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

Preface

Mut'ah was unknown on the earth before Allah sent Muhammad, *sallallahu 'alaihi wa alihi*. An average Sunni Muslim would be surprised to know this. Our brothers and sisters from the Ahl al-Sunnah have been repeatedly bombarded with severe anti-*mut'ah* propaganda for several years (or perhaps even decades or centuries), which claims that it was a pagan custom of the pre-Islamic Arabs that was temporarily tolerated by the Prophet – like alcohol – and was then banned eternally by him. However, ask the Sunni *'alim* to produce reliable Sunni evidence that *mut'ah* was *ever* practised during the *Jahiliyyah* period.

That is when things get really messy. He will never be able to give the proof – no matter the spread of his knowledge, and no matter his scholarly standing. Demand also, if possible, the same evidence from one billion Sunni *'ulama*, and you will never get it till the Day of *al-Qiyamah*. Of course, it does not exist! *Mut'ah* was introduced to this planet, to this cosmos, for the very first time by none other than the Messenger of Allah, on the Order of his Lord. It was part of His Mercy, made especially for this *Ummah*, as Imam 'Abd al-Razzaq (d. 211 H) records:

> عبد الرزاق عن ابن جريج عن عطاء قال: لأول من سمعت منه المتعة صفوان بن يعلى، قال: أخبرني عن يعلى أن معاوية استمتع بامرأة بالطائف، فأنكرت ذلك عليه، فدخلنا على ابن عباس، فذكر له بعضنا، فقال له: نعم، فلم يقر في نفسي، حتى قدم جابر ابن عبد الله، فجئناه في منزله، فسأله القوم عن أشياء، ثم ذكروا له المتعة، فقال: نعم، استمتعنا على عهد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، وأبي بكر، وعمر، حتى إذا كان في آخر خلافة عمر ... قال عطاء: وسمعت ابن عباس يقول: يرحم الله عمر، ما كانت المتعة إلا رخصة من الله عز وجل، رحم بها أمة محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم، فلو لا نهيه عنها ما احتاج إلى الزنا إلا شقي، قال: كأني والله أسمع قوله: إلا شقي ـ عطاء القائل ـ قال عطاء: فهي التي في سورة النساء { فما استمتعتم به منهن } إلى كذا وكذا من الأجل، على كذا وكذا

'Abd al-Razzaq – Ibn Jurayj – 'A□a:

The person from whom I first heard about *mut'ah* was Safwan b. Ya'la. **He narrated to me from Ya'la that Mu'awiyah did *mut'ah* with a woman at □aif**. So, I denied that upon him. Then, we entered upon Ibn 'Abbas, and one of us mentioned (*mut'ah*) to him, and he said, "Yes". But, it did not settle well in me,

until when Jabir b. ‘Abd Allah arrived. So, we went to him at his house, and the people asked him about various things. Then, they mentioned *mut’ah*, and he said, “Yes. **We did *mut’ah* during the time of the Messenger of Allah, Abu Bakr and ‘Umar UNTIL at the last part of the ‘Umar’s caliphate**....”

‘A□a said:

I heard Ibn ‘Abbas saying: “May Allah show mercy to ‘Umar. ***Mut’ah* was nothing except a PERMISSION from Allah the Almighty. He showed MERCY through it to the *Ummah* of Muhammad, peace be upon him**. If he (‘Umar) had not forbidden it, none would have needed to commit *zina* except a wretched person.”

He – ‘A□a – said: By Allah, it is like I am still hearing his statement “except a wretched person”.

‘A□a said: **It is that which is in *Surah al-Nisa*** {**Those of them with whom you contract *mut’ah***} till such-and-such period, for such-and-such.[1]

Commenting on this *hadith*, al-Hafi□ (d. 852 H) states:

> فأخرجه عبد الرزاق من طريق صفوان بن يعلى بن أمية أخبرني يعلى ان معاوية استمتع بامرأة بالطائف واسناده صحيح

‘Abd al-Razzaq recorded it with the chain of Safwan b. Ya’la b. Umayyah: Ya’la narrated to me that Mu’awiyah did *mut’ah* with a woman at □aif. **And its chain is *sahih***.[2]

However, we have seen certain Sunni elements who argue against the authenticity of this *riwayah* on the basis of Ibn Jurayj’s *tadlis*. The keen observer notices though that Ibn Jurayj has narrated from ‘A□a using the phrases (**قال**) [he said] and (**قال عطاء**) [‘A□a said] in addition to his *‘an-‘an* manner of transmission. ‘Allamah al-Albani (d. 1420 H) explains what both phrases indicate:

> روى أبو بكر بن أبى خيثمة بسند صحيح عن ابن جريج قال: " إذا قلت: قال عطاء , فأنا سمعته منه , وإن لم أقل سمعت ".

Abu Bakr b. Abi Khaythamah recorded **with a *sahih* chain** that Ibn Jurayj said: **Whenever I say: “ ‘A□a said”, then I HEARD it from him**, even if I do not say “I heard”.[3]

This basically rules out *tadlis* completely in the above *hadith* of ‘Abd al-Razzaq. As such, the objection of *tadlis* is baseless and erroneous. But, there is more! Al-Albani further submits:

> قد روى أبو بكر بن أبى خيثمة بسند صحيح عن ابن جريج قال: إذا قلت: قال عطاء فأنا سمعته منه , وإن لم أقل سمعت.

فهذا نص منه أن عدم تصريحه بالسماع من عطاء ليس معناه أنه قد دلسه عنه , ولكن هل ذلك خاص بقوله " قال عطاء" أم لا فرق بينه وبين ما لو قال " عن عطاء " كما فى هذا الحديث وغيره؟ الذى يظهر لى الثانى , وعلى هذا فكل روايات ابن جريج عن عطاء محمولة على السماع إلا ما تبين تدليسه فيه , والله أعلم.

Abu Bakr b. Abi Khaythamah has narrated with a *sahih* chain from Ibn Jurayj that he said: Whenever I say: " 'Ata said", then I HEARD it from him, even if I do not say "I heard".

This is an explicit statement from him that his omission to say "I heard" from 'A□a does not mean that he has done *tadlis* from him. However, is this restricted to his statement " 'A□a said" or is there no difference between it and if he said "from 'A□a" as in this *hadith* and others? What is apparent to me is the second. Thus, based upon this, all reports of Ibn Jurayj from 'A□a are considered as what he heard explicitly, except that whose *tadlis* is clear. And Allah knows best.4

Therefore, there is no *tadlis* in the report of 'Abd al-Razzaq, and it has a perfectly *sahih* chain – from Safwan b. Yala from Ya'la; from Ibn 'Abbas; and from Jabir b. 'Abd Allah. Al-Hafi□ has explicitly declared the 'Abd al-Razzaq – Ibn Jurayj – 'A□a – Safwan b. Ya'la – Ya'la *sanad* to be *sahih*. Of course, both Ibn 'Abbas and Jabir were Sahabis. Therefore, the 'Abd al-Razzaq – Ibn Jurayj – 'A□a – Ibn 'Abbas and 'Abd al-Razzaq – Ibn Jurayj – 'A□a – Jabir b. 'Abd Allah chains are *sahih* as well.

That *riwayah* establishes that:

i. *Mut'ah* was a "permission" from Allah. This means that the Muslims were forbidden from practising it until He permitted them. This apparently defeats the theory that it was initially allowed and then disallowed. Rather, it was originally *haram*, and then was permitted by our Lord out of His Mercy to us.

ii. Allah revealed a verse in *Surah al-Nisa* to authorize the practice of *mut'ah*. 'A□a recited that *ayah*, and we will have more to say about it later in this book.

iii. Mu'awiyah practised *mut'ah* during his caliphate, long *after* the death of the Prophet, Abu Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthman and 'Ali, *'alaihi al-salam*. His action was supported by both Ibn 'Abbas and Jabir b. 'Abd Allah al-Ansari, *ra□iyallahu 'anhuma*.

iv. Both Ibn 'Abbas and Jabir said "yes" to *mut'ah*, thereby allowing it and declaring it *halal*.

v. Jabir b. 'Abd Allah asserted that *mut'ah* was allowed by the Prophet till his death, and was also allowed by Abu Bakr till his death. He further claimed that even 'Umar too allowed it for most of his caliphate, but later banned it at the tail end of his rule.

vi. Ibn 'Abbas proclaimed that *mut'ah* was a "mercy" from Allah specially for the *Ummah* of Muhammad. Whosoever knows how *mut'ah* truly works can easily confirm this.

vii. Ibn 'Abbas also declared that if 'Umar had not banned *mut'ah*, none would have needed to commit

zina except the wretched ones. He is right about this too.

viii. Ibn ‘Abbas was very explicit that it was ‘Umar who banned *mut’ah* – NOT Allah, and NOT His Messenger.

‘Abd al-Razzaq has another *hadith* which confirms the last point above:

> عبد الرزاق عن ابن جريج قال: أخبرني أبو الزبير قال: سمعت جابر بن عبد الله يقول: استمتعنا أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، حتى نهي عمرو بن حريث

‘Abd al-Razzaq – Ibn Jurayj – Abu al-Zubayr – Jabir b. ‘Abd Allah:

“**We, the Sahabah of the Prophet, peace be upon him, did *mut’ah* UNTIL the prohibition of ‘Amr b. Hurayth (from it).**”[5]

The only new name here is Abu al-Zubayr. Al-Hafi says about him:

> محمد بن مسلم بن تدرس بفتح المثناة وسكون الدال المهملة وضم الراء الأسدي مولاهم أبو الزبير المكي صدوق إلا أنه يدلس

Muhammad b. Muslim b. Tadrus al-Asadi, their freed slave, Abu al-Zubayr al-Makki: ***Saduq*** (**very truthful**), except that he used to do *tadlis*.[6]

There is no *‘an-‘an* transmission in the above *sanad*. Therefore, it is *hasan*. The report is explicit that the Sahabah generally practised *mut’ah* without interference, from the lifetime of the Prophet, till when ‘Amr b. Hurayth was prohibited from it. ‘Abd al-Razzaq has another *riwayah* which sheds more light:

> عبد الرزاق عن ابن جريج قال: أخبرني أبو الزبير أنه سمع جابر بن عبد الله يقول: قدم عمرو بن حريث من الكوفة فاستمتع بمولاة، فأتي بها عمر وهي حبلى، فسألها، فقالت: استمتع بي عمرو بن حريث، فسأله، فأخبره بذلك أمرا ظاهرا، قال: فهلا غيرها؟ فذلك حين نهى عنها

‘Abd al-Razzaq – Ibn Jurayj – Abu al-Zubayr – Jabir b. ‘Abd Allah:

‘Amr b. Hurayth arrived from Kufah and did *mut’ah* with a slave woman. Then, she was brought to ‘Umar when she became pregnant, and he interrogated her. So, she said, “ ‘Amr b. Hurayth did *mut’ah* with me.” Then, he interrogated him, and he informed him through that of an apparent matter.” **He said, “So, why not other than her?” That was the moment when he forbade it**.[7]

The chain is *hasan*, as our reader can see. It seems that ‘Umar became very angry that ‘Amr b. Hurayth – a Sahabi – did *mut’ah* with a slave woman. For that reason, he banned it altogether – whether with

free women, or with slaves. As Jabir testified in the other *athar*, this incident took place towards the end of ‘Umar’s caliphate.

Jabir made a clear point, that the Sahabah continued to practise *mut’ah* until ‘Umar made it *haram* in the case of ‘Amr b. Hurayth. Then, they stopped. However, it was not all of them that obeyed ‘Umar’s decree. The vast majority did; but, a few – along with their disciples – continued to uphold the Verse of *Mut’ah* and the *Sunnah*. Imam Ibn Hazm (d. 456 H) gives us some of their names:

> وقد ثبت على تحليلها بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم جماعة من السلف، رضي الله عنهم، منهم من الصحابة، رضي الله عنهم، أسماء بنت أبي بكر الصديق، وجابر بن عبدالله، وابن مسعود، وابن عباس، ومعاوية بن أبي سفيان، وعمرو بن حريث، وأبو سعيد الخدري، وسلمة، ومعبد ابنا أمية بن خلف.
>
> ورواه جابر بن عبدالله، عن جميع الصحابة مدة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ومدة أبي بكر وعمر إلى قرب آخر خلافة عمر. واختلف في إباحتها، عن ابن الزبير، وعن علي فيها توقف. وعن عمر بن الخطاب أنه إنما أنكرها إذا لم يشهد عليها عدلان فقط، وأباحها بشهادة عدلين.
>
> ومن التابعين: طاووس، وعطاء، وسعيد بن جبير، وسائر فقهاء مكة أعزها الله.

A group of the *Salaf*, may Allah be pleased with them, were FIRM in declaring it *halal* AFTER the Messenger of Allah. Those of them from the Sahabah, may Allah be pleased with them, were Asma bint Abi Bakr al-Siddiq, Jabir b. ‘Abd Allah, Ibn Mas’ud, Ibn ‘Abbas, Mu’awiyah b. Abi Sufyan, ‘Amr b. Hurayth, Abu Sa’id al-Khudri, and Salamah and Ma’bad – sons of Umayyah b. Khalaf.

Jabir b. ‘Abd Allah also reported it (i.e. declaration of *mut’ah* as *halal*) from all the Sahabah during the time of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, and during the time of Abu Bakr and ‘Umar until near the end of the caliphate of ‘Umar. Ibn al-Zubayr had contradictory opinions on its permissibility, while ‘Ali expressed no opinion concerning it. It is narrated that ‘Umar b. al-Kha□□ab only denied it if two just people did not act as its witnesses, and he considered it permissible if two just people acted as witnesses to it.

And among the Tabi’in were: □awus, ‘A□a, Sa’id b. Jubayr, and the rest of the jurists of Makkah, may Allah honour it.[8]

So, all the Sahabah – including Abu Bakr and ‘Umar – considered *mut’ah* to be *halal* throughout the lifetime of the Prophet, and throughout the rule of Abu Bakr. For most of the era of ‘Umar, all the Sahabah generally affirmed the permissibility of *mut’ah*. However, at the end of his caliphate, he made it *haram*; and that changed everything. The generality of the Sahabah obeyed him; and only a handful remained steadfast in affirming the permissibility of temporary marriage. Some of the Tabi’in also

proclaimed it *halal*. However, the number of the pro-*mut'ah* elements continued to dwindle among the Ahl al-Sunnah, until none – or almost none - accepted it anymore. The Shi'is, on their part, have remained unshakable and unyielding on the permissibility of temporary marriage – from the time of the Messenger till this very day of ours.

But, is it not strange? According to the theory of the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Prophet declared *mut'ah* to be *haram* before his death. Yet, the Sahabah as a whole paid no heed to his words. They continued to regard *mut'ah* as *halal*, and also continued to practise it. When Abu Bakr became caliph, he too made zero efforts to enforce the alleged decree of the Messenger. Instead, he allowed the *Ummah* to freely engage in *mut'ah*. 'Umar also did not give a damn: he let the Sahabah marry people temporarily for most of his rule.

However, he became upset when 'Amr b. Hurayth took it too far by contracting *mut'ah* with a slave woman. He asked 'Amr: "So, why not other than her?" At that point, he declared it *haram*. Then, the same Sahabah who refused to respect the decree of their Prophet followed 'Umar. Most of them abandoned *mut'ah*, and started to oppose it. A few of them, however, remained adamantly in defence of it, and used to practise it, till death.

Is this really a credible theory? Do the Ahl al-Sunnah truly want us to view the Sahabah as people who disregarded the words of their Messenger? Is that it? Do Sunnis seriously want us to believe that the words of 'Umar carried more weight in the sight of the Sahabah than those of Allah and His Prophet? Do they want us to consider the Sahabah as those who indulged in illegal sex during the lifetime of Muhammad, and he did not stop them?! What about Abu Bakr? The Sunni theory assumes that he too condoned the fornication and adultery of the Sahabah during his caliphate.

Is that it? What of caliph 'Umar? Yeah, he permitted *zina* among the people until 'Amr b. Hurayth irritated him by doing it with a slave woman. If 'Amr had not extended the pleasure to the lowest rung of the caste system, he possibly could have tolerated *mut'ah* till his death! Interestingly. The great caliph made no attempt to lash or stone 'Amr for either fornication or adultery. Why was that?!

Or, was it that the generality of the Sahabah only happened to have missed the declaration of the Prophet on *mut'ah*, as many Sunnis claim? Can a kid believe that? The Messenger supposedly announced its prohibition multiple times in public among his Sahabah. Yet, somehow, that information never reached them until when 'Umar re-banned it! Was that really it? What about Abu Bakr? He allowed *mut'ah* throughout his regime. He too never got wind of its prohibition by the Prophet? Where was he when the alleged decree of the prohibition of *mut'ah* was being publicly announced by the Messenger himself, on different occasions? Was he then on Mars? What of 'Umar? Our Sunni brothers argue that he knew of the prohibition and had only enforced it.

Good! But then, why did he initially permit it? He forgot the *hadith*? Why did he not narrate it to Abu Bakr? Moreover, did that *hadith* reach Ibn 'Abbas, Jabir b. 'Abd Allah, Mu'awiyah and other Sahabah

from him? Or did those Sahabah happen to miss the public narration of the *riwayah* once more? If yes, why were they constantly missing the *hadith*? Then, why did none of the majority of the other Sahabah who followed ‘Umar make any attempt to narrate it to them? Or, did they hear it? If yes, why then did they continue to defend the permissibility of *mut’ah*? Why did they continue to practise it? Were they deliberately defending and committing *zina*? But, to what ends was that?

From whatever angle one looks at it, *mut’ah* is always an impossible situation for our Sunni brothers. If they accept its permissibility, ‘Umar takes a very devastating hit. Yet, if they proclaim its prohibition, a lot of the other Sahabah lose a lot of things within the *Ummah*! From our judgment, many Sunnis attack *mut’ah* in order to defend the honour of ‘Umar. However, little do they realize that they are only destroying that of other Sahabah, including Abu Bakr!

But, what is the truth about *mut’ah*? Did Allah truly reveal an *ayah* about it? If yes, was it ever abrogated? Can a *hadith* abrogate a verse of the Qur’an? What is the status of any *riwayah* that attempts to do that? How exactly is *mut’ah* practised? What are its conditions, restrictions and formalities? Is it really how most of the Ahl al-Sunnah picture it in their minds? Is it *zina* in truth? Is it illegal? Is it immoral? Is it a shame or an honour? Can it be contracted with a depraved man, woman or girl? Is it truly a “mercy” from Allah as Ibn ‘Abbas claimed? Or, is it a curse for the *Ummah*? Is it a legitimate marriage? Or, is it only a perversion? In this book, we will be investigating these and other questions, in order to find what really happened in the early history of Islam, about *mut’ah*?

We must find out how we got where we are today, so that we could correct any wrong steps in the past and move to our Lord on a smoother path. This, we will be doing in this exploratory research of ours. We seek Allah’s Help in this effort, and we implore Him to forgive us all our mistakes in it, and to accept it as a worthy act of *‘ibadah*. And may Allah send His *salawat* and *barakat* upon our master, Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah, and upon his purified offspring.

We will leave this preface with a beautiful *athar* recorded by ‘Abd al-Razzaq about Sa’id b. Jubayr – one of the greatest Imams of the Ahl al-Sunnah throughout history. This is part of what al-Hafi has documented about him:

> وقال يعقوب القمي عن جعفر بن أبي المغيرة :كان ابن عباس إذا أتاه أهل الكوفة يستفتونه يقول أليس فيكم ابن أم الدهماء يعني سعيد بن جبير وقال عمرو بن ميمون عن أبيه لقد مات سعيد بن جبير وما على ظهر الأرض أحد إلا وهو محتاج إلى علمه ... وقال أبو قاسم الطبري هو ثقة إمام حجة على المسلمين قتل في شعبان سنة خمس وتسعين وهو ابن ٤٩ سنة ... وكان سفيان يقدم سعيدا على إبراهيم في العلم وكان أعلم من مجاهد وطاووس

Ya’qub al-Qummi narrated that Ja’far b. Abi al-Mughirah said: “Whenever the people of Kufah came to Ibn ‘Abbas to seek his *fatwa*, he used to say, ‘Is there not among you Ibn Umm al-Dahma?’ referring to Sa’id b. Jubayr’” ‘Amr b. Maymun also reported that his father said: “Sa’id b. Jubayr died while there was no one on the face of the earth who did not need his knowledge” ... Abu Qasim al-abari said: “**He**

was *thiqah* (trustworthy), an Imam, a *hujjah* upon the Muslims. He was murdered in Sha'ban 95 H while he was 49 years old" ... Sufyan used to consider Sa'id superior to Ibrahim in knowledge, **and he was more knowledgeable than Mujahid and ▯awus**. 9

This same Ibn Jubayr examined the Sunni arguments and "proofs" against *mut'ah*. Then, he drew his conclusion about it. 'Abd al-Razzaq records:

> عبد الرزاق عن ابن جريج قال: أخبرني عبد الله بن عثمان بن خثيم قال: كانت بمكة امرأة عراقية تنسك جميلة، لها ابن يقال له أبو أمية، وكان سعد بن جبير يكثر الدخول عليها، قلت: يا أبا عبد الله ما أكثر ما تدخل على هذه المرأة، قال: إنا قد نكحناها ذلك النكاح ـ للمتعة ـ قال: وأخبرني أن سعيد قال له: هي أحل من شرب الماء ـ للمتعة.

'Abd al-Razzaq – Ibn Jurayj – 'Abd Allah b. 'Uthman b. Khaytham:

There was a pious, beautiful Iraqi woman in Makkah. She had a son called Abu Umayyah; and Sa'd b. Jubayr10 used to enter upon her a lot. I said, "O Abu 'Abd Allah! Why do you frequently enter upon this woman?" He said, "We have married her in that marriage", referring to *mut'ah*.

He (Ibn Jurayj) said: He ('Abd Allah) informed me that Sa'id said to him: "**IT IS MORE *HALAL* THAN THE DRINKING OF WATER," referring to *mut'ah***.11

Only 'Abd Allah needs an introduction here. Al-Hafi▯ says about him:

> عبد الله بن عثمان بن خثيم بالمعجمة والمثلثة مصغرا القاري المكي أبو عثمان صدوق

'Abd Allah b. 'Uthman b. Khaytham al-Qari al-Makki, Abu 'Uthman: ***Saduq* (very truthful)**.12

Therefore, the report is *hasan*.

1. Abu Bakr 'Abd al-Razzaq b. Hamam al-▯a'nani, al-Mu▯annaf [annotator: Habib al-Rahman al-A'▯ami], vol. 7, pp. 496-497, # 14021
2. Shihab al-Din Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani, Fath al-Bari Sharh ▯ahih al-Bukhari (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah li al-▯aba'ah wa al-Nashr; 2nd edition), vol. 9, p. 151
3. Muhammad Na▯ir al-Din al-Albani, Irwa al-Ghalil fi Takhrij Ahadith Manar al-Sabil (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islami; 2nd edition, 1405 H), vol. 4, p. 244, # 1050
4. Muhammad Na▯ir al-Din al-Albani, Irwa al-Ghalil fi Takhrij Ahadith Manar al-Sabil (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islami; 2nd edition, 1405 H), vol. 3, p. 97, # 629. We do not agree with the conjecture of al-Albani here, that the clearly 'an-'an reportage of Ibn Jurayj also means that he had "heard" the riwayah.
5. Abu Bakr 'Abd al-Razzaq b. Hamam al-▯a'nani, al-Mu▯annaf [annotator: Habib al-Rahman al-A'▯ami], vol. 7, p. 499, # 14025
6. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Hajar al-'Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mu▯tafa 'Abd al-Qadir 'A▯a], vol. 2, p. 132, # 6310
7. Abu Bakr 'Abd al-Razzaq b. Hamam al-▯a'nani, al-Mu▯annaf [annotator: Habib al-Rahman al-A'▯ami], vol. 7, p. 500, # 14029

8. Abu Muhammad ‘Ali b. Ahmad b. Sa’id b. Hazm al-Andalusi al-Qurtubi al-Zahiri, al-Muhalla (Dar al-Fikr li al-Tiba’ah wa al-Nashr wa al-Tawzi’), vol. 9, pp. 519-520

9. Shihab al-Din Ahmad b. ‘Ali b. Hajar al-‘Asqalani, Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (Dar al-Fikr; 1st edition, 1404 H), vol. 4, pp. 11-13, # 14

10. The correct spelling is Sa’id b. Jubayr. A letter has been omitted in “Sa’id”. This is most probably a scribal error. Meanwhile, later in the same athar, the name has been spelt correctly.

11. Abu Bakr ‘Abd al-Razzaq b. Hamam al-Sa’nani, al-Musannaf [annotator: Habib al-Rahman al-A’zami], vol. 7, p. 496, # 14020

12. Ahmad b. ‘Ali b. Hajar al-‘Asqalani, Taqrib al-Tahdhib (Beirut: Dar al-Maktabah al-‘Ilmiyyah; 2nd edition, 1415 H) [annotator: Mustafa ‘Abd al-Qadir ‘Ata], vol. 1, p. 513, # 3477

Source URL:

https://www.al-islam.org/nikah-al-mutah-zina-or-sunnah-toyib-olawuyi/preface#comment-0