

A Research Paper
On the oft Quoted Weak
Hadeeth of
Alee bin Abee Taalib
(Radhiallaahu Anhu).

Compiled by
Abu Hibbaan & Abu Khuzaimah Ansaari

© Maktabah Ashaabul-Hadeeth 2004

There is no doubt Alee (Radhiallaahu Anhu) was very brave and the examples he set in bravery were ones of praise. Also with this he was one of the three chosen to be a representative in the battle of Badr, and with all that is known about him from the authentic narrations that have come to us regarding his bravery, might, boldness and firmness then all of them were ones of example and praiseworthiness. So from the narrations that are mentioned in this regard is the following narration,

The freed slave of the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam), Abu Raaf'e said, "We were with Alee (Radhiallaahu Anhu) when the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) gave him the flag of the fort of Khaybar. So when we approached the fort, its people came forward to fight. So we fought with them and during the fighting, Alee (Radhiallaahu Anhu) whilst in battle with a jew lost his shield, so he (Alee (Radhiallaahu Anhu) pulled the gate of the fort of Khaybar and used it as a shield and continued to fight, and Allaah granted us victory. Then the gate was left on the ground, which I and 8 other people were unable to lift."

The First chain

This narration has been transmitted by Hishaam in as-Seerah an-Nabawiyah (3/349-350), Ibn Jareer in Taareekh al-Malook Wal-Umam (2/94), Baihaqee in Dalaa'il an-Nabuwwah (4/212), Ahmad in his Musnad (Fath ur-Rabbaanee (21/120, 326), via the route of,

Ibn Ishaq from Abdullaah bin Hasan from some of his family members.

The narrators of this chain are all trustworthy except the part Abdullaah bin Hasan from some of his family members which is majhool (unknown), hence this narration is weak.

Allaamah Haithamee after mentioning this narration said, "The name of one narrator is not mentioned." (al-Majma'a az-Zawaa'id (6/152).

The Second chain

However there seems to be another chain which maybe used as a supporting narration for his which has been transmitted by Baihaqee in Dalaa'il an-Nabuwwah (4/212) via the route of Haakim from Haitham bin Khalf Dooree form Ismaa'eel bin Moosaa as-Sadee from Mutallib bin Ziyaad from Laith bin Abee Saleem.

However this chain also has two defect.

Firstly.

Concerning Muttalib bin Ziyaad, Haafidh Ibn Hajr said, “Truthful, but makes mistakes sometimes.”(Taqreeb ut-Tahdheeb (no.6755 pg.948).

So when he is alone in reporting and does not oppose anyone, his narration is of the level of Hasan.

Imaam Ahmad said he was trustworthy, Yahyaa ibn Ma’een said he is trustworthy, Abu Haatim said write his hadeeth but he does not constitute evidence. According to ad-Dooree, Yahyaa ibn Ma’een said there is no harm in him and according to ad-Doorqee’s clarification he is weak in hadeeth. Abu Dawood said he is good, Eesaa bin Shadhaan said he has rejected narrations and Ibn Hibbaan mentioned him in his book of trustworthy narrators.

(See Kitaab al-Illal (2/32), at-Taareekh al-Kabeer (4/2, 8), Tabaqaat Ibn Sa’ad (6/387), Taareekh ad-Dooree (2/570), al-Illal (1/24 no.350) of Imaam Ahmad, Meezaan ul-Ei’tidaal (4/no.8591), Tahdheeb ut-Tahdheeb (10/177-178), Tahdheeb ul-Kamaal (28/78 no.6005).

Secondly.

The second defect is the narrator Laith bin Abee Saleem. Ibn Hajr al-Asqalaanee said about him, “Truthful but became very forgetful and his ahadeeth could not be distinguished and hence he has been declared to be Matrook (abandoned).” (Taqreeb (pg.817-818). Some editions mention he became forgetful at the end of his life.

For criticism concerning refer to Kitaab al-Illal (2/32), Suwaaalat ad-Daarimee (no’s 560, 720), at-Taareekh al-Kabeer (7/no.1051), Tabaqaat Ibn Sa’ad (6/349), Taareekh ad-Dooree (2/501), al-Illal (1/389, 2/332) of Imaam Ahmad, Meezaan ul-Ei’tidaal (2/no.6001), Tahdheeb ut-Tahdheeb (10/177-178), Tahdheeb ul-Kamaal (24/279 no.5017), Ahwaal ar-Rijaal (no.132) of Juzjaanee, al-Ma’arifah (1/519, 706), of Ya’qoob, Sunan Tirmidhee (no.2801), Taareekh Abu Zur’ah (no.551), adh-Dhu’afaa (no.511) of Nasaa’ee, Dhu’afaa al-Kabeer (4/14 no.1569) of Uqailee, al-Jarh Wat-Ta’deel (7/no.1014), Tuqaddimah al-Jarh Wat-Ta’deel (gp.45, 73), al-Maraaseel (of al-Haatim (no.181), al-Majrooheen (3/231) of Ibn Hibbaan, al-Kaamil of Ibn Adiy, Sunan Daarqutnee (1/68, 2/231), Kashf al-

Astaar (163-699), Tahdheeb al-Asmaa (1/2 no.75) of Nawawee, al-Egtibaat (no.382), al-Asamee Wal-Kunaa (2/143 no.528, 345 no.879), Haadee as-Saaree (no.458).

The Third chain

There also maybe another supporting narration for this incident, which Haakim has referenced as Zarkashee has mentioned in al-Tadhkirrah (pg's 118-119 and 152), Imaam Baihaqee has also referenced it in Dalaa'il an-Nabuwwah (4/212) in note form.

via the route of Ismaa'eel bin Muhammad bin al-Fadhal from Ibraaheem bin Hamzah from Abdul-Azeez bin Muhammad from Haraam bin Uthmaan from Abu A'teeq bin Jaabir from his father Jaabir bin Abdullaah.

All the narrators are trustworthy and reliable, except Haraam bin Uthmaan and he is abandoned.

Imaam Mu'ammarr Imaam Maalik and Yahyaa bin Ma'een said he is not trustworthy. Imaam Ahmad said the people have denied his hadeeth. Imaam Shaafi'ee said it is Haraam (unlawful) to narrate the narrations of Haraam and something similar has been mentioned by Yahyaa bin Ma'een and Juzjaanee.

Abu Haatim said he is rejected in hadeeth (Matrook al-Hadeeth) and abandoned in hadeeth (Munkar al-Hadeeth) Imaam Abu Zur'ah said da'eef al-Hadeeth (weak in hadeeth) Imaam al-Bukhaari said, Munkar al-hadeeth.

Zubairee said Haraam was shee'ah. Ibn Ma'een and Abu Dawood said he is nothing. Ya'qoob bin Sufyaan, Ahmad bin Saaleh and Haithamee said he is Matrook. Imaam Daarqutnee said he is weak.

Imaam Ibn Adiiy's position is most of his ahadeeth were rejected. Falaas said he is Matrook. Imaam Ibn Hibbaan said he was an extreme shee'ah and he would interchange the chains, he would make the maraaseel narrations into Marfoo, and Ibn Hajr said he is Matrook.

at-Taareekh al-Kabeer (1/2 no.101), Meezaan ul-Ei'tidaal (1/468 no.1766), al-Majrooheen (1/269), al-Jarh Wat-Ta'deel (1/2 282--283), Leesaan ul-Meezaan (2/182 no.865), al-Kaamil (2/851), al-Majma'a (3/76), Taareekh Baghdaad (8/278).

The summary is that this narration is not worthy to constitute evidence and a group of the scholars of hadeeth have declared it to be weak, Imaam Baihaqee has declared it to be weak, but only the narration of Haraam.

So this narration is not reliable in any of its chains and this is the reason why Imaam Ibn Katheer mentioned the chain of Ibn Ishaq and said, but there is an unknown narrator in it hence the chain is disconnected and he declared the narration of Laith to be weak. (al-Bidaayah Wan-Nihaayah (6/273).

Haafidh ibn Hajr declared all of its chains to be mistakes and errors. Haafidh Sakhawee has also said the same and E'jloonee agreed with both of them. (al-Maqaasid al-Hasanah (pg.312-313, 418).

Ibn Rabee'ah Atharee writes, "All its chains are mistakes and errors due to which some of the scholars have said they are rejected and this is the saying of our Shaikh." (Tameez at-Tayyab Minal-Khabeeth (pg.87).

Zarkashee said, "Some of the scholars have firmly designated that this hadeeth has no basis..." (Tadhkirrah (pg.118).

Compiled by the weak slaves of Allaah, in need of your supplications.
Abu Hibbaan & Abu Khuzaimah Ansaari
Maktabah Ashaabul-Hadeeth, Birmingham UK.

Completed Friday 23rd of January 2004