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‘Audhu Billāhi min ash-Shayṭān al-Rajīm
Bismillāh al-Rahman al-Rahīm

Alhamdu lilīlahi Rabbil A‘lāmin, Waṣalatu Wasalam Ala Rasūlillahil Karīm, Wa Ala Alihi Wa Ashabi Wa Man Tabi‘ahum Bi-Ehsan Ila Yaum al-Dīn; Wa Ba‘d
All Praise belongs and is directed to the Rabb of everthing
that exists, Praise and Salutations be upon His
Final beloved Messenger, his revered family
and his noble Companions and upon
those who follow them in good
until the end of times,

To proceed

The 'reality' of the position the Deobandīs toward the Ṣaḥābah and their riwāyāt, including their abuse and attacks on the Ṣaḥābah.

In fact, we say that the Ḥanafīs-Deobandīs have been at the forefront of speaking ill of the Ṣaḥābah, and thus not only resembling the Shi‘ah but effectively being a support of the Shi‘ah. They did this all to safeguard their Maḏhab as the Ṣaḥābī's riwāyah may have opposed it.

1. The Deobandī Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan, writes in this book Taqārīr Shaykh al-Hind, page: 133, that the Ḥanafīs say concerning Fātimah that:

"She was a woman who was argumentative and lose with her tongue."
2. The Hanafi books of usul Nūr al-Anwār, page: 183 and Uṣūl al-Shāshī page: 85, state:

“Abū Huraīrah ḥ ṭ that he was not a Fāqīḥ, and that his riwāyah should be abandoned if it's in contradiction to qiyās”

The Ḥanafīs have hurled this abuse at Abū Huraīrah ḥ due to the ḥadīth narrated by him known as the ḥadīth of Muṣarrā. This ḥadīth is muttafaq ‘ala‘īhi and in essence states that a person when selling an animal should not stop its milk so to make it seem to the buyer that its udders shall produce more milk than its true reality. Should this have been done once the buyer has milked the animal then the buyer has a right to return the animal together with a saa of dates or he can keep the animal.

For the Ḥanafīs for well over a thousand years they could not see the logic or analogical reasoning behind Abū Huraīrah ḥ stating that along with giving back the animal one should also give a saa of dates to the seller. Thus they had to find an avenue to abandon his authentic ḥadīth and this could only be done by attacking the being and person of the Imām of ḥadīth and Ṣaḥābī Abū Huraīrah ḥ so that there Maḏhabs position could be safeguarded.

They forget that Ibn Masūd ḥ also gave the same verdict as Abū Huraīrah ḥ. Read this in line the hoodwinking they performed as stated above. Dare we ask if Abū Huraīrah ḥ was not a faqīḥ
and would speak in opposition to sound logical reasoning and qiyās then how can Imām Abū Ḥaṁīfa رحمه الله or anyone else be a faqīh?

It is for this reason that these principles in the books of the Ḥanafī Maḏḥab and jurisprudence, remain till today in edition after edition reprints and continue to be taught in their universities and colleges to those who are learning the Maḏḥab of the Ḥanafīs. There has been no omission or retraction from such statements which have been made hundreds of years ago.

Our Shaykh, Ḥāfīz Sanaʾ Allāh Zāhidi ibn Imām al-Dīn رحمه الله in his naqd and critique of Nūr al-Anwār has made detailed footnotes upon the text, and in page: 245-246, volume: 3, he has quoted around eighteen ʿĀʾimmah and Fuqahā of the aḥānāf who held this opinion concerning the Ṣaḥāḥī Abū Huraīrah رضي الله عنه, not being a Fāqīh, waliʾ ʿAʿūḏhubillāh.

Furthermore, one can refer to our Shaykh Zubāʾr ʿAlī Zaʾī(d.1435 Ah) writings where he has gathered in one place at least forty-one statements of the Ṣaḥābah where the Deobandīs have clearly opposed the Ṣaḥābah, just to defend their own Maḏḥab, that is, the Maḏḥab of Imām Abū Ḥanīfa رحمه الله. We hope to record some such instances in a later part to this paper.

3. The aḥānāf have not stopped in criticising Abū Huraīrah رضي الله عنه they've criticised others alongside him also for example, concerning the riwāyah of joining foot to foot, ankle to ankle which
is narrated by Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه then ʿAmīn Ṣaftar Okarvī Deobandī (d.1421 Ah) writes in his book, Ḥāshyah [خاشية] Tafhīm al-Bukhārī ʿala Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, page: 380, volume: 1, that:

"Anas in the time of Rasūlullāh ﷺ was a boy who had not reached puberty and would stand in the back rows".

ʿAmīn Okarvī further writes:

"Anas رضي الله عنه and that which he done was in his infant age with the other children he has simply just narrated, however when he became older than the other Ṣaḥābah and the Tābiʿīn were upset at the actions of Anas of when he was a infant".

**Comment:** Here, we see once again that a riwāyah in Bukhārī from a Ṣaḥābī which no other Ṣaḥābah challenged is being explained away and belittled by saying that the rawi is a child, thus to be rejected. Yet, this riwāyah and those similar to it have been narrated by other than Anas رضي الله عنه including the Ṣaḥābī Abū ʿAbd Allāh Nuʿmān ibn Bashīr رضي الله عنه in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī.

Therefore, once again the precision and trustworthiness, Ḍabṭ and ʿAdālah of the Ṣaḥābah is being attacked as their position is ‘supposedly’ against the Maḏhab of Abū Ḥanīfa رحمه الله. The hoodwinking continues to be unravelled.
4. The ḥadīth which is narrated by ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar رضي الله عنه in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī concerning the rafʿ al-yadayn, the raising of the hands of Rasūlullāh ﷺ in rukūṣ and out of rukūṣ, then in relation to this Ṣāmīn Okarvī, once again writes in Ḥāshyah Tafhīm al-Bukhārī ʿala Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, page 385, volume 1, that:

"However, Imām Bukhārī under this chapter has not brought a ḥadīth from any Muhājur or Anṣārī. He has brought a riwāyah from ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar رضي الله عنه who was a young child, or a ṣīghār Ṣahābī, a small Ṣahābī and would stand in the back rows. And he had brought a riwāyah from Mālik ibn al-Khuwayrīth who had only spent twenty nights with Rasūlullāh ﷺ."


"Likewise, Imām Bukhārī has not narrated anything from any Badrī Ṣahābī, a Ṣahābah who had participated at the battle of Badr rather he narrates from a childlike ibn ʿUmar and from who only spent twenty nights as a guest [Mālik ibn al-Khuwayrīth] who narrates the Ḥadīth of rafʿ al-yadayn at nine different places, incomplete".

This is concerning Wāʾil ibn Ḥujr رضي الله عنه. Ṣāmīn Okarvī writes in his book Tajallīyāt -e- Šaftar, page: 94, volume: 7, that:
"Imām Muslim went one step further and with these two (Mālik ibn al-Khuwayrīth and ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar) he also added a third Ṣaḥābī who was just a traveller by the name of Wāʾil ibn Ḥujr.

This shows the hatred of the Deobandī Imām, not only for Imām Bukhārī ِرِحَمَهُ اللَّهُ and his Jāmiʿ al-Ṣāḥīḥ, but the Ṣaḥābah, he mocks them, he talks about them being merely children, he talks about them not reporting correctly and accurately, and for him the fact that the Muḥaddithīn such as Imām al-Bukhārī and Imām Muslim ِرِحَمَهُمَا اللَّهُ were just picking and choosing aḥādīth from youngsters, wali ʿAʾūḍhubillāh.

We ask, if the Ṣaḥābah did not report correctly, or were merely travellers who spent little time with Rasūlullāh ِرِحَمَهُ اللهُ then did Imām Abū Ḥanīfa ِرِحَمَهُ اللَّهُ spend any more time with the Nabī these very same, Further ِرِحَمَهُ اللَّهُ Ṣaḥābah maintained their positions in adulthood and taught their students the rafʿ al-yadayn whilst continuing to act upon it, what will the blind following Ḥanafīs do with these facts?

Furthermore, what were the ages of the 'golden committee' of the forty scholars which the Ḥanafīs claim formed the backbone of the Ḥanafī Maḏhab? Some were around three and some five yet they are taken as giving verdicts at that age as well as formulating a Maḏhab!

Were Abū Ḥanīfa ِرِحَمَهُ اللهُ or his students 'Badrī Ṣaḥābah'
5. Concerning Anas ibn Mālik, the Ḥanafi Imām Badr al-Dīn Āynī (d.855 Ah) the explainer of Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī writes in his book ʿUmdat al-Qāri Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī [البخاري صحيح شرح القاري عمدة] chapter: What should be said after the takbir, page: 291, volume: 5, that:

"ويعتبر يكون أنس نسي في تلك الحال لكبر سنه وقد وقع مثل هذا كثيراً".

"There is a possibility that Anas Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī in this condition became old and because of his old age he forgot, and such things have happened many times".

**Comment:** So it should be noted that for the Deobandīs to explain away the riwāyāt authentically reported from the Ṣaḥābah they not only call them children, the ones who stood in the back rows but the memory of Ṣaḥābah is challenged by calling them forgetful. Yet Imām Muhammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī (رحمه الله) (d.1420 Ah) is attacked for critiquing a rawī in the isnād to a ḥadīth in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Yahya ibn Sulaīm, who was not a Ṣaḥābah but from Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbals (رحمه الله) (d.241 Ah) period!

"It is possible that Imām Dāraquṭnī رحمه الله (d.385 Ah) brought the narration from Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه when Anas was in his old age and no doubt a person in his old age is prone to forget fullness".

So in order to refute the ḥadīth from Anas رضي الله عنه which goes against the Ḥanafī Maḏhab. The Ḥanafī ‘ulama’ are not only challenging their ‘ʿAdālah but also challenging their Ḟabṭ of the Ṣaḥābah just to preserve their own Maḏhab. If this is not the abuse of the Ṣaḥābah then what is?

7. Again, concerning Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه, the famous personality from Ahl al-Bidʿah, Zāhid Ḥasan al-Kawthrī (d.1371 Ah) writes in his book, Taʿnīb al-Khatīb, page: 80, and also in the book, The upright defence of Abū Ḥanīfa by ʿAbd Allāh Quddūs Khān Qārān Deobandī, page: 213 that:

"Furthermore concerning the narration of the head being squashed then the rawī is Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه alone and he narrated this when he was in his old age, similarly the narration of the Ṣaḥābah drinking the urine of the camels is narrated by him alone, and it is the position of Abū Ḥanīfa رحمه الله that no doubt the Ṣaḥābah are Just [ʿĀdl (عائشة) (عائشة), however despite this they are human beings and general laymen and sometimes because of old age they fell short in their precision of what they had heard and from this angle they are not free from mistake. In an instance where their narration contradicts the scholars of Fiqh then the scholar of Fiqh will be given preference and similarly in a instance where we have to remove the misunderstanding of that person when he narrated when
he was in his old age then we take the narration of the one who contradicts him and who is younger”.

So here we have the Ḥanafī not only attacking the precision of the Ṣaḥābah who gave us our Dīn but they go further in saying that the Ṣaḥābah saying will be abandoned if it 'contradicts a scholar of fiqh'. There is not much more to say on this point as it speaks volumes.


Concerning Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه

"He Anas رضي الله عنه was not known for his Fiqh his understanding of the dīn or his ījtihād". walī ‘A‘ūḍhu billāh.

The irony of Mulla Jīwan quote as referenced by ṬAmīn Ṣaftar Okarvī Deobandī is after quoting this even though he it's from his own books of jurisprudence he says that:

"This quote has been utilised by those who advocate that the Nabī ﷺ has passed away and cannot hear us and by a certain Mawlānā Younus Nu‘mānī Deobandī (d.1434 Ah) would he himself stand on the minbar and announce he has no Fiqh..."
The irony continues further where Younus Nu‘mānī who advocated the Nabī ﷺ passed away and does not hear responses to his Deobandī contemporary ʾAmīn Šaftar Okarvī Ḥayātī who believed the Nabī ﷺ is alive and can hear, in Futūḥāt -e- Șaftar, page: 382-383, volume: 3, the following words that:

"Dear brothers in this speech Mawlānā [Šaftar Okarví] has done a great wrong. He has ascribed to me that I have said a Șahābī is not ʿādl rather a Fāsiq. I have merely quoted from the book Nūr al-Anwār and Uṣūl al-Shāshī, I have pointed what they have written, what Mawlānā should have done was asked me where these are written and I would have shown him but instead he has tried to beguile and fool the masses by ascribing these sayings to me, the irony is that if a ghair muqallid, salafī had done this then it would be a different thing but this is being done by someone who ascribe himself to Ḥanafīyyah and is a clear to the Ḥanafī Madḥhab, and he has said I have said about this Șahābī that he was not known for his Fiqh and ijtihād, then I ask are these books of Ḥanafī Fiqh not also accepted by you? Then let it be known if this is written in there that if the narration of Anas [ibn Mālik] contradicts qiyyās then the analogy will be given precedence this is written clearly in our books Nūr al-Anwār and Uṣūl al-Shāshī, so why am I being blamed?"

Subḥān Allāh, pay close attention to teh above spat between the two Ḥanafī-Deobandī scholars and see how they have abused the Șahābah. In fact, pay heed to how their books of the madhab abuse the Șahābah!!
So, one can see the internal fighting and the abuse that the Ḥanafi-Deobandīs have levied towards the Ṣaḥābah. Then they accuse the Ahl al-Ḥadīth of being the worst perpetrators of abuse against the Sunnah by allegedly weakening reports in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī?

Yet they themselves not only have they put aside many aḥādīth from Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī as has been mentioned above, they have criticised the actual Ṣaḥābah who are the narrators of the aḥādīth of Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī and furthermore they have ridiculed both Imām al-Bukhārī and Imām Muslim رحمهما الله as scholars of ḥadīth. So this is the case of the Deobandīs not being honest with the public about their reality.

How one can attack the likes of Imām Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī رحمه الله after such nonsense is beyond comprehension!! A lot more can be said but it will turn into a large book rather than a short and brief paper. Further, evidences shall follow on how the Deobandīs truly see the Ṣaḥābah, رضوان الله عليهم أجمعين, Allāhu ʿA XLam.

Whilst the Ḥanafīs are putting up a smoke screen and attacking the likes of Imām Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī رحمه الله for making certain non marfūʿ muallaq riwayāt in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī daʿif, then much can be said in regards to this. However, this short treatise is designed as a response to show the actuality of the Ḥanafī Maḏhab and what they say about the aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and those that reported them and carried them to us, that is the Ṣaḥābah. Why al-Albānī رحمه الله felt that certain riwayāt where not connected back to Rasūlullāh ﷺ in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī then this
is a different a discussion for which he had a Salaf whether we agree or disagree with that.

Many of our ‘ulama’ have disagreed with Imām al-Albānī on his position concerning this. But why is it that the Deobandis have decided highlighted this now? We say it is only because the reality of what the Deobandis believe concerning Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī and other than that is hidden from the people and it is becoming apparent to them only now what they actually believe about Bukhārī and the aḥādīth that go back to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the Ṣaḥābah in order to hide this they’ve now decided to counter attack by attacking Imām al-Albānī.

So, what is it that the Ḥanafīs believe about the Ṣaḥābah? Below are just a few quotes concerning the Ḥanafīs and the belief concerning the Ṣaḥābah.


"Allāh knows whether she was truthful in her speech or she was lying".

ʿAʿūḍhubillāh.

If this is not attack on the ‘Adālah and trustworthiness of the Ṣaḥābah in favour of the likes of the Shī‘ah, the Qādiyānī and other than that what else can it be seen as? The scholar of Ḥadīth and master debater of the Deobandīs Ṣaftar Okarvī Deobandī, writes in his book, Tajalliyāt -
e- Ṣaftar, page: 152, volume: 3, which has been published by Ishāt al-
‘ulūm al-Ḥanafiyyah in Faisalabad, Pakistan, and also in his book, Juz al-
Qirra’at bī Ḥāshyah, with the Ḥāshyah of ṬAmin Okarvī, page: 131, he
said:

"And this ʿUbādah is majhūl al-ḥāl, Mīzān al-ʿītidāl"

Comment: ṬAmin Okarvī is referring to ʿUbādah ibn al-Ṣāmit RadiAllahu
Anhu the Ṣahābī who narrates the riwāyah, there is no Ṣalāh without the
Fāṭiḥah in Ṣāḥiḥ al-Bukhārī.

Here ṬAmin Okarvī is calling a Ṣahābī of Rasūlullāh ﷺ unknown whereas
the Ahl al-Sunnah have Ijmāʿ that every single Ṣahābah is upright and
just.

أَهْلُ السَّنَةِ وَالْجِمَاعَةِ عَلَى أَنْهُمْ كُلُّهُمْ عَدُوٌّ

Whether the condition (حاَل) is known to us or not it is irrelevant and does
not matter whatsoever, because they are assumed and presumed to be
all upright and just, but here in order to explain the ḥadīth in a way as it
contradicts the Ḣanafī Maḏhaḥ this individual has called the Ṣahābī
ʿUbādah ibn al-Ṣāmit majhūl al-ḥāl, we do not know his biography to the
extent we do not know about him and his trustworthiness,
ʿAʿūḏhubillāh.

Our Shaykh ZubārʿAlī Zaʾī writes in his book, Masāʾalah Fāṭiḥah
Khalf al-Imām, page: 26, whilst commenting on this quote of the
Deobandī ṬAmin Ṣaftar Okarvī, he says the following:
"It should be noted that the reference which this Deobandi, ʿAmin Okarvi has given concerning the Ṣahābī, ʿUbādah ibn al-Ṣāmit being majhūl al-ḥāl from Mizān al-ʾītidāl is a complete and utter fabrication and lie, we can say without a doubt that there is no reference in Mizān al-ʾītidāl of ʿUbādah ibn al-Ṣāmit being called majhūl al-ḥāl and All Praise belongs to Allāh ☪.

Another particularly famous Deobandi, Ḥussain Ḥamd Tāndwī Deobandi writes in his book, Tawḍiḥ al-Tirmidhī page: 436, printed by Madani mission book depot in Madanī Nagar, Calcutta, India, he writes:

"And this ʿUbādah ibn al-Ṣāmit is making anʿana and he is a mudallis and the anʿana of a mudallis not accepted."

Walīʾ Aʿūḏhubillāh, this ignoramus Deobandi is calling a Ṣahābī a mudallis and no one on the face of this earth has ever said anything about the Ṣahābah from amongst the Muslims except that all of them upright and just and their ʿAdālah and Ḍabṭ of the Dīn and relaying it is unquestionable.

Here he is calling him a mudallis meaning effectively a man would narrate from the Nabī ☪ put not in the correct manner and it's from principles of ḥadīth that the anʿanah of a mudallis is not accepted unless he shows he's heard directly from the one that he narrates from. This station cannot be levied upon ʿUbādah the Ṣahābī for he was a Ṣahābī of Rasūlullāh ☪ and we cannot question the uprightness of any Ṣahābī let allow ʿUbādah ibn al-Ṣāmit who was from the major Ṣaḥāba.
We therefore say as it was by our teacher that this is not only a abuse of the Ṣahābī ʿUbādah ibn al-Ṣāmit but a clear fabrication and lie concerning him so that the Maḏhab of the Ḥanafī can be preserved in not praying Fāṭihah behind the Imām. Will the muqallid not stop at nothing even the abuse of the Ṣahābah in order to safe guard and preserve his Maḏhab?


"In the night in my dream I met Fāṭima and she hugged me close, next to her chest and I became better".

So, this Deobandī scholar claimed to have met Fāṭima and claims she hugged him, walīʾAʿūḏhubillāh, can you imagine if someone said to this Deobandī scholar that I met your sister or mother in my dream and she hugged me, what would he say?


"However, the author of hidāyah has alluded to the fact that he believed Abū Maḥḏūrah that his understanding was weak and based upon suspicion, then this is not something that is correct".

Hence Taqī ʿUthmānī is accepting that the author of hidāyah which is a classical text taught to every Ḥanafī student of knowledge, authored by
Mulla Murghaīnān Īḥānafī is talking ill of Sayyīd Abū Maḥḍhūra and this is something which is incorrect.

We know the ḥadīth of Anas ibn Mālik from Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Book: Call to prayer, Ḥadīth: 725,

"And we joined in the rows our shoulders to each other's shoulders and our foot to foot in a row"

Then making fun and levelling fun and mocking this riwāyah, the Deobandi’Amīn Okarvī writes in this book, Ḥāshyarah Tafhīm al-Bukhārī‘ ala Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, page: 380, volume: 1, published by: Maktabah Madīna, Lahore, he states that:

"Imām al-Bukhārī quotes the riwāyah from Anas, and Anas had not reached the age of puberty at the time of the Rasūlullāh and would stand in the back rows. And Bukhārī has not even quoted the entire quote from Anas. Anas's teacher Abū Bakr ibn Abī Shaybah (d.235 Ah) says that:

"It was said to Anas that you will see that if today you join your feet like you have previously been doing, then the people, meaning the Ṣaḥābah and the Tābi‘īn will run away from you like wild mules. Therefore, it is apparent that when a person becomes older he begins to develop some intellect and leaves off what he was doing when he was young. That which Anas done when he was young he done
whilst he was around children however when he became older the Ṣaḥābah and the Tābī‘īn became upset at this habit of Anas. Therefore, it is clear that to him the feet is not the Sunnah of the Rasūlullāh ﷺ nor the Sunnah of the Ṣaḥābah and if it was a Sunnah or recommended to do this then the Ṣaḥābah and the Tābī‘īn would never be upset from such a habit or a Sunnah."

However, we know what ʾAmīn Okarvī has said has opposed by Anas ibn Mālik myself in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, Book: The book of drinks, Chapter: It is recommended to pass water and milk etc, to the right of the one who drinks first, Ḥadīth: 2029(b), who said:

"فِيدِلُ النَّبِيِ صلى الله عليه وسلم المدينة وأنا ابن عشر ومات وأنا ابن عشرين"

"When the Nabi ﷺ came to Medina when I was ten years old and he died when I was twenty years old.

Therefore, Okarvī calling Anas a young infant child who hadn't reach puberty in the time of Rasūlullāh ﷺ is a utter fabrication and lie because we know at the death of Rasūlullāh ﷺ he was a twenty year old man, and Okarvī has lied upon him [Anas ibn Mālik] and opposed the aḥādīth in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim and he has only done this so he can preserve his own Maḏhab of keeping the space of four handspans between each people in ṣalāh, as stipulated in the Ḥanafī Maḏhab without any bases whatsoever.

This is what he is saying in the previous quote that the Ṣaḥābah if it was done in his time, Anas was told by the other Ṣaḥābah and the Tābī‘īn if you do this today, meaning if you do this now after the death of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and now that you've grown up we'd run away from you
like mules runaway from each other than this is without evidence and there is not authentic riwāyah going back to Anas ibn Mālik or other than that for this.

One can also refer to the acceptance of ʿAmīn Okarvī, who writes in his book, Tajallīyāt -e- Ṣafar, page: 466, volume: 3, and, Futūḥāt -e- Ṣafar, page: 80, volume: 2, he states that:

"Nūr al-Anwār the famous book Ḥanafī of jurisprudence has called the Ṣahābī Muʿāwiya ignorant".

There will be a lot more said about the Ṣaḥābah and the Ḥanafīs but it suffices at this stage just to know that the Ḥanafīs have not left the Ṣaḥābah unscathed in order to defend their own Maḏhab yet they attack the Ahl al-Ḥadīth scholars for talking about the aḥādīth concerning Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī.
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