead, focused on the fact that it seems very bad to consider eating of it lawful and to ask others to eat of it.

Thus it is a sign of thoughtlessness and imprudence to think that the objection is restricted to eating of the said meat. Do wise believers accept that the Holy Prophet (S) is lower in status than Zaid in reframing from doing acts of disobedience? This is while there is consensus among all Muslims that he was infallible and no one was wiser than him among people.

Qazi Ayad says: No doubt, the Holy Prophet's ample intellect, intelligence, strong senses, eloquent tongue, dignified acts and noble character indicate that he was the wisest and the most intelligent person of his time.

If one ponders on the way the Holy the Prophet managed people's affairs and successfully followed his policies and if one takes into consideration his balanced character, his innovative methods and his doctrines (which are not the product any previous learning) one does not doubt that the Holy Prophet was superior to others in terms of reasoning and understanding.

Wahab Bin Munabbih says: I studied seventy one books all of which had introduced the Holy Prophet (S) as the wisest who always made the best choice.

In accordance with another tradition, he says: All these books maintained that compared to the intellect of the Holy Prophet (S) the intellect Allah has given to all human beings from the beginning to the end of creation is nothing but like a sand compared to all other sands combined together.37

How can one now not give the high position of the Holy Prophet (S) in infallibility, reason and thought, except Suhaili's words concerning him?

Despite all these, great Sunni scholars explicitly mention that the Holy Prophet (S) ate of the meat the animals sacrificed for idols.

Ibn Hajar Asqalani says: The tradition of Saeed Bin Zaid – which we touched before – and the tradition of Ahmad contains: Zaid said: I sought refuge to what Ibrahim had sought refuge to. Thereupon he laid in prostration before Ka'aba.

Saeed Bin Zaid said: Zaid passed by the Holy Prophet (S) and Zaid Bin Haritha who were eating of the table spread there. They invited him to the table, but he said: My nephew! I do not eat of the meat of the animal sacrificed for idols. From that day onward, no one saw the Holy Prophet (S) eat of the meat of the animal sacrificed for idols.

Abu Ya'ala Bazzar and others have narrated this tradition as under: Zaid Bin Haritha says: One day the Holy Prophet and I riding on the back of the Holy Prophet's camel – left Mecca. We slaughtered a sheep before an idol and cooked its meat. Thereupon we met Zaid Bin Amr…

After relating the story in detail, Zaid Bin Haritha quotes Zaid Bin Amr as saying: I do not eat of the meat of the animals killed without the name of Allah.[38]

This is the word of Ahmad and other great Sunni scholars. Given all these, what is the use of Suhaili's words? Suhaili has made a claim that the religion of Prophet Ibrahim (a.s) does not forbid the meat of the animals killed not for Allah. This claim is however wrong, fabricated by Sunni scholars in order to defend their predecessors and their superstitious beliefs.

It is a sign of God's grace that Zarkashi rejects Suhaili's claim saying that Ibrahim's religion did not permit eating the meat of animals killed not for Allah. Commenting on this tradition in his Al-Tanqih, he says: They spread a table-cloth before him but he refused to eat anything.

If someone says that the Holy Prophet deserves such a merit more than anyone else, it must be said in response that this tradition does not say that the Holy Prophet (S) did not eat anything. In reply to this objection, Suhaili says: Zaid refused to eat of that meat not on account of previous religions but on account of his own opinion.

This is because Ibrahim's religion had not forbidden the meat of the animals killed not for Allah. It has only forbidden the meat of corpse. Islam is the first religion that has forbidden the meat of the animals killed not for Allah. Suhaili's words are weak. This is because Ibrahim (a.s) was known to be an enemy of idols and his religion was forbidding the meat of the animals killed not for Allah. Allah the Exalted says:

ثم اوحينا اليك ان اتبع مله ابراهيم حنيفا

Then We revealed to you. Follow the faith of Ibrahim[39] &[40]

We thank Allah that Zarkashi made such a rightful remark and thus it became obvious that Suhaili made this lie in order to defend their misled predecessors.

Khattabi has treated the issue in a different manner. Ibn Hajar Asqalani says: The term 'ansab' the plural form of 'nusub' meaning idol, is used to refer to stones around Ka'aba. Pagans used to sacrifice their animals on these stones for idols.

Khattabi says: The Holy Prophet (S) did not eat of that which was sacrificed for idols, though he used to eat of other kinds of meat even that on which the name of Allah was not pronounced. This is because at that time Islam was not revealed. It was forbidden years after the prophetic mission began.[41]

In my point of view, these words are very poetic and discursive. They do not solve the problem the tradition of Bukhari is faced with.

This is because this tradition explicitly says that the Holy Prophet (S) offered Zaid the meat of the animals sacrificed for idols. In response Zaid said: I do not eat of the meat of the animal sacrificed for idols. That is the reason why Bukhari has included this tradition in the book of slaughtered in chapter 'the animals that are slaughtered on the stones surrounding Ka'ab'.

The tradition of Ahmad, Bazzar and Abu Ya'ala which is related by Ibn Hajar Asqalani also mentions explicitly that the said meat was of the animal slaughtered for idols.

Thus it is wrong to believe that the Holy Prophet (S) ate of the meat the animal killed without the observation of Islamic rituals. This is because – as mentioned before – Zarkashi believes that the ban on the meat of animals slaughtered not for Allah is based on the faith of Ibrahim (a.s). How can one thus attribute such things to the Holy Prophet (S)?!

It is obvious that Khattabi's struggles are in vain. They do not contribute anything to the solution of the problem. No one who thinks properly can believe that the Holy Prophet (S) who gives warning and hope has eaten of the meat of an animal killed not for Allah. May Allah keep us distant from obeying Satan.

The tradition 'Prophets do not leave behind inheritance'

Among the baseless traditions of Bukhari is the tradition that has appeared in the book of obligation of Sahih Bukhari.

When the Holy Prophet (S) died his wives decided to send Uthman before Abu Bakr to help them take their share of inheritance [left by the Holy Prophet (S)]. But Aisha said: Did the Holy Prophet (S) not say: We (the prophets) do not leave behind inheritance. What we leave behind is charity.[42]

Our great scholars have mentioned in their books that this tradition is fabricated.[43] The reason why they

fabricated this tradition was that they wanted to deprive Prophet's daughter from the wealth he left behind.44

In a discussion with Abu Barkr, Imam Ali (a.s) rejected this tradition and showed that it is in conflict with the Holy Qur'an. This demonstrates it very well that it is not a valid tradition.

Ibn Sa'ad says: Muhammad Bin Umar narrates from Hisham Bin Sa'ad from Abbas Bin Abdullah Bin Ma'abad, from Abu Ja'afar who says: In order to take their share of inheritance, Fatima (a.s), Abbas Bin Abd Al-Mutallib and Ali (a.s) visited Abu Bakr. Abu Bakr quoted the Holy Prophet (S) as saying: We do not leave behind inheritance. The wealth we leave behind is charity. Thus the wealth he left behind is under my control.

[To prove his point of view], Imam Ali (a.s) appealed to two Qur'anic verses which are:

وورث سليمان داوود

And Sulaiman is the heir of Dawood. 45

And Zakaria said:

يرثنى و يرث من ال يعقوب

(***One that***) ***will*** (***truly***) ***inherit me and inherit the posterity of Jacob.*** 46

Abu Bakr said: That is what I said and you also know it.

Imam Ali said: This is Allah's Book that speaks and then he, Fatima (a.s) and Abbas went out.47

The tradition of 'Ali's quarrel with Prophet over nightprayer'

Among other baseless traditions of Bukhari which is also narrated by Dehlavi in his Tuhfai Al-Ithana'asharia is the following tradition.

In his Sahih, the most authentic tradition collection among Sunnis, Bukhari narrates via various channels the following:

One night Allah's Apostle came to me and Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet and asked, "Won't you pray (at night)?" I said, "By Allah I do not offer any prayer other than compulsory prayer. O Allah's Apostle! Our souls are in the hands of Allah and if He wants us to get up He will make us get up." When I said that, he left us without saying anything and I heard that he was hitting his thigh and saying:

و كان الانسان اكثر شيء جدلا

But man is more quarrelsome than anything. 48& 49

Sunni scholars do not feel shy to appeal to such traditions. Can one believe that Ali (a.s) who was a man of worship and servitude towards Allah quarrels with the Prophet over offering night prayer?

Imam Ali (a.s) was fully obeying the Holy Prophet (S) in every matter. Can one thus believe that he quarreled with the Holy Prophet (a.s) over offering night prayer? How can one accept that Imam Ali (a.s) should have argued like a fatalist against the Holy Prophet (S)?

This is a tradition that is fabricated by the enemies of the Holy Prophet (S). It can be accepted only by those who are the enemies of the Holy Prophet (S) and Imam Ali (a.s).

No believer can stand against offering prayer so insistently saying: By Allah I do not offer any prayer other than compulsory prayer. This is so bad, especially if it is the Holy Prophet (S) who asks you to offer prayer.

This is because speaking in such a manner with the Holy Prophet especially when he orders you to offer prayer is insulation to him. No believer must do such a thing, not to speak of Imam Ali (a.s) who was utterly following the Holy Prophet's commands and was the worshiper.

A glance at Imam Ali's excellences

Speaking about Imam Ali's worship, Ibn Abi Al-Hadid Mu'atazili says: Ali was top in terms of worshiping and piety. His prayers and fasts outnumbered those of all other people. People learnt from him how to offer night prayer, remember Allah and offer supererogatory prayers. He was so careful about supplication and prayer that he did his acts of worship at Lilat Al-Harir in the battle of Siffin on a leather carpet when enemies' arrows were targeting him.

He was not afraid and thus he did not leave his worship until he completed it. Due to long prostration, his forehead was patched like camel's feet. A brief assessment of Imam Ali's prayers and supplications which are full of praises for Allah's glories shows how humble, sincere and devoted he is towards Him. It shows what a mind has arranged these words and what a tongue has uttered them.

When Ali Bin Hussain, an outstanding worshiper was asked how his worship was compared to that of his forefather, he said:

عبادتی عند عباده جدی کعباده جدی عند عباده رسول الله

My worship compared to the worship of my forefather is like my forefather's worship compared to the worship of the Apostle of Allah (S). 50

In chapter seven of his 'Ali's worship, piety and devotedness', Sheikh Muhammad Bin Talha says: In regard with his worship, it has to be said: Obedience is the essence of worship. Anyone who worships Allah and is careful about doing obligations and refraining from what is forbidden, is a worshiper. The subject matters of Allah's orders are various and that is why worships are also of different kinds such as prayer, charity, fasting etc.

Imam Ali (S) used to hasten to perform different worships. By doing so, he attained lofty stages whereas others could not reach them. Imam Ali (S) did two things simultaneously; while he was offering prayer he gave charity as he was bowing. It was at this time that the following verse from the Holy Qur'an was revealed.

إِنَّما وَلِيُّكُمُ اللَّهُ وَ رَسُولُهُ وَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا الَّذِينَ يُقِيمُونَ الصَّلاةَ وَ يُؤْتُونَ الزَّكاةَ وَ هُمْ راكِعُونَ

Only Allah is your Vali and His Apostle and those who believe, those who keep up prayers and pay the poor-rate while they bow. 51

And there is another verse that says:

وَيُطْعِمُونَ الطَّعَامَ عَلَىٰ حُبِّهِ مِسْكِينًا وَيَتِيمًا وَأَسِيرً

And they give food out of love for Him to the poor and the orphan and the captive. 52

Thereupon he says: Worship is of different kinds. Imam Ali (a.s) performed all kinds of worships. He believed in the hereafter and its great events. He knew that all human beings would face, after dying and returning to Allah, certain questions in the hereafter. They all need to bow down before their Creator and receive their suitable rewards by entering Paradise or Hell.

Having reached the stage of certainty, Imam Ali (a.s) needed to fasten his belt and spend all his time obeying Allah's commands. This is because only those who are skeptic and impious shirk acts of worship. Imam Ali (a.s) was at the top of certainty and that is why he openly declared:

لو كشف الغطاء ما ازددت يقينا

If the all the veils are removed I will gain no more certainty.

Thus his worships were of high standards, because he had reached the stage of certainty. After narrating some traditions, Sheikh Muhammad Bin Talha says: These long stories … indicate that Ali (a.s) was known for his worship and excelled all others in terms of performing all kinds of worship.

He worshiped in the best possible way and believed in it theoretically and practically. He worshiped to the extent that he reached the stage of Imamate. Being known for his trusteeship, worship, love, piety, devotion, knowledge, reliance (on Allah), fear (of Allah), hope (in Allah), patience, thankfulness and satisfaction (with Allah), he assumed the leadership of Muslim community.

Ali (a.s) was a man of humble character, thinking, worshipping, contemplating, offering night prayer, remembering Allah, crying (out of fear of Allah), litany and guiding people. He performed various difficult worships which powerful and rich people cannot perform. He went so far worshiping Allah that the Holy Qur'an praised him and introduced him as a righteous person to all others.

In his commentary, Wahidi narrates a Marfu'a tradition, on his own documentation, from Ibn Abbas who says: Ali Bin Abi Talib (a.s) had four Dirhams. He donated one Dirham at night, one at daytime, the third secretly and the fourth openly. It was due to this that the following verse was revealed:

الَّذِينَ يُنفِقُونَ أَمْوَالَهُم بِاللَّيْلِ وَالنَّهَارِ سِرًّا وَعَلَانِيَةً فَلَهُمْ أَجْرُهُمْ عِندَ رَبِّهِمْ وَلَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ

(***As for***) ***those who spend their property by night and by day, secretly and openly, they shall have their reward from their Lord and they shall have no fear, nor shall they grieve.*** 53

Considering the stories related, it becomes clear that Imam Ali (a.s) was a person who had attained all good qualities and attributes. It suffices him as a privilege that Allah has praised him in different verses of the Holy Qur'an, which is recited by all Muslims till the Day of Judgment.

Thereupon he narrates the following poems about Imam Ali (a.s) 54:

هذى المزاما بعض ما حلى بها ـــــ و حبى من الخرات و البركات

و له وظائف طاعه اورادها ـــــ معموره الاناء و الاوقات

بعباده و زهاده و تورع ـــــ و تخشع و تدرع الاحبات

و تقلل و توكل و تفكر ـــــ و تدبر و تذكر المثلاث

و اذا الظلام سجى يناجى ربه ـــــ متضرعا بالذكر و الدعوات

علم علت درجاته و فضائل ـــــ شرقت معارجها على الشرقات

و مناقب نطقت بها اى الكتاب ـــــ و حسبها ان جاء شاهدها من الايات

These are some of the privileges that are bestowed on him.

He performed worships that were indicative of his piety, devotion, humbleness, contentment, reliance (on Allah), thinking, contemplating and remembering ideals.

When darkness prevailed everywhere, he would humbly begin to offer his prayers.

He was down to earth, humble and submissive towards Allah.

He was highly knowledgeable and he had virtues others were envying.

Quranic verses have praised him and it suffices him that Qur'an testifies to his virtues.

Elsewhere, Sheikh Muhammad Bin Talha mentions:

After Ali (a.s) died, Muawiyah Bin Abu Sufyan said to Dirar Bin Damrah," Describe Ali to me." "Will you not excuse me from answering you," said Dirar. "No, describe him," insisted Muawiyah. "Please, excuse me from doing so," said Dirar. "I will not," said Muawiyah.

"I will do so, then," said Dirar with a sigh. "By Allah, he was (far-sighted) and very strong. He spoke with a truthful finality, so that, through him, truth became distinguished from falsehood. He ruled justly, and knowledge gushed forth from him, as did wisdom. He felt an aversion to the world and its (pleasures). By Allah, he would cry profusely (from the fear of Allah); long durations would he spend in contemplation, during which time he would converse with his soul. "

"He showed a liking (for religious reasons, of course; to train his soul to be patient and abstemious) to coarse garments and lower quality food. By Allah, it was as if - in his humbleness - he was one of us: when we asked him a question, he would answer us; when we would go to him, he would initiate (the greetings of peace); and when we would invite him (to our homes), he would come to us.

Yet, in spite of his closeness to us, we would not speak (freely) with him, because of the dignity and

honor that he exuded if he smiled, he revealed the likes of straight and regular pearls (i.e. his teeth). He honored religious people and loved the poor. The strong person could not hope to gain favors from him through falsehood.

And the weak person never lost hope of his justness. I swear, by Allah, that on certain occasions, I saw him in his place of prayer when the night was dark and few stars could be seen; he would be holding his beard and crying the way a very sad person cries; and I would hear him saying,

يا دنيا! دنيا! أبى تعرضت ام إلى تشوقت؟

هيهات ! هيهات ! غرى غيرى، قد بتتك ثلاثا لا رجعه لى فيك. فعمرك قصير و عيشك حقير و خطرك كثير

"O world, O world, are you offering yourself to me? Do you desire me? Never! Never! Deceive someone other than me. I have divorced you for the third time, so that you cannot return to me. O world, your life is short, the existence you offer is base, and your danger is great. Alas for the paucity of sustenance (i.e. good deeds), the great distance of the journey, and the loneliness of the road!"

Upon hearing this description, Muawiyah's eyes swelled with tears, and not being able to hold them from gushing forth, he was forced to wipe them with his cuffs; and the same can be said for those who were present. Muawaiyah then said, "May Allah have mercy on the father of Al Hassan, for he was, by Allah, just as you described him to be." He then said, "O Dirar, describe your sadness at having lost him."

"My sadness," began Dirar, "is like the sadness of a woman who cannot control her tears or allay her grief after her child, while in her lap, has just been slaughtered." Dirar then stood up and left.[55]

In short, it is not easy to describe Imam Ali's piety and devotion. This is something that is accepted by all including his enemies. How good it was if the followers of Muawiyyah like Muawiyyah himself confessed to the reality and did not accept this fabricated tradition.

Fabricated tradition and the objection of fatalism

The above-mentioned tradition implies that Imam Ali's words contain a kind of fatalism (determinism). Resisting against offering night prayer is nothing compared to this accusation. This is because it is very bad and awful to resort to fatalism and it is a sign of misguidance and disbelief to attribute such things to the leader of believers.

Falsity of fatalism from the viewpoint of Ibn Taymiyya

We will now mention Ibn Taymiyya's words concerning the falsity of fatalism.

All rational and religious persons agree that it is false to argue on the basis of fatalism. Even the fatalists themselves agree that it is wrong for a person who has committed oppression or violated someone's rights to appeal to fatalism. They demand for their rights and punish him for what he has done.

Fatalism is something like sophism. It is very obvious that sophism is wrong, though it has its own adherents who go skeptic (not only about other things but also) about their own existence and essential sciences.

Fatalism badly affects practical life to the extent that it dismisses truth and justice and allows falsehood and injustice. Everyone however knows that such a theory is false and no one permits oneself to invoke such theories except unknowingly. If a person knows the expediency and necessity of his actions, he does not appeal to fatalism.

Likewise, if a person knows that his action does not involve any expediency or necessity, again he will not appeal to fatalism.

سيقول الذين اشركوا لو شاء الله ما اشركنا و لا أباونا و لا حرمنا من شيء

Those who are polytheists will say: If Allah had pleased we would not have associated (aught with Him) nor our falterers, nor would we have forbidden (to ourselves) anything. 56

قل هل عندكم من علم فتخرجوه لنا ان تتبعون الا الظن و ان انتم الا تخرصون. قل فلله الحجه البلغه فلو شاء لهدئكم اجمعين

Say: have you any knowledge with you so you should bring it forth to us? You only follow a conjecture and you only tell lies. Say: Then Allah's is the conclusive argument: so if He pleases, He would certainly guide you all. 57

Polytheists naturally know that this argument is invalid. Suppose a polytheist encroaches on another polytheist's family or property, killing his child or violating his rights. When he is criticized by others he simply says that if Allah did not approve of his actions he would not do them.

Other polytheists will not accept his reasoning. Nor does he himself accept such an argument from others. He appeals to such an invalid argument out of necessity with the aim to silencing others.

It is because of this that Allah reproaches them saying:

قل هل عندكم من علم فتخر جوه لنا

Say: have you any knowledge with you so you should bring it forth to us?

Thereupon He says:

تتبعون الا الظن و ان انتم الا تخرصون ان

You only follow a conjecture and you only tell lies.

Thus it is their desire and tendencies (not divine fate) that shape their actions. This is because divine fate is not the main cause behind one's actions and is not accepted as a proof against others justifying your deed. All people are equal in the face of divine fate.

If fate were the main cause behind one's action, then there would be no difference between just and unjust, truthful and liar, knowledgeable and ignorant, good doer and evil doer, well-behaved and mischievous, advantageous and disadvantageous.

In order to justify their position of not following the prophets, polytheists were appealing to the issue of fate. This is while if a polytheist appeals to fate in order to justify his violation of another polytheist's rights or to disobey his orders his words will not be heard.

Above all, all polytheists rebuke each other for acting wrongfully or violating others' rights.

But when the Holy Prophet (S) was sent to them and he began to call on them to observe divine rights and to obey divine commands, they began to appeal to fate (in order to shirk their duties). They did so while if a person encroached upon the rights of a polytheist and justified this on the bases of fate they were not ready to lend their ears to him and accept his words.[58]

Ibn Taymiyya and appealing to a fabricated tradition

Elsewhere Ibn Taymiyya extensively criticizes appealing to fate. In the end of his discussion, he accuses Imam Ali (a.s) out of animosity towards him of being a fatalist. Referring to a tradition in this connection, he says:

It is necessary to believe in fate, but no one given the clear dictate of reason accepts appealing to fate. The fact that this argument is invalid does not falsify the issue of fate. This is because man is naturally inclined to seek his profits and avoid losses. The goodness of his life in this world as well as in the hereafter depends on the observation of this principle.

Man tries to get things that bring him profits and ward off losses no matter whatever they are (be they believing in prophets or something else). To know about advantages and disadvantages of something depends on one's reason and aims. The prophets have come to actualize or increase human's advantages and ward off or lessen his disadvantages.

It is on account of this that the followers of prophets are far better than others in terms of following their interests and avoiding losses. Those who reject prophets are lagging far behind from this perspective. They do evil deeds and abandon good deeds. They need to be therefore considered as the worst among human beings. Nevertheless the opponents of the prophets also need to follow their interests by avoiding wrongful acts and their likes.

When there is an encroachment on another person's life, property or family and the one oppressed demands for justice, no wise person accepts appealing to fate (from the party that has committed the wrong).

If the evil doer says that he is innocent because he was obliged on the basis of fate to do such an action, others will respond him by saying: if you happen to be the one who is oppressed and the oppressor tries to justify his unjust act through appealing to fate you will not accept his words. This is because accepting fatalism will no doubt lead to inevitable and lasting corruption.

Thus all people believe in the principle of fate, though no wise person accepts arguing on the basis of fate. There is no contradiction between accepting the principle of fate and rejecting arguments on its bases. One must believe in fate and at the same time reject appealing to it....

Arguing on the basis of fate is regarded as quarrel that is a negative thing. In his Sahih, the most authentic tradition collection among Sunnis, Bukhari narrates via various channels the following:

One night Allah's Apostle came to me and Fatima, the daughter of the Prophet and asked, "Won't you pray (at night)?" I said, "By Allah I do not offer any prayer other than compulsory prayer. O Allah's Apostle! Our souls are in the hands of Allah and if He wants us to get up He will make us get up." When I said that, he left us without saying anything and I heard that he was hitting his thigh and saying:

و كان الانسان اكثر شيء جدلا

But man is more quarrelsome than anything. 59 & 60

In response it must be said that if appealing to fate is so bad then attributing it to Imam Ali, the commander of the faithful cannot be justified except on the bases of animosity and hatred towards him. Not to speak of believers, no man of understanding can approve of such a big lie.

Moreover, elsewhere in his book, Ibn Taymiyya has termed those who appeal to fate as worse than Jews and Christians. He says:

According to those who appeal to fate to justify their mistakes, the prophets must keep silent in the face of disbelievers not responding them.... Some mystics also hold such views. After reaching the stage of annihilation, mystics believer their deeds cannot be described as good or bad. Such beliefs are abundantly found among different groups including sufis, fakirs, jurists and ordinary people.

No doubt, such people are worse than Shias and Mu'atazilites for the latter two groups accept divine commands and deny fatalism.

Shias and Mu'atazilites on the other hand criticize Sunnis, because they accept divine commands and prohibitions, promise and threat and they admit that they are supposed to do what is made obligatory and to avoid what is forbidden, accepting that thus Allah has not created their deeds and intended their wrongs.

They no doubt glorify Allah, consider Him as pure of injustice and accept divine argument, but they fail to reconcile between Allah's omnipotence, general will, inclusive creation, justice, wisdom, order and prohibition, promise and threat. It is because of this that they say all praise is due to Allah but they deny Him His kingdom.

In my point of view, those who accept Allah's power, will and creation and based on them they deny Allah's order and prohibition, promise and threat, are worse than Jews and Christians. This is because according to their beliefs the prophets must keep silent (in the face of disbelievers).

We criticizing those of their ideas that are false ideas, but as far as their true ideas are concerned they are acceptable and true ideas must be accepted no matter who the holder of the idea is. No one is entitled to answer an innovation through an innovation and falsehood through falsehood.

Though those who deny fate have fallen into the trap of innovation, those who appeal to fate to resist divine orders have fallen into the trap of a bigger innovation. Just as we can compare those who deny fate to those who worship fire, we can compare those who appeal to fate to those who associate other deities with Allah and oppose the prophets saying:

سيقول الذين اشركوا لو شاء الله ما اشركنا و لا أباونا و لا حرمنا من شيء

Those who are polytheists will say: If Allah had pleased we would not have associated (***aught with Him***) ***nor our falterers, nor would we have forbidden*** (***to ourselves***) ***anything.*** 61

It is worth mentioning that there emerged a group of fatalists in early Islam, though no popular Islamic sect advocated such a belief.62

The tradition of Ali's 'proposing to Abu Jahl's daughter'

Among other baseless traditions of Bukhari is the fabricated tradition of Imam Ali (a.s) asking for the hand of Abu Jahl's daughter in marriage. According to this tradition, during the time of the Holy Prophet (S) when Fatima Al-Zahra was alive, the commander of the faithful, proposed to Abu Jahl's daughter. The details of this fabricated story are a under:

Abu Al-Yaman has narrated from Shu'aib, from Zuhri, from Ali Bin Hussain from Miswar Bin Makhrama who said:

'Ali demanded the hand of the daughter of Abu Jahl. Fatima heard of this and went to Allah's Apostle saying, "Your people think that you do not become angry for the sake of your daughters as 'Ali is now going to marry the daughter of Abu Jahl. "On that Allah's Apostle got up and after his recitation of Tashahhud.

I heard him saying, "Then after! I married one of my daughters to Abu Al-'As Bin Al-Rabi' (the husband of Zainab, the daughter of the Prophet) before Islam and he proved truthful in whatever he said to me.

No doubt, Fatima is a part of me, I hate to see her being troubled. By Allah, the daughter of Allah's Apostle and the daughter of Allah's Enemy cannot be the wives of one man." So 'Ali gave up that engagement. 'Al-Miswar further said: I heard the Prophet talking and he mentioned a son-in-law of his belonging to the tribe of Bani 'Abd-Shams.

He highly praised him concerning that relationship and said (whenever) he spoke to me, he spoke the truth, and whenever he promised me, he fulfilled his promise."[63]

This tradition contains reproaches about Imam Ali (a.s) as it also puts to question his high status. It is because of this that believers cannot accept such traditions. How is it possible for the Holy Prophet (S) to reproach a person whom he praised and spoke about his merits among people until his death. Some Sunni scholars have accepted that this tradition contains reproach. As an instance, in his commentary on Sahih Bukhari, Ibn Hajar Asqalani says:

> و لا ازال اتعجب من المسور كيف بالغ فى تعصبه لعلى بن الحسين عليهما السلام حتى قال: انه اودع عنده السيف لا يمكن احدا منه حتى تن هق روحه رعابه لكونه ابن فاطمه

I keep wondering how Miswar exaggerates about his love of Ali Bin Hussain (a.s). He says he has deposited a sword with him. Nobody can take it from him until he is killed. This is because he is the son of Fatima.... It is very strange [that despite all this love] he does not take into account Ali Bin Hussain's feelings and emotions.

This is because this tradition explicitly casts doubt on the personality of Ali Bin Abi Talib (a.s), as it also

distorts the image of his son, Ali Bin Hussain (a.s). According to this tradition, after marrying Fatima, Imam Ali (a.s) proposes to Abu Jahl's daughter. He continued his move to the extent that the Holy Prophet (S) interferes, strongly rejecting his action.64

In his Tuhfa Ithan'ashriyya, Dihlavi has narrated the dialogue between Abu Hanifa and 'Aamash concerning the above mentioned tradition. In the course of dialogue, Abu Hanifa, addressing 'Aamash says that he who relates such a tradition is rude and impolite.65

How can one believe that Imam Sajjad is the narrator of such a tradition (that is absolutely against him and his forefather)?66

The tradition of 'the cause of the revelation of Quranic verse'

Among other invalid traditions of Bukhari is the tradition that contains a story that is related to the companions of the Holy Prophet (S) and the supporters of Abdullah Bin Ubai. Abdullah Bin Ubai apparently accepted Islam but in fact he was not a Muslim. He was the leader of hypocrites. Bukhari says the following verse was revealed in this regard.

وَإِن طَائِفَتَانِ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ اقْتَتَلُوا فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا ۖ فَإِن بَغَتْ إِحْدَاهُمَا عَلَى الْأُخْرَىٰ فَقَاتِلُوا الَّتِي تَبْغِي حَتَّىٰ تَفِيءَ إِلَىٰ أَمْرِ اللَّـهِ ۚ فَإِن فَاءَتْ فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا بِالْعَدْلِ وَأَقْسِطُوا ۖ إِنَّ اللَّـهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ

And if two parties of the believers quarrel, make peace between them; but if one of them acts wrongfully towards the other, fight that which acts wrongfully until it returns to Allah's command; then if it returns, make peace between them with justice and act equitably; surely Allah loves those who act equitably. 67

Musaddad narrates from Mu'atamir from his father from Anas who says:

It was said to the Prophet "Would you see Abdullah Bin Ubai." So, the Prophet went to him, riding a donkey, and the Muslims accompanied him, walking on salty barren land. When the Prophet reached 'Abdullah Bin Ubai, the latter said, "Keep away from me! By Allah, the bad smell of your donkey has harmed me." On that an Ansari man said (to 'Abdullah), "By Allah! The smell of the donkey of Allah's Apostle is better than your smell."

On that a man from 'Abdullah's tribe got angry for 'Abdullah's sake, and the two men abused each other which caused the friends of the two men to get angry, and the two groups started fighting with sticks, shoes and hands. We were informed that the following Divine Verse was revealed (in this concern):--

"And if two groups of Believers fall to fighting then, make peace between them."68

This story is absolutely false and cannot be thus accepted as the cause of the revelation of the verse mentioned above. This is because this happened before Abdullah Bin Ubai apparently accepted Islam. If

it happened after his apparent acceptance of Islam it would certainly indicate his disbelief and his followers' disbelief. If it were he who addressing the Holy Prophet said, "keep away from me! By Allah, the bad smell of your donkey has harmed me", then it would not be possible for Allah to call them believers.

It is exactly on account of this that based on Zarkashi's tradition, Ibn Battal says: The cause of the revelation of this verse does not have anything to do with the story of Abdullah Bin Ubai.

Commenting on this tradition in his Al-Tanqih, he says: By then we came to know that the verse (if two believing groups...) had been revealed. Ibn Battal says: The cause of the revelation of this verse does not have anything to do with the story of Abdullah Bin Ubai. This is because Abdullah Bin Ubai and his companions were not believers. Even after outward acceptance of Islam, they strongly supported Abdullah Bin Ubai in the event of 'Ifk'.

In his Sahih (book of Istizan) Bukhari quotes Usama Bin Zaid as saying: The Holy Prophet attended a meeting that included polytheists, Muslims, idol worshipers, Jews and Abdullah Bin Ubai... This tradition shows that the verse (if two believing groups) does not have anything to do with Abdullah Bin Ubai. The revelation of this verse is related to a group of Uwaisis and Khazrajis, who fell in fight with each other using rod and shoes.69

It is very strange that Ibn Hajar tries to answer Ibn Battal saying: Ibn Battal does not accept that the revelation of this verse is related Abdullah Bin Ubai and his companions. He believes that the companions of the Holy Prophet (S) fell in fight with the companions of Abdullah Bin Ubai when the later had not yet embraced Islam.

Keeping this in mind, how one can say that this verse was revealed about Abdullah Bin Ubai and his companions. Moreover, the story of Anas Bin Malik and that of Usama Bin Zaid are alike. The tradition narrated by Usama says that Muslims and polytheist were abusing each other.

Answering this objection Ibn Hajar says: We can solve this problem by making appeal to Taghlib (if there are two names for example A and B and you use one to represent both you use the technique of Taghlib, a thing that is common in Arabic language), though this may give rise to another objection.

The tradition narrated by Usama openly says that the story mentioned above happened before the battle of Badr and after the acceptance of Islam by Abdullah Bin Ubai and his companions. This is while the verse in question was revealed later when a mission was meeting (the Holy Prophet (S)). It is however probable that this verse was revealed earlier. If it were revealed earlier then the objection would be answered.70

In my point of view it is wrong to make use of Taghlib here without relying on Allah's Book and His Prophet's tradition. Perhaps Ibn Hajar is also aware of the weakness of his argument. That is why he says, "it is possible ... to solve the problem on the basis of Taghlib.

The tradition 'Ali is not superior to the Prophet's companions'

One of the baseless traditions narrated by Bukhari is the tradition that says that Ali (a.s) is not superior to the companions of the Holy Prophet (S).

In a section devoted to the virtues of Uthman, he quotes Ibn Umar as saying: During the time of the Holy Prophet (S), we did not regard anyone of the companions of the Holy Prophet (S) as superior to Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman. No one else other than these three people was superior to the companions of the Holy Prophet (S).71

In response to this fabricated tradition, it has to be said that there are numerous solid proofs that demonstrate Ali's superiority over Abu Bakr and Umar not to speak of Uthman. The baseness and inferiority of those who have fabricated such traditions have nevertheless caused them to regard Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman as superior to Ali (a.s) and compare Ali (a.s) with Mu'awwiya, Amr As and their likes.

There are several traditions narrated by Shias as well as Sunnis that reject this lie. That is the reason why Ibn Abd Al-Barr has rejected it categorically. He quotes Ibn Mu'aeen as saying: Muhammad Bin Zakariya, Yahya Bin Abd Al-Rahman and Abd Al-Rahman Bin Yahya narrated from Ahmad Bin Sa'eed Bin Hazm, from Ahmad Bin Khalid from Marwan Bin Abd Al-Malik who said: From among Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and Ali, Ali is known for his virtues and glorious past.

Thus he is the holder of a prominent tradition. When somebody told him that according to some people only Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman were superior to others not mentioning the name of Ali (a.s), he rebuked him saying that Yahya Bin Mu'aeen mentioned Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and Ali (a.s).

Abu Amr says: Relying on a tradition narrated by Ibn Umar some are of the view that during the time of the Holy Prophet only Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman were regarded as superior to other companions of the Holy Prophet (S) and no one else other than these three people was considered as superior.

Ibn Mu'aeen rejects this tradition very strongly saying: The advocates of this tradition disagree with the practical approach of Sunni jurists and scholars of tradition from the beginning until now.

All these jurists and scholars of tradition regard Ali, after Uthman, as superior to others. No one disagrees with this issue. If they differ at all they differ on whether Uthman is superior to Ali or vise-versa.

Moreover, some previous scholars differed on whether Ali (a.s) was superior to Abu Bakr or vise-versa. This consensus shows that the tradition narrated by Ibn Umar is not but a big illusion, having no correct meaning even if its chain of transmission is authentic.

The advocates of this tradition need to accept the tradition reported by Jabir and Abu Saeed which says:

…. They do not accept the tradition reported by Jabir and Abu Saeed and that is the reason why their approach suffers from inconsistency.

The tradition that allows taking wage for reciting from the Holy Quran

One of the fake traditions narrated by Bukhari is the tradition that permits taking wage for reciting verses from the Holy Quran.

Abu Muhammad Sayyidan Bin Mudarib Bahli narrated from Abu Ma'ashar Yusuf Bin Yazid Barra from Abu Malik Ubaidullah Bin Akhnas from Ibn Abu Malika from Ibn Abbas who said: Some of the companions of the Prophet passed by some people staying at a place where there was water, and one of those people had been stung by a scorpion.

A man from those staying near the water, came and said to the companions of the Prophet, "Is there anyone among you who can do Ruqya as near the water there is a person who has been stung by a scorpion."

So one of the Prophet's companions went to him and recited Surat-Al-Fatiha for a sheep as his fees. The patient got cured and the man brought the sheep to his companions who disliked that and said, "You have taken wages for reciting Allah's Book." When they arrived at Medina, they said, ' O Allah's Apostle! (This person) has taken wages for reciting Allah's Book" On that Allah's Apostle said;

" ان احق ما افذتم عليه اجرا".

"You are most entitled to take wages for doing a Ruqya with Allah's Book."[72]

It is worth mentioning that Ibn Jawzi has reported this tradition in his Al-Mawduat from Aisha.

The tradition of 'asking for rain' narrated by Asbat

One of the traditions that is utterly baseless is the tradition that says the disbelievers ask for rain. Ibn Masruq says: One day I went to Ibn Masud who said, "When Quraish delayed in embracing Islam, the Prophet I invoked Allah to curse them, so they were afflicted with a (famine) year because of which many of them died and they ate the carcasses and Abu Sufyan came to the Prophet and said, 'O Muhammad! You came to order people to keep good relation with kith and kin and your nation is being destroyed, so invoke Allah.

So the Prophet recited the Holy verses of Surat-Ad-Dukhan:

فَارْتَقِبْ يَوْمَ تَأْتِي السَّمَاءُ بِدُخَانٍ مُّبِينٍ

'Then watch you for the day that the sky will Bring forth a kind of smoke plainly visible. 73

When the famine was taken off, the people renegade once again as nonbelievers. The statement of Allah, (in Sura "Ad-Dukhan"-44) refers to that: ***'On the day when We shall seize you with a mighty grasp.'*** (***44.16***) And that was what happened on the day of the battle of Badr."

Asbath added on the authority of Mansur, "Allah's Apostle prayed for them and it rained heavily for seven days. So the people complained of the excessive rain. The Prophet said, 'O Allah! (Let it rain) around us and not on us.' So the clouds dispersed over his head and it rained over the surroundings."74
Sunni scholars have criticized the portion added by Asbat. Isa says: The quotation by Bukhari of the portion added by Asbat has raised criticisms against him. Dawoodi says: The attachment is not related to Quraish; it is related to the people of Medina.

Abu Abd Al-Malik says: The portion added by Asbat is suffering from illusion and confusion. This is because he has mixed up the text of tradition reported by Abdullah Bin Masud with the tradition reported by Anas Bin Malik where it says: "Allah's Apostle prayed for them and it rained heavily for seven days".

Furthermore, Isa quotes Hafiz, Sharaf Al-Din Damyati as saying: The tradition reported by Abdullah Bin Masud relates the story of Quraish in Mecca which does not contain anything as the said additional part. It is very surprising that Bukhari has related this additional part which contradicts with the tradition of authentic reporters.

Aiming at supporting Bukhari, some have said: It is not impossible for this event to have occurred twice. It goes without saying that such justifications do not work. Kermani says: If It is said that the story of Abu Sufayn asking for rain happened in Mecca we must say in response that the story of Abu Sufayan asking for rain happened in Mecca but the part added by Asbat is related to what happened in Medina.75

The tradition 'traditions will increase after me'

One of the false traditions found in Sahih Bukhari is the tradition in which the Holy Prophet (S) talks about false traditions that are attributed to him. Taftazani said that it is only Bukhari that mentions this tradition in his Sahih. Other scholars of traditions have criticized this tradition. Yayha Bin Mu'aeen says that this tradition is fabricated by hypocrites. According to this tradition, the Holy Prophet (S) says:

تكثر لكه الاحاديث من بعدى فاذا روى لكم حديث فاعرضو ه على كتاب الله

Traditions will increase after me. If someone narrated you a tradition, measure it against Allah's Book (to

find out whether or not it is in harmony with it).

In his Al-Talwih, Sharh Al-Tawdih, Taftazani explains everything related to this issue saying: It is said that a tradition reported by a single person is rejected when it is in contradiction with Allah's Book. This is because Allah's Book has priority over a single individual's report, for the former is not doubtful in terms of its text and chain of transmission.

The general concepts of the Holy Quran and its outward meanings are however matters of controversy. If the general concepts of the Holy Quran and its outward meanings are uncertain and indefinite the tradition transmitted by a single reporter will be accepted (as both have the same status of not being certain and definite).

If on the other hand, the general concepts of the Holy Quran and its outward meanings are taken to be certain and definite, then the tradition transmitted by a single reporter will be of no value. It will be rejected when it happens to contract Allah's Book. This is because wherever there is a possibility for attaining certainty there will be no room for accepting something that does not bring about certainty.

In order to prove his point of view, he has appealed to the following tradition by the Holy Prophet (S):

> تكثر لكه الاحاديث من بعدى فاذا روى لكم حديث فاعرضو ه على كتاب الله فما وافق كتاب الله فاقبلو ه و ما خالفه فردوه

Traditions will increase after me. If someone narrated you a tradition, measure it against Allah's Book (to find out whether or not it is in harmony with it). Accept whatever that agrees with Allah's Book and reject whatever that disagrees with it.

In response to this argument it has to be said that the tradition mentioned above is a tradition by a single reporter. The scope of the meaning of this tradition has been limited by other well-known and successively narrated traditions. Thus this tradition does not bring about certainty and as a result it cannot prove an issue pertaining to faith.

Moreover the meaning of this tradition is in contradiction with the general meaning of the following verse of the Holy Quran:

> و ما اتاكم الرسول فخذوه

Take whatever Allah's Apostle gives you. 76

Scholars of tradition have also criticized this tradition on the ground that its chain includes an unknown reporter named Yazid Bin Rabi'a. It also contains some name in between Ash'as and Thawban. Thus

this tradition has been regarded as a Munqati'a (broken) tradition.

According to Yahya Bin Mu'aeen this tradition is the work of disbelievers. Taftazani further points out that Bukhari's narrating of this tradition does not solve the problems (of being unknown and Mutaqati'a) this traditions is faced with.77

The tradition that prohibits (playing) musical instruments

One of the baseless traditions Bukhari has reported is the tradition that has been criticized by Ibn Hazm. Ibn Hazm has rejected this tradition as a fabricated one. In his Sahih, Bukhari quotes Hisham Bin Ammar from Sadaqa Bin Khalid from Abd Al- Rahman Bin Yazid Bin Jabir from Atiyya Bin Qais Kilabi from Abd Al-Rahman Bin Ghanam Ash'ari from Abu Amir or Abu Malik Ash'ari, from the Holy Prophet (S) who says:

ليكونن من امتى قوم يستحلون الخز و الحرير و الخمر و المعازف

No doubt, there will emerge people in my community, who will allow wearing clothes made of wool and silk (or purely of silk), drinking wine and playing musical instruments.

This is a Munqati'a (broken) tradition, for there is no link between Bukhari and Sadqa Bin Khalid (whom the chain of this tradition includes). Thus this tradition is no doubt incorrect and it is totally fabricated.78

The tradition 'a believing adulterer does not in fact commit adultery'

One of the incorrect traditions that have appeared in Sahih Bukhari is the tradition that is found in the book of drinks. Bukhari narrates from Ahmad Bin Salh from Ibn Wahab from Yunus from Ibn Shahab from Abu Salma from Abd Al-Rahman and Ibn Musayyib from Abu Huraira who quote the Holy Prophet (S) as saying: If a believer is in the state of belief while committing adultery he does not in fact commit adultery.79

After rejecting this tradition in his Al-Alim Wa Al-Mut'allim,80 Abu Hanifa says:

Some people say when a believer commits adultery he leaves his belief like a person who takes off his clothes. If he however repents Allah will help him to regain his faith. Do you believe in their tradition? If you accept their tradition then it will imply you have accepted the theories developed by Khawarij and if you are skeptic about it then you are skeptic about Khawarij's theories and as a matter of fact give up the principle of justice which you propagate.

If you reject their words then you have in fact rejected the words of the Holy Prophet (S). This is because

they have narrated the said tradition from different narrators and eventually from the Holy Prophet (S).

Teacher said: They lie. My refutation of their words is not tantamount to the refutation of the words of the Holy Prophet (S). You refute the Holy Prophet (S) when you refute the Holy Prophet himself. If a person however believes in whatever the Holy Prophet (S) says but meanwhile rejects what is unjust and contrary to the teachings of the Holy Quran as the words of the Prophet then he really certifies the Holy Quran and clears the Prophet from uttering anti-Quranic words.

If the Holy Prophet begins to oppose the Holy Quran and attribute lies to Allah, Allah shall instantly put an end to his life, cutting off his jugular vein. Thus the Holy Prophet (S) does not oppose the Holy Quran for a person who opposes Allah's Book is not His apostle. The tradition they have reported is counter to the spirit of the Holy Quran, for Allah, the Exalted, says:

الزَّانِيَةُ وَالزَّانِي فَاجْلِدُوا كُلَّ وَاحِدٍ مِّنْهُمَا مِائَةَ جَلْدَةٍ ۖ وَلَا تَأْخُذْكُم بِهِمَا رَأْفَةٌ فِي دِينِ اللَّـهِ إِن كُنتُمْ تُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّـهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ ۖ وَلْيَشْهَدْ عَذَابَهُمَا طَائِفَةٌ مِّنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

(***As for***) ***the fornicatress and the fornicator, flog each of them,*** (***giving***) ***a hundred stripes, and let not pity for them detain you in the matter of obedience to Allah, if you believe in Allah and the last day, and let a party of believers witness their chastisement.*** 81

In another verse, it says:

وَاللَّذَانِ يَأْتِيَانِهَا مِنكُمْ فَآذُوهُمَا ۖ فَإِن تَابَا وَأَصْلَحَا فَأَعْرِضُوا عَنْهُمَا ۗ إِنَّ اللَّـهَ كَانَ تَوَّابًا رَّحِيمًا

And as for the two who are guilty of indecency from among you, give them both a punishment; then if they repent and amend, turn aside from them; surely Allah is Oft-returning (***to mercy***)***, the Merciful.*** 82

These verses address not Jews and Christians but Muslims. I thus reject the words of those who narrate traditions from the Holy Prophet (S) that are contrary to the Holy Quran. This does not mean that I reject the Holy Prophet (S). I reject those who narrate false words from the Holy Prophet (S). We accuse not the Holy Prophet (S) but reporters (who report false traditions).

As a result, we wholeheartedly accept all [real] traditions reported from the Holy Prophet- whether those which we have heard or those who have not heard.

We believe in all these traditions and testify that all of them are correct. We meanwhile however testify that the Holy Prophet, does not, contrary to divine order, legalize what is forbidden, break the ties Allah has made or praise what Allah has not praised. We stand witness that the Holy Prophet (S) always obeyed Allah, did not bring about innovation or attribute lie to Allah. He was very friendly.

مَّن يُطِعِ الرَّسُولَ فَقَدْ أَطَاعَ اللَّهَ ۖ وَمَن تَوَلَّىٰ فَمَا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ عَلَيْهِمْ حَفِيظًا

Whoever obeys the Apostle, he indeed obeys Allah, and whoever turns back, so We have not sent you as a keeper over them. 83

Three persons take Prophet to Mi'raj

There is a tradition in Bukhari concerning the Mi'raj journey of the Holy Prophet, which is reported by a person called Sharik. This tradition which is utterly baseless is as below:

Abd Al-Aziz Bin Abdullah narrates from Sulayman from Sharik Bin Abdullah who quotes Anas Bin Malik as saying:

The night Allah's Apostle was taken for a journey from the sacred mosque (of Mecca) Al-Ka'ba: Three persons came to him (in a dreamy while he was sleeping in the Sacred Mosque before the Divine Inspiration was revealed to Him. One of them said, "Which of them is he?" The middle (second) angel said, "He is the best of them." The last (third) angle said, "Take the best of them."

Only that much happened on that night and he did not see them till they came on another night, i.e. after The Divine Inspiration was revealed to him. His eyes were asleep but his heart was not and so is the case with the prophets: their eyes sleep while their hearts do not sleep. So those angels did not talk to him till they carried him and placed him beside the well of Zam-Zam.

From among them Gabriel took charge of him. Gabriel cut open (the part of his body) between his throat and the middle of his chest (heart) and took all the material out of his chest and abdomen and then washed it with Zam-Zam water with his own hands till he cleansed the inside of his body, and then a gold tray containing a gold bowl full of belief and wisdom was brought and then Gabriel stuffed his chest and throat blood vessels with it and then closed it (the chest).

He then ascended with him to the heaven of the world and knocked at one of its doors. The dwellers of the Heaven asked, 'Who is it?' He said, "Gabriel." They said, "Who is accompanying you?" He said, "Muhammad." They said, "Has he been called?" He said, "Yes" They said, "He is welcomed." So the dwellers of the Heaven became pleased with his arrival, and they did not know what Allah would do to the Prophet on earth unless Allah informed them...84

Muslim Nayshaburi has related this tradition in a different way. He narrates from Harun Bin Sa'eed Abali from Ibn Wahab from Sulayman- i.e. Bilal from Sharik Bin Abdullah Bin Abu Namr from Anas Bin Malik who relates Mi'araj tradition from the Holy Mosque as under:

Before the Holy Prophet (S) receives any revelation, three persons met him while he was asleep in the Holy Mosque....85

He has related this tradition in the way Thabit Banani has reported, thus altering it considerably.

The occurrence of Mi'araj (ascension) before any revelation was received by the Holy Prophet (S) is incorrect, not accepted by anyone. This is because according to scholars ascension took place at least 15 months after the Prophet mission began.

According to Harbi, ascension happened one year before Hijra on 27th night of Rabi'a Al-Thani, whereas on Zuhri's point of view it took place five years after prophetic mission started.

Based on Ibn Ishaq's opinion ascension occurred at a time when Islam had spread in Mecca as well as in neighboring places among Arab tribes. The closest to reality are the words uttered by Zuhri and Ibn Ishaq. This is because all agrees that Khadija (a.s) offered prayer with the Holy Prophet after prayer was made compulsory and similarly all accepts that she died three to five years before migration.

When all agrees that prayer was made compulsory on ascension night how can one accept that ascension happed before any revelation was received by the Holy Prophet (S)?

According to Nawavi Sharik reports that [the Holy Prophet (S) was transferred while] he was asleep whereas on the basis of another tradition [it is said that this happened when] he was beside Ka'aba in a state between being awake and asleep.

Those advocate the occurrence of ascension as a night dream can make use of the said two traditions as their arguments, but such arguments are flawed, for if the Holy Prophet might have been asleep in the beginning when the angels arrived but later on he was awake and there is no evidence in these traditions that shows that he was asleep throughout all the stages. This has been said by Qazi concerning Sharik's tradition but others have also followed the suit, rejecting thus Sharik's tradition.

Bukhari has narrated Sharik's tradition in detail in his Sahih in a chapter devoted to monotheism. After relating this tradition in his Al-Jam'a Bayn Al-Sahihayn, Hafiz Abd Al-Khaliq says that this tradition is fabricated by Sharik Bin Abu Namr who introduced some unknown phrases into it.

Some prominent memorizers and Imams such as Ibn Shahab, Thabit Banani and Qutada have mentioned this tradition whereas they have not made any mention of Sharik's words. All these aside, Sharik is known among the people of tradition as a memorizer. Rejecting his tradition, Hafiz Abd Al-Haq says that the only traditions he relies on in this connection are those mentioned previously [having nothing to do with Sharik's account].86

Commenting on Sharik's tradition, Kirmani says that it contains illusions that are totally rejected by scholars. As an instance, Sharik claims that ascension happened before revelation was sent down, whereas this is wrong and nobody has approved of it. Similarly when all agrees that prayer was made obligatory on accession night how can one admit that ascension happed before revelation was sent down?

When the gatekeeper addressing Gabriel said: Has he been sent for? He said: Yes. The answer given by Gabriel to the gatekeeper according to me clearly shows that ascension happed after revelation was sent down.87

Commenting on this tradition somewhere in his book, Ibn Qayyim Jawziyya quotes Zuhri as saying: The soul of the Holy Prophet (S) was taken to Bayt Al-Maqdis and Heaven one year before he migrated to Medina. According to Ibn Abd Al-Barr and others accession happened 14 months before the Holy Prophet migrated to Medina. Though accession happened once, some believe it happened twice; once when he was awake and once when he was asleep.

It seems that the advocates of this opinion try to reconcile between Sharik's tradition and other traditions available here. That is why some of them claim that ascension happened twice; once before revelation was sent down as suggested by Sharik's tradition and once after revelation was sent down as suggested by other traditions. Yet others have claimed that ascension happened thrice; once before revelation and two times after it.

All these commentaries show that how confused they are. The problem is that they are literalists and that is why whenever they face any variation in a tradition they take it to mean that the event has taken place more than once. The correct opinion in this regard is that ascension has occurred once and that has happened after revelation was received by the Prophet (S).

It is very surprising that some have wrongly assumed that ascension has happened more than once and though each time fifty prayers were made obligatory upon the Prophet he was able to reduce them to five prayers after going back and forth several time between Allah and Moses. How is it possible that Allah makes a concession during the first ascension but ignores it in the second ascension?

Memorizers believe that Sharik is mistaken in terms of using certain terms in this tradition. After relating this tradition in his Musnad, Muslim says that Sharik has altered this tradition, not relating it in a suitable manner.88

Monkey stoned to death for fornication

Another fabricated tradition reported by Bukhari is the tradition according to which a monkey is stoned to death for committing fornication. Na'aim Bin Hamad narrates from Hashim from Hussain from Amr Bin Maymoon who [quotes the Holy Prophet as saying]:

During the era of ignorance I saw people gathering around an adulterous monkey and stoning it to death. I joined them in stoning it.89

Hamidi and Ibn Abd Al-Barr

Whereas Ibn Abd Al-Barr has rejected this tradition, Abu Abdullah Hamidi, commenting on it, says: Since the original copies of Bukhar's Sahih do not contain this tradition, it is very likely that it is among traditions added by others to his book. Ibn Abd Al-Barr expresses the same opinion in regard with it. Commenting on it, Ibn Hajar Asqalani says: Having rejected Amr Ibn Maymoon's tale, Ibn Abd Al-Barr says that it attributes fornication and punishment to beasts that are not according to scholars under obligation.

According to Ibn Abd Al-Barr, if the chain of this tradition is authentic then it is likely that the people involved in stoning are Jinns, for they are among those under obligation. Ibn Maymoon has reported it only through the chain used by Ismaeli.

In response, it has been said that here fornication and stoning are not to be taken with their literal meanings. Fornication and stoning are used here because the story in question contains elements that are similar to them. Thus the said story does not imply that beasts are under obligation.

In his Al-Jam'a bayn Al-Sahihayn, Hamidi regards this tradition as incorrect, adding that only some copies of Bukhari's copies contain it. Abu Mas'ud is the only figure who has touched this point. According to Hamidi, Bukhar's book does not contain such tradition and thus it is probable that others have added it to his book.

Commenting on his words, Ibn Hajar says that his words that it is likely that some have added certain traditions to Bukhari's book, are not acceptable as they run counter to what scholars hold. Scholars believe that all the traditions included in Bukhari's Sahih are authentic belonging altogether to Bukhari.

Hamidi's words are a false illusion, undermining all traditions in Bukhari's book. If one accepts Hamdi's point of view one may then say that this may be the case with all traditions reported by Bukhari. It thus causes people to lose their faith in the entire traditions reported by Bukhari.[90]

Bukhari and three other fabricated traditions

Bukhari has reported three tradition ending up to Ibn Abbas from 'Ata. From these traditions, two traditions have appeared in divorce book whereas one is available in prophetic commentaries. The traditions in divorce book are as under:

Ibrahim Bin Musa narrates from Hisham from Ibn Jarih from 'Ata who quotes Ibn Abbas as saying: The pagans were of two kinds as regards their relationship to the Prophet and the Believers. Some of them were those with whom the Prophet was at war and used to fight against, and they used to fight him; the others were those with whom the Prophet made a treaty, and neither did the Prophet fight them, nor did they fight him.

If a lady from the first group of pagans emigrated towards the Muslims, her hand would not be asked in marriage unless she got the menses and then became clean. When she became clean, it would be lawful for her to get married, and if her husband emigrated too before she got married, then she would be returned to him.

If any slave or female slave emigrated from them to the Muslims, then they would be considered free persons (not slaves) and they would have the same rights as given to other emigrants. The narrator then mentioned about the pagans involved with the Muslims in a treaty, the same as occurs in Mujahid's tradition. If a male slave or a female slave emigrated from such pagans as had made a treaty with the Muslims, they would not be returned, but their prices would be paid (to the pagans).91

Concerning pagans who had covenant [with Muslims], Ibn Abbas reports a tradition that is similar in content to the tradition reported by Mujahid, according to which if a slave or a female slave embraces Islam he or she will not be returned to pagans. Instead, Muslims pay their prices to pagans.

Quoting Ibn Abbas Qatiba says: Qariba, the daughter of Abi Umaiyya, was the wife of 'Umar Bin Al-Khattab. 'Umar divorced her and then Mu'awiyya Bin Abi Sufyan married her. Similarly, Um Al-Hakam, the daughter of Abi Sufyan was the wife of 'Iyad Bin Ghanm Al-Fihri. He divorced her and then 'Abdullah Bin 'Uthman Al-Thaqafi married her.92

The third tradition found in prophetic commentaries is as below:

Ibrahim Bin Musa narrates from Hisham from Ibn Jarih from 'Ata who quotes Ibn Abbas as saying

All the idols which were worshipped by the people of Noah were worshipped by the Arabs later on. As for the idol Wadd, it was worshipped by the tribe of Kalb at Daumat-Al-Jandal; Suwa' was the idol of (the tribe of) Murad and then by Ban, Ghutaif at Al-Jurf near Saba; Yauq was the idol of Hamdan, and Nasr was the idol of Himyr, the branch of Dhi-Al-Kala.'

The names (of the idols) formerly belonged to some pious men of the people of Noah, and when they died Satan inspired their people to (prepare and place idols at the places where they used to sit, and to call those idols by their names. The people did so, but the idols were not worshipped till those people (who initiated them) had died and the origin of the idols had become obscure, whereupon people began worshipping them.93

Great Sunni leaders and these fabricated traditions

Bukhari has mentioned these three traditions in his Sahih. He has narrated from 'Ata from Ibn Abbas, but it has to be noted that great Sunni scholars have put to question the traditions reported by 'Ata in prophetic commentaries, undermining thus their authenticity.

Albeit Ibn Hajar frequently assists Bukhari and defends his positions, here he confesses that Bukhari is

faced with a problem that is not easy to solve. According to Ibn Hajar, man is prone to error, implying that Bukhari has erred in recording such weak traditions in his book. He explicitly mentions:

Abu Ali Ghasaei quotes Bukhari as saying: Ibrahim Bin Musa narrates from Hisham (Ibn Yusuf), from Ibn Jarih, from Ata from Ibn Abbas who quotes the Holy Prophet (S) as saying:

The pagans were of two kinds as regards their relationship to the Prophet and the believers. Some of them were those with whom the Prophet was at war and used to fight against, and they used to fight him; the others were those with whom the Prophet made a treaty, and neither did the Prophet fight them, nor did they fight him.

If a lady from the first group of pagans emigrated towards the Muslims, her hand would not be asked in marriage unless she got the menses and then became clean. When she became clean, it would be lawful for her to get married, and if her husband emigrated too before she got married, then she would be returned to him. If any slave or female slave emigrated from them to the Muslims, then they would be considered free persons (not slaves) and they would have the same rights as given to other emigrants.

The narrator then mentioned about the pagans involved with the Muslims in a treaty, the same as occurs in Mujahid's tradition. If a male slave or a female slave emigrated from such pagans as had made a treaty with the Muslims, they would not be returned, but their prices would be paid (to the pagans).

The remaining pat of this tradition includes that Umar divorced Qariba, the daughter of Abu Umayya. It also includes other stories.

As the commentary goes on Abu Mas'ud from Damascus writes: This and previous tradition is narrated by Ibn Jarih from 'Ata Khurasani from Ibn Abbas in his commentary. Ibn Jarih did not attend 'Ata's commentary class. As a result the commentary he wrote is not his. He took it from Uthman, son of 'Ata and studied it.

According to Abu Ali Abu Mas'ud's words reflect an important point, for according to Salih Bin Ahmad Bin Hanbal Ali Bin Madini says that he has heard Hisham Bin Yusuf say: Ibn Jarih told me that had asked 'Ata (Abu Rabbah) to comment on some of the verses of Baqara and 'Al Imran chapters, but he had asked him to excuse him, not making such a request from him.

According to Hisham after this happening whenever Ibn Jarih narrated a tradition from 'Ata from Ibn Abbas he would add the term 'Khurasani' after At'a's name. We were tired writing Khurasani so many times and there was no need for using it.

Ali Bin Madini says that he wrote this story for Muhammad Bin Noor reported this tradition from 'Ata from Ibn Abbas. Thus the traditionists who reported this tradition from Muhammad Bin Noor were thinking that the one from whom they were reporting was 'Ata Bin Abu Rabah.

As the discussion goes on, he asks about Yaya Bin Qatan's point of view concerning the tradition

narrated by Jarih from 'Ata Khurasani, but Yahya said that his tradition is weak. When he says that it was something Ibn Jarih told him, Yahya said that the tradition was weak for Ibn Jarih was acquainted with 'Ata through his book.

Thereupon Ibn Hajar says that according to him tis tradition is not broken and that is why Ibn Jarih makes use of the phrase 'he told me'. This is while Bukhari has narrated this tradition from 'Ata Bin Abu Rabh and Khurasani is out of question for he has heard no tradition from Ibn Abbas.

It may be said that that above-mentioned question does not necessarily show that the said 'Ata is 'Ata Khurasani, for this does not mean that Ata Bin Abu Rabah who has recorded it in his commentary was not aware of it. Thus it can be said that both 'Ata Khurasani and 'Ata Bin Abu Rabah were aware of the said two traditions.

Ibn Hajar further says: This answer is not convincing for I believe that it is not possible to give it a definite answer. Man is prone to error and thus one must always invoke Allah's help. The footnote added by Abu Masud is presented by Ismaeli too.

In his Al-Jam'a, Hamidi narrates from Burqani from Ismaeli who says that he has narrated it from Ali Bin Madini. Ismaeli, in this quotation, alludes to the story mentioned by Ghassani.94

A critique of Asqalani's point of view

It is amazing that Ibn Hajar has mentioned this unconvincing answer in his commentary, though not mentioning that there is no correct answer to this question and man is prone to error. In his commentary on the Holy Quran, he says: Ibn Jariha has reportedly said that the said tradition is somewhat modified and altered. Fakihi also quotes Ibn Jarih, though in a different way, as saying: Allah says:

وَقَالُوا لَا تَذَرُنَّ آلِهَتَكُمْ وَلَا تَذَرُنَّ وَدًّا وَلَا سُوَاعًا وَلَا يَغُوثَ وَيَعُوقَ وَنَسْرًا

And they say: By no means leave your gods, nor leave Wadd, nor Suwa; nor Yaghus, and Yauq and Nasr. 95

They were the idols the people of Noah were worshiping and 'Ata quotes Ibn Abbas as having said: Some are of the view that the chain of the transmitters of this tradition is broken, for the said 'Ata is from Khurasan who did not meet Ibn Abbas.

After narrating the above-mentioned tradition from Ibn Jarih, Abd Al-Razzaq in his commentary says that 'Ata Khurasani narrated this tradition from Ibn Abbas.

According to Ibn Mas'ud Ibn Jarih in his commentary said that 'Ata Khurasani narrated this tradition from Ibn Abbas, though he adds that Ibn Jarih did not attend 'Ata's commentary class. Instead, he got his

commentary book from his son Uthman Bin 'Ata and went through it.

Quoting Ali Madini in his Al-Khalal, Salih Bin Ahmad Bin Hanbal says: Once I asked Yaya Bin Qattan about his view concerning the tradition Ibn Jarih reported from 'Ata Khurasani, he said his tradition is weak. I said he uses the phrase "I was told", he said it is not correct, for he got acquainted with 'Ata and his tradition through his book (which borrowed from his son).

Ibn Jarih did not see any harm in using the phrase 'I was told', in what is called 'Munawala96' and 'Mukataba97'.

Ismaeli says that he was informed that Ali Bin Madyani had the following opinion concerning Ibn Jarih's commentary: This tradition was narrated by 'Ata Khurasani from Ibn Abass, but those who were recording traditions omitted the later part 'Khurasin' from his full name in order to make it shorter. Later transmitters not knowing this, took it for 'Ata Bin Abu Rabbah. Ismaeli here mentions a story which Salih Bin Ahmad quotes from Ali Bin Madyani. Ghassani has also mentioned it in his Tamheed Al-Muhmal.

Ibn Madini says that heard Hisham Bin Yusuf says: when I asked about the commentary of some of the verses of Baqara and Al Imran, he asked me to excuse him for not answering. Quoting Hisham Ibn Madyani says: After this happening whenever Ibn Jarih narrated a tradition from Ibn Abbas he would add the term 'Khurasani' after it. Hisham said that it was very boring to follow such a pattern and thus abandoned doing this.

Ibn Madini says that he related this story because Muhammad Bin Thawr who used in accordance with one tradition to narrate this tradition from Ibn Jarih from 'Ata from Ibn Abbas, thinking that the said 'Ata was 'Ata Bin Abu Rabbah. Fakihi however narrates this tradition from Muhammad Bin Thawr from Ibn Jarih from 'Ata from Ibn Abbas not making use of the term 'Khurasani'.

Abd Al-Razzaq also narrates this tradition in the same manner though with the difference that he makes use of the term 'Khurasani'.

Ibn Hajar says that it is very amazing that Bukhari did not note this. He believes that Ibn Jarih has heard this tradition from 'Ata Khurasani as well as 'Ata Abu Rabbah. The fact that 'Ata Bin Abu Rabbah did not narrate commentary traditions does not imply that he has not mentioned it elsewhere in other chapter or in his dialogues with others.

How did it happen for Bukhari that he did not see this whereas he was very strict in terms of fulfilling the condition of 'connection' and was dependent on his master, Ali Bin Madini who has narrated this story?

Concluding his discussion, Ibn Hajar adds one more reason to prove his point of view saying that it is a good reason to prove his opinion that Bukhari has not frequently mentioned this tradition. He has sufficed to quoting it thrice using the above-mentioned chain. If Bukhari did not notice the problem, he would mention it several times. This is because the literal meaning of this tradition is in compliance with

his procedural rules.98

What we want to demonstrate here is that memorizers and jurists did not take the traditions reported by Bukhari and Muslim for granted. They were critical of them. It is not understandable why Ibn Hajar defends Bukhari whereas he knows here Bukhari is not right. We leave passing any judgments in regards with his defenses to our dear readers.

The Tradition Masruq Narrates from Um Ruman

The Tradition Masruq Narrates from Um Ruman is another forged tradition reported by Bukhari in his Sahih, book expedition.

Musa Bin Ismael narrates from Abu Awana from Hussain from Abu Wael from Masruq Bin Ajda'a from Um Ruman, which is as under: Um Ruman, the mother of 'Aisha said that while 'Aisha and she were sitting, an Ansari woman came and said, "May Allah harm such and such a person!" Um Ruman said to her: What is the matter?" She replied, "My son was amongst those who talked of the story (of the Slander)." Um Ruman said, "What is that?" She said, "So-and-so...." and narrated the whole story.

On that 'Aisha said, "Did Allah's Apostle hear about that?" She replies, "yes." 'Aisha further said, "And Abu Bakr too?" She replied, "Yes." On that, 'Aisha fell down fainting, and when she came to her senses, she had got fever with rigors. I put her clothes over her and covered her.

The Prophet came and asked, "What is wrong with this (lady)?" Um Ruman replied, "O Allah's Apostle! She (i.e. 'Aisha) has got temperature with rigors." He said, "Perhaps it is because of the story that has been talked about?" She said, "Yes." 'Aisha sat up and said, "By Allah, if I took an oath (that I am innocent), you would not believe me, and if I said (that I am not innocent), you would not excuse me.

My and your example is like that of Jacob and his sons (as Jacob said): 'It is Allah (Alone) Whose Help can be sought against that you assert.' Um Ruman said, "The Prophet then went out saying nothing. Then Allah declared her innocence. On that, 'Aisha said (to the Prophet), "I thank Allah only; thank neither anybody else nor you."99

Great memorizers and this fabricated tradition

According to this tradition, Masruq in Ajda'a has heard the said story from Um Ruman, mother of Aisha. This is while great Sunni memorizers and scholars have taken this tradition to be wrong, saying that Masruq did not live at a time Um Ruman was living. Among these memorizers are the following names:

Abu Bakr Khatib Baghdadi, Abu Umar Bin Abd Al-Barr Qurtubi, Abu Al-Fazl Qazi Ayaz Yahsibi, Ibrahim Bin Yusuf, author of Matali'a Al-Anwar 'Ala Sihah Al-Athar, Abu Al-Qasim Suhaili, commentator on Al-Sira, Abu Al-Fath Bin Sayyid Al-Nas from Spain, Jamal Al-Din Mazi, Shams Al-Din Dahabi and Abu Saeed Salah Al-Din Ulaei.

Here are the words of these great memorizers concerning this tradition. Commenting on this tradition, Ibn Abd Al-Barr says: The tradition reported by Masruq is mursal (its chain is broken) and thus he might hear it from 'Aisha.[100] After relating this tradition, Mazi quotes Khatib as saying: This is a strange tradition reported by Abu Wael Masruq. No one has reported if from Masruq other than Hussain Bin Abd Al-Rahman.

This tradition is mursal for Um Ruman died at the time of the Holy Prophet (S) and Masruq did not live at her time. Masruq used to report it from Um Masruq in a mursal form saying: 'Um Masruq was asked'. Hussain made a mistake as he took Masruq for the person who raised this question. It is possible that some of the reporters of this tradition may have recorded the passive voice of the verb,

سئلت

as its active voice as some record both voices in the same form.

If this probability holds it implies that Hussain is not mistaken in regard with this tradition and that is why some have narrated this tradition from Hussain in the form of a correct format. According to Abu Bakr Khatib, Bukhari has reported this tradition from Masruq using the active voice (I asked Um Ruman), not grasping the problem existing. He says that he has dealt with this issue in detail in his Al-Marasil and thus there is no need to repeat it again.[101]

Elaborating on Um Ruman's life account, Suhaili, a memorizer, says: Bukhari narrates a tradition from Masruq, which says: I asked Um Ruman, mother of Aisha, about the accusations people leveled against Aisha.... This is while Masruq was born according to all scholars after the demise of the Holy Prophet (S) and thus he never saw Um Ruman.

Some are of the view that he did not understand the problem properly. Whereas others are of the view that the tradition in question is correct, and thus preferable to the opinion that Um Ruman died during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet (S). Abu Bakr Ibn Arabi objected to this tradition and thus he ignored it.[102]

According to Ibn Sayyid Al-Nas, the tradition Masruq reported from Um Ruman has appeared in Bukhari in 'An'ana (observing the order of reporters) and other formats, whereas Musruq did not live at the time of Um Ruman. The summery of Khatib's response is that Masruq may have used the passive voice of,

سئلت

and the recorder may have also used the same format, but later recorders may have recorded it as active voice, thus introducing a change in it. Thus all the problems that emerged later originate in the

way this word was written.[103]

After quoting Khatib's words, Ibn Hajar attempts to answer it and defend Bukhari thus saying: The author of Mashariq and Matali'a, Suhaili and Ibn Sayyid Al-Nas have accepted Khatib's point of view. Following Dahabi, Mazzi in his Mukhtasar, 'Alaei in his Marasil and also other have also agreed with Khatib has pointed out, though the author of Al-Huda has tried to resist the opinion cherished by the said scholars.[104]

A glance at the life account of some the [said] memorizers

Qazi Ayaz, a memorizer, is the author of Mashariq Al-Anwar Ala Sihah Al-Akhbar, a well-known and reliable book. In this book of his, he deals with distortions, misspellings and other errors of books like Al-Muwatta, Sahih Bukhari and Sahih Muslim.

Matali'ah Al-Anwar Ala Sihah Al-Athar is also an important book that is authored by Ibrahim Bin Yusuf, a memorizer of tradition. Describing it, Chalabi says: It treats the problems faced by Al-Muwatta, Sahih Muslimand Sahih Bukhari, explaining the difficult terms and strange traditions in these books. This book is authored by Ibn Qaraqul Ibrahim Bin Yusuf who died in 569 AH. He wrote his book in a way Qazi Ayaz wrote his Mashariq Al-Anwar. Shams Al-Din Muhammd Bin Muhammad Musili (d. 774 AH) presented it in the form poems.

The book begins with these words: Thanks to Allah who made His religion dominant. This work is abstracted from reliable commentaries and explanations made by Abu Al-Fazl Ayaz Bin Musa Bin Ayaz Basti in his MashriqAl-Anwar, with this difference that Abu Ishaq Bin Qaraqul, a jurist, summarized, edited and explained it.[105]

An account of the life of 'Alai, a memorizer

His full name is Khalil Bin Kalidi Salah Al-Adin Abu Sa'ed Demishqi. In his Al-Tabaqat, Qazi Shuhba presents his life account as under:

He was a prominent scholar, researcher and memorizer. He was born in 694 AH in Damascus but settled in Bayt Al-Maqdis. He heard numerous traditions from traditionists. He travelled to different countries hearing traditions from around 700 scholars. He learnt the science of tradition from Mazzi and others and the science of jurisprudence from Sheikh Burhan Fazeri and Sheikh Kamal Al-Din Ibn Zamalkani.

He accompanied Sheikh Burhan Farazi and wrote a Mashikha for him. He topped jurisprudence under Ibn Zamalkani recording plenty of his words and instructions. Though he was allowed to practice Ijtihad, he continued learning and memorizing until he excelled others in this area. He taught at Asadiyya School and Sahib Hams' Circle until he was appointed as a professor at Salahiyya School in Quds.

He lived till the end of his life, teaching, issuing religious decrees, narrating traditions and compiling books. In his Mu'aja, Dahabi mentions the name of 'Alai and praises him. Commenting on him, Hussain in his Mu'ajam (and its supplement), says: He was a pioneer in jurisprudence, syntax, science of principles, sciences of tradition and Rijal.

He was expert in understanding texts and documents. He was heir to the memorizers who preceded him. His works show that he was a leading figure in different sciences. He taught, issued religious decrees and debated (with others on religious issues). No one filled in the vacuum that was created after his death.

Focusing on him, Asnawi in his Al-Tabaqat, says: He was a memorizer and a leading jurist of his time. He was intelligent, careful, eloquent, benevolent and magnificent. He wrote good books on tradition as well as on jurisprudence. He taught at Salahiyya School, spending also part of his time to working, issuing religious decrees and compiling books.

In his Al-Tabaqat Al-Kubra Subki says: He was a famous and reliable memorizer. He was aware of the names of reporters, their weaknesses and also the texts (of traditions). He was also expert in jurisprudence, theology, prose and poems. He was a practicing Muslim. He was an orthodox Ash'arite.

No body replaced him after his death... No one among his contemporaries could reach him in the science of tradition. He was good at other sciences such as jurisprudence, syntax, exegesis and theology. He died in Muharram 761 AH in Quds... He wrote several books ...106

Ibn Sikkin and the said fabricated tradition

Abu Ali Bin Sikkin107, a memorizer and author of Al-Huruf Fi Al-Sahaba which is one of the sources of Al-Isti'ab is another scholar who regards this tradition as wrong and incorrect. Commenting on it, Ibn Hajar says: Prior to Khatib, others also said that this tradition was wrong. Elaborating on Um Ruman's life, Ibn Sikkin in his Sahaba says that Um Ruman died during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet (S). According to the said tradition, Hussain narrates from Abu Wael from Masruq who says that he asked Um Ruman...

According to Ibn Sikkin this is wrong for according to this tradition Masruq reports from Um Ruman. He says Hussain is the only reporter who has reported this tradition. Some are of the view that Masruq did not hear any tradition from Um Ruman. This is because Um Ruman died during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet (S).108

An evaluation of the opinion of author of Al-Huda

As mentioned by Ibn Hajar, the author of Al-Huda is opposed to other scholars in this regard. The author of Al-Huda is Ibn Qayyim Jawziyya, author of Zad Al-Ma'ad Fi Huda Khair Al-Ibad. It seems as if Ibn Hajar's opinion is wrong.

This is because in his book Ibn Qayyim first treats the opinions of those who reject the said tradition. Later on, he deals with the views of those who try to regard it as correct through justifying it. He does not prefer anyone of these two opinions. Thus Ibn Hajar's opinion that Ibn Qayyim is opposed to other scholars who reject this tradition is wrong.

In addition, commenting on the wives of the Holy Prophet (S), Ibn Qayyim says that anyone who is a little bit aware of the history (of Islam) does not dear reject all historians just because of a single tradition. [The tradition Musruq reports from Um Ruman is against what all historians say. This is because according to historians she died during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet (S). Thus the acceptance of this tradition is tantamount to the rejection of the words of historians].

Commenting on this tradition he narrates from 'Akrama Bin Ammar from Abu Zamil from Ibn Abbas who says: Abu Sufyan addressing the Holy Prophet (S) that he had three requests from the Holy Prophet (S). The Holy Prophet (S) fulfilled his requests. One of his requests was that he asked the Holy Prophet (S) to marry Um Habiba, the most beautiful Arab woman who lived in his house.

No doubt, this tradition is wrong. According to Abu Ahmad Ibn Hazm this tradition was no doubt fabricated by 'Akrama Bin 'Ammar whereas on Ibn Jawzi's view it was the result of an illusion which some reporters had. It was because of this tradition that 'Akrama was sharply criticized.

This is because historians are unanimous that Um Habiba was the wife of Ubaidullah Bin Jahsh and she bore a child from him. Ubaidullah and Um Habiba both embraced Islam and migrated to Ethiopia, though later Ubaidullah became a Christian and Um Habiba remained a Muslim.

It was at this time that the Holy Prophet sent someone to Ethiopia to ask for the hand of Um Habiba. Najjashi, the king of Ethiopia married Um Habiba to the Holy Prophet (S) and determined a dowry for her on behalf of the Apostle of Allah.

This happening occurred in the year 8 AH. After the conquest of Mecca, Abu Sufyan went to Medina and visited his daughter there in her house. Um Habiba folded Prophet's bed lest Ubu Sufyan should not sit on it.

All agrees that Abu Sufyan and Mu'awiya embraced Islam in the year 8 AH after the conquest of Mecca. This tradition also contains that Abu Sufyan also asked the Prophet to appoint him as a commander to fight against disbelievers just as he fought against Muslims. The Holy Prophet (S) according to this tradition answered him in the affirmative.

The appointment of Abu Sufyan as a commander by the Holy Prophet (S) is not confirmed [by any historians] but there is too much fuss on the meaning of this tradition with the scholars following different courses. Some have even said that according to this tradition the Holy Prophet (S) married Um Habiba after the conquest of Mecca whereas others are of the view that since historians did not mention it, the claim made by those unaware of history is not acceptable...[109]

In short, historians are unanimous that Um Ruman died at the time of the Holy Prophet (S) and thus Masruq did not see him. It is not thus acceptable to refute the consensus made by scholars through a single tradition related by Bukhari in his Sahih.

As mentioned before, like Khatib and others, Ibn Qayyim rejected this tradition of Bukhari and thus Ibn Hajar is wrong when he says that Ibn Qayyim is opposed to Khatib and others.

I suppose Ibn Hajar criticizes Khatib and his followers for endorsing Waqidi's opinion that Um Ruman died during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet (S) with the aim to defend the tradition reported by Bukhari in his book. The explanations presented by Ibn Qayyim are a suitable answer to what Ibn Hajar said.

As pointed out before, the aim of this study is to prove that great Sunni scholars have criticized some of the traditions reported by Bukhari putting to question their credibility.

Moreover, as Ibn Hajar rejected Waqid's point of view concerning the death of Um Ruman refuting all the objections against it, we also criticize him for his refraining to mention the tradition of Ghadir Khum and state that its authenticity is beyond any doubt. Thus Fakhr Radi's reference to Waqidi's not mentioning the tradition of Ghadir Khum is invalid.

Temporary Marriage forbidden in Khaibar year

Among other invalid traditions reported by Bukhari is the tradition of the prohibition of temporary marriage in the battle of Khaibar.

In his Sahih (book on expedition), Bukhari narrates from Yahya Bin Qaz'a from Malik Bin Ismael from Ibn Shahb from Hassan Bin Muhammad Bin Ali and his brother Abdullah from their father who quotes Ali Bin Abi Talib as saying, "The Holy Prophet (S) prohibited temporary marriage and the flesh of domestic asses in the battle of Khaibar".110

The same tradition has also appeared in chapter 'slaughtered animals' in his Sahih. He narrates from Abdullah Bin Yusuf, from Malik from Ibn Shahab from Abdullah and Hassan from their father who quotes Ali Bin Abi Talib as saying, "The Holy Prophet (S) prohibited temporary marriage and the flesh of domestic asses in the battle of Khaibar".111

Muslim also narrated this tradition in his book, using different chains saying:

Yahya Bin Yahya narrated Ibn Shihab, from Abdullah and Hassan, children of Muhammad Bin 'Ali from their father who quoted Imam Ali as saying, "Allah's Apostle (may peace be upon him) on the Day of Khaibar prohibited forever the contracting of temporary marriage and eating of the flesh of the domestic asses."

● Abdullah Bin Muhammad bn Asma Zab'ai narrated from Juwariyya from Malik (as in the previous

chain) who said that he heard Ali addressing somebody say, "You are forgetful.... This is because the Messenger of Allah had prohibited us from contracting temporary marriage with women ..."

● Abu Bakr Bin Abi Shaiba and Ibn Numair and Zuhair Bin Harb from Ibn Ayyina from Zuhair, from Zuhri from Hassan and Abdullah children of Muhammad Bin Ali from their father who quotes 'Ali (Allah be pleased with him) as saying, "The Holy Prophet (S) on the Day of Khaibar forbade forever the contracting of temporary marriage and the eating of the flesh of domestic asses".

● Muhammad Bin Abdullah Bin Numair narrated from his father, from Ubaidullah from Ibn Shahab from Hassan and Abdullah children of Muhammad Bin Ali from their father who said, "Ali (Allah be pleased with him) heard that Ibn Abbas gave some relaxation in connection with the contracting of temporary marriage, whereupon he said: Don't be hasty (in your religious verdict), Ibn 'Abbas, for Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) on the Day of Khaibar prohibited forever the doing of it and eating of the flesh of domestic asses".

● Abu Tahir and Harmala Bin Yahya narrated from Wahab from Yunus from Ibn Shahab from Hassan and Abdullah children of Muhammad Bin Ali from their father from an a person who heard Ali (S) addressing Ibn Abbas say, "The Messenger of Allah (S) forbade contracting temporary marriage with women and flesh of domestic assess on the day of Khaibar."112

Great Sunni scholars and this fake tradition

This tradition that has appeared in Sahih Bukhari and Sahih Muslim with various chains explicitly mentions that temporary marriage was forbidden in the battle of Khaibar. This is while great Sunni scholars and traditionists do not accept this story and take it to be a mere illusion. Here are the words of some of great Sunni scholars in this regard.

Commenting on this story, Suhaili, a memorizer says the tradition Malik reports from Abu Shihab, is flawed. This is because according to this tradition the Holy Prophet (S) prohibits temporary marriage in the battle of Khaibar.

This is while no historiographer has accepted that temporary marriage was prohibited in the battle of Khaibar. Quoting this tradition from Abu Shihab from Abdullah Bin Muhammad, Abu Ainiyya says: Allah's Apostle prohibited eating the flesh of domestic asses and temporary marriage in the battle of Khaibar. This tradition implies that he prohibited it soon after the battle of Khaibar was over. This shows that the words used by Abu Shihab not Malik are altered. This is because some of the reporters of Abu Shihab have stated the very words stated by Malik.113

Somewhere in his Zad Al-Ma'ad, Ibn Qayyim Jawziyya says: The truth is that temporary marriage was prohibited not in the battle of Khaibar but in the year of the conquest of Mecca. This is while some scholars relying on the tradition reported from Ali Bin Abi Talib (a.s) in Sahih Bukhari and Sahih Muslim have thought that temporary marriage was prohibited in the battle of Khaibar...114

Elsewhere in his book, he says: The truth is that temporary marriage was prohibited in the year of the conquest of Mecca. This is because authentic traditions signify that Muslims were practicing temporary marriage with the permission of the Holy Prophet (S) in the year of the conquest of Mecca.

If temporary marriage was prohibited in the battle of Khaibar it would imply that the same ruling was abrogated twice a thing that has never happened in Islamic laws. On the other hand, those who dwelled in Khaibar fortress were Jewish not Muslim women and it was not yet permissible for Muslims to marry the People of Book.115

He also mentions elsewhere in his book that it is reported that the Holy Prophet (S) legalized temporary marriage in the year of the conquest of Mecca, whereas elsewhere it is reported that he prohibited it in the same year.

In addition, the scholars are divided on whether or not temporary marriage was prohibited in the battle of Khaibar. Thus the truth is thus that temporary marriage was prohibited in the year of the conquest of Mecca and what was prohibited in the battle of Khaibar was only the eating of the flesh of domestic asses...116

In his Al-Maghazi, Badr Al-Din Aiyni quotes Ibn Abd Al-Barr as saying: It is incorrect to say that temporary marriage was forbidden in the battle of Khaibar. According to Suhaili no historiographer has said that temporary marriage was prohibited in the battle of Khaibar.117

In Sahih Bukhari (chapter on marriage), Shihab Al-Din Qastalani reports this tradition as under: Malik Bin Ismael narrates from Ibn Ainiyya who heard Zuhri say: Hassan Bin Muhammad Bin Ali and his brother Abdullah quoting their father informed me that Ali (a.s) addressing Ibn Abbas said: Prophet prohibited temporary marriage and eating the flesh of domestic asses in the battle of Khaibar.

Commenting on this tradition he says: The phrase 'in the battle of Khaibar' shows that both of them (temporary marriage and eating the flesh of domestic asses) were prohibited [in the same year]. In his Al-Maghazi, commenting on the battle of Khaibar, he says:

Allah's Apostle prohibited temporary marriage and eating the flesh of domestic asses in the battle of Khaibar. Despite all these, in his Al-Ma'arifa, Bayhaqi says: Ibn Ainiyya thought Ali's tradition was related to the prohibition of eating the flesh of domestic asses in the battle of Khaibar not to the prohibition of temporary marriage.

According to Bayhaqi it seems that Ibn Ainiyya intends to say the Prophet – based on the existing traditions legalized temporary marriage after the battle of Khaibar though he prohibited it again. When Ali (a.s) talked about the prohibition of temporary marriage to Ibn Abbas he referred to the ultimate prohibition.

According to Suhaili the prohibition of temporary marriage in the battle of Khaibar is something that is not

approved by historiographers...118

Commenting on the tradition in the book of expedition, Qastalani quotes Ibn Abd Al-Bar as saying that it is wrong to say that temporary marriage was prohibited in the battle of Khaibar. According to Bayhaqi no historiographer has agreed with it.119

Ibn Hajar 'Asqalani

Commenting on this tradition, he said: It is said that this tradition is altered, but the truth is that Prophet (S) prohibited eating the flesh of domestic asses and temporary marriage in the battle of Khaibar.

Temporary marriage was not legalized in the battle of Khaibar. We will throw light on it elsewhere in the book of marriage.

Quoting related traditions and presenting in detail the opinions expressed by Bayhaqi, Suhaili, Ibn Abd Al-Barr and others in the book of marriage, he says: The problem can be solved in this way that Ali (a.s) was not aware of the permissibility of temporary marriage on the day of the conquest of Mecca. This is because as we will explain temporary marriage was prohibited at night as they were starting their journey.

Abu Awana has reported a tradition from Salim Bin Abdullah in this regard, considering it as authentic. This tradition confirms the outward meaning of the said tradition. According to this tradition, when a man told Ibn Umar that such and such person puts to question the permissibility of temporary marriage, the latter said that by Allah he knew that Allah's Apostle (S) prohibited temporary marriage in the battle of Khaibar and since then "we did not practice temporary marriage".120

According to me the desire to defend Bukhari has caused Ibn Hajar to accuse on the basis of Sunni traditions Imam Ali (a.s), the gate of knowledge of committing error and suffering from ignorance. We must take refuge to Allah from the prejudices that may bring one's downfall.

Dehlavi

The words uttered by Dehlavi and his father Shah Waliullah in Qurra Al-'Ainain, tell us that Ibn Hajar's opinion is wrong. In his book, Dehlwi addresses the objections raised against Umar Bin Khattab. Commenting on the eleventh objection he says: Though temporary marriage and Mut'a Hajj were lawful during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet (S), Umar prohibited both of them, abrogating thus divine laws and prohibiting lawful things.

As mentioned in Sunni books, Umar himself confesses that he has done such a thing, saying: Two pleasures were lawful during the time of the Holy Prophet (S) but I prohibited them.

In response it has to be said that Sahih Bukhari is the most authentic Sunni source. Here Bukhari narrates a tradition from Salma Bin Akwa'a and Sabra Bin Ma'abad Juhani from Abu Huraira. This

tradition has also appeared in other authentic sources.

According to this tradition, Prophet (S) permitted temporary marriage in the battle of Awtas for three days but after the expiration of these three days he prohibited it forever.

Imam Ali's tradition is very popular in this regard, with everybody knowing it to the extent that even his grandchildren narrated this tradition from him. Al-Muwatta, Sahih Muslim and other famous sources have recorded this tradition, using various chains of transmitters.

Some Shias have cast this doubt that temporary marriage was prohibited in the battle of Khaibar, but it was legalized again in the battle of Awtas.

In reply it has to be said that this doubt originates in misunderstanding and confusing concepts. This is because Ali's tradition of the battle of Khaibar tells us that eating the flesh of domestic asses is forbidden not temporary marriage. Despite all these, his words imply the doubt that both were prohibited in the battle of Khaibar.

Some have dealt with this misunderstanding as truth, considering thus it was in the battle of Khaibar that temporary marriage was forbidden. If Ali (a.s) really believed that it was in the battle of Khaibar that temporary marriage was forbidden how could he refute Ibn Abbas' point of view convincing him (that this was not the case)?

This is while Imam Ali (a.s) referred to this tradition while making attempts to convince Ibn Abbas. He strongly prevented Ibn Abbas from permitting temporary marriage accusing him of being forgetful.

On the other hand, those who think that temporary marriage was forbidden in the battle of Khaibar actually refute the argument presented by Ali (a.s). This kind of approach shows their ignorance and stupidity.[121]

In my point of view, these comments show that the traditions concerning the prohibition of temporary marriage in the battle of Khaibar are wrong and scholars like Bukhari, Muslim and others who rely on such traditions are ignorant. This is because the correctness of these traditions implies that the argument present by Imam Ali (a.s) is not sound.

This shows that Ibn Hajar and those who followed his line of thinking are not prudent enough, because they accuse Imam Ali (a.s) of not knowing about the prohibition of temporary marriage.

It has to be noted that here Dehlavi has related some objections concerning Shias. [We cannot due to lack of space, deal with them here]. To know about the flaws of his objections, dear readers can refer to Tasheed Al-Mataeen.

Imam Shaf'ai

He believes that the traditions reported from Ali (a.s) concerning the prohibition of the flesh of domestic asses, wrongly contains the term 'temporary marriage'. According to Aini Shafi'ai narrates from Malik (using his chain) from Ali (a.s) who said that Prophet (S) prohibited eating the flesh of domestic asses in the battle of Khaibar.

Shafi'ai did not comment on this tradition, refraining from touching the issue of temporary marriage due to the difference existing about it.122

Thus it is crystal clear that Shafi'ai is also critical of these so called authentic traditions!

Abstract

Great Sunni scholars, tradition memorizers and critics of traditions do not accept many of the traditions reported by Bukhari and Muslim. To explain it further distances us from what is our real aim. Thus we suffice to what we have thus far said.

Now that we learnt that great Sunni scholars questioned many of the traditions reported by Bukhari and Muslim, how can we accept Fakhr Razi's argument that Ghadir tradition is false when he says to prove his point of view that Bukhari and Muslim have not mentioned it? How can we say that the Holy Prophet (S) did not say it, for Bukhari and Muslim have not paid attention to it?

1. Sahih e Bukhari, vol. 7, p. 8.
2. Fah Al-Bari, vol. 9, p. 31.
3. Sahih e Bukhari, vol. 6, p. 202.
4. Ibid, vol. 4, pp. 277 and 278.
5. Qur'an, Tawba, 114.
6. Radi's Tafsir, vol. 16, p. 210.
7. Qur'an, Tawba, 113.
8. Qur'an, Ibid.
9. Qur'an, Nisa, 48.
10. Qur'an, Ghafir, 60.
11. Qur'an, Tawba, 113.
12. Razi's Tafsir, vol. 16, p. 209.
13. Fath Al-Bari, vol. 8, p. 405.
14. Qur'an, Tawba, 114.
15. Fath Al-Bari, vol. 8, p. 406.
16. Razi, Tafsir, vol. 14, p. 211.
17. Al-Tawshih fi Sharh Al-Sahih, vol. 4, p. 250.
18. Al-Durr Al-Manthur, vol. 4, p. 300.
19. Qur'an, Tawba, 8.
20. Sahih e Bukhari, vol. 6, p. 131.
21. Al-Manhul fi Ilm Al-Usul, p. 212.
22. Irshad Al-Sari ila Sahih Al-Bukhari, vol. 7, p. 155.
23. Akhbar Ahad are traditions that do not satisfy the concisions of successively narrated traditions.

24. Fath Al-Bari, vo. 8, p. 273.
25. Al-Jam'a bayn Al-Sahihain, vol. 3, p. 184 Tradition no. 2415.
26. Tafsir e Razi, vol. 26, p. 148.
27. Al-Lubab fi Ulum Al-Kitab, vol. 16, p. 324.
28. Qur'an, Naml, 18.
29. Sahih e Bukhari, vol. 4, p. 262.
30. A place in Mecca.
31. Sahih e Bukhari, vol. 7, p. 165.
32. Ibtal Al-Batil, manuscript.
33. Sahih e Bukhari, vol. 5, p. 124.
34. Subul Al-Huda Wa Al-Rashad fi Sira Khair Al-Ibad, vol. 2, p. 182.
35. Fath Al-Bari, vol. 7, 113.
36. Quran, An'am, 121.
37. Al-Rawd Al-Anf, vol. 2, pp. 360 – 363.
38. Al-Shifa be Ta'arif Huquq Al-Mustafa, vol. 1, pp. 161 and 162.
39. Quran, Nahl, 123.
40. Al-Tanqih li alfaza Al-Jami'a Al-Sahih, vol. 3, p. 797.
41. Fath Al-Bari, vol. 7, pp. 112-113.
42. Sahih Bukhari, vol. 8, p. 266.
43. Allah, the Exalted has caused Hafiz Bin Kharash (283), a great Sunni scholar to admit this reality. In his Tadkira Al-Huffaz (vol. 2, p. 682, narrator no. 705).
44. For further information see Tasheed Al-Mataeen and other reliable books.
45. Qur'an, Naml, 16.
46. Qur'an, Maryam, 6.
47. Al-Tabaqat Al-Kubra, vol. 2, p. 315.
48. Qura'n, Kahf, 54.
49. Mukhtarsari Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyya, p. 281, See Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyya, p. 286.
50. Sharh Nahj Al-Balagha, vol. 1, p. 27.
51. Qur'an, Ma'ida, 55.
52. Qur'an, Insan, 8.
53. Qura'n, Baqara, 274.
54. Matalib Al-Sauel, p. 137.
55. Matalib Al-Sauel, pp. 131-132.
56. Quran, An'am, 148.
57. Qur'an, 148-149.
58. Minhaj Al-Sunna, vol. 2, pp. 3-5.
59. Qura'n, Kahf, 54.
60. Mukhtarsari Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyya, p. 281, See Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyya, p. 286
61. Quran, An'am, 148.
62. Minhaj Al-Sunna, vol. 2, pp. 11-12.
63. Sahih Bukhari, vol. 5, p. 95 and vol. 4, p. 185.
64. Fath Al-Bari, vol. 7, p. 69, vol. 6, p. 162, vol. 9, pp. 268 and 269.
65. Tuhfa Ithan'ashriyya, p. 355.
66. For further information in this regard see Fabricated Marriage proposal, a Critical Assessment of the story of Ali's asking for the hand of Abu Jahl's daughter in marriage. This book is also compiled by Ayatollah Milani.
67. Quran, Hujurat, 9.
68. Sahih Bukhari, vol. 4, p. 19.
69. Al-Tanqih Li-Alfaz Al-Jami'a Al-Sahih, vol. 2, p. 596.

70. Fath Al-Bari, vol. 5, p. 228.
71. Sahih, Bukhari, vol. 5, p. 82.
72. Sahih Bukhari, vol. 7, p. 401.
73. Qur'an, Ad Dukan, 10
74. Sahih Bukhari vol. 2, pp. 74-75.
75. Umda Al-Qari fi Sharh Al-Bukhari, vol. 7, pp. 27-29.
76. Quran, Hashar, 7.
77. Al-Tanwih fi Sharh Al-Tawdih, vol. 2, p. 21.
78. Sahih Bukhari, vol. 7, p. 193, Al-Muhalla, vol. 9, p. 59.
79. Sahih Bukhari, vol. 7, p. 190.
80. This book written by Abu Hanifa arranged in the form of dialogue. The term alim in the title of this book refers to Abu Hanifa and the term Al-muta'allim to Abu Muti'a Balkhi, his pupil.
81. Quran, Noor, 2.
82. Quran, Nisa, 16.
83. Quran, Nisa, 80.
84. Sahih Bukhari, vol. 9, p. 265.
85. Sahih Muslim, vol. 1, pp. 148 and 262.
86. Al-Minhaj fi Sharh Sahih Muslim Bin Hajjaj, vol. 1, pp. 209 and 210.
87. Al-Kawkib Al-Darari fi Sharh Sahih Al-Bukhari, vol. 25, p. 204.
88. Zad Al-MI'ad fi Huda Khair Al-Ibad, vol. 3, pp. 41 and 42.
89. Sahih Bukhari, vol. 5, p. 56.
90. Fath Al-Bari, vol. 7. P. 127.
91. Sahih Bukhari, vol. 7, pp. 62-63.
92. Ibid.
93. Sahih Bukhari, vol. 6, p. 199.
94. Hady Al-Sardi, Muqaddima Fath Al-Bari, vol. 2, pp. 135-6.
95. Quran, Noah, 23.
96. in the process of 'munawala', a tradition master lends his book to his disciple, but the latter without taking permission, uses the traditions it contains applying the phrase 'he told me' or 'he informed me'.
97. In the process of 'mukataba', a tradition master writes tradition his disciple at his request. Here the disciple is not allowed to use phrases such as 'he told me or 'he informed me'. Instead, he needs to say "he wrote me saying. For further information, see Ilm Al-Hadith, pp. 198-9.
98. Fath Al-Bari, vol. 8, p. 541.
99. Sahih Bukhari, vol. 5, p. 154.
100. Al-Isti'ab, vol. 4, p. 1937.
101. Tahdib Al-Kamal fi Ma'arifat Al-Rijal, vol. 35, p. 361.
102. Al-Rawz Al-Anf, vol. 6, p. 440.
103. Uyun Al-Athar, vol. 2, p. 101.
104. Fath Al-Bari, vol. 7, p. 353.
105. Kashf Al-Dunun, vol. 2, p. 1715.
106. Tabaqat Al-Shafi'ayya, Manuscript.
107. He is Saed Bin Uthman Baghadadi. He died in 353 AH. Fro further information seeTadkira Al-Huffaz, vol. 3, p. 937. Al-Nujum Al-Dahira, vol. 3, p. 338, ShAzerat Al- Dahab, vol. 7, p. 142 and Tabaqat Al-Huffaz, p. 378.
108. Al-Isaba, vol. 4, p. 434.
109. Zad Al-Ma'ad fi Huda Khair Al-Ibad, vol. 1, p. 27.
110. Sahih Bukhari, vol. 5, p. 172.
111. Ibid, vol. 7, p. 123.
112. Sahih Muslim, vol. 4, pp. 134 and 135.

113. Al-Rawz Al-Anf, vol. 6, p. 557.
114. Zad Al-Ma'ad fi Huda Khair Al-Ibad, vol. 2, p. 142.
115. Ibid, vol. 2, p. 183.
116. Zad Al-Ma'ad, vol. 4, p. 6.
117. Umda Al-Qari fi Sharh Sahih Al-Bukhari, vol. 17, pp. 246-7.
118. Irshad Al-Sari ila Sahih Al-Bukhari, vol. 8, p. 41.
119. Ibid, vol. 6, p. 536.
120. Fath Al-Bari, vol. 9, p. 138.
121. Tuhfa Ithna Ashariyya, chapter on mataeen.
122. Umda la-Qari, vol. 17, p. 247.

Source URL: https://www.al-islam.org/fr/node/40393#comment-0