

تفسير المنظوم

شَرْحُ

الْمِنْظُومَةِ الْبَيْقُونِيَّةِ

فِي عِلْمِ مُصْطَلَحِ الْحَدِيثِ

A COMMENTARY ON THE POEM

AL-BAYQUNIYYAH

SHAYKH MUHAMMAD IBN SĀLIH AL-'UTHAYMĪN



بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

“The house of al-Arqam is the house of Islam”

Al-Hakim (d. 403 H.) in *al-Mustadrak 'Ala al-Sahihayn* (6185)

A Commentary on the Poem al-Bayqūniyyah

By Shaykh Muhammad ibn Sālih al-
'Uthaymīn



ISBN: 09928136 4 2

British Library Cataloguing in Publishing Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

© Copyright 2016 Dar al-Arqam Publishing

All rights reserved worldwide. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any language, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the express permission of the publisher.

Prepared and published by: Dar al-Arqam Publishing
Birmingham, United Kingdom

www.daralarqam.bigcartel.com
Email: daralarqam@hotmail.co.uk

Translated by S. 'Abdullah
Edited by A. Karim

Printed in Turkey by Mega | export@mega.com

A Commentary on the Poem al-Bayqūniyyah

By Shaykh Muhammad ibn Sālih al-
‘Uthaymīn

[A translation of his work: *Sharh al-Manzūmah al-Bayqūniyyah fī Mustalah al-Hadīth*. Which is a commentary on the classical poem on *hadīth* terminology by Imām al-Bayqūnī al-Shāfi’ī.]

Contents

The Text of <i>al-Manzūmah al-Bayqūniyyah</i>	9
A Brief Biography of the Composer	19
An Introduction to the Science of <i>Hadīth</i> Terminology	21
A Commentary on <i>al-Manzūmah al-Bayqūniyyah</i>	25
An Explanation of the <i>Basmallah</i> and the Opening Words of the Composer	25
The Categories of <i>Hadīth</i>	38
The <i>Sahīh</i> Narration and its Criterion	42
Other Criteria of the <i>Sahīh</i> and Matters Related to the Praise and Criticism of Narrators	50
Topics of <i>Hadīth</i>	59
The <i>Hasan</i> Narration	65
The <i>Da'īf</i> Narration and Its Categories	67
The <i>Marfū'</i> and the <i>Maqtū'</i>	72
The <i>Musnad</i> and Its Criterion	83
The <i>Muttasil</i> and Its Criterion	87
The <i>Musalsal</i> and Its Example	91
One of the Illustrations of <i>Musalsal</i> and Its Example	94
The <i>'Azīz</i> and the <i>Mash-hūr</i>	96
The <i>Mu'an'an</i> and the <i>Mubham</i>	103
The <i>'Alā</i> and the <i>Nāzil</i>	107
The <i>Mawqūf</i> and Its Criterion	110

The <i>Mursal</i>	112
The <i>Gharīb</i>	114
The <i>Munqati</i> and Its Criterion	116
The <i>Mu'dal</i> and the <i>Mudallas</i>	119
The <i>Shāth</i> and the <i>Maqlūb</i>	127
The Categories of <i>Maqlūb</i>	136
The <i>Fard</i> and Its Types	143
The <i>Mu'allal</i> Narration	147
The <i>Mudtarīb</i> and Its Explanation	150
The <i>Mudrajāt</i> in <i>Hadīth</i>	158
The <i>Mudabbaj</i>	162
The <i>Muttafaq</i> and the <i>Muftaraq</i>	164
The <i>Mu'talif</i> and the <i>Mukhtalif</i>	166
The <i>Munkar</i> and Its Explanation	169
The <i>Matrūk</i> and Its Explanation	171
The <i>Mawdū'</i> and Its Explanation	173
The Number of Lines in the Poem and Its Conclusion	176

متن المنظومة البيقونية
THE TEXT OF AL-MANZŪMAH AL-
BAYQŪNIYYAH

١: أَبْدَأُ بِالْحَمْدِ مُصَلِّياً عَلَى
مُحَمَّدٍ خَيْرِ نَبِيِّ أَرْسَلَ

*(1) I begin with praise, and prayers and salutations,
Upon Muhammad the finest prophet ever given the message.*

٢: وَذِي مِنْ أَقْسَامِ الْحَدِيثِ عِدَّةٌ
وَكُلُّ وَاحِدٍ أَتَى وَحَدَّهُ

*(2) And these are a number of categories of hadith,
Each one having come with its definition.*

٣: أَوَّلُهَا الصَّحِيحُ وَهُوَ مَا اتَّصَلَ

إِسْنَادُهُ وَلَمْ يَشُدَّ أَوْ يُعَلَّ

(3) *The first of them is saḥīḥ which is what is connected,
In its chain, and is neither contradicting nor defected.*

٤: يَرْوِيهِ عَدْلٌ ضَابِطٌ عَنْ مِثْلِهِ

مُعْتَمَدٌ فِي ضَبْطِهِ وَنَقْلِهِ

(4) *Narrated by one who is just and precise from his like,
Reliable in his precision and his transmission.*

٥: وَالْحَسَنُ الْمَعْرُوفُ طُرُقًا وَغَدَتْ

رِجَالُهُ لَا كَالصَّحِيحِ اشْتَهَرَتْ

(5) *Al-ḥasan is the one whose chains are known but,
Whose transmitters are not as famous as the saḥīḥ.*

٦: وَكُلُّ مَا عَنْ رُتْبَةِ الْحُسْنِ قَصُرُ

فَهُوَ الضَّعِيفُ وَهُوَ أَقْسَامًا كَثُرُ

(6) *All that falls below the rank of ḥasan,
Is thus da'īf and it has many categories.*

٧: وَمَا أُضِيفَ لِلنَّبِيِّ الْمَرْفُوعُ

وَمَا لِتَابِعٍ هُوَ الْمَقْطُوعُ

- (7) *What was attributed to the Prophet is known as al-marfū',
While the one to a tābi'i is known as al-maqtū'.*

٨: وَالْمُسْنَدُ الْمُتَّصِلُ الْإِسْنَادِ مِنْ

رَاوِيهِ حَتَّى الْمُصْطَفَى وَلَمْ يَبْنِ

- (8) *The musnad is that whose isnād is connected from,
Its narrator up to the Chosen One and not detached.*

٩: وَمَا بِسَمْعٍ كُلِّ رَاوٍ يَتَّصِلُ

إِسْنَادُهُ لِلْمُصْطَفَى فَالْمُتَّصِلُ

- (9) *And one whose chain, by every narrator's bearing,
Is connected to al-Mustafā is the muttasil.*

١٠: مُسْلَسَلٌ قُلُوبًا عَلَى وَصْفٍ أَتَى

مِثْلُ أَمَّا وَاللَّهِ أَنَّبَانِي الْفَتَى

- (10) *Say musalsal is one which comes with a description,
Such as: "Indeed by Allāh, the youth informed me.*

١١: كَذَلِكَ قَدْ حَدَّثَنِيهِ قَائِمًا

أَوْ بَعْدَ أَنْ حَدَّثَنِي تَبَسُّمًا

(11) Similarly: "Indeed he narrated it to me while standing."

Or "After he narrated it to me he smiled.

١٢: عَزِيزٌ مَرْوِي اثْنَيْنِ أَوْ ثَلَاثَةً

مَشْهُورٌ مَرْوِي فَوْقَ مَا ثَلَاثَةً

(12) 'Azīz is narrated by two or three,

Mash-hūr is narrated by more than three.

١٣: مُعْنَعَنْ كَعَنْ سَعِيدٍ عَنْ كَرَمٍ

وَمُبْهَمٌ مَا فِيهِ رَاوٍ لَمْ يُسَمَّ

(13) Mu'an'an is like "from Sa'id from Karam,"

Mubham is that in which a narrator hasn't been named.

١٤: وَكُلُّ مَا قَلَّتْ رِجَالُهُ عَلَا

وَضِدُّهُ ذَاكَ الَّذِي قَدْ نَزَلَا

(14) That which has few narrators shall arise,

And its opposite is the one which shall descend.

١٥: وَمَا أَضْفَتْهُ إِلَى الْأَصْحَابِ مِنْ

قَوْلٍ وَفِعْلٍ فَهُوَ مَوْقُوفٌ زَكِينٌ

- (15) *And whatever you attributed to the companions such as,
A statement or an action is known as maʿwqūf.*

١٦: وَمُرْسَلٌ مِنْهُ الصَّحَابِيُّ سَقَطُ

وَقُلٌ غَرِيبٌ مَا رَوَى رَأُو فَقَطُ

- (16) *And al-mursal, from it the companion was omitted,
And say that gharīb is that which was narrated by only one.*

١٧: وَكُلُّ مَا لَمْ يَتَّصِلْ بِحَالٍ

إِسْنَادُهُ مُنْقَطِعُ الْأَوْصَالِ

- (17) *And all that is not connected in any instance,
Its chain has munqati' (severed) ties.*

١٨: وَالْمُعْضَلُ السَّاقِطُ مِنْهُ اثْنَانِ

وَمَا أَتَى مُدَلِّسًا نَوْعَانِ

- (18) *And the muḍdal has two omitted from it,
That which comes as mudallas is of two types:*

١٩: الْأَوَّلُ الْإِسْقَاطُ لِلشَّيْخِ وَأَنْ

يَنْقُلُ عَنْ مَنْ فَوْقَهُ بِعَنْ وَأَنْ

(19) *The first is omission of the shaykh and to,
Transmit from the one above him by using “an” and “anna”;*

٢٠: وَالثَّانِي لَا يُسْقِطُهُ لَكِنْ يَصِفُ

أَوْصَافَهُ بِمَا بِهِ لَا يَنْعَرِفُ

(20) *And in the second he does not omit him but he describes,
His characteristics with that by which he is not known.*

٢١: وَمَا يُخَالِفُ ثِقَّةً بِهِ الْمَلَأَ

فَالشَّاذُّ وَالْمُقْلُوبُ قِسْمَانِ تَلَا

(21) *And when a trustworthy narrator contradicts the assembly,
Is al-shāth while al-maqlūb has two types that follow:*

٢٢: إِبْدَالُ رَاوٍ مَا بَرَأَوْ قِسْمٌ

وَقَلْبُ إِسْنَادٍ لِتَيْنِ قِسْمٌ

(22) *Substituting a narrator for a narrator is a category,
And exchanging a chain of a text is a category.*

٢٣: وَالْفَرْدُ مَا قَيَّدَتْهُ بِثِقَةٍ

أَوْ جَمْعٍ أَوْ قَصْرِ عَلَى رَوَايَةٍ

- (23) *And al-fard is what you limit to a trustworthy narrator,
Or a group or a restriction upon a particular narration.*

٢٤: وَمَا بِعِلَّةٍ غُمُوضٍ أَوْ خَفَا

مُعَلَّلٌ عِنْدَهُمْ قَدْ عُرِفَا

- (24) *And that which has an obscure or hidden defect,
Is known to them as mu'allal.*

٢٥: وَذُو اخْتِلَافٍ سَنَدٍ أَوْ مَتْنٍ

مُضْطَرِبٌ عِنْدَ أَهْلِ الْفَنِّ

- (25) *And that which has a discrepancy in a chain or text is,
Mudtarib according to the people of the art.*

٢٦: وَالْمُدْرَجَاتُ فِي الْحَدِيثِ مَا أَتَتْ

مِنْ بَعْضِ أَلْفَاظِ الرُّوَاةِ اتَّصَلَتْ

- (26) *Insertions in the hadith are what came,
From some of the words of the narrators that were connected.*

٢٧: وَمَا رَوَى كُلُّ قَرِينٍ عَنْ أَخِيهِ

مُدَبَّجٌ فَاعْرِفْهُ حَقًّا وَانْتَخِ

- (27) *And what was narrated by every qarīn from his associate,
Is mudabbaj, know it well and be proud of it.*

٢٨: مُتَّفِقٌ لَفْظًا وَخَطًّا مُتَّفِقٌ

وَضِدُّهُ فِيمَا ذَكَرْنَا الْمُفْتَرِقُ

- (28) *Identical in pronunciation and writing is muttāfiq,
While the opposite of what we mentioned is muftariq.*

٢٩: مُؤْتَلِفٌ مُتَّفِقُ الْخَطِّ فَقَطْ

وَضِدُّهُ مُخْتَلِفٌ فَاخْشَ الْغَلَطَ

- (29) *Mu'talif is similar only in writing,
And its opposite is mukhtalif, so beware of mistakes.*

٣٠: وَالْمُنْكَرُ الْفَرْدُ بِهِ رَأَوْ غَدَا

تَعْدِيلُهُ لَا يَحْمِلُ التَّفْرُدَا

- (30) *Munkar is the singular narration by a narrator,
Whose standing does not allow for a singular narration.*

٣١: مَتْرُوكُهُ مَا وَاحِدٌ بِهِ انْفَرَدَ

وَأَجْمَعُوا لِضَعْفِهِ فَهُوَ كَرَدٌ

(31) *Matrūk is that in which there is a solitary narrator,
And they agreed upon its weakness like the rejected.*

٣٢: وَالْكَذِبُ الْمُخْتَلَقُ الْمَصْنُوعُ

عَلَى النَّبِيِّ فَذَلِكَ الْمَوْضُوعُ

(32) *And the lie which was fabricated and created,
Upon the Prophet is thus al-mawdū'.*

٣٣: وَقَدْ أَتَتْ كَالْجَوْهَرِ الْمَكْنُونِ

سَمَّيْتُهَا مَنْظُومَةَ الْبَيْقُونِي

(33) *Indeed it came like a hidden gem,
Which I have entitled "The Poem of al-Bayqūnī".*

٣٤: فَوْقَ الثَّلَاثِينَ بِأَرْبَعٍ أَتَتْ

أَقْسَامُهَا تَمَّتْ بِخَيْرٍ خُتِمَتْ

(34) *It came with four above thirty,
Its sections, concluded and sealed with goodness.*

الناظم رحمه الله تعالى

A BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF THE COMPOSER

He - may Allāh have mercy on him - is known for the poem, *al-Manzūmah al-Bayqūniyyah* in the science of *mustalah al-hadīth*. The attribution of this poem to him is apparent in the thirty-third line:

وَقَدْ أَتَتْ كَالْجَوْهَرِ الْمَكْنُونِ
سَمَّيْتُهَا مَنْظُومَةَ الْبَيْقُونِي

(33) *Indeed it came like a hidden gem,
Which I have entitled "The Poem of al-Bayqūnī".*

His name: 'Umar¹ and it was said that he was Taha² Ibn Muhammad Ibn Futūh al-Bayqūnī al-Dimashqī al-Shāfi'ī.

¹ *Mu'jam al-Mu'allifin* by 'Umar Rida Kuhālah (volume 2, page 18, published in 1414 H. by Mu'assasah al-Risālah, Beirut).

² *Al-A'lām* by al-Zirqānī (volume 5, page 64).

Regarding his *laqab* (nickname) “al-Bayqūnī”: It is not known if the origin of this name is an attribution to the country he came from or his father etc.

As for his year of decease, may Allāh have mercy on him: It was mentioned by those who wrote about him that he was alive before the year 1080 H.³

³ *Al-A'lām* by al-Zirqānī (volume 5, page 64).

مقدمة في علم مصطلح الحديث

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF HADĪTH TERMINOLOGY

In the Name of Allāh, the Entirely Merciful, the Especially Merciful. Verily all praise is due to Allāh, we praise Him and seek His Assistance and Forgiveness, and we seek refuge in Allāh from the evils of our souls and our bad deeds. Whomsoever Allāh guides, none can mislead him, and whomsoever He leaves astray, there is none who can guide him. I bear witness that there is no god rightful of being worshipped except Allāh alone without ascribing partners to Him, and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger, may Allāh Bestow His blessings, peace and salutations upon him, his family, companions and all those following them in goodness until the Day of Judgement.

To proceed:

In this opening section we will provide a brief introduction to the science of *mustalah al-hadīth* (terminology of *hadīth*):

The science of *mustalah* is the study of the status of the narrator and

the narration in terms of acceptance and rejection.

From the benefits of this knowledge is to purify and clarify the evidence of *ḥadīth* from distortions such as *da'if ḥadīths* (weak narrations) etc., in order to be able to make conclusions from it because the one making inferences from the Sunnah requires two conditions and they are:

1. That it is proven to be narrated from the Prophet ﷺ.
2. And that its use as a proof for the ruling is justified.

As such, careful analysis of the Sunnah is something of extreme importance. This is because important matters are built upon it, such as Allāh's Commands to His servants to perform acts of worship, beliefs and mannerisms etc.

This kind of analysis of the Sunnah is specific to the *ḥadīth* corpus. This is because the Qur'ān has been widely and unanimously transmitted by the Ummah with certainty in terms of its recitation and meanings, passed down from generation to generation. As such, there is no need to prove its authenticity.

Following which, know that the science of *mustalah* is divided into two categories:

1. The science of *ḥadīth* in terms of *riwāyah* (narration).
2. The science of *ḥadīth* in terms of *derāyah* (reasoning).

As for the science in terms of *riwāyah*, it is the study of what was nar-

rated from the Prophet ﷺ from his sayings, actions and circumstances. And what was narrated is the focus of the study and not the narration itself.

For example, if there is a *hadith* narrated from the Prophet ﷺ, we shall find out if it is a saying, an action or a circumstance.

And whether it implies such and such or it doesn't.

Hence, this is the science of *hadith* in terms of *riwāyah*, and it studies the Prophet ﷺ himself and what comes from him such as his sayings, actions and circumstances, and his actions include his endorsements as this is taken to be an act. His circumstances include his characteristics such as height, shortness, skin colour, anger, happiness etc.

As for the science in terms of *derāyah*, it is the study of the circumstances of the narrator and the narration, concerning its acceptance or rejection.

For example: if we found a narrator, we shall find out if this narrator can be accepted or if he is to be rejected.

As for the narration, it is the study of what can be accepted from it and what has to be rejected.

Therefore, we learn that the acceptance of a narrator does not mean that the narration is acceptable as the chain of narrations could be comprised of reliable and righteous narrators but the *matn* (text) could be *shāth* (contradictory) or having an *'illah* (defect) and henceforth we cannot accept it. Similarly the case whereby sometimes the chain of narrators may not be acceptable and reliable to a certain extent but

the *ḥadīth* itself is acceptable due to the presence of other supporting evidences from the Qur'ān and the Sunnah or the principles of the *Sharī'ah* (legislation) that testify for it.

So the benefit of the science of *mustalah al-ḥadīth* is the identification of what is acceptable and rejected from the *ḥadīth*.

And this is very important in itself because the *Sharī'ah* rulings are dependent upon whether the evidence is confirmed or not, and its authenticity or weakness.

The author.

شرح المنظومة البيقونية
A COMMENTARY ON AL-MANZŪMAH AL-
BAYQŪNIYYAH

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
In the Name of Allāh, the Entirely Merciful, the Especially Merciful.

The *basmalah* is an ayah from the Book of Allāh ﷻ. Hence, it is from the Speech of Allāh. Each *sūrah* of the Holy Qur'ān begins with it except *Sūrah Barā'ah* (*Sūrah Tawbah*, named here after its opening words i.e. {*Barā'atun min Allāhi wa rasūlibī...*}) as it does not start with the *basmalah* following the way of the Companions. If the *basmalah* was revealed at the start of this *sūrah*, it would have been preserved just like in the rest of the *sūrahs* but it was not revealed as such to the Prophet ﷺ. However, the Companions would sometimes become confused whether *Sūrah Barā'ah* is part of *Sūrah al-Anfāl* or

whether it is an independent *sūrah*. Thus they put a divider between the two without the *basmalah*.

In the *basmalah*, there is a *jār* (preposition) and a *majrūr* (noun of the preposition), a *mudāf ilayhi* (possessor) and a *sifah* (adjective).

As for the *jār* and the *majrūr*, it is “*bism*” (in the name).

The *mudāf ilayhi* is the *lafzul jalālah* (Majestic word): “Allāh”.

And the *sifah* is “*al-rahmān al-rahīm*” (the Entirely Merciful, the Especially Merciful).

And every *jār* and *majrūr* must have an attachment either to a *fi’il* (verb) such as “stood” or its meaning such as *ism al-fā’il* (the doer) or *ism al-maf’ūl* (the direct object) for example.

As such, the *basmalah* is attached to an erased attachment, so what is this erased attachment?

The grammarians differed in the assessment of this erased attachment, but the best of what has been said and the correct opinion is that the erased attachment is a verb appropriate to the situation delayed in the order of the sentence structure.

For example, if a man said, “In the Name of Allāh,” and he wants to read the poem (i.e. *al-Bayqūniyyah*), then the assessment of what it alludes to is, “In the Name of Allāh I read”. And if the composer of a poem is the one who says, “In the Name of Allāh”, then the assessment is, “In the Name of Allāh I compose”.

Why did we assess the meaning using a verb and not an *ism al-fā'il* (the doer) for example?

We say: we deciphered it as a verb because verbs are the basis of any action and hence this act works without any conditions, while actions of the other nominal factors need to have a condition.

And why did we analyse the verb as being delayed in the order of the sentence structure?

We say that it is delayed for two reasons:

1. To begin the sentence with the Name of Allāh ﷻ on the right such that it precedes the action, and it is rightful for Him to precede.
2. To bring about a restriction of the statement. Delaying the verb or the action achieves this goal. Stating Allāh's name first brings a connotation of singularity. As such, if you say, "In the Name of Allāh I read", it means that you read the Name of Allāh and not in the name of other than Him.

We also assess the appropriate verb according to the situation because it is indicative of the meaning and it does not occur to the mind of the speaker of the *basmalah* except this meaning.

For example: a man who says, "In the Name of Allāh" when he is performing his ablution. If it was asked to him what he meant by saying, "In the Name of Allāh," he would reply, "In the Name of Allāh I make my ablution."

If someone were to say, "I want to assess the attachment to the *bas-malah* as 'I begin with.'"

We say: there is nothing wrong with that, but the verb "I begin" is a general statement that can include your other actions such as eating, making ablution and composing a poem. And as we have said, this intended meaning does not come to the mind of the speaker of the *basmalah*.

As for the noun *ism* (name), it is derived from the word "*al-sumū*" which means highness.

It is also said that it comes from the word "*al-simah*" which means the sign of something.

Regardless of the root of *al-ism*, here it refers to all the beautiful names of Allāh, not specific to any name in particular despite its singular form. This is due to the principle that states that any singular *mudāf* (possession) connotes generality. Henceforth it is understood from one who says, "In the Name of Allāh", that he intends all of the beautiful Names of Allāh. As such you will find that the one who says, "In the Name of Allāh", it does not occur to him a certain name such as *al-Rahmān* (the Entirely Merciful) or *al-Rahim* (the Especially Merciful) or *al-Ghafūr* (the Forgiving) or *al-Wadūd* (the Affectionate) or *al-Shakūr* (the Grateful) etc. The one making the statement intends generalisation. And the evidence that shows that the singular *mudāf* connotes generality is the ayah: **{And if you should count the favour [i.e. blessings] of Allāh, you could not enumerate them.}**¹ If what is meant in the ayah is a single favour, "you could not enumerate them"

¹ Ibrāhīm: 34

would not have been said. In light of this, the meaning of the *basmalah* is, “I start my action with every one of all the beautiful Names of Allāh ﷻ.”

Is the preposition *bā* in the phrase “*bism*” for the sake of *al-isti’ānah* (seeking assistance) or for *al-musāhabah* (accompaniment)?

There are those who say that it is for the sake of *al-isti’ānah*.

And there are others who say that it is for the sake of *al-musāhabah*.

Amongst those who said that it is for the sake of *al-musāhabah* is al-Zamakhsharī who is the author of *al-Kashāf* and he is a Mu’tazilite from the Mu’tazilah sect. His book *al-Kashāf* contains a great amount of the *i’tizāl* ideologies that not many could identify within it. In fact, al-Balqīnī said, “I extracted the *i’tizāl* ideologies from *al-Kashāf* using chisels,” which shows that they were hidden.

Al-Zamakhsharī favoured the opinion that the preposition *bā* is for *al-musāhabah* even though it is obvious that it is for *al-isti’ānah*! He favoured *al-musāhabah* because the Mu’tazilites view that man is independent in his actions, as such he does not require assistance to perform them.

However, it is beyond doubt that the preposition *bā* refers to *al-isti’ānah* that accompanies every action due to the fact that it is originally for seeking assistance which accompanies the person from the start of the action until the end. It could also refer to another meaning which is *al-tabarruk* (the seeking of blessings). If we do not take *al-isti’ānah* as carrying the meaning of *al-tabarruk*, we can still say that every person seeking assistance with something is seeking its blessings as well.

“Allāh”: *Lafz al-jalālah* (word of the Majestic) is a name of the Highest Self which is not assigned to anyone other than Him. And it is derived from the word *al-ulūhiyyah* (divinity) and its origin is the word *ilāh* (god) but the letter *hamzah* was deleted and replaced with the prefix “*al*” and thus it becomes Allāh.

And it was said that its root word is from *al-ilāh* (the god) and that the prefix *al* is present originally in its structure and the letter *hamzah* was deleted to ease pronunciation just like it was deleted from *al-nās* (the people) which was originally *al-unās*, and just like *khayr* (good) and *sharr* (evil) and the original forms are *akhayr* and *asharr* respectively.

The meaning of Allāh is taken from the word *al-ulūhiyyah* which is defined as worship with love and glorification. It is said that the phrase, “*Alaha ilayhi*” (he idolises him) means that he yearns for him, loves him, turns to him and glorifies him.

As such, it is derived from *al-ulūhiyyah*, from which arises love and glorification.

Thus the word *ilāh* means *ma'lūh* which is the one worshipped.

And does the word structure *fi'āl* imply the meaning of *maf'ūl* (the direct object)?

We say: Yes. For example; the word *firāsh* (mattress) refers to the *mafrūsh* (the object that was slept on), *binā'* (building) refers to the *mabnū'* (the object that was built), and *ghirās* (plant) refers to the *maghrūs* (the object being planted).

As for *al-Rahmān*, it is an adjective to the *lafz al-jalālah*. It is also one

of the names of Allāh ﷻ which signifies mercy. And all those who describe mercy actually describe the effects of mercy. For example, if one says, "I had mercy on the young child." Does it mean that the word mercy here refers to the kindness demonstrated towards him?

The answer is no because kindness is an effect of mercy.

As such, mercy is mercy! Hence we are unable to define mercy or describe its extent with any other clearer term.

Thus we say that the meaning of mercy is clear. However, how the mercy is with regards to Allāh ﷻ is unknown but its effects are known. As such, *al-Rahmān* is one of the Names of Allāh which implies mercy.

As for *al-Rahīm*, it is a noun which encompasses mercy.

Does *al-Rahīm* mean *al-Rahmān* or does it have a different meaning?

Some scholars said that it has the same meaning as *al-Rahmān*. As such, the second word is an emphasis of the first and does not come with a separate meaning. However other scholars said that it has a different meaning and it is not possible that it has the same meaning as *al-Rahmān* due to two reasons:

1. The basis of speech is for *al-ta'sīs* (to establish a new meaning) and not for *al-tawkīd* (an emphasis of the previous meaning) which means that if someone told us that this word is an emphasis for the previous word, we would tell him that originally it is a separate word with a meaning other than the previous. This is because the basis of *tawkīd* is redundancy, and the basis of speech is to avoid redundancy.

2. The difference in word structure between the two words. *Al-Rahmān* is upon the structure of *fi'lān* while *al-Rahīm* is upon the structure *fa'il*. And the principle in Arabic language states that a difference in word structure implies a difference in meaning.

Therefore, the meaning should be different, so what is the difference?

Some scholars say that *al-Rahmān* signifies universal mercy while *al-Rahīm* signifies specific mercy. This is because there are two categories of Allāh's Mercy:

1. *Rahmah 'āmmah* (universal mercy); which is for all creation.
2. *Rahmah khāsah* (specific mercy); which is only for the believers as mentioned in the ayah: **{And ever is He, to the believers, Merciful.}**²

And some of the scholars said that *al-Rahmān* signifies an attribute while *al-Rahīm* signifies an action. As such, *al-Rahmān* means the possessor of immense mercy and *al-Rahīm* refers to the transmission of mercy to the blessed. Thus, the attribute can be observed in *al-Rahmān* and the action can be observed in *al-Rahīm*.

And my preferred opinion is the second one, whereby *al-Rahmān* implies an attribute and *al-Rahīm* implies an action.

² Al-Ahzāb: 43

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

أَبْدَأُ بِالْحَمْدِ مُصَلِّياً عَلَى
مُحَمَّدٍ خَيْرِ نَبِيِّ أَرْسَلَ

(1) *I begin with praise, and prayers and salutations,
Upon Muhammad the finest prophet ever given the message.*

His saying: "I begin with praise" gives the idea that he did not mention the *basmalah*. If he began with the *basmalah*, it should have been the first line. As such, one may doubt that the author began with the *basmalah*. However, the commentator mentioned that the author began the poem with the *basmalah*. Based on this, the beginning is relative i.e. in terms of the entry to the subject matter or the book.

And his phrase: "With praise, and prayers and salutations", the word "prayers and salutations" (*musalliyan*) is in the accusative case as it is the *hāl* (condition) of the *damīr* (pronoun) in *abda'u* (I begin). Thus the assessment of this phrase is, "In the condition of me saying the prayers and salutations".

The meaning of *al-hamd* (the praise), as the scholars say, is describing the perfectly praised one with love and glorification. If he described one with perfection not due to love and glorification but due to fear and dread, it is termed as *madh* (flattery) and not *hamd* (praise). This is because praise has to be coupled with the love and glorification of the praised one.

The author did not mention whom he praised but it is understood with the *qarīnah* (indication) of the circumstance. Due to the fact that the author is a Muslim, we assume that the praise is intended to praise Allāh ﷻ.

And the meaning of, "Prayers and salutations upon Muhammad" is the seeking of tribute upon him from Allāh ﷻ. This is if the *salāh* (prayers and salutations) is from humankind. If Allāh is the One who is making the *salāh*, then the meaning is that Allāh's praise is upon him in the presence of the Noble Angels. This is the opinion of Abū al-'Āliyah. As for those who say that the *salāh* from Allāh refers to mercy, it is a weak opinion due to the ayah: **{Those are the ones upon whom are blessings from their Lord and mercy.}**³ If *salāh* refers to mercy, the meaning of the ayah would be, "Those are the ones upon whom are mercies from their Lord and mercy." And this does not make sense as the basis of speech is the establishment of a new meaning. If we say, "The mercies from their Lord and mercy," it becomes a conjunction of two identical words.

So, the correct opinion is the first one which states that Allāh's *salāh* upon his servant is His praise upon him in the presence of the Noble Angels.

As for the phrase: "Upon Muhammad the finest prophet ever given the message," Muhammad is one of the names of the Prophet ﷺ. And Allāh has mentioned two of his names in the Holy Qur'ān and they are: Ahmad and Muhammad.

As for the name Ahmad, it was mentioned by Isa عليه السلام. And Isa men-

³ Al-Baqarah: 157

tioned this name either due to the fact it was not revealed to him except this name or it is to signify *tafdīl* (superlative noun) as Ahmad at its root is a superlative noun just like if you said, "*Fulān ahmadun nās*" (so and so is the noblest of the people). Thus he addressed the Children of Israel to explain his nobility.

As for the name Muhammad, it is the direct object from the verb *hamidah* (he praised him). However, the correct opinion is that Allāh revealed to Isa ﷺ as such due to two reasons:

Firstly: To explain to the Children of Israel that the Prophet ﷺ is the noblest of mankind;

Secondly: To test the Children of Israel and to put them to trial. And this is due to the fact that the Christians said, "Indeed the one that we received glad tidings from Isa about is Ahmad, while the one who came for the Arabs is Muhammad, and Ahmad is not Muhammad, thus Ahmad has yet to come." Those people are whom Allāh mentioned about in the ayah: **{As for those in whose hearts is deviation [from truth], they will follow that of it which is unspecific.}**⁴

However, we say to them that their belief that he has yet to come is false because Allāh mentioned in the same ayah: **{But when he came to them with clear evidences, they said, "This is obvious magic."}**⁵ The verb "came" in this ayah is in the past tense which means that Ahmad came and we know no one else who came after Isa ﷺ except Muhammad ﷺ.

⁴ Ali 'Imrān: 7

⁵ Al-Saff: 6

There is a difference between Ahmad and Muhammad in terms of word form and meaning.

As for the word form; Muhammad is an *ism maf'ūl* (direct object) while Ahmad is an *ism tafdīl* (superlative noun).

As for the difference between the two in terms of meaning:

In Muhammad; the action took place from the people i.e. that the people praised him.

Whereas in Ahmad; the action took place from himself, i.e. that he ﷺ is the noblest of mankind to Allāh, and the action that took place from himself is that he is the most deserving to be praised of all mankind.

As such, Muhammad is praised by action, and Ahmad in terms of being praised in the manner that he deserved because he is the most worthy of all mankind to be praised. Perhaps this is the secret behind the fact that Allāh inspired Isa to say: **{And bringing good tidings of a messenger to come after me, whose name is Ahmad.}**⁶ This was to elucidate to the Children of Israel that he is the noblest of mankind to Allāh ﷻ and that he is the most worthy of all mankind to be praised.

In the phrase, "Finest prophet ever given the message," the author here combined between prophecy and bestowment of the message. The word *nabi* (prophet) is derived from *nabā'* (news) and is upon the *fa'il* structure, which implies the meaning of *maf'ūl* (direct object). Or it is derived from *al-nubūwah* (the prophecy) i.e. the verbs *naba yanbū* which mean he has risen in the past and present tenses respectively.

⁶ Al-Saff: 6

There is no doubt that the prophet is high in ranking, and Muhammad ﷺ is the best who was given the message and prophecy. For these reasons, the author said that he is the finest prophet ever given the message.

The author here mentioned, "Prophet ever given the message," instead of, "The finest messenger ever given the message." This is because all messengers were prophets and the indication of the message upon the prophecy is inevitable as it is certain that a messenger would be a prophet as well. As such, the explicit mention of the word is more eloquent in the implication of the intended meaning. Thus the combination of the prophecy and message tells us that the author mentioned the prophecy in the text, and if he just mentioned the message alone, the meaning of prophecy would not be obvious except through deduction. And the fact that the word is indicative of the meaning in its own text is better than the deduction of its indication just like in the narration of Barra' Ibn 'Azib ؓ when the Prophet ﷺ taught him the supplication before going to sleep. When Barra' Ibn 'Azib ؓ repeated the supplication, he said, "I believe in the Messenger who You Sent." The Prophet ﷺ said to him, "No but say, 'And in the Prophet who You Sent,'" in order to ensure that the indication of the prophecy is textual. This is one perspective.

And the other perspective is that if the author had said "finest messenger", the word messenger could imply the Angel Messenger who is Jibrīl ؑ and the human Messenger who is Muhammad ﷺ! However, the author did mention the name Muhammad anyway, thus excluding Jibrīl.

The scholars named the vowel *alif* in *ursilā* (given the message) as *alif al-itlāq* i.e. for the releasing of the *rawiyy* (the last consonant and vowel of the rhyme).

أقسام الحديث THE CATEGORIES OF HADĪTH

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَذِي مِنْ أَقْسَامِ الْحَدِيثِ عِدَّةٌ
وَكُلُّ وَاحِدٍ أَتَى وَحَدَّهُ

*(2) And these are a number of categories of hadīth,
Each one having come with its definition.*

The word “*thī*” (this) is an *ism ishārah* (demonstrative noun).

And it refers to what resulted in the mind of the author. It is a reference made to something that was present and existent in reality, be it if the reference was made before or after the compilation of the poem.

As such, what was the author referring to here; is it the science of *al-derāyah* (reasoning) or *al-riwāyah* (narration)?

We say that what he meant here is the science of *al-derāyah* as he mentioned *hadīth* categorisation.

And when he mentions “a number”, he means a number which is not many.

The author’s speech: “Each one having come with its definition”, i.e. the author brings every single one of these divisions.

And when he said: “come with its definition”, the particle *wāw* (and/with) here is called *wāw al-ma’eyyah* (particle of concomitance), and “definition” is the *maf’ūlun ma’ah* (the concomitant object). There is a principle that states that it is more eloquent to say that the particle is for concomitance and what comes after it is regarded as accusative if the object was coordinated upon a *damīr mustatir* (a hidden pronoun).

As such, if you say, “*Muhammadun ja’a wa ‘Aliyyan*” (Muhammad came with ‘Ali), then it is more eloquent than saying, “*Muhammadun ja’a wa ‘Aliyyun*” because the letter *wāw* indicates *al-musāhabah* (accompany). And the pronoun is the accompanied one.

And the meaning of “*haddahu*” (definition) in the poem is “defined it”. *Al-hadd* is the definition of something. The condition of *al-hadd* is that the definition must be consistent and indicative, which means that it is conditioned not to exclude anything from the *al-mahdūd* (confined definition) and not to include anything other than the *al-mahdūd*.

For example: If we defined “human” in the manner that many have done so, “The living thing that speaks”, this is a definition that is consistent and indicative.

So when we state, “living thing”, we exclude everything other than living things, such as the inanimate.

And when we state, “that speaks”, we exclude all that does not speak such as the animals. As such, the definition is now complete and it does not include anything other than the defined and it does not exclude all that is part of the defined.

Contrarily, if we say that the human is a “living thing” alone, this is not true. Why?

This is because it includes what is not from it. If we state that the human is a living thing then the definition shall include animals.

And if we say that the human is, “The living thing that speaks and thinks”, this is also not true because it excludes some individuals from the definition, such as the mentally unsound.

Therefore, the definition has to be consistent and indicative.

If we say that *wudu'* (ablution) is the, “Washing of the four body parts” only, then this is incorrect. We will have to add, “In a specific manner.” The reason for this is due to the fact that if one were to wash these body parts in a disorderly manner, the ablution would not be legitimate according to the *Shari'ah*.

And if it is said that the definition of the ablution is, “The washing of the four body parts thrice in a specific manner”, this is also incorrect because some matters that fit into the definition were excluded, one of which is the ablution whereby the body parts are washed only once.

After saying this, we conclude that *al-hadd* is the definition and it is, "The description that includes all that it describes and distinguishes it from all the others".

And its condition is that it is constant and indicative, i.e. it does not exclude all its entities from it and it does not include anything other than its entities.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

أَوَّلُهَا الصَّحِيحُ وَهُوَ مَا اتَّصَلَ
إِسْنَادُهُ وَلَمْ يَشُدَّ أَوْ يُعَلَّ

(3) *The first of them is *sahih* which is what is connected,
In its chain, and is neither contradicting nor defected.*

In the phrase: “The first of them is *sahih*”, the author begins listing the categories of *hadith* and commences with *al-sahih* (the sound narration) as it is the most superior among all the types of *hadith*. Then he defined it by saying, “Which is what is connected in its chain.” Here he meant whatever narration that is narrated with an *isnad* (chain) which is connected whereby every narrator transmits from the one above him. So we say for example, if number one (and we identify the narrators with numbers) told me, and said, “Number two told me”, and he said, “Number three told me,” and he said, “Number four told me.” This type of narration is connected because every single narrator said that the one he narrates from told him as such.

And if number one told me that he narrated from number three, then the narration is not *muttasil* (connected) because number two is dropped from the chain and thus it becomes *munqati'* (disconnected).

And the author's saying: “neither contradicting nor defected” refers to the condition that the narration does not contradict other narrations and has no defects in itself.

The term *shāth* (contradicting) refers to what the reliable narrator narrates which is contradictory to someone else's who is more reliable in terms of number, integrity or righteousness.

As such, if a *hadīth* has a connected *sanad* (chain of narrators) but is *shāth* by which it contradicts another narration which is more acceptable due to the numbers, integrity or righteousness of the narrators, we are still unable to accept the *hadīth* even though the narrator is righteous and the chain is connected, and this is due to the *shuthūth* (contradiction) of the narration.

Shuthūth may come in a *hadīth* or in two separate *hadīth*. This means that it is not conditional for *shuthūth* to occur when the narrators differ in one *hadīth*. In fact, the contradiction may come in another *hadīth*. For example, the narration in the *Sunan* that the Prophet ﷺ prohibits the fasting when half of the month of Sha'bān has passed.⁷ The *hadīth* has no problems in terms of its chain of narrators. However, it is confirmed from the Prophet ﷺ, as reported in the *Saḥīhayn* that he said, "Do not precede Ramadān by fasting a day or two except for someone who has been fasting voluntarily and so he fasted."⁸ If we take the second *hadīth* which is narrated in the *Saḥīhayn* into consideration, we say that it implies the permissibility of fasting after half of Sha'bān has passed and that there is no problem with it. This is because the prohibition is confined to preceding Ramadān by a day or two. And if we

⁷ Reported by Imām Ahmad 2/325, Abū Dawūd; The Book of Fasting; Chapter: Disapproval of fasting the half of *Sha'bān* (1990), al-Tirmidhī; The Book of Fasting; Chapter: Disapproved fasting (669) and Ibn Mājah; The Book of Fasting; Chapter: What comes in the prohibition of preceding (1641).

⁸ Reported by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Fasting; Chapter: Do not precede Ramadān with fasting a day or two (1914), and Muslim; The Book of Fasting; Chapter: Do not precede Ramadān (21) (1082).

consider the first *hadīth*, we say that the prohibition starts from mid-Sha'bān. As such, Imām Ahmad gave due consideration to the *hadīth* which was narrated in the *Saḥīhayn* whereby fasting before Ramadān by a day or two is prohibited, and he considered the other *hadīth* which is narrated in the *Sunan* as *shāth* due to the fact that it contradicts the narration which is more acceptable.

Another example is the narration in *Sunan Abū Dawūd* which states that the Prophet ﷺ forbade fasting on Saturdays, "Do not fast on Saturdays except those fasts that are obligatory upon you."⁹ Some scholars regard this narration as having *shuthūth* in it as it contradicts the Prophet's ﷺ statement to one of his wives when he found her fasting on a Friday, "Did you fast yesterday?" She replied, "No." Then he asked, "Will you be fasting tomorrow?" She answered, "No." He said, "Break your fast then."¹⁰ This *hadīth* is confirmed in *Saḥīh al-Bukhārī* and there is evidence in it to show that fasting on a Saturday is permissible and without any problems. Some scholars say here that the *hadīth* that prohibits fasting on Saturdays is *shāth* because it contradicts a more acceptable narration. And there are other scholars who said that there is no contradiction here due to the fact that combining the two is possible, and if combination is possible, then there is no contradiction. As such the combination is that the prohibition is due to singling out the fast, i.e. fasting on a Saturday on its own is prohibited. As such, if the person fasts on the Friday or Sunday together with it, then there is no problem with this. And it is a known fact that if the combination of narrations is possible, then there is neither contradiction nor *shuthūth*.

⁹ Reported by Imām Ahmad (17026), Abū Dawūd; The Book of Fasting; Chapter: Prohibition of fasting on a Saturday by itself (2421), al-Tirmidhī; in the Chapters of Fasting; Chapter: What comes with regards to fasting on Saturdays (744) and he said: *hadīth hasan*.

¹⁰ Reported by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Fasting; Chapter: Fasting on a Friday.

Among the *shuthūth* is the contradiction of a narration with a fact known in the religion by necessity.

An example is the narration in *Sahīh al-Bukhārī* which states that, "There is space left in the Hellfire after the people of the Earth have been sent into it, thus Allāh created nations and sent them into the Hellfire."¹¹

Even though the *sanad* for this *hadīth* is connected, it is regarded as *shāth* because it contradicts a known fact in the *dīn* by necessity i.e. that Allāh shall not oppress anyone. This narration in actual fact was inverted by the narrator, and the correct narration is that there will be space left in Paradise after the people of the Earth have been sent into it, thus Allāh created nations and sent them into Paradise. This narration demonstrates Allāh's Grace and there is no oppression in it, unlike the former which has the essence of oppression.

Whatever the case, in order for a *hadīth* to be sound, it must not be *shāth*.

If a trustworthy and righteous narrator narrated a *hadīth*, and two other narrators similar to him in terms of integrity and righteousness narrated in a way that contradicts the first, what do we say about the first *hadīth*?

We say that the first *hadīth* is *shāth* and thus it is not a *sahīh* narration even though it was narrated by a trustworthy and righteous narrator.

¹¹ Reported by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Tawhīd; Chapter: The ayah: "And He is the Exalted in Might, the Wise" (7384).

And if someone narrated a *hadīth*, and another person narrated in a way that contradicts the first, if the second narrator is better than the first in terms of righteousness or accuracy, then the first narration is *shāth*.

This principle is very beneficial for someone who has been presented with a *hadīth*. If he looks at the *sanad* and finds that it is connected, and finds that all the narrators are trustworthy, but when he looks at the text of the *hadīth* and finds that it is contradictory as previously mentioned, we tell him to regard the *hadīth* as not being *sahīh*, and that he shall not be held responsible.

The individual may ask regarding how he can regard it as not being *sahīh* when the chain is connected and the narrators are trustworthy and righteous.

We shall answer him that the *hadīth* has a reason that causes its weakness and the reason is the *shuthūth*.

The author's phrase, "Nor defected" means that the *sahīh* narration does not possess a dispraise worthy '*illah* (defect) that prevents it from being acceptable. Hence, if we found an '*illah* in the *hadīth* that prevented it from being acceptable, it is regarded as not being *sahīh*.

The original meaning of '*illah* is an attribute that causes the body to be out of its natural balance.

For this it is said that someone who has an '*illah*, it means that he is handicapped or sick, as the defect prevents the body's well-being.

And the word '*illah* in the science of *hadīth* carries a meaning close to

this and it is:

The characteristic that causes the *ḥadīth* to be prevented from being acceptable.

However, this requirement has an additional condition as mentioned by the author and it is that the *ḥadīth* has no '*illah*' that is *qāḍihah* (dispraise worthy). This is because the *ḥadīth* may have a defect that is not dispraise worthy and we shall mention this in detail later *inshā'allāh*.

Therefore, the sound *ḥadīth* has three requirements that we have studied so far and they are:

1. The *sanad* must be connected.
2. It must be free from *shuṭhūth*.
3. It must be free from *al-'illah al-qāḍihah* (the dispraise worthy defect).

As for the '*illah qāḍihah*', the scholars have many differing opinions. This is because some may see that the defect in the *ḥadīth* is dispraise worthy and others may not see it as being so.

An example we can use to understand this is: An individual may conclude that a particular *ḥadīth* contradicts another narration which is more acceptable and thus it is said to be *shāth*, then someone else analyses the *ḥadīth* and finds that it is not contradictory and thus regards the narration as *sahīh*. This can occur due to the obscure nature of the '*illah*' subject; the lifting of the defect may be ambiguous to someone and hence he will regard the narration defective whereas another individual may detect the lifting of such '*illah*' and thus disregard the

defect.

For this reason, we say that the definition must have a condition that the defect must be dispraise worthy, and it must be within the subject matter of the *ḥadīth*. If it is outside the subject matter of the *ḥadīth* then it is not considered as *'illah qādiḥah*.

To illustrate this, we give the example of the *ḥadīth* of Fudālah Ibn 'Ubayd ؓ regarding the story of the golden necklace that was sold for twelve dinars (the dinar is a currency made of gold). Then it was fragmented and found to be more than twelve dinars.¹²

The narrators differ in opinions with regards to the price of the necklace.

There are those who said: twelve dinars.

And there are those who said: nine dinars.

And also there are those who said: ten dinars.

And there are those who mentioned other than these. It is evident that this is a defect that affects the *ḥadīth*. However the *'illah* here is not *qādiḥah* because the differing opinions with regards to the price do not affect the subject matter of the *ḥadīth* which is: trading of gold with gold; if it comes with other than it then the transaction is not permissible and invalid.

¹² Reported by Muslim; The Book of Crop Sharing; Chapter: The sale of the necklace in which there are beads and gold (90) (1591).

Likewise in the story of the camel of Jābir ¹³ ﷺ where the Prophet ﷺ bought it from him. The narrators differ in the price of this camel, differing on whether it was one ounce of silver or more or less. This difference of opinion is not taken as a dispraising defect in the *hadīth* because the subject matter is that the Prophet ﷺ brought the camel from Jābir at a certain price and that Jābir put the condition that the camel shall carry him to Madīnah. The subject of the *hadīth* is not affected and not damaged by any *'illah* that dispraises it. This is because the extent of difference was that they differed on the price of the camel and this is not an *'illah qādiḥah* in the *hadīth*.

Amongst the dispraise worthy defects is where two narrators narrate a *hadīth*, one narrates in the negative and the other narrates in the positive. Definitely this is an *'illah qādiḥah* and we shall speak about it later in the chapter of *hadīth mudtarib* (inconsistent *hadīth*) where the narrators are inconsistent in their narrations in a manner that affects the meaning.

¹³ Reported by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Transactions; Chapter: Purchase of the livestock (2097), and Muslim; The Book of Crop Sharing; Chapter: The sale of the camel and the exception of riding it (109) (715).

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

يُرْوِيهِ عَدْلٌ ضَابِطٌ عَنْ مِثْلِهِ
مُعْتَمَدٌ فِي ضَبْطِهِ وَنَقْلِهِ

(4) *Narrated by one who is just and precise from his like,
Reliable in his precision and his transmission.*

The author said, “Narrated by one who is just”, which means that the narrator must be just and this is the fourth criteria for the *ḥadīth* to be *ṣaḥīḥ*.

The root of the word *al-’adl* (just) is *al-istiḳāmah* (straightness). When the path is straight without any curves, it is called a path of *’adl*, which means straight path. Its example would be a straight cane which is called *’adlah* in Arabic, and this the origin of the word.

However, according to people of knowledge it is the description of a person who displays integrity in the *dīn* as well as dignity.

Thus the straightness of a person in his religion and his dignity is called *’adālah*.

Upon this, the wrongdoer (*fāsiq*) is not considered as *’adl*, because he is not *mustaqīm* (straight or correct) in his *dīn*. And if we saw someone who severs his relations, he is not considered as *’adl* even though he may be the most truthful in his transmission because he is not

mustaqīm in his religion. Likewise if we found a man who does not perform his prayers in congregation, and he may be the most truthful in speech of all the people, but he is not considered as *'adl*, hence his narrations shall not be accepted.

The evidence for this fact is the ayah: **{O you who have believed, if there comes to you a disobedient one with information, investigate, lest you harm a people out of ignorance.}**¹⁴ As such, when Allāh ﷻ commanded to investigate the information from the disobedient, it is understood that his information is not acceptable; it is neither accepted nor rejected until we have investigated.

We placed the criteria in the narration of *hadīth* that the narrator has to be *'adl* in order to accept his narration, and the narration from the disobedient shall not be accepted.

As for the *'adl*, his narration is acceptable due to the ayah, **{And bring to witness two just men from among you.}**¹⁵ We were not commanded to witness their testimony except for the transmission of their testimonial, as it would be meaningless and absurd if we were ordered to accept the testimony of one whose statements were rejected.

As for *murū'ah* (dignity), it is doing that which beautifies and adorns the person in the eyes of the people and brings forth praise from them. It is also leaving that which would stain and tarnish his image. Likewise if a person was to perform an act in public which would be seen as inappropriate to the masses and they would deem it as a hideous act that only the despicable and immoral would perform, we will say that

14 Al-Hujurāt: 6

15 Al-Talāq: 2

such a person is not *'adl*. This is due to the fact that his character is undignified and his action that is inappropriate to the people diminished his dignity.

For instance, if a man in our country was to come out during noontime carrying a plate of food and eating while walking in the markets in front of the members the public, his dignity would lessen in the eyes of the people and he would be the subject of mockery and criticism.

And if someone were to come out of his residence with a pot of tea and coffee to drink outside his house, would it be considered as undignified or not?

We say that this requires further elaboration:

Firstly: If the culture of the people is as such, then it is not deemed as undignified because it is a common practice among the people and they are familiar with it. Just like our older generation do at present, coming out to their front yard during early daytime with coffee and tea to drink in front of the people and offering to passersby by saying, "Please have some". There is no problem with this as it is the common practice of the people to do it.

Secondly: And if someone was to do this practice in a different way in which the people would criticise him for doing it, the practice becomes a flaw to the person as the people disapprove of this conduct, thus the action is considered as undignified.

The scholars differed in opinion with regards to the *ta'dil* (validation) of a certain narrator and this occurs commonly. For example, take a look in the book *Tahthib* or *Tahthibul Tahthib* by Ibn Hajar or other

books and you will find that the *huffāz* (custodians of *hadith*) differ in the validation of a particular person; one of them may say that nothing is wrong with him.

And another may say that he is trustworthy.

While another may say, "Throw away his narration, he is nothing."

As such, when they differed in opinions, what should we do?

We say that if the scholars differ in this issue or others, we shall take the most justified opinion. If the one who validated the narrator is the more informed than the others regarding his personality, then we shall take his opinion because he is the most knowledgeable of the status of the narrator.

Due to this reason, we never see anyone who is more informed of a narrator's status other than the one who frequents him. Thus, if we know that the scholar frequented the narrator and described him as a person of integrity, we shall say that he is more knowledgeable than the others and thus we shall accept his opinion.

Likewise if one of them regarded a narrator as weak, and he used to frequent him, we shall accept his opinion because he is the most acquainted with the person when compared to the others.

Most importantly, if the *huffāz* of *hadith* differ in the *ta'dīl* or *tajrīb* (discredit) of a narrator, and one of them is superior to the others in knowing more about the specified person, then we shall take the opinion of the one who is closest to the narrator and most familiar of his status.

And if in these two matters, the scholars are equal whereby every single one of them is distant from the narrator or if we are uncertain of their knowledge of the individual.

As such, the scholars differed if they should take the *ta'dil* or the *tajrih*, based on whether the origin (*asl*) of any individual is to regard him as someone of integrity or not.

Those who said that the *asl* is *al-'adālah*, will consider the person as someone of integrity.

And those who said that the *asl* is the absence of *al-'adālah*, will consider the *jarh* (depreciation) and reject his narration.

Some of them elaborated and said that the detailed of the two shall be accepted. An example of explicit analysis is when the one making the *ta'dil* says that he is just, and he made repentance from whatever that was discredited of him, e.g. the depreciation of his standing from drinking alcohol.

As such, the one describing him as having integrity would say, "He is just, and whatever that was mentioned of him such as drinking alcohol, he has made repentance from it". Hence, we give preference to the detailed description because it comes with additional knowledge; that is he knew the narrator was discredited at first, and then the depreciation was withdrawn from him.

If the issue was the opposite, whereby the one making the *jarh* said, "This narrator is not just because he is addicted to drinking alcohol," hence we give preference to the one making the *jarh* in this case.

And if neither of the two are detailed, or both elaborated something about the narrator, here we say that if the *jarh* or the *ta'dil* is not elaborated, then we should put a halt if we do not find something to justify. Thus it is obligatory to hold back from determining the status of this narrator.

It is for us to know that some scholars of *hadith* may be strict in their validations, and some may be lenient.

This means that there are some who made *jarh* with a matter that is not considered as discrediting due to their rigor.

And amongst them are the opposite who are lenient and thus regarded someone undeserving as just. This fact is well known to the people of knowledge. As such, the validation of the one who is strict upon the narrators is closer to acceptance than the one who is lenient. Nevertheless, it is rightful for one to be fair, neither strict nor lenient. This is because, should we be strict, perhaps we may reject a *hadith* which is confirmed from the Prophet ﷺ based on this rigor. Likewise if one were to be lenient, perhaps he may attribute a *hadith* which is not confirmed to the Prophet ﷺ due to this leniency.

The author's saying, "[One who is] precise."

He is the one who memorises what he narrates in terms of receiving and transmission.

For example, an intelligent and attentive student listens to his teacher narrating the *hadith*. There is hardly any word that comes out from the mouth of his teacher except that he has memorised it by heart with precision and this is called *al-tahammul* (reception).

As for *al-adā'* (transmission), it is the state of being retentive such that if he was to report what he heard from the teacher, he would be able to transmit it exactly how he heard it. Thus precision is required in both situations, during the process of *tahammul* and *adā'*.

The opposite of *al-dabt* (precision) is someone who displays negligence during the process of *tahammul* or forgetfulness during the process of *adā'*.

And we do not say that he does not forget at all. If we were to set the criteria that he is one who does not forget, we would have abandoned a tenth of what is confirmed from the Prophet ﷺ. However, what we mean by retentiveness is to not be frequently forgetful. If the person is very forgetful, his narration would not be sound. Why?

Due to the possibility that he could have forgotten the particular narration. And each individual's memory strength differs with so much variation during the process of *tahammul* or *adā'*. For some people, Allāh Bestowed upon them good understanding and memorisation. As such, when he hears a word, he would have visualised, memorised with precision and kept it in his memory at once exactly the way it was. And some people would misunderstand something and retain these mistakes in their memory.

Likewise people differ with great variation with regards to forgetfulness. There are amongst the people those that whenever they memorise a *ḥadīth*, they would have stored it exactly the way they memorised it and would not forget a thing from it. Even if they were to forget, it would be on rare occasions. Likewise, there are the opposite in relation to this.

As for the first example, it is a known fact that he is precise.

As for the second, since he is very forgetful, he is not considered as being precise. However, it is obligatory upon him to safeguard the narrations he hears more than the aforementioned type [of narrator]. This is because, if he does not safeguard them (e.g. by writing them etc), the knowledge will be forgotten and lost in the long run.

If someone were to ask if there is a cure or treatment for forgetfulness?

We say: yes. There is a cure for it with Allāh's Grace and it is writing. Due to this, Allāh ﷻ favoured His servant with it and He said in the ayah: **{Recite in the name of your Lord who created. [Who] created man from a clinging substance. Recite, and your Lord is the most Generous. Who taught by the pen.}**¹⁶ Indeed He said "Recite", and later He said, "Who taught by the pen" i.e. recite from your memory or otherwise from your writing. As such, Allāh ﷻ taught us how to cure this ailment, which is the ailment of forgetfulness, by treating it with writing. And now, writing has become a more precise means of retention than before because it is recorded (through the publishing of books etc.), all praises to Allāh.

The author's phrase, "From his like":

This means that the narrator, who is described as having integrity and precision, has to narrate from someone who is also described as having *'adālah* and *dabt*.

If the just narrator narrated from a sinner, his narration is not consid-

¹⁶ Al-'Alaq: 1-4

ered as *sahīh*. Likewise, if a person who is just and strong in memorisation were to narrate from another narrator who has poor memory and is very forgetful, his narration would not be accepted and not considered as *sahīh* because he did not narrate from someone precise like him.

مباحث الحديث

TOPICS OF HADĪTH

First topic:

The *akhbār* (statements) that were transmitted to us are categorised into three types:

1. *Al-Hadith*: It is specific to what was attributed to the Prophet ﷺ.
2. *Al-Athar*: It is specific to what was attributed to other than him, such as the companions, the *tābi'īn* or those who came after them.
3. *Al-Khabar*: It includes the *hadith* and *athar*.

And the *athar* is not taken as *marfū'* (lifted) to the Prophet ﷺ unless it is specifically attributed to him e.g. by saying that the *athar* is from the Prophet ﷺ. However in general, the *athar* is attributed to a companion or someone from the later generations.

Second topic:

The three states of *talaqqī* (reception):

1. Proclamation that the narrator heard from the teacher.
2. Confirmation of the meeting between the two without one hearing from the other.
3. Both were contemporaries, but it is not confirmed that one met the other.

As for the confirmation of hearing directly from the teacher, it is to say, "I heard from so-and-so (*sam'itu fulān*)" or, "So-and-so told me (*hadathana fulān*)." Hence the connection is clear.

As for the confirmation of the meeting without the hearing, the narrator would say, "So-and-so said such-and-such (*qāla fulān kathā wa kathā*)" or "On the authority of so-and-so (*'an fulān kathā wa kathā*)." He does not say "I heard" or "He told me" but the meeting between the two is confirmed. Hence, the narration is considered to be connected as long as the narrator has integrity, he would not have attributed a saying to anyone except that he would have heard it from him and this is the root principle (*asl*).

And if he lived in the same era but it is not confirmed that he met the narrator above him in the chain, is the *ḥadīth* taken as connected?

Al-Bukhārī said, "It is not considered as connected until it is confirmed that he met him."

Muslim said, "It is regarded as being connected, as long as he lived in the same era as him and attributed the narration to him, then the *asl* is that he heard it from him."

However, al-Bukhārī's opinion that it is a must to confirm that the narrator met whom he narrated from is the stronger of the two.

Due to this reason, *Saḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* is taken to be sounder than *Saḥīḥ Muslim* as al-Bukhārī made the meeting between narrators as a requirement whereas Muslim did not take it into account.

And some of the scholars who are strict in the transmission of *ḥadīth* say that it is a necessity to confirm the hearing because the narrator may have met the one he narrated from but did not hear from him. Definitely this requirement is even stronger. However, if we take the hearing as a prerequisite, we would have missed out on a significant amount of authentic Sunnah.

Which is the soundest of all the books of the Sunnah?

And which is the soundest of the *saḥīḥ*?

We say that the *ahādīth* (plural of *ḥadīth*) that al-Bukhārī and Muslim agreed upon are considered as the soundest *ahādīth*. For example, *al-Hāfiz* [Ibn Hajar al-Asqalānī] said after a *ḥadīth* in *Bulūgh al-Marām*, "*Muttafaqun 'alayhi* (agreed upon)" i.e. reported by al-Bukhārī and Muslim.

This is followed by what al-Bukhārī reported as his requirement is stronger than that of Muslim, which is the confirmation of the encounter between the narrator and the one he narrated from. This is contrary to Muslim who regarded the existence of the two in the same era as sufficient, without having to confirm the encounter. As such, al-Bukhārī's criterion is stronger and more rigorous. Therefore the scholars say that *Saḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* is sounder than *Saḥīḥ Muslim*.

The composer of the poem said:

تَشَاَجَرَ قَوْمٌ فِي الْبُخَارِيِّ وَمُسْلِمٍ
لَدَيَّ وَقَالُوا أَيُّ ذَيْنِي قَدُّمٌ
فَقُلْتُ لَقَدْ فَاقَ الْبُخَارِيُّ صِرَاحَةً
كَمَا فَاقَ فِي حُسْنِ الصِّنَاعَةِ مُسْلِمٌ

*The people quarrel regarding al-Bukhārī and Muslim,
In my presence, and they said: which of the two is better?
So I answered: Indeed al-Bukhārī outshines in terms of soundness,
Just like Muslim excelled in terms of craftsmanship to perfection.¹⁷*

He meant that Muslim's arrangement and sequence of the channels of *hadīth* is better than that of al-Bukhārī, but in terms of soundness, al-Bukhārī outshines Muslim.

And in the science of *hadīth*, we are more concerned with soundness than the arrangement and quality craftsmanship.

There are seven ranks of *ahadīth* and they are:

1. What al-Bukhārī and Muslim agreed upon.

¹⁷ Reported by 'Abdul Qādir Ibn 'Abdullāh al-Ēdrūs in his book *al-Nūr al-Sāfir 'An Akhbār al-Qarn al-Āshir* Volume 1, page 143 and he attributed the lines to al-Hāfiz 'Abdul Rahmān Ibn 'Alī al-Daibā'i.

2. What is reported by al-Bukhārī alone.
3. What is reported by Muslim alone.
4. What is upon the requirements of both scholars. Sometimes it is also referred to as being upon the prerequisites of the *Sahīhayn* or the conditions of al-Bukhārī and Muslim.
5. What is upon al-Bukhārī's requirements.
6. What is upon Muslim's requirements.
7. What is upon the conditions of other than the two.

Third topic:

Are all that were agreed upon by al-Bukhārī and Muslim considered as *sahīh*?

Does this mean that we need not scrutinise the narrators and ask about the text or not?

We say that most scholars are in agreement that the narrations found in both compilations are considered as *sahīh* and beneficial for knowledge because the Ummah (Muslim nation) acknowledged them with acceptance and our Ummah is safeguarded from making mistakes. This is the opinion of Ibn al-Salāh and the opinion of Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah and his student Ibn al-Qayyim.

As for the narration that is reported by either one, it is taken as authentic; however it is lesser in degree than the ones that are agreed upon. As such, some of al-Bukhārī's narrations were criticised, and a greater number of Muslim's narrations were scrutinised likewise. Al-Hāfiz [Ibn Hajar] replied to such criticisms from two perspectives:

The first perspective: The criticisms contradict the way of al-Bukhārī i.e. the critics of al-Bukhārī went against al-Bukhārī's opinion while al-Bukhārī is an *imām* of the *hadīth* scholars. Thus his view is given precedence over the rest who came after him including his critics. Moreover, if there are two contradicting opinions from the people of knowledge, normally we take the most justified opinion.

Therefore it is said that al-Bukhārī is a leading custodian of *hadīth*, and if someone were to come and say that a particular *hadīth* is not *sahīh* whereas al-Bukhārī already regarded it as such and reported it in his collection, if al-Bukhārī is more proficient and more knowledgeable in the science of *hadīth* than the critic, then we view the criticism as contradictory to al-Bukhārī's opinion. This is the answer in general.

As for the elaborated answer, it is:

The second perspective: The scholars refuted those who scrutinised al-Bukhārī and Muslim, and they refuted the criticism of each and every *hadīth*. With this, the objections upon al-Bukhārī and Muslim were removed. However, there is no doubt that misconceptions may arise from the narrators of al-Bukhārī and Muslim, but this does not depreciate the transmissions from al-Bukhārī and Muslim. The reason is that no one can free himself from misconceptions and it is never a criterion of the narrator's integrity that he be completely free of mistakes as such a person never existed in the first place.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَالْحُسْنُ الْمَعْرُوفُ طُرُقاً وَغَدَتْ
رِجَالُهُ لَا كَالصَّحِيحِ اشْتَهَرَتْ

(5) *Al-hasan is the one whose chains are known but,
Whose transmitters are not as famous as the sabīh.*

The author has now moved on to the definition of *al-hasan* (the fair *hadīth*). And *al-hasan* in the poem refers to the second category of *hadīth*.

He says in his definition, “One whose chains are known,” which means that the chain of the *hadīth* is known in such a way that it is known that a narrator reports from the people of al-Basrah (a city in Iraq), another narrates from the people of al-Kūfa (another city in Iraq), while another reports from the people of Greater Syria, and another from the people of Egypt, and another from the people of Hijāz (the western strip of the Arabian Peninsula) etc.

The phrase, “But whose transmitters are not as famous as the *sabīh*” means that the narrators of the *hasan hadīth* are lighter in significance than those of the *sabīh hadīth*. Thus the *hasan* differs from the *sabīh* in such a way that the narrators of the *hasan* do not match the narrators of the *sabīh*. And what is meant by them not matching the narrators of the *sabīh hadīth* is in terms of precision.

Due to this the scholars of later generations who expanded this science

such as al-Hāfiz Ibn Hajar said that the difference between the *ṣaḥīḥ* *ḥadīth* and the *ḥasan ḥadīth* is only one: Which is to say that we find “fair precision” in the *ḥasan* contrary to “perfect precision” in the *ṣaḥīḥ*. Other than this, the conditions in the *ṣaḥīḥ* are present in the *ḥasan* narrations.

Upon this, we can say that the definition of the *ḥasan ḥadīth* is: What is narrated by one who has integrity and fair precision in a connected chain whilst being free from contradiction and dispraise worthy defects.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَكُلُّ مَا عَنِ رُتْبَةِ الْحُسْنِ قَصُرُ
فَهُوَ الضَّعِيفُ وَهُوَ أَقْسَاماً كَثُرُ

(6) *All that falls below the rank of hasan,
Is thus da'if and it has many categories.*

The *da'if* (weak) narration is the third category mentioned in the poem. It is the narration that falls short of the rank of *al-hasan*.

It is also understood that anything lower than the rank of *hasan* will also fall short of *sahih* narrations. As such, we say that *da'if* narrations are those that do not meet the requirements of *sahih* and *hasan* i.e. they are neither *sahih* nor *hasan*. If a person narrated a *hadith* and he is of integrity but his level of precision is weak and not fair, then the *hadith* is regarded as *da'if*. And if the *sanad* is disconnected, the narration is also considered as weak and so forth.

At this point, the author has mentioned three categories of *hadith* and they are:

- (1) *Al-sahih* (sound)
- (2) *Al-hasan* (fair)
- (3) *Al-da'if* (weak)

However, in reality, there are five categories as stated by Ibn Hajar and others:

1. *Al-sahīh li thātihi* (sound in itself).
2. *Al-sahīh li ghayrihi* (sound due to others).
3. *Al-hasan li thātihi* (fair in itself).
4. *Al-hasan li ghayrihi* (fair due to others).
5. *Al-da'if* (weak).

As for *al-sahīh li thātihi*, its definition is as we mentioned earlier.

Whereas *al-sahīh li ghayrihi*, it is a *hasan hadīth* which has numerous routes of transmission. It is termed as *sahīh* due to others because it only reached the level of *sahīh* due to its numerous routes.

For example, if we have a *hadīth* with four *asānīd* (plural of *sanad*), and each route has a narrator who is fair in terms of precision, then we say that now the *hadīth* reaches the level of *sahīh*, and becomes *sahīh li ghayrihi*.

As for *al-hasan li thātihi*, its definition is as mentioned earlier, which is what was narrated by a just narrator with fair precision in a connected chain, and free from contradiction and dispraise worthy defects.

Regarding *al-hasan li ghayrihi*, it is the weak *hadīth* of which its routes are numerous in such a way that each one complements the other, hence it becomes fair due to others. Why?

This is because, if we look at every *isnad* individually, it does not reach the rank of *al-hasan*, but collectively taken together, it becomes *hasan*.

As for *al-da'if*, it is neither *sahīh* nor *hasan*.

All the types of *hadīth* are acceptable except the weak narrations, and all are valid evidences except the *da'if*.

And it is permissible for people to transmit and report all these categories of the *hadīth* as they are acceptable and taken as valid evidences except the *da'if*, which is not allowed to be transmitted or reported unless it is mentioned clearly that it is weak. This is due to the fact that the one who narrates a weak *hadīth* and does not declare its weakness to the people, then he is considered as one of the liars who lied about the Prophet ﷺ as reported by Muslim in his *Sahīb* that the Prophet ﷺ said, "If someone narrated from me a *hadīth* and he knew it was a lie, then he is one of the liars,"¹⁸ and in another narration, "Whoever deliberately lied upon me, he shall take his place in Hellfire."¹⁹

Therefore, the narration of weak *hadīth* is not permissible except with one condition, which is that its weakness is explained to the people. For example, if someone narrates a *da'if* narration, he is to say, "This *hadīth* was narrated from the Prophet ﷺ and it is *da'if*."

Some scholars made exceptions to the *ahādīth* that were narrated for the sake of *al-targhīb* (enticements) and *al-tarhīb* (warning). So they allowed the narration of weak *hadīth* but with four conditions:

1. The *hadīth* has to be for *al-targhīb* or *al-tarhīb*.
2. The narration must not be extremely weak. If it is extremely weak, then it is not permissible to narrate it even for the sake

¹⁸ Recorded by Muslim in the introduction; Chapter: The obligation of narrating from the reliable and leaving the liars (1).

¹⁹ Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The book of funerals; Chapter: What was disliked of mourning (1291) (105), and Muslim in the introduction; Chapter: The harsh warning against lying upon the Messenger of Allāh 3) 3 (3).

of enticing or warning.

3. The *ḥadīth* must have a correct origin that is confirmed from the Qur'ān or the Sunnah. For example, if we come across a weak *ḥadīth* that encourages dutifulness to parents, another weak *ḥadīth* that encourages congregational prayers, and another that encourages reciting the Qur'ān. However these are supported by sound narrations that are confirmed in the Qur'ān and the Sunnah.
4. One shall not believe that the Prophet ﷺ said it because it is not permissible to believe that he ﷺ said a *ḥadīth* except that it is confirmed to have been narrated from him.

However, it seems to me that it is not permissible to narrate a weak *ḥadīth* except to make clear of its weakness in all circumstances, especially to the public. This is because whenever you narrate to the common people a *ḥadīth*, they will believe that the *ḥadīth* is *ṣaḥīḥ* and that the Prophet ﷺ said it.

As such, one of the principles that is established amongst them is that whatever is said at the pulpit is taken to be correct. And this principle is affirmed among the members of the public. As such, they would believe in you even if you were to present to them the most misleading speech on the surface of the earth. Due to this, the commoner would believe in you even if you told them that the *ḥadīth* is *da'īf*, especially in the subject of *al-targhīb* and *al-tarhīb* as he would memorise any *ḥadīth* that he heard without paying attention to its ranking or soundness.

Furthermore, there are other evidences from the Noble Qur'ān and the pure and authentic prophetic traditions that can be used instead of these narrations.

And it is strange that some of the fabricators of *hadīth* who lied upon the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ and placed narrations of the Prophet ﷺ to encourage the people to hold firmly onto the Sunnah and said, “We did not lie upon the Messenger ﷺ. Rather we fabricated for him. The Messenger ﷺ said, ‘Whoever deliberately lies upon me, he shall take his place in the Hellfire.’²⁰ As for us, we fabricated for him and not upon him.” This is a distortion of words from their proper usage because they attribute to the Messenger ﷺ what he did not say, and this is clearly a falsification against him whereas there are other evidences from the authentic Sunnah that could take the place of what you have lied upon him.

²⁰ Mentioned previously.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَمَا أُضِيفَ لِلنَّبِيِّ الْمَرْفُوعُ
وَمَا لِتَابِعٍ هُوَ الْمَقْطُوعُ

(7) *What was attributed to the Prophet is known as al-marfū',
While the one to a tābi'i is known as al-maqtū'.*

The author mentions another two types of *ḥadīth* and they are *al-marfū'* (lifted) and *al-maqtū'* (disconnected). These two are the fourth and fifth categories mentioned in the poem.

We say that the *ḥadīth* are categorised into three types with regards to whom they are attributed to:

1. *Al-marfū'* (lifted).
2. *Al-mawqūf* (stopped), and the author does not make mention about it here, but it shall be discussed later.²¹
3. *Al-maqtū'* (severed).

And these three categories differ from one another due to the different endings of the *sanad*:

As for *al-marfū'*, the *sanad* ends at the Prophet ﷺ.

Whereas *al-mawqūf*, the *sanad* ends at a companion.

²¹ Mentioned previously.

Anything else that ends after the companions is regarded as *al-maqtū'*. It is important to note that *al-maqtū'* is different to *al-munqati'*, which will be discussed later.

The definition of *al-marfū'* is the speech, action or approval attributed to the Prophet ﷺ.

For example; the Prophet ﷺ said, "Verily actions are according to intentions, and everyone will receive what was intended."²² This is an example of speech which is *marfū'*.

As for the example of an action, the Prophet ﷺ used to make ablution and he wiped over his leather socks. This is an example of an action which is *marfū'*.

And an example of his approval was when he ﷺ asked a slave girl, "Where is Allāh?" She replied, "In the sky" and he approved of this.²³ This is an example of an approval which is *marfū'*.

Is everything that was done or said in the Prophet's time considered as *marfū'*?

We say that if the Prophet knew about it, then it is taken to be *marfū'* because he approved it. If it is not known to be as such, then it is not considered as *marfū'* because it is not attributed to him. However, the correct opinion is that this is taken to be valid evidence due to the fact

²² Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Revelations; Chapter: How revelations started (1) and Muslim; The Book of Leadership; Chapter: Verily actions are according to intentions (1907).

²³ Recorded by Muslim; The Book of Mosques; Chapter: The forbidding of talking during prayer 33 (537).

that Allāh approved it.

The proof for this is that the companions took Allāh's consent upon some of their actions as evidence, and He did not object to it. For example, Jābir ؓ said, "We practised coitus interruptus while the Qur'ān was being revealed."²⁴ The Qur'ān was revealed during the lifetime of the Prophet ﷺ and it is as though they said, "If this practice was forbidden, Allāh would have prohibited it in His Book or revealed to the Prophet ﷺ about its prohibition because Allāh would not approve the forbidden."

And the evidence for this is the ayah: **{They conceal [their evil intentions and deeds] from the people, but they cannot conceal [them] from Allāh, and He is with them [in His knowledge] when they spend the night in such as He does not accept of speech.}**²⁵ As such, those who spent the night in a manner that caused Allāh ﷻ to be displeased with their speech, they had concealed themselves from the eyes of the people and the public did not know about them. But when Allāh was not pleased with their actions, He disapproved of them.

Thus, this shows that whatever was done during the time of the Prophet ﷺ and Allāh did not object to it, then it is taken as valid evidence. However, we do not consider it as *marfū'* because it is not correct to attribute it to the Prophet ﷺ.

The *marfū'* is termed as "lifted" due to its high ranking because at the utmost end of the *sanad* is the Prophet ﷺ. Thus this is the highest

²⁴ Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Marriage; Chapter: The coitus interruptus (5208) and Muslim; The Book of Marriage; Chapter: The ruling of the coitus interruptus 136 (1440).

²⁵ Al-Nisā': 108

ranking possible.

As for any narration attributed to Allāh, it is called *al-hadīth al-quḍṣī* (sacred narration), or *al-hadīth al-ilāhī* (Allāh's narration) or *al-hadīth al-rabbānī* (The Lord's narration). This is due to the fact that the chain of narration ends with the Lord of the worlds whereas *al-marfū'* ends with the Prophet ﷺ.

The author said: "While the one to a *tābi'i* is known as *al-maqtū'*."

This is the seventh category. The definition of *al-maqtū'* (severed) is a narration that is attributed to a *tābi'i* (successor of the companions) or anyone after, and this is how the scholars of *hadīth* termed it.

It is named as such because it is severed below the levels of the *marfū'* and the *mawqūf*.

An example would be: if a saying was transmitted from al-Hasan al-Basrī, then we say that this is an *athar maqtū'*.

Meanwhile, the narration that is attributed to a companion is classified into two categories.

1. The narration that is confirmed as being *marfū'*. This is called *al-marfū' hukman*.
2. The narration that is not *marfū'*. This is called *al-mawqūf*.

As such, the *āthār* (plural of *athar*) that were narrated from Abū Bakr and 'Umar ؓ or any of the other companions are called *mawqūf*. And this is the correct terminology and there is no argument about it, though it is known that we may call the *marfū'* narration *al-mawqūf*.

due to it stopping at the Prophet ﷺ. However, the aforementioned is the correct usage of the term in terms of *mustalah*.

The scholars mentioned that the criteria for a narration to be termed *al-marfū' hukman* is the absence of the possibility for *ijtihād* (independent reasoning) and opinion in the subject matter, and it can only be taken from the Islamic law.

For example: if a companion described the events of the Day of Judgement, or tidings of the unseen, then we say that these narrations are *al-marfū' hukman*. This is because there is no room for *ijtihād* in it. Likewise if a companion performed an act of worship which was not mentioned in the Sunnah, then we say that this is also *al-marfū' hukman*.

The scholars gave an example of when 'Alī Ibn Abī Tālib ؑ prayed the *kusūf* (solar eclipse) prayer and made three *rukū'* (bows) in every *rak'ah* (unit of prayer),²⁶ whereas the *Sunnah* came with two *rukū'* in every *rak'ah*.²⁷ They said that there is neither room for opinion nor the possibility of *ijtihād* here because the number of bows is *tawqifī* (restricted by religious text) and requires evidence from the Qur'ān or the Sunnah. As such, if 'Alī Ibn Abī Tālib ؑ did not possess this knowledge he would not have made three *rukū'* in one unit. Therefore, this is an example of *al-marfū' hukman* as there is no room for *ijtihād* in it.

And likewise if a companion mentioned that a particular practice is

²⁶ *Al-Mughnī* 3/328

²⁷ Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of the Solar Eclipse Prayer; Chapter: The *imām's* sermon during the solar eclipse (1046), and Muslim; The Book of the Solar Eclipse Prayer; Chapter: The mention of the punishments of the grave during the solar eclipse prayer 8 (903).

from the Sunnah, then this is also classified as *al-marfū' hukman*. This is because if a companion said that it is from the Sunnah, he meant that it is the practice of the Prophet ﷺ. An example would be the speech of Ibn 'Abbās ؓ when he recited al-Fātihah loudly during the *janāzah* prayer. He said, "I did this so that you learn that it is from the Sunnah."²⁸

Similarly, the incident where Anas Ibn Mālik ؓ said that it is from the Sunnah for one to spend seven days with a virgin newlywed if he already has a matron wife.²⁹ Thus this narration and its likes are considered as *al-marfū' hukman* because the companions would not attribute a practice to the Sunnah except if it was truly from the Messenger ﷺ.

And if one of the companions were to describe Paradise and the Hell-fire, then we would classify it as *al-marfū' hukman*. However, there is one requirement for this type of narration which is that the companion should not be amongst those who were known to take from the narrations of the Children of Israel. If the companion is known to be as such, then his saying is not taken to be *al-marfū' hukman*. This is because there is the possibility that the narration came from the Children of Israel. There are a number of such companions, for example 'Abdullāh Ibn 'Amr Ibn al-'Ās ؓ who acquired a large number of the books of the *Ahlul Kitāb* (the People of the Scripture) which were left behind by the Romans or others during the battle of Yarmūk because there was *ruksah* (permission) to do this. Thus, if the companion is known to quote from the Children of Israel, then his speech is not

²⁸ Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of the Deceased; Chapter: Recitation of al-Fātihah (1335).

²⁹ Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Wedlock; Chapter: If one were to marry a virgin and he already had a matron wife (5213), and Muslim; The Book of Breastfeeding; Chapter: The number of days that the virgin deserves (1461).

considered as *al-marfū' hukman*.

Is the narration that is attributed to a companion but does not have the status of *al-marfū' hukman* considered as valid evidence or not?

We say that the scholars have different opinions on the matter.

Amongst them are those who said that it is considered as valid evidence with the condition that it does not contradict any other religious text or companion. If the narration contradicts a text, then the text is given precedence, and if it contradicts another companion, then the correct opinion is taken.

And there are those who said that the opinion of a companion is not a valid evidence because he is a human being and when he makes an *ijtihād*, he may be correct or wrong in his judgement.

There are also those who said that the valid evidences are those that come from the sayings of Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنهما because the Prophet ﷺ said, "Follow the way of those after me; Abū Bakr and 'Umar,"³⁰ and he also said, "If they were to abide by Abū Bakr and 'Umar, they would be guided."³¹

As for the rest of the companions other than the two, their statements are not considered as valid evidence.

³⁰ Recorded by Imām Ahmad (382), al-Tirmidhī; The Book of Virtues; Chapter: *Hadīth* of Huthaifah (3662), and Ibn Mājah in the Introduction (97).

³¹ Recorded by Muslim; The Book of Mosques; Chapter: The fulfillment of missed prayers 311 (681)

The opinion which is most manifest to me is that the saying of the companion is considered as valid evidence if he is amongst the people of knowledge and understanding. If he is not, then it is not a valid evidence because some of the companions came to the Prophet ﷺ and heard from him some of the laws of the *Shari'ah* but they were not from the scholars or the knowledgeable amongst the companions, thus their speech would not be regarded as valid evidence.

And this is the moderate opinion amongst them all, and it is the correct opinion in this matter.

What would be the ruling of a saying of a *tābi'i*, if he were to say that such-and-such is from the Sunnah, is it considered as *al-marfū' hukman* or not?

We say that the scholars of *hadith* have differing opinions on this matter.

There are those who said that it is regarded as *mawqūf* and not from the classification of *marfū'* because the *tābi'i* did not live during the era of the Prophet ﷺ. Due to this reason we are unable to say that when he states "Sunnah" he is referring to the Sunnah of the Prophet ﷺ. In fact, there is the possibility that he meant the Sunnah of the companions.

And some scholars stated that it is in fact *marfū'* in ruling, but disconnected *mursal*³² in chain because the companion was abandoned. Therefore the Sunnah here refers to the Sunnah of the Prophet ﷺ.

32 [T] Definition of *mursal*: Khatib al-Baghdādī said, "*Mursal* refers to a report whose *isnād* is interrupted, meaning that among its narrators is one who did not hear it from the one whose name comes before his. But in most cases, what is described as *mursal* is that which was narrated by the *tābi'i* from the Prophet ﷺ." (*Al-Kifāyah*)

In general, upon both opinions, if the *ḥadīth* is considered as *mursal* then it is a *da'īf* narration because the *sanad* is disconnected.

And if it is considered as *mawqūf*, then it is considered as a saying of the companion or his action.

We have mentioned previously regarding the different opinions concerning whether the speech of a companion is taken to be a valid evidence, as well as its explanation and the correct opinion is that it is considered as valid evidence if it meets three requirements:

1. The companion has to be amongst the scholars.
2. The narration does not contradict a religious text.
3. The narration does not contradict another companion's opinion.

If the companion is not one of the scholars, then his opinion is not taken to be a valid evidence. Likewise if he is among the scholars but his opinion contradicts a religious text, then the text is given precedence over his opinion, even though he is one of the scholars of the companions. And if he is among the scholars and his opinion does not contradict a religious text but conflicts with the opinion of another companion, then we seek out the correct opinion.

Amongst those that are considered as *al-marfū' hukman* is when something is attributed to the era of the Prophet ﷺ. If it was said that the people did such an action during the time of the Prophet ﷺ, then this is considered as *al-marfū' hukman*.

There are many examples for this, one of which is the narration of Asmā bint Abī Bakr رضي الله عنها where she said, "We slaughtered a horse dur-

ing the time of the Prophet ﷺ and we ate it.”³³

It was not made obvious here that the Prophet ﷺ knew about this incident. If it was made obvious then this narration is obviously *marfū'*. Thus this narration is considered to be *al-marfū' hukman*.

And the reason for this is that if it was forbidden, then Allāh ﷻ would not have permitted it. Thus the approval from Allāh means that it is a valid evidence. As we have mentioned previously, there are scholars that say that this narration is not *marfū' hukman* but it is a valid evidence. They state that it is not considered to be *marfū'* because the Prophet ﷺ did not know about it, but it is still considered to be valid evidence because Allāh knew about it and hence approved it.

If a companion said “it is narrated”, this is considered as *al-marfū' hukman* as well.

An example would be the connection of a *sanad* to a companion and he said, “On the authority of Abī Hurairah, it is narrated that whoever did such-and-such or whoever said such-and-such,” then this is taken as *al-marfū' hukman*. This is because it is a narration of a companion's saying and it is not obvious that it was narrated from the Prophet ﷺ. However, it is understood that the companions studied under the Messenger ﷺ. Therefore the scholars considered it as *al-marfū' hukman*.

Likewise, if a *tābi'i* were to say on the authority of a companion, “He attributed it to the Prophet ﷺ,” it is also considered as *al-marfū' huk-*

³³ Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Slaughter; Chapter: The meat of horses (5519).

man. For instance, what some of the *tābi'īn* (plural of *tābi'ī*) said, "On the authority of Abī Hurairah, he attributed it," or "On the authority of Abī Hurairah its attribution," or "On the authority of Abī Hurairah, he attained it." All of these are considered as *al-marfū' hukman* as the attribution to the Prophet ﷺ was not clearly stated.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَالْمُسْنَدُ الْمُتَّصِلُ الْإِسْنَادِ مِنْ
رَاوِيهِ حَتَّى الْمُصْطَفَى وَلَمْ يَبْنِ

(8) *The musnad is that whose isnād is connected from,
Its narrator up to the Chosen One and not detached.*

This is the sixth classification of the categories of *hadīth* mentioned in the poem, and we have five things that are related to the *sanad*:

1. *Musnad* (the attributed narration).
2. *Musnid* (the one who attributes).
3. *Musnad ilayhi* (the one attributed to).
4. *Isnād* (the attribution).
5. *Sanad* (the chain).

The author defined the *musnad* as one whose *isnād* is connected from its narrator up to Muhammad the Chosen One ﷺ.

His saying, "Not detached": this is explaining the connection of the chain i.e. not disconnected. Thus, the *musnad* according to the author is the *marfū'* narration of which its *isnād* is connected.

As for it being defined as *al-marfū'*, it is deduced from the phrase, "Up to the Chosen One".

And as for the continuity of the chain, it is deduced from the phrase,

“Whose *isnād* is connected... not detached.” This is the definition of *al-musnad*.

Based on this definition, the *mawqūf* is not classified as a *musnad* because it is not taken to be *marfū'* i.e. not connected to the Prophet ﷺ.

Likewise the *munqati'* where some of its narrators were abandoned is not considered as *musnad* because we have laid the requirement that it has to be connected. This is the opinion of the author and majority of the scholars of *hadīth*.

And some of them said that the *musnad* is more general than this definition. As such, everything that was attributed by its narrator is termed as *musnad*. Hence, it includes the *marfū'*, *mawqūf*, *maqtū'*, *muttasil* and *munqati'*.

There is no doubt that this opinion is in line with the linguistic meaning of the word because *al-musnad* refers to anything that is attributed to its narrator, whether it is *marfū'* or not and whether it is *muttasil* or *munqati'*. However, most scholars of *hadīth* define *musnad* as the narration whose *isnād* is continuous to the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ.

As for *al-musnid*, it refers to the narrator who attributed the *hadīth* to its narrator. As such, if one said, “So-and-so told me.”

The speaker here is the *musnid*.

And the person he mentioned is the *musnad ilayhi*.

Which means that all those who attributed a narration are called the *musnid*, and all those whom the *hadīth* was attributed to are the *mus-*

nad ilayhi.

As for the *sanad*, they are the *rijāl* (men) of the *hadīth* i.e. its narrators. If someone were to say, "So-and-so told me from so-and-so from so-and-so", all of them are the *sanad* of the *hadīth*. This is because the narration is supported by them, thus they become the *sanad* (support) for it.

As for *al-isnād*; some scholars of *hadīth* say that the *isnād* is the *sanad* itself. This expression is commonly used amongst them hence they say, "Its *isnād* is *sahīh*," in reference to its *sanad* i.e. the narrators.

And some of them say that the *isnād* is the attribution of the *hadīth* to its narrator.

It is said, "He made *isnād* of the *hadīth* to so-and-so," i.e. he attributed it to him.

And the correct opinion is that it can be used in both situations.

As such, sometimes the *isnād* refers to the *sanad*, which is the narrators.

And sometimes it refers to the attribution of the narration to its narrator, hence it is said, "He made *isnād* of the *hadīth* to so-and-so", "He made *isnād* of it to Abī Hurairah", "He made *isnād* of it to Ibn 'Abbās", "He made *isnād* of it to Ibn 'Umar", etc.

Does an *isnād* confirm that the *hadīth* is *sahīh*?

We say no, because the *sanad* may be connected from the narrator to

the Prophet ﷺ, but the narrators are weak or unknown etc.

As such, not all *musnad* narrations are considered to be *sahih*. The *hadith* may be sound but not *musnad*. For instance, if it was attributed to a companion with a sound *sanad*, hence it is *mawqūf* and *sahih* but not *musnad*. This is because it is not attributed to the Prophet ﷺ. It could also be *musnad* with a continuous *isnād* but the narrators are weak thus the narration is *musnad* but not *sahih*.

Therefore, there is a difference between the definition of *musnad* in terms of language and terminology, and the relation between the two is that one is generic and the other is specific.

As for *al-musnad* in terms of language; it is the speech that was attributed to its speaker, whether it is *marfū'*, *mawqūf* or *maqtū'*.

Thus, if you were to say: "So-and-so said this," this sentence is considered as *musnad* even if you were to attribute it to someone who is present with you and you are speaking to him right now.

And if I were to say, "So-and-so said this", this is considered as *musnad* because I attributed the speech to its speaker.

However, in terms of terminology, the *musnad* is one that is *marfū'* with a *sanad* that is *muttasil*.

Thus the *musnad* in terminology is more specific than its linguistic meaning. Hence, all that is considered as *musnad* in terminology is a *musnad* linguistically, but the opposite is incorrect. Therefore the difference between the two is generality and specificity.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَمَا بِسَمْعِ كُلِّ رَاوٍ يَتَّصِلُ
إِسْنَادُهُ لِلْمُضْطَقِّ فَالْمُتَّصِلُ

(9) *And one whose chain, by every narrator's hearing,
Is connected to al-Mustafā is the muttasil.*

The word *al-Mustafā* (the chosen one) is derived from the word *al-safwah*, which means the best thing. Its linguistic origin is *al-mustafā* with the letter *ta'*.

And the principle states that if the letters *ta'* and *sād* were to meet, and one of the two precedes the other with a *sukūn* (absence of a vowel), then the letter ت shall change into the letter ط and thus it becomes *al-Mustafā* [with a ط].

And the preposition *lām* in the author's words, "*lilmustafā*" has the meaning of "to" i.e. to the chosen one.

And *al-muttasil* is the seventh category of the classifications of *hadīth* mentioned in the poem.

There are two opinions on its definition:

Al-muttasil according to the author is the *marfū'* narration that was taken by each of its narrators from the one above him through hearing.

As such, the author laid down two requirements for a narration to be considered as *muttasil*:

1. By hearing i.e. where every single narrator heard the narration from the one before him.
2. The narration must be *marfū'* to the Prophet ﷺ.

This is due to the author's speech, "*lilmustafaa*" i.e. to the chosen one. Hence, based on this, the *mawqūf* and the *maqtū'* are not considered as *muttasil*. This is because the author laid the condition that the narration must be connected to the Prophet ﷺ. As for the *maqtū'* and the *mawqūf*, the *sanad* is not connected to the Prophet ﷺ.

Likewise for the *marfū'*, if one of the narrators were to be abandoned, it would also not be considered *muttasil* because it is disconnected.

Upon the apparent meaning of the author's definition, if the hearing or anything else in its place is not clearly stated by the narrator, then it is not considered as *muttasil*. Therefore, the hearing is a must, and the hearing from the narrator is the strongest form of *al-tahammul* (reception) and this is the opinion of the author in defining the *muttasil*.

And it is said that the *muttasil* is the one whose *isnād* is connected whereby each and every narrator takes from the one above him until its end.

Upon this definition, it includes the *mawqūf*, *maqtū'* as well as the narration through hearing and other than hearing. The crucial matter is that it must be connected.

And this opinion is more correct than the author's, which is that the

muttasil is one whose *isnād* is connected whereby each and every narrator narrates from the one above him. [According to the more correct view the narration is *muttasil*] regardless whether the narration is *marfū'* or *mawqūf* or *maqṭū'*, and regardless whether the transmission is through hearing or other than hearing. Thus everything that has a connected chain is considered as *muttasil*.

With regards to the differing opinions regarding whether the meeting of narrators is a criterion or if it is acceptable if they lived in the same era, we have already discussed it earlier with the answer for it.³⁴

And it is not a requirement that the specific *ḥadīth* was heard from the narrator. In fact, it is sufficient to confirm the hearing in general unless if it is said that the narrator did not actually hear from the other except for one narration and it is the *ḥadīth* of such-and-such for example, then all the other narrations are not considered as *muttasil*.

For instance, if it was said that al-Hasan al-Basrī did not hear from Samurah Ibn Jundub ؓ except one *ḥadīth*, which is the one regarding *al-'aqīqah* (the sacrifice for the newborn).

Based on this, if al-Hasan al-Basrī were to narrate from Samurah Ibn Jundub ؓ another *ḥadīth* other than the *ḥadīth* of *al-'aqīqah*, then the narration is not considered as *muttasil*.

And the scholars have different opinions on the issue. But we say that it is difficult to limit the narrations, thus there is difficulty in confirming our statement that al-Hasan did not hear from Samurah except the *ḥadīth* of *al-'aqīqah*. Even if we were to assume that al-Hasan said,

³⁴ Previously mentioned on page 40 in the Arabic text.

“I did not hear from him except this *hadīth*”, we say that if he were to declare this statement after the death of Samurah, then we conclude that he did not hear from Samurah except this one narration because it was not possible for him to hear from Samurah after he died. As for the case whereby he proclaimed this during Samurah’s lifetime, then there is the possibility that when he said, “I did not hear from him except this *hadīth*”, he may have heard another narration after that point of time. Allāh Knows best.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

مُسَلْسَلٌ قُلُ مَا عَلَى وَصْفٍ أَتَى
مِثْلُ أَمَّا وَاللَّهِ أَنَّبَانِي الْفَتَى

(10) Say *musalsal* is one which comes with a description,
Such as: "Indeed by Allāh, the youth informed me."

Al-musalsal is also one of the classifications of the *hadīth*. It is the eighth category in the poem and it is the direct object of the Arabic verb *salsalahu* which means: he tied him in a *silsilah* (chain). This is the literal meaning of the word.

As for its definition in terminology, it is the narration where the narrators concurred in the narration and transmitted it in a particular way or in a particular situation.

It means that the narrators concurred upon a certain description in it, either it could be the description of the *adā'* or situation of the narrators etc.

The *musalsal* is one of the studies of the *sanad* and the *matn* altogether because it can occur in both or in either one of the two without the other.

The benefit of *al-musalsal* is the observation that the narrator was precise in the narration. There are many examples of this, one of which is the *hadīth* of Mu'ādh Ibn Jabal ؓ that the Prophet ﷺ said

to him, "Indeed I love you dearly, so never forget to recite after every prayer, 'O Allāh help me in remembering You, in offering thanks to You, and in worshiping You properly.'"³⁵

This *ḥadīth* was repeated sequentially such that every narrator that wished to narrate it to another person, he would state to him the sentence, "Indeed I love you dearly, so never forget to recite [to the end of the *ḥadīth*]."

Thus this narration is considered as *musalsal* because the narrators concurred in it with this sentence.

Likewise if one were to say, "So-and-so told me while he was having lunch," and then this narrator told the one after him and he was having his lunch and said, "So-and-so told me while he was having lunch," and the next narrator in the chain said, "So-and-so told me while he was having lunch," and this was repeated by those following in the chain. Thus we term this narration as *musalsal* as the narrators concurred upon one situation in it and thus transmitted the *ḥadīth* during lunch.

Similarly if the narrators were to concur upon a certain format of transmission whereby they all said, "So-and-so reported to me and he said, 'So-and-so reported to me and he said, 'So-and-so reported to me,'" until the end of the *sanad*, then we term this narration as *musalsal* as well. This is due to the fact that the narrators concurred upon a certain format which is "he reported to me".

The author's phrase, "Say *musalsal* is one which comes with a descrip-

³⁵ Recorded by Imām Ahmad 5/ 244

tion”.

He meant that it comes upon one description of the narrators, regardless whether the description was about the format of *adā'* or the situation of the narrator. If the narrators concurred upon something, whether it is the format of transmission or situation of the narrator, then the narration is called *musalsal*.

As for the phrase, “Such as, ‘Indeed by Allāh, the youth informed me.’”

Its example is as mentioned earlier which is that every single one of them said, “So-and-so reported to me and he said, ‘So-and-so reported to me,’” until the end of the *sanad*. We call this narration *musalsal* because the narrators concurred upon a particular format for transmission. Likewise if they were to concur upon the formats “I heard” or “He said” and its likes, all these are called *musalsal*.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

كَذَاكَ قَدْ حَدَّثَنِيهِ قَائِمًا
أَوْ بَعْدَ أَنْ حَدَّثَنِي تَبَسُّمًا

(11) Similarly: "Indeed he narrated it to me while standing."

Or "After he narrated it to me he smiled."

He meant that these are illustrations of *musalsal* where the narrators say, "So-and-so narrated to me while standing and he said, 'So-and-so narrated to me while standing and he said, 'So-and-so narrated to me while standing,'" in this manner to the end of the *sanad*.

Similarly if one was to say, "So-and-so narrated to me while lying on his mattress," or "He narrated to me and then he smiled," and then the narrators concurred upon this wording, thus the narration is considered as *musalsal*.

And if the narrators concurred in the narration of the *hadith* of Abu Hurairah ؓ regarding the story of the man who had intercourse during the daytime of Ramadān. The man said after alms were brought to him, "O Messenger of Allāh, do I give it away to anyone poorer than me? Indeed by Allāh there is no family between its (Madīnah) two mountains who is poorer than me", then the Prophet ﷺ laughed until his molars were seen.³⁶ If all of the narrators of this *hadith* laughed

³⁶ Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Fasting; Chapter: When one had intercourse during the daytime in Ramadān (1936) and Muslim; The Book of Fasting; Chapter:

when they arrived at this sentence until their molars were seen, then this narration is also considered as *musalsal* because the narrators concurred in it upon one situation which is the laughter.

What is the benefit of identifying the *musalsal*?

We say that there are benefits from knowing the *musalsal* and they are:

Firstly: It is actually an interesting art whereby the narrators concurred in it upon a specific situation, especially if one said, "He told me as he was lying on his mattress", "He told me as he was making ablution", "He told me as he was eating", "He told me then he smiled", "He told me and then he cried", thus these situations are interesting, and that all of the narrators concurred upon one situation.

Secondly: The transmission of the *musalsal* in such a manner, to the level that the situation of the narrator was described, is an evidence of the full precision of the narrators and that some of them had accuracy even in the description of the situation the narrator was in when he narrated from him and hence this strengthens the *hadīth*.

Thirdly: If the state of the *musalsal* is one of the acts of getting closer to Allāh, then there is additional worship and means of getting closer to Allāh from the *hadīth*. An example would be in the previously mentioned *hadīth* of Mu'ādh رضي الله عنه, "Indeed I love you dearly, so never forget..." whereby every single one of the narrators told the other, "Indeed I love you dearly." This is something that increases *imān*, and it gets the person closer to Allāh ﷻ because the love and hatred for the sake of Allāh is one of the strongest manifestations of true faith.

The penalty for the prohibition of intercourse during the daytime in Ramadān (1111).

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

عَزِيزٌ مَّرْوِيٌّ اِثْنَيْنِ أَوْ ثَلَاثَةً
مَشْهُورٌ مَّرْوِيٌّ فَوْقَ مَا ثَلَاثَةً

(12) *'Azīz is narrated by two or three,
Mash-hūr is narrated by more than three.*

The author mentioned two types of the classifications of *ḥadīth* in this line and they are: *al-'azīz* and *al-mash-hūr*. With these two, the ninth and tenth of the classifications of *ḥadīth* have been completed in the poem.

The word *'azīz* linguistically is taken from the verb *'azza* which means "he became powerful". It also has other meanings; amongst them are strength, overcoming and invulnerability. However, the one that we are concerned with in terms of terminology is the first meaning which is strength.

As for its definition in *ḥadīth* terminology, it is what was narrated by two narrators from two narrators from another two until the end of the chain.

The author here did not state the condition that the narration has to be *marfū'*. Thus it includes the *marfū'*, *marwqūf* and *maqtū'* because he said, "Narrated by two," and he did not specify the *marfū'* which was narrated by two. Due to this reason, it is not a requirement for the *'azīz* to be *marfū'*.

The logic behind naming this type of narration as *'azīz* is that it becomes stronger with the support of the second narration. And the more the narrators, the stronger the *ḥadīth* or *ḵabar*. As such, if a trustworthy person reported to you about an incident, and another trustworthy person came and told you the same thing, followed by third person and a fourth who told you the same thing, then this piece of news shall increase in strength due to the increase in numbers of reporters.

And his saying, "or three":

The preposition *aw* (or) connotes variety. It is possible that it can denote change due to the context, but as the author said after it that the *mash-hūr* is narrated by more than three, we know that the preposition here is for variety i.e. that the *'azīz* is what was narrated by two from two until its end, or what was narrated by three from three until its end. Thus, what was narrated by three narrators from another three until the end of the *sanad* is taken to be *'azīz* according to the author because it is strengthened by the two other routes.

However, it is commonly known amongst the later generations of scholars that the *'azīz* is what was narrated by only two narrators.

As such, *al-mash-hūr* is known as what was narrated by three or more. Based on this fact, the opinion of the author that it could also be narrated by three is incorrect. Thus the correct opinion is that the *'azīz* is one that is narrated by only two from the start of the *sanad* until its end.

If the narration was narrated by two narrators from one narrator and then from two, then another two until its end, then it is not called

'*azīz* because the criterion is not met at one of the levels. And even if the criterion is not met at only one of the levels, the term still does not apply.

Is being '*azīz* a requirement of *sahīh* narrations?

We say that '*azīz* is not a requirement for the *sahīh* status.

However some scholars said that it is in fact a requirement for *sahīh* narrations.

They reasoned by saying that the testimony is not acceptable except from two witnesses. Definitely the narration from the Prophet ﷺ is the greatest thing ever witnessed. As such, whoever deliberately lied upon the Prophet ﷺ, he shall take his place in Hellfire.

However, the author stated earlier that this is not a condition for *sahīh* status by saying, "What is connected in its chain, and is neither contradicting nor defected," and he did not mention the requirement of being '*azīz*.

And the rebuttal given by those who hold the opinion is that the testimony cannot be accepted except from two sources.

However [in relation to *mustalah al-hadīth*] this is a form of report (*khabr*) and not a testimony, and one source suffices the report. Evidence of this is the case of the *mu'athin* who makes the *athān* and the people break their fast upon hearing his call despite the fact that he is only one person. This is because it is a form of religious report and one source is sufficient. And it is evident from the fact that the scholars agreed upon accepting the *hadīth* of Amīr al-Muminīn 'Umar Ibn al-

Khattāb ؓ where he heard the Prophet ﷺ say, "Indeed actions are according to intentions, and indeed for every man is what he intended."³⁷ The scholars do so despite the fact that it is narrated by only one narrator in three levels in the chain of this *ḥadīth*. Thus this shows that it is not a criterion of the *ṣaḥīḥ* status for the narrators to be two or more.

The author's phrase: "*Mash-hūr* is narrated by more than three":

This is according to the author while we say that the correct opinion is that the *mash-hūr* is what was narrated by more than two. As such, according to the author, the *mash-hūr* is that which was narrated by four narrators and above whereas based on the correct opinion, it is what was narrated by three or more narrators but still below the level of *al-tawātur* (mass transmission).

The word *mash-hūr* has two meanings:

1. What is widespread amongst the people.
2. What has been termed by the scholars as *mash-hūr*.

There are two types of that which is widespread amongst the people:

- a. What is widespread amongst the common people.
- b. What is widespread amongst the people of knowledge.

As for what is widespread among the common people, there is no ruling for it because some fabricated narrations may be widespread among the commoners and thus it is not taken into account and the fact that it is widespread among the people has no effect. This is because the

³⁷ Reported by Bukhārī (1) and Muslim (1957)

common people are not the specialists for accepting or rejecting narrations so that we can say that what is widespread amongst them is considered as acceptable. As such, we find that scholars wrote a number of books regarding many of the famous *ahādīth* that were widespread among the common people. One of these books is *Tamyīzūt Taiyibī minal Khabīthi Fīmā Yadūru 'alā al-Sinatin Nāsi minal Hadīth* (Distinction of the Good from the Evil of Common Narrations Amongst the Speech of the People).

An example of such widespread *hadīths* amongst them is, "The best of names is one that begins with Muhammad or 'Abd."³⁸ This is famous amongst the common people and it is said to be a *sahīh* narration. However it is a *hadīth* which has no origin and it is not confirmed from the Prophet ﷺ. In fact, the Prophet ﷺ said, "The most beloved names to Allāh are 'Abdullāh and 'Abdul Rahmān."³⁹

Another example would be, "The love for one's country is part of faith"⁴⁰ and it is popularly spread amongst the common people as being a *sahīh* narration. However it is a fabricated and untrue *hadīth*. In fact its meaning is not sound as the love for the country is part of fanaticism.

Another example is the narration, "The day you fast is the day you slaughter."⁴¹ It is famous amongst the common people and held as a *sahīh* narration but there is no origin for it.

³⁸ *Al-Maqāsīd al-Hasanah* page 103 and *al-Asrār al-Marfū'ah* page 193.

³⁹ The book of Manners; Chapter: The forbiddance of having Abil Qasim as a nickname 2 2132

⁴⁰ *Kashf al-Khafā'*; volume 1 page 413, *Tathkirah al-Mawdū'āt* 11, and *al-Silsilah al-Da'ifah* 36.

⁴¹ *Kashf al-Khafā'*; volume 2 page 211.

Likewise is the narration, "The fourth of Rajab is the start of Ramadān, in it you shall slaughter." I.e. the fourth day of the month of Rajab is the first day of Ramadān and the tenth day of Dhul Hijjah. It is an embellished *hadīth* with no origin and thus false and unsound.

The second type is what is widespread amongst the scholars and thus is taken as a valid evidence even if it has no *isnād* according to some scholars. They reason that the popularity of the narration amongst the people of knowledge, their acceptance and taking it into consideration shows that there is origin for the narration.

One such *hadīth* is: "There is no execution for the father who murdered his son."⁴² I.e. the father is not executed as a form of *qisās* (legal retribution) for killing his son. It is a *mash-hūr* narration amongst the scholars and there are those who took it into consideration saying that due to its popularity amongst the scholars, its circulation amongst them and their deductions from it, it shows that the narration has an origin.

There are scholars who did not take this narration into consideration.

And there are those who elaborated and said that if the narration does not contradict the apparent meaning of a religious text, then it is acceptable.

As for the one that contradicts the apparent meaning of a religious text, it is rejected. And this the closest opinion to the truth, which is

⁴² Recorded by Imām Ahmad 1/49 and al-Tirmidhī; The Book of Blood Monies; Chapter: What comes regarding the man who killed his son, whether he is to be executed or not (1400).

that the narration which is widespread amongst scholars has to be analysed; if it does not contradict a religious text then it can be accepted, and if it contradicts a religious text then it cannot be accepted.

For instance, the narration, "There is no execution for the father who murdered his son" contradicts with the apparent meaning of the religious text which is the ayah: **{And We ordained for them therein a life for a life.}**⁴³ In fact, it is also contradictory with the ayah, **{O you who have believed, prescribed for you is legal retribution for those murdered – the free for the free.}**⁴⁴ And the *hadith*, "The blood of the Muslim man is not permissible except due to three reasons: a life for a life..."⁴⁵

43 Al-Mā'idah: 45

44 Al-Baqarah: 178

45 Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Blood Monies; Chapter: The verse: "life for a life" (6878) and Muslim; The Book of Oaths; Chapter: What permits the blood of the Muslim 25 (1676).

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

مُعْنَعَنْ كَعَنْ سَعِيدٍ عَنْ كَرَمٍ
وَمُبْهَمٌ مَا فِيهِ رَاوٍ لَمْ يُسَمَّ

(13) *Mu'an'an* is like "from Sa'id from Karam,"
Mubham is that in which a narrator hasn't been named.

Al-Mu'an'an is taken from the word 'an (from) and it is what was transmitted with the format "from so-and-so".

And this is the eleventh category from the classifications of *hadīth* mentioned in this poem. An example is to say: "*An* (from) Nāfi, 'an (from) Ibn 'Umar ؓ." Another example would be to say: "*Hadathanā fulān* (So and so informed me), 'an *fulān* (from so and so), 'an *fulān* (from so and so), 'an *fulān* (from so and so)."

The author simplified its definition to the illustration of an example. This is because the definition by example is permissible, and the aim of defining something is to clarify the identified and providing the example may suffice in doing so. The example that the author gave is, "From Sa'id from Karam" thus he said, "I narrated this *hadīth* from Sa'id from Karam" and this is *al-mu'an'an*.

There is another type of narration called *al-mu'annan* which is what is narrated with the word *anna* (that). An example is to say, "*Hadathanā fulān* (so and so told me) *an fulān qāla* (that so-and-so said) *an fulān qāla* (that so-and-so said) [... to the end]."

And the ruling for *mu'an'an* and *mu'annan* is that the chain is connected except if it includes a narrator who is known to make *tadlīs* (deception). In this case it is not considered as being connected until it is made obvious in another narration that the hearing occurred. Hence, we need to know the *mudallisīn* (deceivers) so that we are capable of identifying a *ḥadīth* as not being connected when it comes with the word '*an*' and it is narrated from a *mudallis* (singular of *mudallisīn*). This is because the deceiver may abandon a narrator between him and the one mentioned in the chain as a form of deception due to the weakness of the abandoned narrator in his narration or his religion and hence he is being abandoned to give the *sanad* an appearance of authenticity. Therefore, we do not consider it as being connected as we fear from his deception. And this is the cautiousness of the people of knowledge when it comes to the Sunnah of the Prophet ﷺ and one of Allāh's Blessing that is bestowed upon this nation is that the scholars were very reserved in attributing anything to the Prophet ﷺ.

The author's statement: "*Mubham* is that in which a narrator hasn't been named."

The *mubham* (ambiguous) narration is one that has an unidentified narrator and this is the twelfth category from the classifications of *ḥadīth* mentioned in this poem.

An example would be to say: "A man told me and he said, 'So-and-so told me from so-and-so from so-and-so.'" We term this *ḥadīth* as *mubham* because a narrator in the chain is unknown. Likewise if he were to say, "The trustworthy person told me", it is also considered as *mubham* because we do not know who this trustworthy person is; he could be reliable in the eyes of the narrator but is not trustworthy according to the others.

Similarly if he were to say, "Someone I trust told me", this is also considered as *mubham*.

If he were to say, "The owner of this residence told me", it is considered as *mubham* as well as long as the owner of the house is not well-known.

Therefore, the *mubham* is everything that has an ambiguity in the identification of a narrator. As for the *hadīth* regarding a man who is not named e.g. the *hadīth* of Anas ؓ who said, "A Bedouin man entered the *masjid* on a Friday when the Prophet ﷺ was delivering his sermon ..." ⁴⁶ The Bedouin here is unknown but the narration is not considered to fall under the term we are discussing here because the Bedouin did not narrate a *hadīth*, rather he was spoken about.

Hence the author's statement, "That in which a narrator hasn't been named" refers to the instance when a narrator in the *sanad* is not named.

The ruling of *mubham* is that the *hadīth* is not acceptable until the identity of this *mubham* narrator is ascertained. This is because we do not know the status of this ambiguous person. However an exception is the *mubham* narrator from amongst the companions for his ambiguity does not cause any harm. This is because all of the companions are righteous and trustworthy with Allāh's testimony in the ayah: **{But to all Allāh has promised the best [reward].}** ⁴⁷ And His commendation in the ayah: **{Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among**

⁴⁶ Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Seeking Rain; Chapter: The seeking of rain on a Friday (1014) and Muslim; The Book of Seeking Rain; Chapter: Supplications during the seeking of rain 8 (897).

⁴⁷ Al-Hadid: 10

themselves.}⁴⁸ As well as the ayah: **{And the first forerunners [in the faith] among the Muhājirīn and the Ansār and those who followed them with good conduct – Allāh is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him.}**⁴⁹

Therefore, the ruling of the *mubham* narration is put on hold until the unknown narrator is identified except for the companions as the ambiguous amongst them are acceptable as discussed earlier.

48 Al-Fath: 29

49 Al-Tawbah: 100

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَكُلُّ مَا قَلَّتْ رِجَالُهُ عِلًّا
وَضِدُّهُ ذَاكَ الَّذِي قَدْ نَزَلَ

(14) *That which has few narrators shall arise,
And its opposite is the one which shall descend.*

These are two categories of the classifications of *hadith*, which are the thirteenth and fourteenth mentioned in this poem. They are called *al-'alā* (high graded) and *al-nāzil* (low graded).

The highness of a chain or its lowness is a description of the *isnād*.

And there are two types of highly graded chains:

Firstly: The highness in terms of numbers, and it is as defined by the author in his statement, "That which has few narrators ..." As such, every *sanad* that has a lower quantity of narrators is considered as highly graded, while every *sanad* that has a higher quantity of narrators is considered as lowly graded. This is because the lower the number of narrators is leads to fewer intermediaries, and the fewer the intermediaries that are present lowers the risk of mistakes. This becomes clear through the illustration of an example:

If the narrators were Zayd from 'Amr from Bakr, the risk of making mistakes can occur at the first, the second and at the third narrator. Thus there are three possibilities. And if they were Zayd from 'Amr

from Bakr from Khālid from Sufyān, then there are five possibilities. It is known that the lower the risk of making mistakes, the closer the narration is to being accepted.

Thus, if the *ḥadīth* was narrated with a *sanad* having five individuals between the narration and the narrator, and in another route there are three individuals between the narration and the narrator, then the second is termed as *al-ʿalā* and the first is called *al-nāzil*. This is due to the reduced possibility of making mistakes when there are three intermediaries compared to five.

Does the highness of the *sanad* in terms of numbers imply that it is more sound than that of *al-nāzil*?

We say that it does not imply as such because the one with fewer numbers may include weak narrators whereas the one with more numbers may include trustworthy and steadfast narrators. Hence, the highly graded *sanad* in terms of numbers does not lead us to conclude that *al-ʿalā* is more authentic as the status of the narrators is an important matter to take into consideration.

Secondly: The highness in terms of description. This is the *sanad* where narrators are more consistent in terms of memorisation and righteousness than the other *sanad*.

Its example:

If a *ḥadīth* were to be narrated through a route of three narrators, and it is also narrated through another route of three narrators, but the narrators of the first route are weaker in terms of memory and righteousness than that of the second, then undoubtedly the second is stronger and

higher in grade than the first route.

And if a *ḥadīth* were to be narrated through a route of four narrators, and the same *ḥadīth* is also narrated through another route of three narrators. If the first route is more consistent in terms of memory and righteousness than that of the second, then the first is higher in grade in terms of the status of the narrators.

So if the first is higher in terms of description while the second is higher in terms of numbers, which of the two situations should we give more priority?

We say that we prefer the first which is the highness in terms of description. This is because it is the one that is taken into consideration for the soundness of the *ḥadīth* as the numbers may be for example three narrators and all of them are reliable thus the narration is *ṣaḥīḥ*, and the numbers may be twenty narrators but all of them are weak thus the *ḥadīth* is not *ṣaḥīḥ*.

Therefore, there are two categories in terms of the highness of an *isnād*:

1. Highness in terms of number: There are fewer numbers of narrators.
2. Highness in terms of description: In which the statuses of the narrators are stronger and higher in terms of memorisation and righteousness.

And the author did not speak about the highness in terms of description and only spoke about the highness in terms of numbers.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَمَا أَضَفْتُهُ إِلَى الْأَصْحَابِ مِنْ
قَوْلٍ وَفِعْلٍ فَهُوَ مَوْقُوفٌ زَكِينٌ

(15) *And whatever you attributed to the companions such as,
A statement or an action is known as mawqūf.*

This is the fifteenth category from the classifications of *hadith* mentioned in the poem, and it is called *al-mawqūf*.

The word *mā* (whatever) is a conditional preposition.

“Attributed to the *as-hāb* (companions)” i.e. whatever the narrator attributes to the *as-hāb*. *As-hāb* is the plural of *shabb*, and *shabb* is the plural noun of *sāhib* (companion).

And *as-hāb* here refers to the companions of the Prophet ﷺ.

The companion is one who met with the Prophet ﷺ, believed in him and passed away upon it.

Even if the meeting was for a moment, and this is amongst the specific attributes of the Prophet ﷺ, that his companions include those who met him even for a moment.

Other than those attributed to him ﷺ, a companion is not termed as

such until the companionship occurs for a long period of time. As for someone who meets another individual for the first time at a location, he would not be considered as a companion of the other merely from this meeting.

It is a criterion for a companion to pass away as a believer of the Prophet ﷺ. Even if he were to renounce Islām and then return to embrace it once again, in this case he is still considered as a companion according to the correct opinion amongst the scholars.

What is attributed to a companion is termed by the scholars of *ḥadīth* as *maʿwqūf*.

And the author's word "*zūkin*" means known.

The exceptions of *al-maʿwqūf* are the narrations which are ruled to be *al-marfūʿ*. Whether it is the speech of the companion or his action, it has the ruling of *marfūʿ* even if it is his action such as the prayer of 'Alī ؑ whereby he made three bows (*ruku*) in every unit of the solar eclipse prayer. This is because, the number of bows in a unit of prayer is a matter bound by the Islamic law and there is no room for *ijtihād* in it. Similar is the case for the speech of the companions regarding the matters that shall happen in the future or the unseen. These are given the ruling of *marfūʿ* due to the fact that there is no room for logical reasoning in the matters of the unseen.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَمُرْسَلٌ مِنْهُ الصَّحَابِيُّ سَقَطُ

(16) *And al-mursal, from it the companion was omitted,*

This is the sixteenth category of the classifications of *hadīth* mentioned in the poem and it is called *al-mursal* (the released chain).

In the Arabic language, *al-mursal* means the one released. An example of its usage is the sentence, "*Arsalan nāqata fil mar'ā*" which means he released the camel at the pasture.

In terms of terminology, the author defined it as the narration where the companion was omitted from it.

And some scholars defined it as the attribution of a narration to the Prophet ﷺ by a *tābi'i* or a companion who did not hear the narration from the Prophet himself. This definition is more detailed because the apparent meaning of the author's speech is that if the name of the companion is mentioned, then it is not considered as *mursal* even if the companion did not hear from the Prophet ﷺ such as Muhammad Ibn Abī Bakr ؓ who was born during the *Hajjatul Wadā'* (the Farewell Pilgrimage) and this is not a legitimate definition. As such, the *hadīth* of a companion who did not hear from the Prophet ﷺ is also categorised as *mursal* according to the *muhāqiqīn* (*hadīth* reviewers).

The *mursal* is one of the divisions of the weak narrations because the intermediary between the Prophet ﷺ and the one who attributed it to

him is unknown. There are exceptions in a few situations:

Firstly: If the intermediary between the Prophet ﷺ and the one who attributed it to him ﷺ is known, then the ruling is according to the status of the intermediary.

Secondly: If the one attributing it is a companion.

Thirdly: If the one who made the attribution is known to always attribute through the route of a companion.

Fourthly: If the Ummah has received the narration with acceptance.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَقُلْ غَرِيبٌ مَّا رَوَى رَأُو فَقَطْ

(16) And say that *gharīb* is that which was narrated by only one.

This is the seventeenth category of the classifications of *hadīth* mentioned in the poem and it is called *al-gharīb* (the one-of-its-kind chain).

The author's statement, "And say that *gharīb* is that which was narrated by only one": The word *al-gharīb* comes from *al-ghurbah* (strangeness). And the *gharīb* (stranger) in a country is one who is not its resident.

And the term *gharīb* in the science of *hadīth* is the narration that was narrated by only one narrator. Even if it was a companion, it is considered as *gharīb*. For example if we do not find any other companion except Ibn 'Abbās ؓ then it is considered as *gharīb*. Or if we do not find any other *tābi'i* except Qatādah, then it is considered as *gharīb*.

The state of *gharīb* may occur either at the beginning of the *sanad*, or in the middle, or at the end.

Which means that the *hadīth* may be *gharīb* at the end of the *sanad* whereby it is only narrated by one *tābi'i* from a companion, followed by it being narrated by a large number of narrators. Thus this narration is *gharīb* at the end of the *sanad* even if the ones after him may reach the level of *tawātur*. As such, the *hadīth*, "Indeed actions are accord-

ing to intentions ...”⁵⁰ is considered as *gharīb*. It is *gharīb* at the levels of the companions and the *tābi’in*. As for the levels after that, it was widely spread.

The narration may also be *gharīb* in the middle whereby it was narrated by a group of narrators followed by only one person and then a group of narrators. It could also be *gharīb* at the beginning whereby only one narrator narrated it from a group of narrators.

And the *gharīb* narration may be *sahīh* or *da’if*, but usually the *gharīb* narrations are taken to be *da’if*.

⁵⁰ Mentioned previously.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَكُلُّ مَا لَمْ يَتَّصِلْ بِحَالٍ
إِسْنَادُهُ مُنْقَطِعُ الْأَوْصَالِ

(17) *And all that is not connected in any instance,
Its chain has munqati' (severed) ties.*

This is the eighteenth category of the classifications of *hadīth* mentioned in the poem and it is called *al-munqati* (disconnected).

The author's phrase, "And all":

Which refers to either all *hadīths* or all *isnāds*, but the apparent meaning is that he is referring to the *hadīths*. The proof is that he said, "That is not connected ... its chain" i.e. that all *hadīths* with *isnāds* not connected in any instance are called *al-munqati*'. And this is the general meaning. As such, if the *hadīth* were to be narrated by five narrators; from the first, from the second, from the third, from the fourth, from the fifth.

And then we found that it was narrated from the first, from the third, from the fourth, from the fifth, then it is considered to be *munqati*'.

And if we found that it was narrated from the second, from the third, from the fourth, from the fifth, then it is also considered to be *munqati*' as the first narrator was abandoned.

And if it was narrated from the first, from the third, from the fifth, then it is also considered to be *munqati'*.

The scholars classified the state of *munqati'* into four divisions:

1. The disconnection is from its beginning.
2. The disconnection is from its end.
3. The disconnection is by only one narrator from its middle.
4. The disconnection is by two or more narrators consecutively from its middle.

As for the first category which is the disconnection from the beginning of the *sanad*, it is called *al-mu'allaq* (the hanged chain).

And the logic behind its name is apparent because if you were to hang something from the ceiling, it is then disconnected from its lowest end and does not reach the ground. Therefore, the *mu'allaq* is what was omitted from the beginning of its chain.

Is the *mu'allaq* one of the types of the *sahih* or the *da'if* narrations?

We say that it is one of the types of *da'if* narrations because one of the requirements of the *sahih* narration is the connection of its chain. However, whatever al-Bukhārī recorded as *mu'allaq* and he was certain about it, it is considered as *sahih* according to him even if it was not according to his conditions. And we say that it is *sahih* according to al-Bukhārī because he recorded it as *mu'allaq* and used it as a valid evidence to infer the rulings. Evidently it is not possible that he would conclude any of Allāh's rulings except by deriving from the sound narrations he possessed. However the narration did not meet al-Bukhārī's criteria, and if it had, he would have mentioned its *sanad* so that it is

known, with the fact that he reported the *ḥadīth* as *mu'allaq* in a chapter but *muttasil* in another.

As for the second category which is the disconnection from the end of the *sanad*, it is called *al-mursal* (the released chain).

As for the third category which is the disconnection by one narrator from the middle of the *sanad*, it is called *al-munqati'* (the disconnected chain) in terms of nomenclature. Thus the *munqati'* according to the scholars is what was omitted from the middle of the chain by one narrator only.

As for the fourth category which is the disconnection by two or more narrators consecutively from the middle of the *sanad*, it is called *al-mu'dal* (the impassable chain).

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَالْمُعْضَلُ السَّاقِطُ مِنْهُ اثْنَانِ

(18) And the *mu'dal* has two omitted from it,

This is the nineteenth category of the classifications of *hadith* mentioned in the poem and it is called *al-mu'dal* (the impassable chain).

The author's words "the *mu'dal*" is the subject (Arabic grammar: *mubtada*) and "omitted" (*al-sāqitu*) is its predicate (Arabic grammar: *khabr*). And the phrase, "has two omitted from it" means consecutively and not separately.

For example, if the *sanad* comprises of the first, second, third, fourth and fifth narrators, and the second and third were omitted, then it is called *mu'dal* because two of its consecutive narrators were omitted. Similar is the case if three or more consecutive narrators were omitted.

If the second and fourth were abandoned, then this is called *munqati'*. This is because even if two narrators were abandoned, they were not consecutive.

And if the first and the last were abandoned, then it is *mu'allaq* and *mursal* at the same time i.e. *mu'allaq* in view of the abandonment at the beginning of the *sanad* and *mursal* in view of its end.

All these categories are taken to be types of *da'if* narrations.

And if we found two narrations, one of which is *mu'dal* and the other may be *munqati'*, *mu'allaq* or *mursal*, then the *mu'dal* is the weakest of all, because two of its consecutive narrators were abandoned.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَمَا أَتَى مُدَلِّسًا نَوْعَانِ

(18) *That which comes as mudallas is of two types:*

The statement: “That which comes as *mudallas* is of two types” brings us to the twentieth category of the classifications of *hadith* mentioned in the poem.

The word “*mudallas*” is in the state of the doer (Arabic grammar: *fā'il*) of the verb “come”. While “two types” (*naw'ān*) is the predicate for the subject. “What” (*mā*) is a relative pronoun (Arabic grammar: *ism mawsūl*) with the meaning “the one that” i.e. the one that comes as *mudallas* is of two types.

The author's word, “*mudallas*”: *Al-mudallas* (the deceived narration) comes from the word *al-tadlis*. Its origin comes from the word *al-dulsah* which means the darkness. And the act of *tadlis* in trading is to display the goods in a manner that makes them seem better in quality than they really are, such as the accumulation of milk in the udders of livestock or to colour the wall with paint so that the one who sees it will think that it is new but in actual fact it is not.

As for *tadlis* in the science of *hadith*, it is divided into two categories as mentioned by the author: “That which comes as *mudallas* is of two types”, while some scholars divided it into three categories.

As for the classification of the author, it is divided into two categories.

The first category is mentioned in the next couplet of the poem:

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

الأَوَّلُ الإِسْقَاطُ لِلشَّيْخِ وَأَنْ
يَنْقُلَ عَمَّنْ فَوْقَهُ بِعَنْ وَأَنْ

(19) *The first is omission of the shaykh and to,
Transmit from the one above him by using "an" and "anna";*

This is called *tadlīs al-taswiyah* whereby the narrator abandoned his *shaykh* (teacher) and narrated from the one above the teacher with a format that is made to appear connected.

Such as if Khālid were to say that 'Alī said such-and-such, whereas between Khālid and 'Alī is a narrator named Muhammad. However Khālid had abandoned Muhammad and did not mention his name, instead he said that 'Alī said such-and-such.

We say that this is an act of *tadlīs* and it is in actual fact not a form of lying as he is speaking the truth. However there are a few reasons that cause the narrator to make *tadlīs*. Examples being to hide himself in a manner that it is not said that he studied from a particular *shaykh* for example, or to hide it for political reasons, or due to his fear from the authorities or its likes, or due to other reasons. Or perhaps that the *shaykh* he abandoned is someone whose narration is not acceptable, either due to the fact that he has poor memory or is weak in his religion, or maybe that his *shaykh* is of lower status than him etc.

Most importantly, the objectives behind the abandonment of the

shaykh are many and limitless but the worst of them is where the *shaykh* is not righteous and the abandonment is so that the *hadīth* becomes acceptable. This is because it may have an effect on many of the *Shari'ah* rulings and perhaps the *hadīth* may be fabricated by the abandoned *shaykh* himself.

The *mudallas* narration is not acceptable even if the narrator is trustworthy, except if he made it obvious that he was told directly by saying: "So-and-so told me" or "I heard so-and-so", only then it becomes connected.

The second category is the *tadlis* of *shuyūkh* (plural of *shaykh*) whereby the *shaykh* is not being abandoned but being described with characteristics that he was not known for, and the author pointed this out in his next couplet:

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَالثَّانِي لَا يُسْقِطُهُ لَكِنْ يَصِفُ
أَوْصَافَهُ بِمَا بِهِ لَا يَنْعَرِفُ

(20) *And in the second he does not omit him but he describes,
His characteristics with that by which he is not known.*

An example would be to identify one of his teachers with other than his name, or to call him with other than his nickname, while the *shaykh* cannot be identified except with the name that was omitted. Another example is to describe him with a general characteristic such as the one who says, “The one whose nose is between his two eyes told me,” or “The one who sat to narrate *hadīth* told me”.

And the reasons that cause the narrator to act in such a way are similar to the objectives that were mentioned earlier in the first category. The narrator may hide the *shaykh*’s name so that the *hadīth* isn’t termed as *da’if*, rejected or due to other reasons.

And this type of *tadlīs* is not acceptable just like the previous type. This is not the case if the one that was made *tadlīs* of is being described by what identifies him and thus we look at his status.

Is the act of *tadlīs* permissible or prohibited?

We say that the *asl* (root) is that it is prohibited. This is because it is a form of cheating and the Prophet ﷺ said, “Whoever cheats is not

from amongst us.”⁵¹ This is especially so if the cheating was regarding a matter that is attributed to the Messenger ﷺ for this is worse than cheating in business. If the Prophet ﷺ told the trader of the food that was wet by the rain, “Whoever cheats is not from amongst us”, if the person were to cheat in the *sanad* of the *hadīth*; this would be greater and more serious. Even so, some of the *tābi’in* or other than them may have used *tadlis* for good reason, and they did not intend to wrong the Sunnah of Prophet ﷺ or the people, but rather they intended to do so for some good reasons. However, in actual fact, it does not rationalise what they have done. Rather we say that they made the *ijtihād* so they are rewarded for their reasoning, but if they were to be explicit and clarified the matter, then it would have been preferable and better.

⁵¹ Recorded by Muslim; The Book of Faith; Chapter: His speech, prayers and blessings upon him: “Whoever cheated us ...” with the number 164 (102).

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَمَا يُخَالِفُ ثِقَةً بِهِ الْمَلَأَ
فَالشَّاذُّ وَالْمُقْلُوبُ قِسْمَانِ تَلَا

(21) *And when a trustworthy narrator contradicts the assembly,
Is al-shāth while al-maqlūb has two types that follow:*

These two are the twenty first and twenty second categories of the classifications of *hadīth* mentioned in the poem and they are: *al-shāth* (contradictory) and *al-maqlūb* (inverted).

As for *al-shāth*, it is taken from the word *al-shuthūth* which means the exclusion from the general principle (*qā'idah*) or from the norm of the people. As in the *hadīth*, "Being in congregation is obligatory upon you as the Hand of Allāh is upon the congregation, and whoever excludes himself (*shatha*) shall be segregated (*shatha*) in the Hellfire,"⁵² which refers to whoever diverted from them. As such, the *shāth* is when the trustworthy narrator contradicts the assembly (i.e. the congregation). It is known that the congregation is closer to the truth and more correct than one person. Due to this we can say that when the author said, "When a trustworthy narrator contradicts the assembly", he was giving an example, whereas in principle, the *shāth* is when the trustworthy narrator contradicts whoever is more correct than him in terms of numbers, righteousness or accuracy.

⁵² Recorded by al-Hakim in his *Mustadrak* volume 1, page 199.

The author mentioned the first type, which is the numbers, because the assembly is a group. It is said that the assembly refers to the eminent ones of the people as mentioned in the ayah: **{Said the eminent ones who were arrogant among his people.}**⁵³ It is known that the eminent ones in the science of *ḥadīth* are the righteous *ḥuffāz* hence his statement is comprehensive, including whoever is more correct in terms of numbers, righteousness or memorisation.

The example for numbers would be the case whereby a congregation narrate a *ḥadīth* from their *shaykh* but one of them came with an isolated narration that contradicts the congregation and he is trustworthy.

As such we say that this particular narration is *shāth* because the narrator contradicts the one who is more correct than him in terms of numbers.

The example for the more correct narrator in terms of righteousness or memorisation is well-known.

We term the first narration, which is correct, as *al-rājih* (correct), and the second narration, which is incorrect, as *al-shāth* and *al-marjūh* (incorrect).

And we call the *ḥadīth* which is the opposite of *al-shāth* as *al-mahfūz* (preserved).

An example would be the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet's ablution that he ﷺ made his *wudū'* by taking water for his head other than the excess

⁵³ Al-A'raf: 88

water for his arms⁵⁴ i.e. when he was about to wipe his head, he would take water and not just use the excess water from wiping his forearms. This was how it was narrated in *Sahīh Muslim*. In a narration by Ibn Mājah it stated that he ٲ wiped his ears with water that was not the excess from wiping his head.⁵⁵ As such, the two narrations differ; as the narration of Muslim stated that he used new water for wiping his head and not the excess from washing his arms.

While the second narration stated that he used new water for wiping his two ears and not the excess from wiping his head. Ibn Hajar said in his book *Bulūgh al-Marām* that the first i.e. Muslim's narration is *mahfūz* while Ibn Mājah's narration is *shāth*.

One should not regard the narrations as contradictory merely due to a variance that makes one think that there is a confliction. In fact, it is obligatory to ponder and think about it and try to combine the narrations together. This is because if you regard the narrations as conflicting, followed by ruling the second narration as *shāth*, it means that the second narration is not acceptable, as from the requirements of an acceptable *sahīh* narration is that it does not have a defect and that it isn't contradictory. If the narration is considered to be *shāth*, then we have to reject it and it is not permissible to reject a conflicting *hadīth* merely with what comes as a misapprehension in the mind. As such, it is a must to ponder upon it as it may seem to be conflicting, but after some thought it is found not to be conflicting. For example, the *hadīth*, "O Allāh the Lord of this perfect call and the established prayer. Grant Muhammad the intercession and favour, and raise him

⁵⁴ Recorded by Muslim; the Book of Purity; Chapter: Characteristics of the ablution no. 19 (236).

⁵⁵ I did not find it in the chapters of purity of *Sunan Ibni Mājah* but it is recorded by al-Bayhaqī 1/303 *hadīth* no. 719.

to the honoured position that You have promised him.”⁵⁶ “Indeed You do not fail in Your promise.”⁵⁷ Some people said that the additional phrase, “Indeed You do not fail in Your promise,” is *shāth* because most of the narrators narrated it without this addition, and the isolated narration is considered to be contradictory because it conflicts with the trustworthy narrators even though the narrator himself is trustworthy.

However, it is possible for us to say that there is no conflict between the two narrations here. This is because the additional phrase does not contravene the former by denying it or making it specific. Rather it ends the narration with a seal that is from the supplication of the believers as Allāh mentioned in the ayah: **{Our Lord, and grant us what You promised us through Your Messengers and do not disgrace us on the Day of Resurrection. Indeed You do not fail in [Your] promise.}**⁵⁸ And here you say, “And raise him to the honoured position that You have promised him. Indeed You do not fail in Your promise.” Which is parallel to the ayah: **{And do not disgrace us on the Day of Resurrection. Indeed You do not fail in [Your] promise.}** Therefore it is a need to confirm in the case of the addition if it is a confliction or not. This means that we do not to rush to a conclusion that it is conflicting because this would entail that combination is not possible, whereas if it is possible to combine then there is no contradiction.

Is it a requirement for the *shuthūth* to be in one narration; meaning that this *hadīth* is narrated by a group of narrators in a certain way and an individual narrated it in a way that conflicts with the group, or is it

⁵⁶ Recorded by *al-Bukhārī*; The Book of Prayer Call; Chapter: The supplication upon hearing the call (614).

⁵⁷ *Al-Bayhaqī* vol. 1 page 410, and our *shaykh* - may Allāh have mercy upon him and forgive him - regarded it as *sahīh* in *Majmū' al-Fatāwā* vol. 12 page 199.

⁵⁸ *Ali 'Imrān*: 194

not a requirement?

We say that it is not a requirement as it may occur in a *ḥadīth* or two. This is made obvious to us from the actions of the scholars.

The example for it is what was recorded by the authors of the *Sunan* from the *ḥadīth* of Abū Hurayrah ؓ that the Prophet ﷺ said, “Do not fast when the half point of the month of Shaʿbān has passed.”⁵⁹ Some scholars regarded this narration as *sahīh*. They said that it is discouraged to voluntarily fast after half of Shaʿbān has passed, except for the one who fasts due to it being a habitual practice. As for Imām Ahmad, he said that there is no discouragement because this *ḥadīth* is *shāth* as it conflicts with the *ḥadīth* of Abū Hurayrah ؓ which is in the *Sahīhayn* where he ﷺ said, “Do not precede Ramadān with fasting a day or two except for someone who has been fasting voluntarily, so he fasted.”⁶⁰ This is because the second *ḥadīth* shows that it is permissible to fast two days before and this is more correct than the first.

Therefore we understand that it is not a requirement for *shuthūth* to occur in one *ḥadīth*.

Another example is what was recorded by Abū Dawūd in his *Sunan* from the Prophet ﷺ that he said, “Do not fast on Saturdays except those that are obligatory upon you.”⁶¹ As such, this narration contradicts the *ḥadīth* in the *Sahīhayn* where the Prophet’s ﷺ wife told him that one of his wives was fasting that day and it was on a Friday, so he asked her, “Did you fast yesterday?” She replied, “No.” Then he asked, “Will you be fasting tomorrow?” She answered, “No.” He said, “Break

⁵⁹ Mentioned previously.

⁶⁰ Mentioned previously.

⁶¹ Mentioned previously.

your fast then.”⁶²

So his saying: “Will you be fasting tomorrow” which refers to a Saturday, shows that it is permissible to fast on a Saturday. Due to this, the scholars differ with regards to the soundness of the *hadīth* prohibiting the fasting on Saturdays to a few opinions:

1. Amongst them were some who said that the *hadīth* was abrogated. However this is a weak opinion because one of the requirements of the abrogation ruling is that the chronological order of the narrations is known, whereas here we do not know the chronological order.
2. Amongst them were some who said that the *hadīth* is *shāth*, because it conflicts the narration which is in the *Saḥīhayn* that shows the permissibility of fasting on a Saturday.
3. And there are those who considered it from the perspective that it does not contradict the narration in the *Saḥīhayn* by considering the prohibition as being upon the singling out of fasting on a Saturday. As such, if the person fasts a day before or after then there is nothing wrong with it. And this last opinion is where the two narrations are combined, and if combination is possible then there is no contradiction because conflict is a requirement of *shuṭhūth* and there is no conflict here. Thus they said that the prohibition of fasting on a Saturday is taken upon the singling out of the day so if the person were to combine to it a day before or after, then there is no problem with it.

Third example: There are a number of narrations (but which were not

⁶² Mentioned previously.

recorded by Bukhārī or Muslim) regarding the prohibition of wearing gold in the form of circles such as rings, bracelets etc.⁶³ And there are other narrations in the *Sahīhayn* and others that show the permissibility of wearing gold in the form of circles. For example, the *hadīth* of Jābir ؓ that the Prophet ﷺ told the women to contribute to charity so they threw their rings and earrings into the robe of Bilāl ؓ. When the Prophet ﷺ saw a man who wore a gold ring, he took it from him, flung it and said: "If anyone of you desires a live ember from the Hellfire, then he shall have it in his hands."⁶⁴

Thus there are some scholars who said that the prohibition of wearing gold in the form of circles is a valid argument with a basis behind it.

And there are those who said that the prohibition of wearing gold in the form of circles is *shāth* and not something that should be acted upon as it contradicts what is confirmed in the *Sahīhayn* and other *hadīth* collections which permit the wearing of gold in the form of circles. And this is the opinion that our *shaykh* 'Abdul Azīz Ibn 'Abdullāh Ibn Bāz is upon.

And there are those who said that the *ahādīth* that prohibit the wearing of circular gold were narrated during the early times when the people were in poverty and hardship and then it was legalised later on.

Indeed I gave these examples to illustrate that it is not a criterion of the *shuthūth* to occur in one *hadīth*, but rather it could occur in two or more narrations.

⁶³ *Musnad Imām Ahmad* vol. 1 page 119 (138), and *Sunan al-Nasā'i* vol. 8 page 545; The Book of Ornaments; Chapter: The gold ring.

⁶⁴ Recorded by Muslim; The Book of Garments; Chapter: The prohibition of gold rings upon men, no. 52 (2090).

Therefore we learnt what is *shāth* and its opposite. There is another type of contradiction which the author did not mention. This is if the contradicting narrator were to be untrustworthy, then his narration would be called *al-munkar* (the denied).

Al-munkar occurs when the weak contradicts the trustworthy narrator. It is worse than *al-shāth* because the *munkar* is a contradiction with weakness whereas the *shāth* is a contradiction with trustworthiness.

And the opposite of *al-munkar* is *al-ma'rūf* (the well-known). Therefore there are four categories:

1. *Al-mahfūz*
2. *Al-shāth*
3. *Al-munkar*
4. *Al-ma'rūf*

As for *al-shāth*: It is what a trustworthy narrator narrates which contradicts another who is more correct than him.

And *al-munkar* is when a weak narrator narrates something that contradicts a trustworthy narrator.

Whereas *al-mahfūz* is what a stronger narrator narrates that contradicts a less trustworthy narrator than him and it is the opposite of *shāth*.

And *al-ma'rūf* is what a trustworthy narrator narrates that contradicts a weak narrator.

The author's phrase, "While *al-maqlūb* has two types that follow" is

the completion of the line i.e. it follows *al-shāth* in terms of the order mentioned. Its addition here is not due to it being connected to the *shāth* narration or for a specific reason, rather it is for the sake of completing the line. And *al-maqlūb* is divided into two categories mentioned in the following couplet:

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

إِبْدَالُ رَاوٍ مَا بَرَأَوْ قِسْمُ
وَقَلْبُ إِسْنَادٍ لِمَتْنٍ قِسْمُ

(22) *Substituting a narrator for a narrator is a category,
And exchanging a chain of a text is a category.*

The author's phrase, "Substituting a narrator for a narrator":

The word "*mā*" (some) here is an indefinite adjective (*nakiratu wāṣifatu*).

And the meaning of an indefinite adjective is that you can decipher "*mā*" with "*ayyu*" (any). Thus the decipherment here is substituting any narrator. And "*mā*" comes in the form of an indefinite adjective or an indefinite adverb (*nakiratu maṣṣūf*) such as in the ayah: **{Excellent is that (*ni'ma*) which Allāh instructs you.}**⁶⁵ While the example of it being used as an indefinite adjective is the author's speech: "Substituting a narrator."

And *al-maqlūb* is classified into two categories:

The first category is as mentioned by the author in his phrase, "Substituting a narrator for a narrator" and it is called *qalb al-isnād* (inversion of the chain).

65 Al-Nisā: 58

An example is if someone were to say, "Yūsuf told me from Ya'qūb", and then the chain becomes inverted to, "Ya'qūb told me from Yūsuf". This mostly occurs mistakenly, either due to forgetfulness or other reasons because there is no benefit from intentionally doing it.

And if someone were to ask: "What makes us think that the chain is inverted as it could be in its correct state?"

We say that we know that it is *maqlūb* if the narration comes from a different route that is more trustworthy in a way that conflicts what it is upon, or it comes from the same narrator who inverted it; during his youth he memorised it and could have perfected it thus narrated it in the correct manner, then during his old age and forgetfulness, he could have narrated the *ḥadīth* and inverted its chain. From this case we know that the first is correct and the second is *maqlūb*.

Its example would be when there are two narrators who narrated a particular *ḥadīth* with a particular sound *isnād*, one of the two is more trustworthy than the other, and the narrator who is not as trustworthy as his colleague came with an inverted chain by making the student as the *shaykh* and the teacher as the student, then we regard this narration as *maqlūb* because he inverted the *sanad*.

Another example would be the case where an individual narrated a particular *ḥadīth* during his youth and memorised it in a particular order, and when he reached his old age and became forgetful, he narrated it in a different order; hence we regard the latter as *maqlūb*. We could also find this through another method whereby we know that the one that was named as student is actually the *shaykh* because he is known to be earlier in terms of his era through history.

And *maqlūb* is one of the categories of *da'if* narrations because it shows the inaccuracy of the narrator.

The second category is what the author mentioned in his line, "And exchanging a chain of a text is a category." Meaning to exchange the *isnād* of a particular *matn* for another *matn*.

An example of this is: A narrator narrates a *hadīth* through the route of Zayd from 'Amr from Khālid, and another *hadīth* through the route of Bakr from Sa'd from Hātim. Then he attributed the *isnād* of the second *hadīth* to the first one, and the *isnād* of the first *hadīth* to the second one. Hence this is called *qalb isnād al-matn* (exchange of the chain of a text). Usually it occurred intentionally for the sake of trial i.e. for the sake of testing the scholar of *hadīth*.

Just like what the people of Baghdad did with al-Bukhārī, and that occurred when they knew he was coming to them, so they came from Irāq and its surroundings to a gathering and said, "We would like to test this man." So they set one hundred *hadīth* and set for each *hadīth* an *isnād* which was not its chain and thus exchanged the chains in order to test al-Bukhārī and said, "Every single one of you shall have ten *ahadīth* to ask him about," and they appointed ten men who were strong in memorisation. When al-Bukhārī arrived the people gathered and they began reporting all of the *asānīd* (chains) until they finished them, and every time an *isnād* was reported with a *matn* al-Bukhārī would say, "I do not know it" until they completed all of it. As such, the common people said that this man does not know anything; he was presented with a hundred *hadīth* but he said, "I do not know it," i.e. I do not know this *sanad* with this *hadīth*. Then he stood up afterwards and reported all the *hadīth* with their correct *isnāds* until he completed all one hundred. Henceforth the people knew that this man is one of

the miracles of Allāh in terms of memorisation, thus they recognised and obeyed him.

Therefore, we call this *qalb isnād al-matn* i.e. to fix the chain of a text upon another text. Usually it does not occur except for the purpose of trial, and it may occur as a form of cheating whereby the narrator wishes to circulate a *ḥadīth* but its *isnād* is abandoned i.e. all of the narrators were weak for instance. So he would come with the *isnād* of a sound narration and fix it upon it. This is a type of *tadlīs* but in a different way.

There is another category which is *qalb al-matn* (inversion of the text). This is the one that the scholars of *fiqh* (jurisprudence) are concerned with. The scholars of *ḥadīth*, however, are concerned with *qalb al-isnād* because they pay more attention to the authenticity of the *sanad*, and whether the *ḥadīth* becomes *ṣaḥīḥ* with it or not.

As for the scholars of *fiqh*, they emphasise paying attention to *qalb al-matn* because it is the one that changes the rulings, and they seek the meanings of the text.

Qalb al-matn occurs from some of the narrators and thus the texts were inverted and they narrated some of the *ahādīth* in a way that it is contrary to the actual form.

One example of this is the *ḥadīth* of Abu Hurayrah رضي الله عنه that the Prophet ﷺ said, "Seven whom Allāh will shade under His Shade on the Day when there is no shade except His Shade ..." ⁶⁶ In the *ḥadīth* there is

⁶⁶ Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of *Zakah*, Chapter: Donations with the right hand (1423), (620), (1334), (5998) and (6308) and Muslim; The Book of *Zakah*,

the statement, "And a man who gave charity discreetly until his left hand did not know what his right hand gave." Some narrators inverted the wording and said, "Until his right hand did not know what his left hand gave." This is considered to be *maqlūb* because they inverted the right for the left and the left for the right.

Another example is the *hadīth* which is confirmed in *Sahīh al-Bukhārī*, "There is space left in the Hellfire after whom have been sent into it, thus Allāh created nations and sent them into the Hellfire." This *hadīth* is inverted upon the narrator and the correct version of the *hadīth* is, "There is space left in the Paradise after the people of the earth have been sent into it, thus Allāh created nations and sent them into the Paradise."⁶⁷

This is because the creation of the nations for Hellfire denies the perfect justice of Allāh, i.e. how could Allāh create nations for the sake of punishment. Also due to the fact that this denies the sound *hadīth*, "The people will continue to be thrown into Hellfire as it keeps saying, 'Is there any more?' until Allāh puts His Foot over it, causing its different sides to come close to each other and it will say, 'Enough! Enough!'"⁶⁸

Another example would be the *hadīth* of Abu Hurayrah ؓ that the Prophet ﷺ said, "If anyone of you were to make the prostration do not kneel like the kneeling of the camel but to place his two hands before his two knees."⁶⁹ This *hadīth* was inverted by one of the narrators in

Chapter: The significance of giving donations discreetly 91 (1031), (1712).

⁶⁷ Mentioned previously.

⁶⁸ Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of *Tawhīd* and Muslim; The Book of Paradise; Chapter: the verse: "And He is the Exalted in Might, the Wise" (7384)

⁶⁹ Recorded by Imām Ahmad vol. 2 page 381, Abū Dawūd; The Book of Prayers;

the phrase, "But to place his two hands before his two knees," as the correct narration is, "But to place his two knees before his two hands." Indeed we say this because this part of the *ḥadīth* conflicts with the first part of the *ḥadīth* whereby it says, "Do not kneel like the kneeling of the camel." Thus the prohibition regarding the resemblance of the camel in the characteristics of the *sujūd* is, "Do not kneel like the kneeling." We witness that the camel, when it is about to kneel, descends with its front legs first before its two knees of the hind legs whereby the front part of its body descends before the back. And if you were to descend with your two hands first, the upper part of your body shall descend before your lower part, then you have resembled the kneeling of the camel.

And if it was said that, "But to place his two hands before his two knees" becomes irrelevant to the first part of the *ḥadīth*, then the one which is relevant is, "But to place his two knees before his two hands." Some scholars thought that there is no inversion in the *ḥadīth* and said that the knees of the camel are also present in its two forelegs, and so we agree that the knee of the camel is present on both forelegs.

However, the Messenger ﷺ did not mention in the *ḥadīth*, "Do not kneel upon what the camel kneels upon." If he did say as such, then we would say not to kneel upon the two knees because the camel descends upon its two knees. On the contrary, the Prophet ﷺ said, "Do not kneel like the", and the preposition *kāf* (like) here is for the purpose of comparison, and between the two phrases is a difference in meaning.

We say that the meaning of his statement, "Do not kneel like the

Chapter: How he placed his knees before his two hands (840) and al-Nasā'i; The Book of Prayers; Chapter: What comes in contact with the ground first of the human in his prostration (1092).

kneeling of the camel," is to not place your two hands first in a manner that will cause your upper body to descend before your lower body. This is due to the fact that the descent for prostration is upon the knees, which is the natural posture.

Then the normal order of what descends is what is closest to the ground, which is the knees, followed by the hands and then the forehead and the nose.⁷⁰

⁷⁰ Our *shaykh* - may Allāh have mercy upon him and forgive him - made the conclusion of this issue in *Majmū' al-Fatāwā* vol. 13 pages 175-179.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَالْفَرْدُ مَا قَيَّدَتْهُ بِثِقَةٍ
أَوْ جَمَعَ أَوْ قَصَرَ عَلَى رِوَايَةٍ

(23) *And al-fard is what you limit to a trustworthy narrator,
Or a group or a restriction upon a particular narration.*

This is the twenty third category of the classifications of *hadīth* mentioned in the poem which is *al-fard* (unique narrations) and the author mentioned three types of it:

1. What is limited to a trustworthy narrator.
2. What is limited to a group.
3. What is limited to a narration.

So, what is *al-fard*?

We say that *al-fard* is that a *hadīth* is unique to a narrator i.e. the *hadīth* is narrated by one narrator.

Usually the *afrād* (plural of *fard*) are weak narrations, though some of them are *ṣaḥīḥ* and received acceptance. However usually the ruling for *al-afrād* is that it is *da'īf* especially if it was narrated after the first three generations because there were many narrators from one *shaykh* after the third generation. As such we found that a single *shaykh* may have six hundred narrators under him. Thus, if he had only one narrator and no one else, then this leads to doubt; how could he have hidden this

ḥadīth from a large number and no one narrated it except only one person.

However, during the era of the companions, there were many *fard* narrations. Likewise during the time of the *ṭābi'īn* but it occurred less than in the time of the companions due to the spread of the *ṭābi'īn* and their large numbers. And in the time of the *ṭābi' al-ṭābi'īn* (followers of the successors) there were many *fard* narrations but it was less than that in the time of the *ṭābi'īn*.

Therefore, the *fard* is typically from the *da'if* narrations.

It has three types and they are:

1. What is limited to a trustworthy narrator i.e. what is unique to a trustworthy narrator and no one else narrated it but it does not conflict the others. An example is the *ḥadīth* of 'Umar Ibn al-Khattāb ؓ: "Indeed actions are according to intentions, and indeed for every man is what he intended."⁷¹ Indeed it was unique to him and in the three levels of his narrators. Even so, it is *ṣaḥīḥ* because it is unique to a trustworthy narrator, from a trustworthy narrator, from a trustworthy narrator. Thus this is called *fard* or *gharīb*.
2. What is limited to a group and "group" refers to the people of a certain country, village, tribe or its likes. If this *ḥadīth* is unique to one person from the people of a certain country, meaning to say that the narration of this *ḥadīth* is exclusive to so-and-so from the people of Shām, or the narration of this *ḥadīth* is exclusive to so-and-so from the people of Hijāz etc then it is consid-

⁷¹ Mentioned previously.

ered to be *fard* but not in its absolute sense. Rather it is *fard* to a particular country, and it may be unique amongst the scholars of the *hadīth* from the people of this country.

For example, if we assume that there are one thousand scholars of *hadīth* in Greater Syria and one of them narrated this *hadīth* and there was no one else who narrated it except him.

Then we say that this is *fard*, but is it *fard mutlaq* (unique absolutely)?

Rather it is *fard nisbī* (relatively unique) i.e. in relation to the people of Shām.

There is another meaning for the *fard* which is limited to a group and it is that the narration from so-and-so is exclusive to the people of some country. Thus to say, for example, that the people of Greater Syria exclusively narrated from so-and-so.

3. The author's phrase, "Or a restriction upon a particular narration":

The restriction upon a certain narration is to say that no one narrated this *hadīth* with this meaning except so-and-so, i.e. that this *hadīth* with this meaning was not narrated by anyone else except one person from so-and-so. Thus you find that the restriction is upon the narration only but the actual *hadīth* is well-known from other routes and its chains are numerous.

Indeed the author divided *al-fard* into these divisions to explain that the uniqueness could occur comparatively (*fard nisbī*) or absolutely (*fard mutlaq*). If the *hadīth* was not narrated except from one route in relation to the people of Shām or any other country, then it is called

fard nisbī.

And likewise if it was in relation to a certain *shaykh*; if it was said that so-and-so was unique in narrating from this *shaykh*, then it is also *fard nisbī*. The uniqueness of *fard nisbī* is relative while the uniqueness of *fard mutlaq* is general. And the *fard nisbī* is closer to soundness because it could be unique in relation to those people but in relation to other than them, it may be *mash-hūr* or *‘azīz* i.e. narrated from a number of routes.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَمَا بَعِلَّةٍ غُمُوضٌ أَوْ خَفَا
مُعَلَّلٌ عِنْدَهُمْ قَدْ عُرِفَا

(24) *And that which has an obscure or hidden defect,
Is known to them as mu'allal.*

This is the twenty fourth category of the classifications of *hadīth* mentioned in the poem which is *al-ma'lūl* or *mu'allal* (the narration with a defect).

It is said that, "The *hadīth* is *mu'allal*," or, "The *hadīth* is *mu'all*," or, "The *hadīth* is *ma'lūl*." All of these terminologies are from the scholars of *hadīth*. No doubt that the most accurate of them linguistically is *al-mu'all*. This is because the lexicological structure (i.e. in the Arabic language science of *sarf*) for *mu'all* is *muf'al* and that is due to the consonant *lām* being emphasised (having a *shaddah* above it), thus it becomes two letters, the first having a *sukūn*. When we look at its etymology (study of the source of the word) we shall find that this is the precise derivation because it is derived from *a'llahu yu'lluhu* (he spoiled it) and thus the person is called *mu'all* (the one who spoiled). Another example to make this clearer is the word *aqarrahu yuqirruhu* (he admitted it); therefore the person is called *muqirr* (the one who admitted).

Whereas those who said that it is *ma'lūl* derived it from *'illah* (ailing) like in the case of the word *shaddahu* (he tied it) and thus it becomes

mashdūd (tightened). So they named it *ma'lūl* (the ill) as it was derived from a three-letter verb.

And those who termed it as *mu'allal* derived it from the word '*allalahu* (he regarded it as defective) so it is *mu'allal* (defective). Just like *qawwamahu* (he straightened it) so it is *muqawwam* (straightened). And the correct opinion is *al-mu'all* as previously mentioned.

Thus we say that *al-mu'all* is the *ḥadīth* which is apparently *ṣaḥīḥ* but after doing research it is found to have a dispraise worthy defect which is discreet.

Its example is to narrate a *ḥadīth* as *marfū'* to the Prophet ﷺ with a connected *sanad* and this narration is popular and circulated amongst the scholars of *ḥadīth*. Then one of the *ḥuffaz* came and said that this *ḥadīth* has an '*illah qādiḥah* (dispraise worthy defect) and that the *ḥuffaz* narrated it as *munqatī'*. Thus it possesses a defect of the weak narrations which is the disconnection of the *sanad*, though it is popular amongst the people that the *ḥadīth* is connected.

Al-Hāfiz Ibn Hajar said in his book *Sharḥ al-Nukhbah*, "This category is from the most ambiguous classifications of *ḥadīth* as no one can detect it except the critics amongst the people of knowledge who studied the chains (*isānīd*) and texts (*matūn*) of the narrations."

And Ibn Hajar would frequently say in *Bulūgh al-Marām*, "Defective due to being *mursal*," or "Defective due to being *mawqūf*," etc.

Thus, when he says this, we have to analyse the *isnād* and look at who were the narrators.

Due to this, it has been made a requirement for *sahih* narrations to be free from *shuthūth* and *'illah qādiyah*. Therefore, the *mu'all* is one of the divisions of the science of *mustalah*, and it is of extreme importance for the students of the science of *hadīth*. Possessing knowledge of it is of great benefit because one could read a *hadīth* which seems to be *sahih* but it is not.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَذُو اخْتِلَافٍ سَنَدٍ أَوْ مَتْنٍ
مُضْطَرَبٌ عِنْدَ أَهْلِ الْفَنِّ

(25) *And that which has a discrepancy in a chain or text is,
Mudtarib according to the people of the art.*

This is the twenty fifth category of the classifications of *hadith* mentioned in the poem which is *al-mudtarib* (the narration with *ikhtilāf* in its *isnād* or *matn*).

The word *idtirāb* (state of being *mudtarib*) means “difference” (*ikhtilāf*) linguistically.

As for *al-mudtarib* in *mustalāh al-hadith*: It is the one that the narrators differ regarding its *sanad* or *matn* in such a way that it is neither possible to combine them (*jama'*) nor outweighing one over the other (*tarjīh*).

As for the difference in the *sanad*; its example would be that some of the narrators narrated the *hadith* as *muttasil*, whilst others narrated it as *munqati'*.

And as for the difference in the *matn*; its example would be that some of them narrated it as *marfū'*, while others narrated it as *marwqūf* or they narrated it in a different manner without doing *tarjīh* or *jama'*.

As such, if combination (*jama'*) is possible, then there is no *idtirāb*.

And if outweighing (*tarjih*) is possible, then we take the correct opinion and thus there is no *idtirāb*.

And if the difference is not based on the original meaning, then there is no *idtirāb* in this case as well.

An example of where combination is possible is the *hadīth* of the Prophet ﷺ Hajj, as the narrators differ in a number of ways.

Some of them said that he performed the *Hajj* in the manner of *qiran*.

And some said that he performed it in the manner of *ifrād*.

While others said that he performed it in the manner of *tamattu'*.

In the *hadīth* of 'Aishah, she said, "We travelled with the Prophet ﷺ in the year of the Farewell Hajj (*Hajj al-Wadāi'*). Some of us performed the *tahallul* (freedom from the restrictions of *ihrām*) with a Hajj, while some with an 'Umrah and some with a Hajj and an 'Umrah. And the Prophet ﷺ performed the *tahallul* with the Hajj."⁷²

Whereas in the *hadīth* of Ibn 'Umar ؓ and the other companions, he performed the Hajj as *tamattu'*⁷³ and in some of the *ahādīth*; he per-

⁷² Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Pilgrimage; Chapter: The *tamattu'*, the *qiran* and the *ifrād* (1562) and Muslim; The Book of Pilgrimage; Chapter: The ways of pilgrimage 118 (1211).

⁷³ Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Pilgrimage; Chapter: Those who herded camels with them (1691) and Muslim; The Book of Pilgrimage; Chapter: The obligation of slaughter upon the *mutamatti'* 174 (1227).

formed it as *qirān*.⁷⁴

As such, if we look at this difference in the beginning (i.e. without analysis), we would say that the *ḥadīth* is *mudtarib*. And as we rule it as *idtirāb*, then the pilgrimage of the Prophet ﷺ remains an unsolved problem. Thus we do not know if the Prophet ﷺ performed it as *tamattu'*, *qirān* or *ifrād*.

However, after contemplation we see that combination is possible to expel the *idtirāb*.

There are two ways to combine these narrations:

1. The first perspective is that those who narrated that he performed the *ifrād* pilgrimage refer to the state of *ifrād* of the rites, i.e. that he did not go beyond the rites of the one performing the *ifrād* pilgrimage.
 - ❖ And the *ifrād* rites are such that upon arriving in Makkah, one would perform the *tawāf al-quḍūm*, followed by the *sa'i* for Hajj. On the day of 'Eid, one performs only the *tawāf al-ifādah* and not the *sa'i*. And when one intends to leave Makkah, he performs the *tawāf al-wadā'* and then leaves.
 - ❖ While those who narrated that he performed the *tamattu'* form of Hajj refer to him coupling the 'Umrah and Hajj in one journey, thus enjoying the privilege of abandoning one of the

⁷⁴ Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Pilgrimage; Chapter: The speech of the Prophet ﷺ: al-'Aqīq is a blessed valley (1534) and Muslim; The Book of Pilgrimage; Chapter: The exit of the Prophet ﷺ from the state of *ihram* and his sacrifice 214 (1251).

two journeys.

- ❖ And those who narrated that he performed *qirān* by integrating the Hajj and 'Umrah, then this is the actual case.

Imām Ahmad said, "There is no doubt that the Prophet ﷺ performed *qirān*, whereas the *tamattu'* is more preferred to me."

2. The second perspective is that he entered the state of *ihram* for Hajj initially and then inserted the 'Umrah into it. Thus he entered into the state of *ifrād* in terms of his initial *ihram*, and the state of *qirān* in the second case. However, this is not correct according to the fundamentals (*usūl*) of Imām Ahmad's *madhab*. This is because, one of his *usūl* is that it is not permissible to insert the 'Umrah into the Hajj, and indeed it is permissible only to do the opposite.

Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyāh said, whilst confirming the first perspective, "Whoever narrated that he ﷺ performed the *ifrād* pilgrimage, refers to his performance of the rites of the Hajj.

And whoever said that he ﷺ performed the *tamattu'* pilgrimage, then he refers to the fact that he ﷺ came with an 'Umrah and a Hajj in one journey and thus enjoyed the privilege of abandoning one of the two journeys upon it. This is due to the fact that if he were to perform the 'Umrah and the Hajj, then he would have performed the 'Umrah in one journey and the Hajj in another. Thus the state of *tamattu'* was due to his abandonment of one of the two journeys as he only set out once and combined the 'Umrah and Hajj. And as such, he enjoyed this privilege.

As for whoever states that he was in the state of *qirān*, then this is the

reality. He was in the state of *qirān* because there is no doubt that the Messenger ﷺ did not exit the state of *ihram* from the 'Umrah. In fact he remained in the state of *ihram* as he brought with him his animal sacrifice."

Now, we return to the topic of Hajj. We say that there are three types of rites:

- (i) *Al-ifrād.*
- (ii) *Al-tamattu'.*
- (iii) *Al-qirān.*

- (1) As for *al-ifrād*, it is such that a person enters the state of *ihram* for Hajj on its own from the *miqāt* and says, "*Labbayk allāhumma hajjā*," (O Allāh I answer your call for Hajj) followed by performing the *tawāf al-qudūm* and the *sa'i* for Hajj upon arrival in Makkah. He shall remain in the state of *ihram* until he completes his Hajj. On the Day of 'Eid he shall perform the *tawāf al-ifādah*. Upon leaving he performs the *tawāf al-wadā'*.
- (2) As for *al-qirān*, it is such that a person enters the state of *ihram* for 'Umrah and Hajj combined at the *miqāt* and says, "*Labbayk allāhumma 'umratan wa hajjā*" (O Allāh I answer your call for 'Umrah and Hajj). When he arrives in Makkah he performs the *tawāf al-qudūm* and the *sa'i* for 'Umrah and Hajj. Then he shall remain in the state of *ihram*. On the day of 'Eid, he shall perform the *tawāf al-ifādah* and upon leaving he shall perform the *tawāf al-wadā'*. Thus his rites are similar to that of *al-ifrād* but the intention is different.
- (3) As for *al-tamattu'*, it is such that a person enters the state of *ihram* for 'Umrah from the *miqāt*. Then, when he arrives at Makkah he

shall perform the *tawāf*, the *sa'i* and shorten his hair as he is performing 'Umrah. As such he shall exit from the state of *ihram* completely and may wear his clothes. Then on the eighth day of Dhul Hijjah he shall enter the state of *ihram* for Hajj, and on the day of 'Eid he shall perform the *tawāf al-ifādah* and the *sa'i* for Hajj. And upon leaving he shall perform the *tawāf al-wadā'*.

- ❖ If the combination of the narrations is not possible, we shall work upon outweighing one of the narrations and take the most correct opinion and abandon the *mudtarib*.

Its example would be the *hadith* of Barīrah رضي الله عنها when she was freed from slavery by 'Aishah رضي الله عنها, then the Prophet ﷺ gave her the choice to remain with her husband or to annul the marriage from him.⁷⁵

In some of the narrations, it was stated that her husband Mughīth was as a free man. And in some he was said to be a slave.

Thus, there is a discrepancy in the *hadith* though the *hadith* is one. Combination (*al-jama'*) is not possible thus we work upon outweighing one of the narrations (*tarjih*).

And the correct opinion is that he was a slave. If this is the correct opinion, then we shall abandon the incorrect opinion and take the correct one, and this correct opinion shall be free from *idtirāb* because it is the *rājih* (correct opinion).

⁷⁵ Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Freeing Slaves; Chapter: Selling of the right guardianship, and Muslim; The Book of Freeing Slaves; Chapter: The prohibition of selling the right of guardianship.

- ❖ And if there is no discrepancy in the original meaning (i.e. in the root of the meaning or *asl al-ma'nā*), then there is no *idtirāb*, and it is seen as a secondary matter.

Example: The narrators differ regarding the price of the camel belonging to Jābir ⁷⁶ and the narrators in the *hadīth* of Fudālah Ibn 'Ubayd differ regarding the price of the necklace containing gold and pearls, whether he purchased it with twelve dinars or more or less than that.⁷⁷

Thus we say that this difference has no impact because it does not go back to the original meaning of the *hadīth*, which is the selling of gold with gold as all of them agreed upon the fact that the necklace had gold and pearls, and was sold with gold coins. The difference is merely regarding the amount of gold coins that it was sold for.

The narrators differed upon it, but this is a difference that has no affect.

Similarly in the *hadīth* of Jābir where the narrators agreed upon the fact that the Prophet brought his camel and that Jābir laid the condition that he would ride it to Madīnah, but they differed upon its price. Thus we say that this difference has no affect because it does not go back to the original meaning of the *hadīth* of which the subject of the *hadīth* revolves around.

The ruling of the *mudtarib* narration is that it is *da'if* because the discrepancy of the narrators shows that they were not precise in its narration. And it is known that if there is no precision in the *hadīth*, then it is one of the divisions of *da'if* narrations.

⁷⁶ Mentioned previously.

⁷⁷ Mentioned previously.

The author's phrase, "*Mudtarib* according to the people of the art":

In the Arabic, the wording is, "*Mudtarib 'inda uhayl al-fann.*"

It may be asked, "Why is the word *ahl* in its *tasghīr* (diminutive) form and should one diminish the people of knowledge?"

We say that the author was in need of the *tasghīr* form due to the [structuring of the] poem. As such, the *tasghīr* is considered only as a means of completing the line. If not, he would have said, "To the *ahl* (people) of the art" (*'inda ahl al-fann*).

And if someone were to say, "Art (*al-fann*) is known to be not praise-worthy to us":

We say that the scholars refer to *al-fann* as the category of knowledge.

A poet once said:

You wish to become a scholar of fiqh with views overnight,

Without any pain while madness has different arts.

Meaning that the one who wishes to be a scholar of *fiqh* able to give opinions on issues overnight without enduring the required fatigue, he is considered to be *majnūn* (mad). And madness has different types, one of which is if someone were to say, "I want to be a scholar of *fiqh* with deep insight whilst I sleep on my mattress."

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَالْمُدْرَجَاتُ فِي الْحَدِيثِ مَا أَتَتْ
مِنْ بَعْضِ أَلْفَاظِ الرُّوَاةِ اتَّصَلَتْ

(26) *Insertions in the hadīth are what came,
From some of the words of the narrators that were connected.*

This is the twenty sixth category of the classifications of *hadīth* mentioned in the poem which is *al-mudraj* (the insertion).

The *hadīth* which is *mudraj* is where one of the narrators inserted something into the *hadīth* without distinguishing it. Due to this, it is termed as *mudraj* (inserted) because it was inserted into the *hadīth* without differentiating the narration from the insertion. Thus the *mudraj* is not from the speech of the Prophet ﷺ but from the speech of the narrators. Sometimes the narrator brings it either to explain a word in the *hadīth* or for other reasons.

The *mudraj* sometimes occur:

- ❖ In the beginning of the *hadīth*.
- ❖ Or sometimes in the middle of it.
- ❖ And sometimes at the end.

An example of the occurrence in the beginning of the *hadīth*: The *hadīth* of Abū Hurairah ؓ where he said, "Perform the ablution thor-

oughly. Woe to the heels from the Hellfire.”⁷⁸ The *marfū*’ is his saying, “Woe to the heels from the Hellfire.” As for his saying: “Perform the ablution thoroughly”, it is from the speech of Abū Hurairah ؓ. And the one who reads this *ḥadīth* may think that all are from the speech of the Prophet ﷺ because it was not made clear as such.

As for the example of *idrāj* (state of *mudraj*) in the middle of the *ḥadīth*: The narration of al-Zuhri on the authority of ‘Aishah ؓ regarding the ways of the revelation i.e. what was revealed to the Prophet ﷺ during the beginning of his Prophethood. She said, “The Prophet ﷺ used to go in the state of *al-hinth* to the cave of Hirā’ for a number of nights, and the state of *al-hinth* is a form of worship [... to the end of the *ḥadīth*.]”⁷⁹

The one who hears this *ḥadīth* may think that the explanation is from ‘Aishah’s ؓ speech, “And the state of *al-hinth* is a form of worship.” However, the explanation is actually from al-Zuhri and it is now *mudraj* (an addition) in the *ḥadīth* without clarification from him that it has been inserted. And this type of *idrāj* is intended to be an explanation, and the explanation here is a must because *al-hinth* is originally considered to be a sin as it was mentioned in the ayah: {**And they used to persist in *al-hinth al-‘azīm* (the great violation i.e. shirk).**}⁸⁰ If the meaning of *al-hinth* is not made clear, then it could be confused with the wrongdoing. However, the Prophet ﷺ was performing

78 Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Ablutions; Chapter: Washing of the heels (165) and Muslim; The Book of Purity; Chapter: The obligation of washing the two feet 30 (240).

79 Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of the Commencement of Revelations; Chapter: How revelation first started (3) and Muslim; The Book of Faith; Chapter: The commencement of revelations 252 (160).

80 Al-Wāqī’ah: 46

an act of worship, and worship is the remover of *al-hinth* (which is the wrongdoing). This is from the manner of naming something with its opposite.

And an example of *idrāj* at the end of the *hadīth*: The *hadīth* of Abū Hurairah ؓ in which he narrated that the Prophet ﷺ said, "Verily on the Day of Resurrection, my followers will be called *al-ghurr al-muhajjalūn* from the trace of ablution. So whoever amongst you who can extend the area of his *ghurr* (whiteness on his forehead) and *tahjīl* (the whiteness on his limbs) should do so."⁸¹ As such, if you were to read this *hadīth*, you would think that it is from the speech of the Messenger ﷺ. However, the last sentence, "So whoever amongst you who can extend the area of his *ghurr* (whiteness on his forehead) and *tahjīl* (the whiteness on his limbs) should do so," is actually not from the speech of the Prophet ﷺ. In fact it is *mudraj* from the speech of Abu Hurairah ؓ whereas the part from the Prophet's speech is: "Verily on the Day of Resurrection, my followers will be called as *al-ghurr al-muhajjalūn* from the trace of ablution."

As for the last sentence, Abu Hurairah inserted it due to his understanding from the *hadīth*. Due to this, Ibn al-Qayyim said in his *Nūniyyah*:

And Abu Hurairah said this is from his understanding,

So tomorrow the people of knowledge shall differentiate it.

⁸¹ Recorded by al-Bukhārī; The Book of Ablutions; Chapter: The virtues of ablution and *al-ghurr al-muhajjalūn* from the traces of ablution (136) and Muslim; The Book of Purity; Chapter: The recommendation to extend the *ghurr* and the *tahjīl* during ablution 35 (246).

❖ The insertion is identified through a number of ways:

1. The text (*al-nas*): Whereby it comes from another route and this makes it clear that it is *mudraj*.
2. The impossibility that the statement is from the Prophet ﷺ and this occurs due to an apparent mistake in it or another presumption that shows that it is not possible to be from the speech of the Prophet ﷺ.
3. The text of one of the leading *huffaz* that defines in it that this is *mudraj*.

❖ What is the ruling of *idrāj*?

We say that if the meaning changes due to the *idrāj*, then it is not permissible but to explain it.

And if the meaning does not change, such as the *hadīth* of al-Zuhri, “And the state of *al-hinth* is a form of worship”, then there is nothing wrong with it. This is because it does not oppose the *hadīth* which is *marfūʿ*, and if it does not contradict it, then there is no objection for it to be mentioned as a form of explanation and clarification.

And when the *idrāj* is made clear, then it is not considered as an evidence (*hujjah*). This is because it is not from the sayings of the Prophet ﷺ and thus it is not taken as an argument.

The author’s phrase, “From some of the words of the narrators that were connected”: The word “connected” is a *jumlaḥ ḥāliyah* (circumstantial sentence) from the *fāʿil* (doer) of the verb “came”. So the meaning is: Whatever came to be connected in the *hadīth* without identification of it being distinct.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَمَا رَوَى كُلُّ قَرِينٍ عَنْ أَخِيهِ
مُدَبَّجٌ فَاعْرِفْهُ حَقًّا وَانْتَخِهُ

(27) *And what was narrated by every qarīn from his associate,
Is mudabbaj, know it well and be proud of it.*

This is the twenty seventh category of the classifications of *ḥadīth* mentioned in the poem which is *al-mudabbaj* (narration from associates).

And the author defined it with his saying, “And what was narrated by every *qarīn* from his associate.”

The *qarīn* (peer) is he who accompanied the one whom he narrated from, was close to him in terms of age or narrating from the same *shaykh*.

If it was said that so-and-so is the *qarīn* for so-and-so, i.e. he is an associate of the other, either in terms of age or the narration from the same teacher whom both narrated from. An example of this is that the period when they studied under the *shaykh* was close, such as in the same year etc.

Thus *al-aqrān* (the plural of *qarīn*) is when one of them narrates from the other. As such the scholars of *ḥadīth* termed this narration as *riwāyah al-aqrān* (narration of the peers). Due to this you shall find in the books of narrators that they say, “And his narration from so-and-so

is *riwāyah al-aqrān*,” i.e. that he is of the same age or narrated from the same *shaykh* as him. If each one of them narrated from the other, then it is called *mudabbaj*.

An example would be that I narrated the *hadīth*, “Indeed actions are according to intentions” from my friend, and he narrated the *hadīth*, “Allāh does not accept the prayer of any one of you if he were to be in the state of impurity until he performs the ablution” from me. Hence this is *mudabbaj*. Alternatively if he were to narrate the same *hadīth* that I narrated; and I narrated it from him through a route, while he narrated from me through another route, thus this is also called *mudabbaj*.

What is the reason for calling this *mudabbaj*?

Scholars said that it is taken from *dibājah al-wajh* (meaning *jānib al-wajh* or the side of the face) as each one of the peers turns to his associate in order for the other to narrate to him, therefore each one faces the other with his side of the face. Of course this derivation is in terms of *mustalah*. On the other hand, we may say that if every *hadīth* between two narrators where each one of them turned to the other in it, then it is called *mudabbaj*. However the scholars of the terminologies of *hadīth* were more specific with it, so there is nothing wrong with the term.

- ❖ Thus the *mudabbaj* narration is whereby each *qarīn* narrated from the other, be it in one *hadīth* or more.

And the difference between the two terminologies is that the *mudabbaj* is whereby each one narrated from the other whereas *al-aqrān* is when only one of them narrated from the other.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

مُتَّفِقٌ لَفْظاً وَخَطاً مُتَّفِقٌ
وَضِدُّهُ فِيمَا ذَكَرْنَا الْمُفْتَرِقُ

(28) *Identical in pronunciation and writing is muttafiq,
While the opposite of what we mentioned is muftariq.*

These two are in the twenty eighth category of the classifications of *hadīth* mentioned in the poem, which is *al-muttafaq* (identical names of narrators) and *al-muftaraq* (different personalities).

And these two are in actual fact considered as one category, which is contrary to the apparent appearance given by the statement of the author where he divided them into two categories. This classification is related to the narrators; and it is about us finding two names that are identical in terms of pronunciation and writing, but they are two different personalities i.e. two or more persons with one name.

We require this knowledge so as to avoid confusion. For example, the word ‘Abbās is the name of a narrator whose narration is acceptable, and it is also the name of another person whose narration is not acceptable. Thus this is called *al-muttafaq* and *al-muftaraq*.

As such, if we look at al-Hāfiz [Ibn Hajar] for example, he would say, “Abbās told me”, and this is one of his *shuyūkh* who is trustworthy, and he would say, “Abbās told me” on another occasion and this is also one of his teachers but he is not trustworthy. Thus the *hadīth* comes as such

and we do not know which one of the two ‘Abbās he is referring to. Therefore the soundness of the *hadīth* remains doubtful to us. This is called *al-muttafaq* and *al-muftaraq* according to the scholars.

- ❖ The reasoning for this nomenclature is apparent, that is the state of *ittifāq* (congruency) in terms of pronunciation and writing, and the state of *iftirāq* (divergence) in terms of the identified.
- ❖ Knowing this is an important matter because if both narrators differ in terms of trustworthiness, then the evaluation of the *hadīth* is put to a halt until this is clarified. If each one of the two is trustworthy, and both have met the narrator before them, then there is no effect because the status of the *hadīth* will remain as *sahīh*.

Therefore, the *muttafaq* and the *muftaraq* are from the science regarding the narrators and not the text. Since it is related to the narrators, we have to look at the *muttafaq* and the *muftaraq*; if each one of them is trustworthy, then there is no effect, and if one of them is trustworthy while the other is weak, then the evaluation of the *hadīth* is put to a halt, and we do not rule the *hadīth* as *sahīh* or *da’if* until the *muttafaq* and the *muftaraq* are clarified.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

مُؤْتَلِفٌ مُتَّفِقٌ الْخَطُّ فَقَطْ
وَضِدُّهُ مُخْتَلِفٌ فَاخْشَ الْغَلَطُ

(29) *Mu'talif is similar only in writing,
And its opposite is mukhtalif, so beware of mistakes.*

This is the twenty ninth category of the classifications of *hadith* mentioned in the poem, which is *al-mu'talif* (similar writing) and *al-mukhtalif* (different pronunciations).

The *mu'talif* and *mukhtalif* is one that is similar in terms of writing but has different pronunciation such as 'Abbās and 'Ayyāsh, Khayāt and Habāt etc.

I.e. the writing in terms of the word structure is one, but the difference is in the pronunciation; so this is called *mu'talif* and *mukhtalif*.

- ❖ It is called *mu'talif* due to the state of *i'tilāf* (conformity) in terms of writing, and called *mukhtalif* due to its state of *ikhtilāf* (difference) in terms of pronunciation. At the same time, it is also called *muftariq* due to the difference in persons and selves.

As such, the personalities are numerous in the *muttafiq* and the *muftariq* as well as the *mu'talif* and the *mukhtatif*. However in the topic of names; if they are different, then they are classified as *mu'talif* and *mukhtatif*, whereas if they are the same, then they are classified as *mut-*

tafiq and the *muftariq*. This is the proper terminology, and there is no dispute in terminology of the scholars of *ḥadīth* because it is said that there is no argument in defining terminologies.

- ❖ As such, what is the benefit from knowing these categories from the classifications of *ḥadīth*?

We say that the benefit is to avoid the arising of confusion amongst people. For example, if we have ten narrators all of them by the name of ‘Abbās, so we have to know which ‘Abbās was referred to because one of them could be a weak narrator:

- (i) Either due to his weak memory,
- (ii) Or due to his lack of righteousness or other reasons.

Thus it is a must to know who this ‘Abbās is in order to determine whether his narration is acceptable or not. Many scholars, amongst the leading from them is al-Hāfiz Ibn Hajar, have written books and spoken about this matter.

So if someone were to ask: “How do we differentiate one from another?”

We say: As for *mu’talif* and *mukhtalif*, the differentiation is easy because of the difference in the pronunciation and there is no confusion in reality unless we follow the way of the predecessors in the absence of *i’jām*.

- ❖ And *al-i’jām* is the absence of dots from the Arabic letters.

An example would be through the words ‘Abbās and ‘Ayyāsh

which were regarded as one to the predecessors due to the absence of dots and vowels. As for the contemporary scholars, the confusion rarely occurs in this matter as they practise *‘ijām* of the words.

As for *muttafiq* and *muftariq*, it is difficult even in the time of the contemporary scholars because identifying the narrator whom was referred to requires in depth research to specify the person in particular and his full description.

- ❖ Therefore the benefit of learning this chapter is to identify the narrator in order to rule him as someone whose narration is acceptable or not. As such, the reference for this is the books that were written in this field, and amongst those that help in identifying the narrator is the knowledge of his teachers from whom he narrated from as well as his students who narrated from him.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَالْمُنْكَرُ الْفَرْدُ بِهِ رَأَوْ غَدَا
تَعْدِيلُهُ لَا يَحْمِلُ التَّفَرُّدَا

(30) *Munkar is the singular narration by a narrator,
Whose standing does not allow for a singular narration.*

This is the thirtieth category of the classifications of *hadith* mentioned in the poem, which is *al-munkar* (the rejected narration).

- ❖ The scholars differ in the definition of *munkar*. It is said that it is what was narrated by a weak narrator which contradicted that of a reliable narrator.

An example would be a *hadith* narrated by a reliable narrator in a certain way whilst a weak one narrated it in another way even though the two narrators were students of the same *shaykh*.

- ❖ And some scholars defined the *munkar* as what was exclusive to one narrator and there is no possibility of accepting it if he was the sole narrator. And this is how the author defined it.

Upon this definition, the *munkar* is taken to be the *gharib* which has no possibility of soundness due to the singularity of the sole narrator, and it is rejected even if it has other supporting evidences of its type, so it does not move up to the grade of *al-hasan*. This is because the weakness in it has reached its peak.

As for the first definition, it was the one adopted by al-Hāfiz Ibn Hajar in his book *Nukhbat al-Fikr*.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

مَتْرُوكُهُ مَا وَاحِدٌ بِهِ انْفَرَدَ
وَأَجْمَعُوا لِضَعْفِهِ فَهُوَ كَرَدَ

(31) *Matrūk is that in which there is a solitary narrator,
And they agreed upon its weakness like the rejected.*

This is the thirty first category of the classifications of *hadīth* mentioned in the poem and it is called *al-matrūk* (the abandoned sole narration).

The meaning of the author's words is that the *matrūk* is what was exclusive to one narrator, and they agreed upon his weakness.

The pronoun in, "They agreed upon" refers to the scholars of *hadīth*.

And his words, "Like the rejected" means it is being rejected. And the letter *kāf* (like) is an additional preposition in terms of emphasising the meaning.

Thus, the *matrūk* as defined by the author is the narration by a weak narrator whom the scholars have agreed upon regarding his weakness.

As such, the exception would be what was narrated by one who was not regarded as weak. In this case it is not termed as *matrūk*. Likewise is the case for what was narrated by an individual whom the scholars differed in opinion with regarding his weakness.

And this is the definition that the author adopted.

Some scholars said, amongst them is Ibn Hajar in his book *al-Nukhbah*, that the *matrūk* is what was narrated by someone who was accused of lying.

For example; if we found in the book *al-Tahdhīb* by Ibn Hajar that he said that the scholars agreed upon the weakness of one of the narrators, then we call his narration as *matrūk* if he was the sole narrator as the scholars agreed upon his weakness.

And if we found in it that he said that the narrator was accused of lying, then we shall call it as *matrūk* also because the *ḥadīth* of the one who is being accused of lying is considered to be like the *mawḍūʿ* (fabricated) narration. We are not affirmative with the particular narration being fabricated, but the fact that he was accused of lying degrades his narration too close to the state of *mawḍūʿ*.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَالْكَذِبُ الْمُخْتَلَقُ الْمَصْنُوعُ
عَلَى النَّبِيِّ فَذَلِكَ الْمَوْضُوعُ

(32) *And the lie which was fabricated and created,
Upon the Prophet is thus al-mawdū'.*

This is the thirty second category of the classifications of *hadīth* mentioned in the poem, which is *al-mawdū'* (fabricated narration).

The author has defined it with his statement, "And the lie which was fabricated..." until the end of the quote.

I.e. it is that which was created by some people and attributed to the Prophet ﷺ so we call it *mawdū'* terminologically.

And the word "*mawdū'*" (placed); does it refer to the scholars placing it in their books and not paying attention to it or that the narrator attributed it to the Prophet ﷺ?

We say that in actual fact, it encompasses both types. As such, the scholars reported it without giving any regard to its status and so it is *mawdū'* i.e. the narrator attributed it to the Prophet ﷺ.

There are many fabricated *ahādīth* that scholars wrote separate books on and spoke about some of the narrations specifically. Amongst the books that were written for this purpose are: *al-Lāli' al-Masnū'ah fī*

al-Aḥādīth al-Mawdū'ah, *al-Fawā'id al-Majmū'ah fī al-Aḥādīth al-Mawdū'ah* by al-Shawkānī and *al-Mawdū'āt* by Ibn al-Jawzī. However Ibn al-Jawzī was very quick in giving the ruling of *mawdū'* upon the *ḥadīth* to the extent that the scholars said that he reported a *ḥadīth* which was recorded by Muslim and ruled it as *mawdū'*! As such, it was said that, "There is no consequence in Ibn al-Jawzī's ruling of *mawdū'*, al-Hākim's ruling of *ṣaḥīḥ* and Ibn al-Munthir's report of *ijmā'* (consensus)." This is because all of them were quick to give these attributes to narrations. In fact I have deeply analysed Ibn al-Munthir's work and found issues with what he stated as *ijmā'*. However he says, "And we do not know of any difference in opinions." And when he says this (i.e. limiting his ruling to his own knowledge), he freed himself of responsibility in front of Allāh ﷻ.

There are many reasons for the fabrication of *ahādīth*:

Amongst them is the *ta'assub* (fanaticism) for or against the *mathabs* (schools of thought) or for groups e.g. the *Ahl al-Bayt* (family of the Prophet ﷺ). The *Rāfidah* are the worst of the liars upon the Prophet ﷺ because they are unable to support their ideology except through lying. Thus their school of thought is false as Shaykh al-Islām [Ibn Taymiyyah] mentioned about them.

There are also many narrations that dispraise the *Banī al-Umayyah*, and most of it was fabricated by the *Rāfidah* because the Umayyads and 'Alī Ibn Abī Tālib ؑ were at war and engulfed in tribulations.

And the *mawdū'* narration is to be rejected and the mention of it is prohibited except in the case of mentioning it in order to clarify that it is a fabricated *ḥadīth*. So it is obligatory upon the narrator to explain it to the common people as the fabrication of *ḥadīth* upon the Prophet ﷺ

is one of the major sins due to the narration, "Whosoever intentionally lies upon me shall have his place in the Hellfire."⁸² And it is confirmed that he said, "Whosoever narrated from me a *hadīth* of which he knew was a lie, then he is one of the liars."⁸³

If you were to mention this type of *hadīth* to the people, then you will have to explain to them that it is *mawdū'* and a lie attributed to the Prophet ﷺ. It is also a must to report in the third person such as using, "It was said that", "It was narrated that", "It was mentioned that" and its likes so as not to attribute it to the Prophet ﷺ in an affirmed manner. The reason is that if you did this, then you may cause a misconception to the audience.

Amongst the important matters that we must bring to attention about is al-Zamakhsharī's method in his *tafsīr* book where he would begin or end the *sūrah* that he was commentating upon by reporting *ahādīth* regarding the virtues of the *sūrah* which were very weak or *mawdū'*. However Allāh has made this task easy as al-Hāfiz Ibn Hajar made the *takbrīj* (extraction of the chains of narrators) of the narrations in the *tafsīr* work *al-Kashāf* by al-Zamakhsharī and explained which were the *sahīh*, the *da'īf* and the *mawdū'* narrations.

⁸² Mentioned previously.

⁸³ Mentioned previously.

The author, may Allāh have mercy upon him, said:

وَقَدْ أَتَتْ كَالْجَوْهَرِ الْمَكْنُونِ
سَمَّيْتُهَا مَنْظُومَةَ الْبَيْقُونِي

(33) *Indeed it came like a hidden gem,
Which I have entitled "The Poem of al-Bayqūnī".*

The author's statement, "It came"; the *damir* refers to this poem.

And his statement, "Like a hidden gem" means it came like the example of a hidden gem, thus the preposition *kāf* (like) is for the sake of comparison.

The verb "came" is in the past tense with its doer (Arabic *fā'il*) hidden while the phrase, "Like a gem" (*kalja'whar*) is accusative as it is situational i.e. it came like the parable of a gem.

His statement, "hidden" i.e. kept away from the sun, the wind and the dust. As such it shall always be shining lustrously.

And his statement, "The Poem of al-Bayqūnī"; he attributed the poem to himself as he was the one who composed it.

Then the author, may Allāh have mercy upon him said:

فَوْقَ الثَّلَاثِينَ بِأَرْبَعٍ أَتَتْ
أَقْسَامُهَا تَمَّتْ بِخَيْرٍ خُتِمَتْ

*(34) It came with four above thirty,
Its sections, concluded and sealed with goodness.*

The author's line, "It came with four above thirty" i.e. it came in thirty four lines.

And his saying, "Its sections, concluded and sealed with goodness": i.e. that the lines of this poem came four above thirty and then were concluded with goodness.

This commentary ends here, with the grace of Allāh ﷻ,
On a Monday night, the 10th of *Jamād al-Akhir* 1412 H (1991 CE),
We ask Allāh ﷻ to accept from us our pious deeds,
And to forgive our imperfections and mistakes as He is hearing and
answering.
Allāh knows best, and may His salutations, peace and blessings
Be upon our Prophet and Leader Muhammad Ibn Abdillāh
As well as upon his family, companions and followers,
With wellness until the Day of Judgement.



The importance of this subject:

The knowledge of *usūl al-hadīth* is a science that serves the radiant Prophetic traditions; with it one can distinguish the Prophetic narrations in terms of authenticity and fabrication, soundness and weakness.

Al-Imām ‘Abdullāh ibn al-Mubārak said, “The quality of the *hadīth* is not in the conciseness of the *isnād*, rather its quality lies in the soundness of its narrators.”

Al-Imām Yahyā ibn Sa‘īd al-Qattān said, “Do not look at the *hadīth* but rather look at its chain. If the chain is sound [then the narration is sound]. If not, then do not be deceived by the narration with a chain that is not sound.”

Al-Hāfiz ibn Qutaybah al-Daynūrī said, “There is no nation amongst the nations with the *isnād* like their chains (i.e. this nation); narrator from narrator, the trustworthy from the trustworthy in such a way until it reaches the Prophet ﷺ and his Companions, so that the sound can be differentiated from the weak, the connected from the disconnected and the fabricated from the genuine.”

The Merits of the Poem of al-Bayqūnī:

Shihāb al-Dīn al-Dimyāthī said, “The poem of the knowledgeable imām of understanding and perception, al-Shaykh al-Bayqūnī is one of the most interesting summaries of the science of *hadīth* and the most eloquent of the writings upon which one takes the rigorous course upon, for it is comprised of clear yet fine expressions that overwhelms its counterparts with a grim face.”