

Dismantling the Proofs for Tawassul and Istighātha with Conclusive Evidences

The Ḥadīth of Fātimah bint Asad رضي الله عنها and
the Tawassul of Messenger of Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم
Through Himself and the Prophets

PART 2

Compiled, Translated and Annotated

Abū Ḥibbān Malak

Abū Khuzaimah Imran Masoom Anṣārī



SALAFI RESEARCH INSTITUTE

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

كالمتوق
محمولة

© Copyright 2017 Salafi Research Institute

THE HADITH OF FATIMAH BINT ASAD رضي الله عنها AND THE TAWASSUL OF THE MESSENGER OF ALLAH صلوات الله وسلامه THROUGH HIMSELF AND THE PROPHETS

Compiled, Translated & Annotated
Abū Ḥibbān Malak & Abū Khuzaimah °Imrān Masoom Anṣārī

1st Edn. © [SRI] Salafi Research Institute
Dhul Hijjah 1438H / September 2017

All rights reserved No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, No known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, without prior Permission from the publishers or authors.

www.salafiri.com



Facebook/salafiri



Twitter/salafiri





IN DEFENCE OF THE SUNNĪ CREED AND MANHAJ

Dismantling the Proofs for Tawassul and Istigathā with Conclusive Evidences

*The Ḥadīth of Fātimah bint Asad رضي الله عنها and the
Tawassul of the Messenger of Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم Through
Himself and the Prophets*

www.salafiri.com

Compiled, Translated and Annotated

Abū Ḥibbān Malak

Abū Khuzaimah Imran Masoom Anṣārī

SALAFI RESEARCH INSTITUTE
LONDON - BIRMINGHAM - LAHORE



فہرست
Contents

Introduction	5
Publishers Introduction	5
Introduction	7
The Ḥadīth	7
References	9
The Chain	9
1. The weakness of Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ.	
2. Rawhū is alone in reporting it.	
3. Most of the narrations from Rawhū are reprehensive and rejected 9	
INTERESTING BENEFIT - Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ is Weak	
According to the Principles of Shaikh Ṣafar Aḥmad Thānwī	24
Understanding Ḥāfiz al-Haithami's Words	
<i>Rijāluhu Rijāl al-Ṣaḥīḥ</i>	24
Those Who Authenticated Rawhū in Ṣalāḥ and the Chain	25
Imām Ibn Ḥibbān's Authentication of Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ	30
The Leniency - Tasāhul of Imāms Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Ḥākim	31
4. The report has a broken or disconnected chain ie inqit'a	33
The First Indicative Factor – Timeline	33
The Second Indicative Factor – Country	35
BENEFIT - Revisiting Imām Ibn Ḥibbān's Authentication	36
5. Matters of belief are not accepted if they are lone reports	
according to the principles of the detractors. The Ḥanafī madhab,	
the Ash'arī's and Maturidī's.	36
Other Chains for this report	37
Answering the Fallacious Claim of Necrophilia	37
Answer	38



‘Audhu Billāhi min ash-Shayṭān al-Rajīm

Bismillāh al-Raḥmān al-Raḥīm

*Alḥamdullilāhi Rabbil ‘Alamīn, Waṣalatu Wassalām ‘Ala Rasūlillahil Karīm, Wa ‘Ala
Alihī Wa Aṣḥābī Wa Man Tabiāhum Bi-Eḥsan 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,*

www.salafiri.com

Publishers Introduction

One of the main aims of Salafi Research Institute is to uphold the views of Ahl al-Sunnah wa Ahl al-Ḥadīth with regards to the matters of creed and manhaj as established by the pious predecessors namely the Salaf us-Ṣāleḥ. In serving this aim we within SRI continuously strive to rebut and clarify the doubts posed by deviant ideologies based on authentic clear and pristine teachings of the Qur’ān and Ḥadīth.

In line with the above; we present to you the second part in a series answering the false arguments presented for the impermissible forms of Tawassul and Istighātha.

This and other research papers, we hope In-Shā’-Allāh, will aid the Sunnī Muslim to protect himself from the misinterpretations, distortions and



alterations of the people of deviation and innovation. With the aid and assistance of Allāh, The Most Merciful; these articles and research papers will be released and shared on a periodic basis. May Allāh have Mercy on us and grant us the understanding of the correct ‘Aqīdah of Ahl al-Sunnah wa’l Jama‘ah and the Salaf us-Şāleḥ.

Abu’l ‘Āliyyah & Abū Rumaiṣah

Salafi Research Institute

www.salafiri.com



Facebook/salafiri



Twitter/salafiri

Introduction

The Sūfi's, including the likes of the Barewlī's and Deobandī sects use this ḥadīth of Fātimah bint Asad RaḍiAllāhū 'Anha as proof for making Tawassul through the Messenger of Allāh (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) and the Prophets. They claim the wording of the ḥadīth is proof for the permissibility of wasīlah through the Prophets. The proceeding discourse investigates this ḥadīth by looking at its authenticity and a brief overview of the text.

At the end, we have touched on the ridiculously despicable claim made by some desperate abhorrent people, who tried to allege our beloved and beautiful Prophet, Muḥammad (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) committed necrophilia. When such people have no share of any academic discourse they always resort to such despicable lies and weak arguments to defame Islām. This then is an answer to the Ḥadīth of Fātimah bin Asad; The mother of 'Alī RaḍiAllāhū 'Anhumā

The Ḥadīth

عن أنس بن مالك قال: لما ماتت فاطمة بنت أسد بن هاشم أم علي رضي الله عنهما دخل عليها رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فجلس عند رأسها فقال: "رحمك الله يا أمي، كنت أمي بعد أمي، تجوعين وتشبعيني، وتعرين وتكسيني، وتمنعين نفسك طيباً وتطعميني، تريدن بذلك وجه الله والدار الآخرة". ثم أمر أن تغسل ثلاثاً فلما بلغ الماء الذي فيه الكافور سكب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بيده، ثم خلع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قميصه فألبسها إياه، وكفنها ببرد فوقه، ثم دعا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أسامة بن زيد وأبا أيوب الأنصاري وعمر بن الخطاب وغلاماً أسود يحفرون، فحفروا قبرها، فلما بلغوا اللحد حفره رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بيده وأخرج ترابه بيده، فلما فرغ دخل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فاضطجع فيه فقال: "الله الذي يحيي ويميت، وهو حي لا يموت، اغفر لأمي فاطمة بنت أسد، ولقنها حجتها، ووسّع عليها مدخلها بحق نبيك والأنبياء الذين من قبلي فإنك أرحم الراحمين". وكبر عليها أربعاً، وأدخلوها اللحد هو والعباس وأبو بكر الصديق رضي الله عنهم

It is narrated by Anas bin Mālik. He said: When the mother of ‘Alī bin Abū Ṭālib — Fātimah bint Asad bin Hāshim (RaḍiAllāhū ‘Anhumā— died, Allāh’s Messenger (Peace Be Upon Him) called on her and sat down by the head of the bed and said, “O dear mother, may Allāh have mercy on you. After my mother, you were the one I regarded as my mother. When I was hungry you fed me to the point of saturation while you yourself remained hungry. Then you helped me put on clothes and instead of eating yourself, you gave me nice things to eat. You did all this for Allāh’s pleasure and for a good reward in the Hereafter.” Then he (the Prophet) commanded to bathe her three times. When camphor water was brought, Allāh’s Messenger (Peace Be Upon Him) poured some water into his hands. Then Allāh’s Messenger (Peace Be Upon Him) took off his shirt and clothed her with it and used his own sheet of cloth as her coffin. Then Allāh’s Messenger (Peace Be Upon Him) sent for Ūsāmah bin Zayd, Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī and ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb and the Abyssinian slave to dig up the grave. So they dug her grave. When they reached near the laḥd, Allāh’s Messenger (Peace Be Upon Him) dug it up and drew the soil out with his own hands. When he finished, Allāh’s Messenger (Peace Be Upon Him) entered and lay down in (the grave), and said, “It is Allāh Who controls life and death, and He is Ever living and will never die. (O Allāh,) forgive my mother—Fātimah bint Asad— and help her answer properly at the time of questioning and through the mediation/right of Your Prophet (Muḥammad) and the former Prophets, Surely You are infinitely Merciful.” Then he repeated, “Allāh is Great” four times (i.e. led the funeral prayer). Then he, ‘Abbās and Abū Bakr as-Siddīq lowered her into the grave.

References

Imām al-Ṭabarānī transmits it in *Mu‘ajam al-Kabīr* (24:351 no.871), *Mu‘ajam al-Awsaṭ* (1:67-68 no.189), *Majma‘a al-Baḥrayn Fi Zawa‘id al-Mu‘jamayn* (6:361-362 no.3841) and *Majma‘a al-Zawā‘id* (9:256) of Shaikh Nūr al-Dīn al-Haythamī, Shaikh Abū Nu‘aym in *Ḥilyahtul Awliyā’* (3:121) from al-Ṭabarānī. Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī also transmits it in his *Jām‘e al-Saghīr* and ‘Alī al-Muttaqī al-Hindī transmits it from him in his *Kanz al-‘Amāl*. It has also been transmitted with a continuous chain to Anas, Ibn ‘Abbās and Jābir RaḍiAllāhū ‘Anhum and in mursal form from Muḥammad bin Ḥanafīyyah and Muḥammad bin ‘Umar bin ‘Alī, all of which are weak.

This report is weak and also munkar ie rejected.

The Chain

The chain in al-Ṭabarānī’s *Mu‘ajam al-Kabīr* and in his *Mu‘ajam al-Awsaṭ* which also leads to the same chain by default in the *Majma‘a al-Baḥrayn*

al-Ṭabarānī says transmitted to us **Aḥmad bin Ḥamād bin Zugbah** from **Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ** from **Sufyān al-Thawrī** from (‘Ann) **‘Āṣim al-Aḥwal** from **Anas bin Mālīk** (RaḍiAllāhū ‘Anhū) who said.....

This narration has five defects;

1. The weakness of Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ.
2. Rawhū is alone in reporting it.
3. Most of the narrations from Rawhū are reprehensive and rejected.
4. The report has a broken or disconnected chain ie inqit‘a.
5. Matters of belief are not accepted if they are lone reports according to the principles of the detractors. The Ḥanafī madhab, the Ash‘arī’s and Maturidī’s.

1. The Weakness of Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ and the Scholars of Ḥadīth



2. Rawhū is Alone in Reporting this Report

3. Most of the narrations from Rawhū are reprehensive and rejected.

Imām Ṭabārāni after transmitting in in *Mu‘ajam al-Awsaṭ* said,

“No one has transmitted this Ḥadīth from ‘Āṣim al-Aḥwal except Sufyān and it’s the lone report of Rawhū bin Ṣalāh.” (*Mu‘ajam al-Awsaṭ* (1:68), Cairo: Dar al-Ḥaramayn, 1415H/1995)

Shaikh Abū Nu‘aym al-Aṣḥānī said after transmitting the report,

“It is Gharīb from the Ḥadīth of ‘Āṣim and al-Thawrī and we do not write it except it being the lone report of Rawhū bin Ṣalāh.” (*al-Ḥilyah ul-Awliyā’ wa Ṭabaqāt al-Aṣfiyā* (3:121, under the entry of ‘Āṣim bin Suleimān al-Aḥwal no.226), Beirut: Maktabah Khanjī/Dār al-Fikr, 1416H/1996)

He also transmits it with the same chain in *Ma‘rifah al-Ṣahābah* and he cites the same chain as the Ḥilyah. (*Ma‘rifah al-Sahābah* (6:3408, tarjamah no. 3970 no.7783), Riyadh, Dār al-Waṭan, 1419H/1998)

Shaikh Nūr al-Dīn al-Haythamī said after transmitting it,

“No one narrates it from ‘Āṣim except Sufyān and it is a lone report of Rawhū bin Ṣalāh.” (*Majma‘a al-Baḥrayn* (6:362), Riyadh: Maktabah Ibn Rushd, 1413H/1992)

He, al-Haythamī also said after transmitting it in his *Majma‘a al-Zawā‘id* said,

“Transmitted by Ṭabarānī in *al-Kabīr* and in *al-Awsaṭ* and *Rawhū* ibn Ṣalāḥ is in the chain who was declared trustworthy by Ibn Ḥibbān and *al-Ḥākim*, however he has weakness with him and the remaining narrators are the narrators of the *Ṣaḥīḥ*.” (*Majma‘a al-Zawā‘id* (9:256-257), Cairo: Maktabah al-Quddūsī, 1414H:1994)

Ḥāfiẓ Ya‘qūb bin Sufyān al-Fasawī narrates from *Rawhū* bin Ṣalāḥ (*Kitāb al-Ma‘rifah wal-Tārīkh* (3:513), Madīnah: Maktabah al-Dār, 1410H), *Mawḍe‘ al-Awhām al-Jam‘a wa’l Tafriq* (2:96-97)

He said he wrote narrations from 1,000 teachers and all of them were trustworthy as stated by Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajr in his *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* under the entry of Ya‘qūb bin Sufyān (*Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 11:337 no.8138), Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1415H/1994).

Thus, this renders *Rawhū* to be trustworthy according to Ya‘qūb bin Sufyān al-Fasawī.

Imām Abū Aḥmad al-Ḥākim al-Kabīr brings his entry in his book of names and kunyahs, without any praise or criticism. (*Kitāb al-Asāmī wal-Kuna* (3:419 no.1637), Madīnah: Maktabah al-Ghurabā‘ al-Athariyyah, 1414H/1994)

Imām Ibn ‘Adiyy brings under *Rawhū* bin Ṣalāḥ’s entry says,

“Weak.... he does not have many ḥadīth narrated from (names of narrators) and some of them are rejected.” He also cites a few other reports under *Rawhū*’s biographical entry and says these two aḥadīth are unpreserved.” (*al-Kāmil Fi’l Du‘afa’ al-Rijāl* (4:553-554 no.668), Riyādh: Maktabah al-Rushd, Edn. Māzin al-Sarsāwī)

Imām Ibn ‘Adiyy thus further indicates the weakness of Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ by mentioning two unpreserved chains.

Imām al-Dāraquṭnī brings his entry in his book and says,

“Rawhū ibn Ṣalāḥ bin Sayābah, he narrates from Ibn Lahiyah and from al-Thawrī and others, he was weak in ḥadīth and he resided in Miṣr.” (al-Mu‘talif wa’l Mukhtalif (3:1377), Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1406H/1986)

In Ḥāfiẓ al-Burqānī’s question to Imām al-Dāraquṭnī he said,

“Abu’l Ḥasan (ie Imām Dāraquṭnī) said to me, I heard Abū Ṭālib say, the brother of Maymūn, his name was Aḥmad bin Muḥammad bin Zakariyyah Abū Bakr al-Baghdādī, he was a resident of Miṣr, he said to me, “We are in agreement (ie the people of ḥadīth) that we do not write the ḥadīth of three people of Miṣr, (1) ‘Alī bin al-Ḥasan al-Sāmī (2) Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ and (3) ‘Abd al-Mun‘im bin Bashīr.” (Suwālāt Abī Bakr al-Burqānī lil-Dāraquṭnī Fī al-Jarḥ wa’l Ta‘dīl (p.56-57 no.18), Cairo: Maktabah al-Qur‘ān, ?)

Ḥāfiẓ al-Burqānī further said,

“And then Abu’l Ḥasan (ie Imām Dāraquṭnī) said to me, Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ, he is also referred to as Rawhū bin Sayābah Miṣrī, likewise ‘Abd al-Mun‘im Miṣrī and ‘Alī bin al-Ḥasan al-Sāmī Miṣrī.” (Suwālāt Abī Bakr al-Burqānī lil-Dāraquṭnī Fī al-Jarḥ wa’l Ta‘dīl (p.57)

The people of a country know its people better, especially when it comes to praise and criticism and this is a general principle. Aḥmad bin Muḥammad bin Zakariyyah Abū Bakr al-Baghdādī was given the title of al-Ḥāfiẓ and he was also a resident of Miṣr, the likes of Imām al-Ṭabarānī narrated from him. He died in the year 296H. (*Tārīkh Baghdād* (5:8).

This is why Imām al-Dāraqūṭnī specifically mentions Aḥmad bin Muḥammad bin Zakariyyah Abū Bakr al-Baghdādī as a resident of Miṣr and he further emphasises this by mentioning the names of the three narrators and refers to them as al-Miṣrī. The affair of the other two narrators is very disparaging which gives us an indication of Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ. (refer to the general books of Rijāl)

Imām Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī brings his entry in his book on making distinctions between narrators without mentioning any praise or criticism and clarifies Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ, is also Rawhū bin Sayābah al-Ḥarithī and then brings the statement of Imām al-Dāraqūṭnī, where he says,

“Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ bin Sayābah.” (*Mawḍeḥ al-Awhām al-Jam‘a wa’l Tafrīq* (2:96-97) Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-Islāmī, 1405H/1985)

Imām Ibn Ḥibbān added his biographical note in his book of trustworthy narrators, he said,

“Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ, from the people of Miṣr, he narrates from Yaḥyā bin Ayūb and his countrymen and Muḥammad bin Ibrāhīm al-Bawshanjī narrates from him, he was from the people of Miṣr.” (*Kitāb al-Thiqāt* (8:244), Hyderabad: Da’irah al-Ma‘ārif al-Uthmāniyyah, 1393H/1973)



Ḥāfiẓ al-Sijzī asked Imām al-Ḥākīm about him and he replied,

“Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ, trustworthy and safe, he was from the people of Shām.” (Suwālāt Mas‘ud bin ‘Alī al-Sijzī Ma‘a Asilah al-Baghdadiyīn ‘Ann Aḥwāl al-Rūwāt Lil Ḥākīm (p.98 no.68), Beirut, Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1408H/1988)

Imām Ibn Mākūlā after mentioning him says,

“Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ bin Sayābah, who narrates from Ibn Lahiyy‘ah, al-Thawrī and others, he was declared weak in ḥadīth and was a resident of Miṣr.” (al-Ikmāl Fī Raf‘a al-Irtiyāb ‘Ann Mu‘talif Fī al-Asmā wal-Kunā wa’l-Ansāb (5:15), Hyderabad: Da’irah al-Ma‘ārif al-Uthmāniyyah, 1383H/1963)

The words of Imām Ibn Mākūlā, *“He was declared weak ie Ḍa‘fūhu.”* Indicates a number of scholars of Ḥadīth declared him to be weak and hence indicates a general agreement.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajr al-‘Asqalānī said under his entry,

“Ibn ‘Adiyy weakened him, Ibn Ḥibbān mentioned him in his al-Thiqāt, al-Ḥākīm said he was trustworthy and safe, Ibn Yūnus mentioned in Tārīkh al-Ghurabā‘ he was from the people of Moṣul and resided in Miṣr and they narrate from him, and narrations which are rejected have been transmitted from him (ie he would narrate rejected narrations). al-Dāraqūṭnī said he was weak in ḥadīth. Ibn Mākūlā said they have declared him to be weak and Ibn ‘Adiyy said after transmitting two of his ḥadīth, he has many aḥadīth and some



of them are rejected.” (*Lisān al-Mizān* (2:539-540 no.3433), Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1416H/1996)

We looked at the *Tārīkh al-Ghurabā’* of Ibn Yūnus and were unable to find his statement on Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ, this does not indicate in any form that Ibn Ḥajr erred but rather that we were unable to find it, therefore, if anyone does find Ibn Yūnus’s statement please do inform us.

Imām al-Dhahabī said in his biographical note on Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ,

“Ibn ‘Adiyy weakened him, Ibn Ḥibbān mentioned him in his al-Thiqāt, al-Ḥākim said he was trustworthy and safe.” (*Mizān al-‘Etidāl* (3:87 no.2804), Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1416H/1995)

In his reference work on the history of Islām, Imām al-Dhahabī includes an entry for him, after mentioning the people he narrated from as well as those who narrated from him, he says,

“He has reprehensive (Manākīr-narrations), Ibn ‘Adiyy said he is weak, Ibn Ḥibbān mentioned him in his al-Thiqāt, he died in Ramaḍhān in Miṣr in (2)33H, he was from the last people who narrated from Musā, Yaḥyā and Sa‘īd. al-Ḥākim said he was trustworthy and safe and a Shāmī.” (*Tārīkh al-Islām wa Wafyāt al-Mashāhīr al-‘Alām* (17:160-161 no.138), Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabī, 1411H/1991)

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajr, Imām al-Dhahabī and others have taken al-Ḥākims view from al-Sijzī and mentioned it in their respective books. Likewise, it is possible that Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajr also quoted the view of Ibn Yūnus from his *Tārīkh al-Ghurabā’*.



The intent here is to show Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajr in his *Lisān* takes the statement from the books of the earlier scholars.

Imām al-Dhahabī further brings his entry in his book of weak and abandoned narrators.

“Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ, he narrates from Ibn Lahiyy‘ah, Ibn ‘Adiyy said he is weak.” (Diwān al-Ḍu‘afā’ wal-Matrūkīn (1:294 no.1427), Beirut: Dār al-Qalam, 1408H/1988)

He also brings him in his other book on weak narrators, wherein he says,

“Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ al-Miṣrī, he narrates from Ibn Lahiyy‘ah, Ibn ‘Adiyy weakened him and he is also called Ibn Yasābah (this is a typo it should Sayābah).” (al-Mughnī Fī’l Ḍu‘afā’ (1:356 no.2139), Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1418H/1997), Edn. Nūr al-Dīn al-‘Ittar (1:339 no.2139), Qatar: Idārah Ihyā’ al-Turāth, 1407H/1987)

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Jawzī has also classed him as a weak and abandoned narrator, he mentions,

“Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ, or they say Rawhū bin Shibābah (it should be Sayābah), his kunyah is Aba’l Ḥārith, he narrates from Ibn Lahiyy‘ah, Ibn ‘Adiyy said he is weak.” (Kitāb al-Ḍu‘afā’ wal-Matrūkīn (1:287 no.1643), Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah,?)

Furthermore, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Jawzī cites this report in his book of fabricated and weak narrations under the chapter of the virtues of Fātimah bint Asad, and then transmits it with his chain through to al-Ṭabarānī and thereafter says,

“The author (ie referring to himself) says this is a lone report of Rawhū ibn Ṣalāḥ who is from the unknown narrators and furthermore, Ibn ‘Adiyy has declared him to be weak.” (*al-‘Ellal al-Mutānahiyyah Fīl Aḥadīth al-Wahīyyah* (1:268-269 no.433), Faiṣalabād: Idārah ‘Ulūm al-Atharīyyah, 1399H/1979), Cf. Edn. Khalil al-Mayyis, (1:269-270 no.433), Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1403H/1983)

Imām Dhahabī in his summary of the *al-‘Ellal al-Mutānahiyyah Fīl Aḥadīth al-Wahīyyah* of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Jawzī again grades Rawhū weak thus showing his consistency. (*Talkhīs Kitāb al-‘Ellal al-Mutānahiyyah Li-Ibn al-Jawzī* (p.91 no. 218), Riyadh: Maktabah al-Rushd, 1419H/1998)

Shaikh Irshād ul-Ḥaḡ al-Atharī said in his notes to *al-‘Ellal* after mention the statements of Imām Ibn ‘Adiyy, Imām al-Dāraquṭnī, Imām Ibn Mākūlā, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Yūnus, the authentication of Imām al-Ḥākīm and the entry of Imām Ibn Ḥibbān in his *al-Thiqāt* as mentioned in *Lisān* (2:465),

“I say their leniency (*tasāhul* ie of *al-Ḥākīm* and *Ibn Ḥibbān*) is well known and *al-Shaikh al-Albānī* has mentioned in *Silsilah al-Da‘īfa* no.23 so refer to it.” (*al-‘Ellal al-Mutānahiyyah Fīl Aḥadīth al-Wahīyyah* (1:269 footnote no.5), Edn, Khalīl Mayyis (1:270 footnote no.8)

Shaikh Ḥamdī ‘Abd al-Majid al-Salafī said in his footnotes to to *Mu‘ajam al-Kabīr*,

“Ṭabāranī transmits in in his *al-Awsaṭ* p.356-357 part of the *Majma‘a al-Baḡrayn* and he said, “no one has transmitted this from

‘Āṣim except Sufyān and it’s the lone report of Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ and it is mentioned in Majma‘a 9:257 that Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ is in the chain, who was declared trustworthy by Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Ḥākim, however he has weakness in him and the rest of the narrators are the narrator of the Ṣaḥīḥ and Abū Nu‘aym also transmitted it from the author in al-Ḥilyah 3:121.

My Shaykh (ie Shaykh al-Albānī) has challenged the statement of Ḥāfiẓ al-Haythami in his Silsilah Āḥadith al-Ḍa‘īfah’ no.23, where he says in Majma‘a the rest of the narrators are the narrators of the Ṣaḥīḥ, that Aḥmad bin Ḥamād (bin Zughbah), who although is in himself trustworthy the authors of the Ṣaḥīḥs have not transmitted from him as only al-Nasā‘ī transmits from him.

Shaykh Ḥamdi ‘Abd al-Majīd al-Salafī answers the authentication of Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ and says,

“As for Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ who has been declared to be trustworthy by Ibn Ḥibbān and Hakim, then it is well known about both of them that they are mutasāhil ie lenient. He was declared to be weak by Ibn ‘Adiyy and Ibn Yūnus said he would narrate rejected narrations. Darāquṭnī said he is weak in Ḥadīth and Ibn Mākūlā weakened him and Ibn ‘Adiyy said after transmitting two of this ḥadīth he has many āḥadīth and some of them are abandoned.

Thus, this is detailed criticism from the specialist critical analysts, furthermore, his narrations are rejected and this is the case with this narration and when he is alone in reporting such ḥadīth they are rejected and cannot be used as evidence therefore, the ḥadīth is

is weak.” (Mu‘ajam al-Kabīr (24:351-352), Cairo: Maktabah Ibn Taymiyyah, 1415H/1994)

The verifier of *Majma‘a al-Baḥrayn Fi Zawā‘id al-Mu‘ajamayn*, ‘Abd al-Quddus bin Muḥammad Naẓīr also declared the chain to be weak as well as the narrator Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ. (*Majma‘a al-Baḥrayn* (6:361)

Shaikh ‘Abd Allah bin Ṣiddīq al-Ghumārī also acknowledges that Rawhū has some weakness with him and says,

“Rawhū, his weakness is light.” (*Ittihāf al-Azkiya’ Bijawāj al-Tawassul bil-Anbiyā’ wa’l Awliyā’* (p.11) (? : ‘Alī Raḥmī, p.11) and (p.20) cited from *Mafāhīm Yajib ‘Ann Tuṣaḥaḥ* (p.146)

Shaikh al-Albānī also categorically grades it to be weak. He quotes the references first and then the chain followed by the words of Imām al-Ṭabarānī and Ḥāfiẓ al-Haythamī and then proceeds to answer al-Haythamī’s claim. We have quoted the words of Shaikh al-Albānī via the words of Shaikh Ḥamdī ‘Abd al-Majīd al-Salafī that only al-Nasā‘ī transmits from Aḥmad bin Ḥamād bin Zughbah. Shaikh al-Albānī said,

“and his statement “the rest of the narrators are the narrators of the Ṣaḥīḥ” is highly disputable as Zughbah is not from the narrators of the Ṣaḥīḥ’s, rather they did not transmit from him except al-Nasā‘ī, I say we know from this that he is in of himself trustworthy. What therefore remains is the affair of Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ, and he is a lone reporter as al-Ṭabarānī said and also what al-Haythamī mentions the authentication of Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Ḥākim but his weakening (by al-Ṭabarānī) has precedence over their statements due to two issues.

The First: He is criticised and criticism takes precedence over praise with conditions.

The Second: Ibn Ḥibbān is lenient in his authentication of narrators and he has authenticated many narrators who are unknown to the extent that at times he clarifies he does not know who they are nor their fathers as Ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī has mentioned in al-Ṣārim al-Munkī.

Shaikh al-Albānī adds a footnote at this point and says,

“I have mentioned some examples (of Imām Ibn Ḥibbān’s leniency) in ‘al-Radd ‘Ala al-Ta‘qub al-Ḥathīth (p.18-21) and then in the introduction of my book, ‘Taysīr Intifā‘ al-Khalān Bikitāb Thiqāt Ibn Ḥibbān’

Shaikh al-Albānī continues and says,

“The affair is the same with al-Ḥākim and his lapses which are not hidden from the one who is well acquainted with biographies and narrators. Therefore, their statements do not hold weight when there are contradictions even when there is undetailed criticism and the reasons for the criticism is not mentioned but then how about the affair with Ibn Ṣalāḥ when the details are mentioned...”

Then Shaikh al-Albānī then mentions the criticism and disparaging remarks of the scholars of ḥadīth which have preceded. He continues and says,

“You have seen how the Imams of criticism (Ai‘mah al-Jarḥ) are in agreement in their words in the weakening of this narrator and they clarify the reason for his weakness due to him narrating rejected reports. The same applies to this report in which he is alone in reporting and thus he is rejected and not used as evidence and therefore, no one is deceived by this praise and authentication except the ignorant or the one with other agenda’s.

After what has preceded it is apparent to a fair minded person that when Shaikh Zāhid al-Kawtharī spoke about this ḥadīth he was not just with the knowledge of this science. He attempts to strengthen this ḥadīth and he only mentioned the praise and authentication of Rawhū ibn Ṣalāḥ and totally failed to mention the criticism and disparaging remarks which were greater than those who authenticated him. (Refer to (p.379) Maqalāt al-Kawtharī) (Silsilah Āḥadīth al-Ḍa‘īfah’ (1:79-82 no.23), Riyadh, Maktabah al-Mā‘rif, 1412H/1992)

Shaikh al-Albānī continues and shows the contradictions of al-Kawtharī and his principles and takes charge of the claims, showing his double standards on the authentications of Imāms Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Ḥākim. He also answers the claim the reason for the criticism is not mentioned and proceeds to mention the reasons. Shaikh Mamḥūd Sa‘īd Mamduḥ despite his valiant digressive efforts fails to answer the reason for the criticism as he gracefully glosses over it in his *Raḥ al-Minārah*.

It must be noted Shaikh Maḥmūd Sa‘īd Mamduḥ’s response to Shaikh al-Albānī’s answer to this report are significantly inadequate and falls short of being even remotely convincing.

Shaikh al-Albānī further answered some of their retorts and replied directly back to them in his book on Tawassul and went onto to say some of their points were laughable, he said after quoting the text of the ḥadīth,

"al-Haythamī said in Majma' al-Zawā'id (9:257) "al-Ṭabarānī reports it in al-Kabīr and Awsaṭ and it contains Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ who is declared reliable by Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Ḥākim, but is somewhat weak. Then the rest of its narrators are those of the Ṣaḥīḥs."

I say: by the way of Ṭabarānī it is reported in Abū Nu'aym in Ḥilyatul Awliyā' (3:121) and their chain of narration is weak since Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ who is one its narrators is alone in narrating it as Abū Nu'aym himself said. Then Rawhū is declared to be weak by Ibn 'Adiyy, and Ibn Yūnus said, "Weak and reprehensible things are reported from him." al-Dāraquṭnī said, "He is Ḍa'īf (weak) in ḥadīth." Ibn Mākūlā said, "They declare him weak." Ibn 'Adiyy said after quoting two of his ḥadīth, "He reports many Āḥadith and some of them are reprehensible."

So they agree upon his weakness, so the ḥadīth is weak ie munkar since he is alone in reporting it. There are some people who try to strengthen this ḥadīth based upon the declaration of Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Ḥākim that Rawhū is reliable. However, this will not benefit them due to what is known with regard to their leniency in declaration of reliability.

So this saying of theirs when opposed by sayings of other scholars does not carry any weight even if the declaration of weakness by the other scholars is not explained, so how about when the reason



for weakness is made clear as is the case here? I have also fully explained the weakness of this Ḥadīth in al-Ḍaʿīfah no.23 and so I will not repeat that here.

The antagonists whom we have indicated quote that which can only cause laughter, saying, "Shaikh Nāṣir judged it to be weak, so we ask that he tell us who from the scholars of ḥadīth has declared this ḥadīth to be weak." We quoted those who declare its narrator Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ to be weak, and he is alone in reporting it. This automatically means weakness of the ḥadīth unless someone is found to report it along with him, and Abū Nuʿaym had denied that there is anyone supporting this narration, unless another narration of it is found, and that is not the case!

Then they say, "Even if we accept that it is weak, then it is only slightly weak which would not prevent action upon it, since it is a case of acting on a ḥadīth whose weakness is not severe in that which relates to mere encouragement and warnings, which is allowed by the scholars of Ḥadīth and Fiqh."

I say: there is no encouragement in this ḥadīth, nor does it explain some excellent for an action which is already established as being practised in the shariʿah. Rather it is speaking about something which may be permissible or may not be permissible, therefore it is being used to establish a shariʿah ruling, if it were authentic. Furthermore, these people are quoting it as a proof for this form of Tawassul about which there is disagreement. So when you accept its weakness then it is not permissible to use it as proof. I do not think any intelligent person would agree that it pertains to encouragement and warnings. Rather this is the way of those who



flee away from submission to the truth, they say things which no intelligent person would say." (Tawassul: It's Types and Its Rulings (p.101-102) Eng. Trans. Abū Talhah Ronald Burbank, Birmingham: al-Hidāyah)

INTERESTING BENEFIT - Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ is Weak According to the Principles of Shaikh Ṣafar Aḥmad Thānwī

According to the principle of Shaikh Ṣafar Aḥmad Thānwī any narrator not mentioned in The *Lisān al-Mizān* of Ḥāfiẓ and in the *Mizān al-‘Eitidāl* of Imām Dhahabī is considered to be trustworthy. Then we say the opposite must also be true by natural default according to Shaikh Ṣafar Aḥmad Thānwī, meaning that any narrator mentioned in the *Lisān* and *Mizān* is rendered to be untrustworthy. (*I‘la al-Sunan* (7:256)

Understanding Ḥāfiẓ al-Haithamī's Words *Rijāluḥu Rijāl al-Ṣaḥīḥ*

ie and "*the remaining narrators are the narrators of the Ṣaḥīḥ*" sometimes when the words of Ḥāfiẓ al-Haythamī are quoted like this after a ḥadīth has been mentioned, a reader's natural inclination is that the remaining narrators are trustworthy and in turn the narration is authentic.

The Ḥanafī scholar, Ḥāfiẓ Zayla‘ī has explained this is not the case and says in very clear words,

"If a narrator has been utilised as evidence in the Ṣaḥīḥ, it does not necessitate that every ḥadīth he is in (as a narrator) will fulfil the conditions of an authentic ḥadīth." (Naṣb al-Rāyah (1:342)

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajr also said the same with almost identical words in *his al-Nukt ‘Ala Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ* (1:275) as does Imām Ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī in his *Ṣārim al-Munkī* (p.256, 259)



Those Who Authenticated Rawhū in Ṣalāḥ and the Chain

From those who have authenticated the chain are,

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajr al-Haythamī wherein he says,

“Narrated by al-Ṭabarānī with a good chain...” (Ḥāshiyah al-‘Allāmah Ibn Ḥajr al-Haythamī ‘Ala Sharḥ al-Ayḍah Fi Manāsik al-Hajj Lil Imām al-Nawawī (p.500), Beirut: Dar al-Ḥadīth, ?)

He also said the same in his *al-Jawhar al-Munazzam Fī Ziyārah al-Qabr al-Sharīf al-Nabawī al-Mukarram* (p.110-111), Cairo: Maktabah Madbūlī, 2000)

An infamous writer Abul Hasan Hussain Ahmed has alleged, ‘Imām al-Samhūdī in his *Khulāṣatul Wafā’ bi-Akḥbār Dār al-Muṣṭafā* has apparently mentioned that this Ḥadīth has a *Jayyid Sanad*.’ However, al-Samhūdī said the opposite, wherein he asserts and acknowledges weakness in the chain as is evident from his words.

al-Samhūdī said,

“Transmitted in *al-Kabīr* and *Awsaṭ* with a chain containing Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ who was declared trustworthy by Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Ḥākim however he has weakness whereas the remaining narrators are the narrators of the *Ṣaḥīḥ*.” (*Wafā’ al-Wafā Biakḥbār Dār al-Muṣṭafā* (3:898-899), Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1404H/1984), Cf. *Khulāṣah al-Wafā Biakḥbār Dār al-Muṣṭafā* (p.421), Madīnah: al-Maktabah al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1392H/1972), another edition (2:369), Dr. Muḥammad al-Āmīn)

None of the earlier scholars authenticated the chain except the later ones as mentioned above and they were from the 8th-9th century. This authentication



of the later scholars has to be scrutinised and investigated before it is taken as accepted. Even this in the current state only leaves the view of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajr al-Haythamī to be investigated as Ḥāfiẓ Samhūdī pointed to its weakness.

Naturally al-Kawtharī cites the significant words of this report and says,

“The narrators of this ḥadīth are trustworthy except Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ and al-Ḥākim said he was trustworthy and safe and Ibn Ḥibbān brings his entry in his al-Thiqāt.” (Maḥqū al-Taḥawwūl Fī Masalāḥ al-Tawassūl (p.4), Cairo: al-Maktabah al-Azhariyyah lit-Turāth, 2006), also from Maḥqalāt al-Kawtharī (p.340), Cairo: Maktabah al-Tawfiqia, ?)

However, al-Kawtharī himself acknowledges the leniency of Imām Ibn Ḥibbān and Imām al-Ḥākim in the same book *al-Maḥqalāt* as mentioned by Imām al-Albānī in *Silsilah al-Ḍa‘īfah* (1:81), yet here they take and accept the same leniency as evidence.

Muḥammad ibn ‘Alawī al-Malikī quotes it in his book and says,

“There is a difference of opinion regarding one of the narrators, Rawhū ibn Ṣalāḥ, however Ibn Ḥibbān mentions him in his al-Thiqāt and al-Ḥākim said he was safe and trustworthy. So both of them, the two Ḥāfiẓs authenticated the ḥadīth. Likewise al-Haythamī followed up on this in (Majma‘a al-Zawā‘id) and said Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ is in the chain, Ibn Ḥibbān declared him to be trustworthy as did al-Ḥākim, however, he has some weakness and the remaining narrators are the narrator of the Ṣaḥīḥs.” (Mafāhīm Yajib ‘Ann Tuṣaḥaḥ (p.146), Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1430H/2009)

Maḥmūd Saʿīd Mamdūḥ does the same and claims the narration is Ḥasan. He also quotes the statements of the scholars as we have mentioned above. He says the scholars have differed over Rawhū, some have said he is weak and others have declared him trustworthy. (*Raʿ ul-Minārah Li-Takhrīj Aḥādīth al-Tawassul wal-Ziyārah* (p.147-148), Cairo, Maktabah al-Azhariyyah Lit-Turāth, 2006)

ʿIsā Himyarī jubilantly went on to assert the Ḥadīth is Ṣaḥīḥ ie authentic according to the conditions of Imām Ibn Ḥibbān and Imām al-Ḥākim and Ḥasan according to the conditions of others. (*al-Tāʾmul Fī Ḥaqīqah al-Tawassul*, p.214-215)

It is a little imaginative of Himyarī to say the ḥadīth is authentic according to the condition of both Imām Imām Ibn Ḥibbān and Imām al-Ḥākim!

G.F. Ḥaddād has also attempted to authenticate this report while relying on the works of Maḥmūd Saʿīd Mamduḥ and Muḥammad bin ʿAlawī al-Malikī. He pushes the line of argument of Maḥmūd Saʿīd Mamduḥ that the criticism is undetailed which is laughable as we have shown in this discourse. The Sūfī Aḥmad Daḥlān has also attempted to authenticate this report as does al-Ḥabīb al-Jifrī.

The central argument of the detractors is that Rawhū is differed over and that the criticism levied against him is not detailed but rather general and therefore we take the general praise and authentication of him.

It is well known and accepted by the detractors themselves that Imām Ibn Ḥibbān and Imām al-Ḥākim are both mutāsahil ie lenient with their gradings and authentication. It does not make sense for them to accept this and leave

the criticism. They couple this argument with the fact the criticism and discrediting is undetailed and vague, therefore one retorts to the position of praise.

This has been answered by Shaikh al-Albānī and the scholars before him wherein he mentions the reasons Rawhū is weak. The main reason being he would narrate rejected narrations and that his narrations were rejected themselves. At times he would be a lone reporter of narration without any support.

Shaikh ‘Amr bin ‘Abd al-Mun‘im explains that Imāms al-Ṭabarānī, Abū Nu‘aym and Ḥāfiẓ al-Haythamī have all declared this to be a lone report of Rawhū ibn Ṣalāḥ and none of the other students and companions of Sufyān narrates this from except Rawhū ibn Ṣalāḥ and these other students of Sufyān were memorisers and trustworthy narrators.

As for Imām Ibn Ḥibbān citing Rawhū in his *al-Thiqat*, it is not tantamount to trustworthiness as he is known to be lenient ie Mutasāhil. Whatever he mentions under his entry in his *al-Thiqāt* does not clarify the affair of Rawhū except that it is information as we have shown under his entry, which has preceded. Rather we find this entry alludes to all of his narrations being of the rejected type.

This is because Imām Ibn Ḥibbān in his entry states he narrates from the people of Misr and the people of Miṣr narrate from him, however in this report Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ narrates from Sufyān al-Thawrī, who was not from the people of Miṣr, therefore this alludes to it being strange and odd as Abū Nu‘aym has highlighted with his words when he said, “It is *Gharīb* from the *ḥadīth* of ‘Āṣim and *al-Thawrī* and we do not write it except it being the lone report of Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ.”





Imām al-Ḥākim is even more lenient than Imām Ibn Ḥibbān, ie more mutasāhil, as al-Suyūṭī has quoted from Ḥāfiẓ al-‘Irāqī who said,

“al-Ḥākim is more lenient than him (ie Ibn Ḥibbān)” (al-Tadrīb al-Rāwī (1:108)

Shaikh ‘Amr bin ‘Abd al-Mun‘im goes into detail answering the authentication of Imām al-Ḥākim and answers Maḥmūd Sa‘īd Mamduḥ’s discussion on the validity of al-Ḥākim’s statement.

As for Ya‘qūb bin Sufyān’s authentication. This is also inaccurate and needs investigation, in fact such a point is rejected. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajr quotes the statement of Ya‘qūb bin Sufyān al-Fasawī that he wrote narrations from 1,000 teachers from Ḥāfiẓ al-Mizzī’s *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* (23:324).

Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī rejects this assertion and claims and says,

“I say he does not have that many teachers except roughly about 300, so where are the remainder? And the ones which are mentioned a group (of scholars) have weakened them.” (Siyar ‘Alām al-Nabulā’ (13:181)

(Summarised from ‘Amr ‘Abd al-Mun‘im Salīm’s, *Hadmul Minārah Liman Ṣaḥḥaha Āḥādīth al-Tawassul wal-Ziyārah* (p.126-134), Ṭanṭā: Dār ul-Dhiyā‘, 1422H/2001)

Shaikh Fawzān bin Sābiq bin Fawzān al-Fawzān (d.1373H) also weakened Rawḥū bin Ṣalāḥ and this report. (*al-Bayān wa’l Ishār Likashf Zaig al-Mulḥid al-Hāj Mukhtār* (p.363), Beirut, Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1422H/2001)



Shaikh Muqbil also alludes to Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ being weak in his checking of the narrators in *Sunan al-Dāraquṭnī*. (*Tarājim Rijāl al-Dāraquṭnī Fi Sunan* (1:225 no.550), Ṣanʿa, Dār al-Athār, 1420H/1999)

Shaikh Zubair ʿAlī Zaʿī graded the report to weak on account of the weakness of Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ according to the scholars of Ḥadīth. He also argued, even if he was authentic the second problem is the *tadlīs* of Sufyān al-Thawrī. Shaikh Zubair said seven scholars of Ḥadīth classed Rawhū to be weak,

(1) Ibn ʿAdiyy, (2) Ibn Yūnus, (3) al-Dāraquṭnī, (4) Ibn Mākūlā, (5) al-Dhahabī, (6) Ibn al-Jawzī, (7) Aḥmad bin Muḥammad bin Zakariyyah al-Baghdādī

While Imāms Ibn Ḥibbān, al-Ḥākim authenticated him and Yaʿqūb bin Sufyān al-Fasawī narrated from him. These three authentications are rejected based on the criticism of the majority of the scholars of ḥadīth. (*al-Ḥadīth no.76, Ramaḍhān 1431H/September 2010, p.9-12*).

In fact, rather it is argued there is only actually one scholar who praised him and that is Imām al-Ḥākim with two words of *Thiqah al-Māmūn* and therefore holding onto just the words of al-Ḥākim, whose authentication is known to be unreliable.

Imām Ibn Ḥibbān's Authentication of Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ

The detractors rely on the alleged authentication of Imām Ibn Ḥibbān, that he entered Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ in his *al-Thiqāt*.

Firstly: We have shown and mentioned from the words of the scholars it is generally well known that Imām Ibn Ḥibbān was lenient in his gradings, and even the detractors have admitted and accepted this.

Secondly: Imām Ibn Ḥibbān renders this report to be weak on account of saying Rawhū only narrated from the people of Miṣr, where as in this narration he narrates from Sufyān, who was a Kūfan.

Thirdly: Imām Ibn Ḥibbān entering Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ in his *al-Thiqat* does not necessitate he did not have reprehensive weak and or rejected narrations. This is because Imām Ibn Ḥibbān includes other narrators who have reprehensible and rejected narrations in the same book. For example, he includes Muḥammad bin ‘Abd Allāh bin ‘Amr in his *al-Thiqāt* and says about him that some of his Āḥādīth are manākīr ie of the reprehensible rejected type. (*al-Thiqāt* (7:417))

The Leniency - Tasāhul of Imāms Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Ḥākim

The statement of Ḥāfiẓ Suyūṭī quoting Ḥāfiẓ al-‘Irāqī has preceded where both Imams Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Ḥākim were declared to be lenient as quoted by Shaikh ‘Amr bin ‘Abd al-Mun‘im.

Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī is also of the view that Imām al-Ḥākim was lenient. (*Zikr Man Yu‘tamad Qawlihi Fi’l Jarḥ wat Ta‘dīl* (p.159) Cf. *al-Muwa‘qizah* (p.83))

Ḥāfiẓ al-Sakhawī also categorises Imām al-Ḥākim to be lenient. (*al-‘Alān Bil-Tawbih Liman Zam al-Tārīkh* (p.168), *al-Mutakallimūn Fi’l Rijāl* (p.137))

Shaikh ‘Abd al-Rahman Yahyā al-Mu‘allamī al-Yamānī outlined the methodology of Imām Ibn Ḥibbān and his categorisation of trustworthy narrators and those who he includes in his book, amongst them are those who are unknown ie majhul, because they do not fit the other categories. (*al-Tankīl Bimā Fī Ṭanīb al-Kawtharī Min al-Abāṭīl* (1:437-438 no.199))

The detractors have again themselves admitted and clearly acknowledged in their various writings that both Imāms Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Ḥākim are lenient and mutasāhil. For example, Muḥammad Zāhid al-Kawtharī has admitted this himself in his *Maqalāt* (p.185) as mentioned by Shaikh al-Albānī in his *Silsilah aḤadīth al-Ḍa‘īfah* (1:81).

Regarding another ḥadīth and the narrator contained, Shaikh al-Albānī quotes Muḥammad Zāhid al-Kawtharī as saying,

“Yes Imām Ibn Ḥibbān mentioned him in his al-Thiqāt however his method in al-Thiqāt is that he mentions narrators in it when he is unaware of any criticism against them but this does not take them out of the condition in being unknown according to the other scholars and thus Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajr has refuted Imām Ibn Ḥibbān's inconsistencies in his Lisān al-Mizān.” (Maqalāt (p.309)

I say: we find the madhab from the words of al-Kawtharī, which is, that he does not rely on the authentication of Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Ḥākim because both of them are lenient ie mutasāhil. Therefore, how is that he can declare the ḥadīth under discussion to be authentic and he does this just on the basis of them authenticating Rawhū ibn Ṣalāh, especially since others who are more knowledgeable than them in terms of narrators declare him weak.” (Silsilah Āḥadīth al-Ḍa‘īfah’ (1:82)

Shaikh Ḍafar Aḥmad Uthmānī has also categorised Imām al-Ḥākim as being lenient in two of his works. (*I‘la al-Sunan* (2:107), *Qawa'id ‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth* (p.189)

So they apply the rule when it suits their needs and desires while rejecting and overlooking it when it does not serve their intent and purposes in promoting



the incorrect type of Tawassul and Wasīlah. Shaikh al-Albānī has yet again highlighted their inconsistencies and discrepancies while they play non the wiser card.

Shaikh Muḥibullāh Shāh al-Rāshidī al-Sindhī has also indicated the leniency of Imām Ibn Ḥibbān [SEE HERE](#)

Shaikh Muḥammad Bashīr Sehaswānī also discusses the narration and we conclude with his words,

“We find that Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ is in the chain who is weak. He was declared to be weak by Ibn ‘Adiyy and according to Sakhawī he was of the intermediate level of criticised narrators. There is no reliance on Ibn Ḥibbān mentioning him in his al-Thiqāt because he is well known to authenticate unknown narrators which we have already mentioned from Mizān al-‘Eitidāl. Likewise, al-Ḥākim’s lone authentication is also unworthy to be relied upon as he is from the lenient ones.” (Ṣiyānatul Insān ‘Ann Waswasah al-Shaikh Daḥlān (p.132)

4. The Report has a Broken or Disconnected Chain ie inqit‘a.

Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ hearing this report from Sufyān al-Thawrī is suspect and questionable from two separate indicative factors, both of which allude to Rawhū not hearing or even meeting Sufyān al-Thawrī let alone reporting this narration.

The First Indicative Factor - Timeline

The time difference between Sufyān’s death and Rawhū’s is contentious. Sufyān died according to most reports in 161H and Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ died in



233H (*Lisān al-Mizān* (2:540), *Mizān al-‘Eitidāl* (3:87), *Tārīkh al-Islām* (17:161 no.138)

Thus, there is a difference of approximately 72-73 years between their deaths and if Rawhū heard this report from Sufyān, he would have least been 16-20 years old making his birth date approximately 141-145H, taking Rawhū’s age to the late 80’s and early 90’s. It would also lead to the idea of Rawhū hearing from Sufyān al-Thawri during his later life.

This should also be coupled with the fact that Sufyān al-Thawrī was a Mudallis. It is known that Imām, ‘Amīr al-Mu‘minin Fil-Ḥadīth, al-Hujjah, al-‘Abid, Sufyān al-Thawrī was an Imām of Ahl al-Sunnah and a preserver of ḥadīth of the highest level yet still he was a mudallis.

Imām al-Dhahabī said,

“Sufyān would do *tadlīs* from weak narrators.” (*Mizān ul-‘Eitidal* (2:169), *Siyar ‘Alām an-Nabulā’* (7:242, 7:274).

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajr also said he was a mudallis. (*Ṭabaqāt al-Mudallisīn* (p.32 no.51) and *Taqrīb ut-Tahdhīb* (no.2458 pg.394) in another ed. (p.197), *an-Nukt* (2/621), *Irshād al-Sārī* (1:286)

Imām ‘Abdullāh ibn al-Mubārak also said Sufyān al-Thawrī would do *tadlīs*. (*Tahdhīb ut-Tahdhīb* (4/102)

As well as the following Imāms,

Bukhārī (*al-‘Ellal al-Kabīr* (2:966) of Tirmidhī, *at-Tamhīd* (1:34)
Nasā’ī (*Ṭabaqāt al-Mudallisīn* (p.32 no.51)

- Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn (Sharḥ ʿEllal at-Tirmidhī (1:357), *al-Kifāyah Fī ʿIlm ar-Riwāyah* (p.361)
- Yaḥyā al-Qaṭṭān (*Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* (11:192)
- Ḥākim (*Maʿrifah ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth* (p.105)
- Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (*al-Kifāyah Fī ʿIlm ar-Riwāyah* (p.361)
- Ibn as-Ṣalāḥ (*Muqaddimah* pg.60)
- Abū Maḥmūd al-Maqdisī (*Qaṣīdah Fīʾl Mudallisīn* (p.47, second poem)
- Ṣalāḥ ud Ḍīn al-Laʿī (*Jāmʿe at-Taḥṣīl Fī Aḥkām al-Marāsīl* (p.99)
- Ibn Rajab (*Sharḥ ʿEllal at-Tirmidhī* (1:358)
- Nawawī and Suyūṭī (*Tadrīb ar-Rāwī Sharḥ Taqrīb* (1:263) in another ed. (1:230)

The Second Indicative Factor – Country

Rawhū could not have heard from Sufyān al-Thawrī because Rawhū only narrated from the people Miṣr and only they narrated from him, whereas Imām Sufyān was from Kūfah! Remember Imām Ibn Ḥibbān said,

“Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ, from the people of Miṣr, he narrates from Yaḥyā bin Ayūb and his countrymen and Muḥammad bin Ibrāhīm al-Bawshanjī narrates from him, he was from the people of Miṣr.” (*al-Thiqāt* (8:244)

Some of the other scholars have also alluded to Rawhū only narrating from the people of Miṣr, like Ibn Yūnus, Ibn Mākūlā and al-Dāraqūṭnī. These two important factors further indicate the weakness of this report based on the chain and the narrator. Furthermore, Ḥāfiẓ al-Mizzī brings a detailed entry of Sufyān al-Thawrī and lists all the people who narrated from him without mentioning Rawhū as his student or from the people who narrated from Sufyān. (*Tahdhīb al-Kamāl Fī Asmāʿ al-Rijāl* (11:161-164 no.2407), Beirut, Muassisah al-Risālah, 1408H/1987)

It can be argued with regards to the first point, that the meeting between Rawhū and Sufyān is still possible, however based on general norms it seems highly unlikely, norms like lifespans, travelling to different lands, possible meetings etc.

If someone says the Imāms have mentioned Rawhū narrates from Sufyān, then we say they have mentioned this based on the chains of narration or transmission of reports where Rawhū reports on Sufyān's authority, it does not however make this a reality or fact.

BENEFIT - Revisiting Imām Ibn Ḥibbān's Authentication

It is highly pertinent to mention according to Imām Ibn Ḥibbān's own statement in his *al-Thiqāt*, he himself renders this report to be weak due to Rawhū narrating from Sufyān, who was from Kūfa, so how can they present his authentication.

5. Matters of belief are not accepted if they are lone reports according to the principles of the detractors. The Ḥanafī madhab, the Ash'arī's and Maturidī's.

There is no other option but to accept that this report is a single lone narration of Rawhū bin Ṣalāḥ based on the clarifications and elucidations of the scholars of Ḥadīth from the likes of Imām al-Ṭabarānī, Ḥāfiẓ Abū Nu'aym and Ḥāfiẓ Nūr al-Dīn al-Haythamī.

The principle of the detractors whether Ḥanafī, Ash'arī or Matūridī is that lone reports ie Khabar al-Ahād are not accepted in matters of creed and Imān because for them matters of belief must be based on certainty and therefore issues that are in relation to belief and disbelief cannot be established by Aḥād or single lone reports. One can refer to *Usūl Sarkhasī* (p.116), *Fawātih al-Rahmūt* (2:136) and other general book on Ḥanafī 'Usūl.



The antagonists present this report as an evidence for Tawassul and since it is related to matters of belief and Imān, it is imperative that it must be mutawatir and not Khabr al-Aḥād in order for them to accept it.

Other Chains for this report

Muḥammad ‘Alawī al-Malikī and others have mentioned other reports which differ in the wording, whilst some of them do not even mention the the words the detractors attempt to prove their belief system from. All of these other narrations are either weak, with weak and unknown narrators or the chains are unconnected and are mursal. G.F. Haddād has also admitted some of these reports do not contain the contentious words.

Answering the Fallacious Claim of Necrophilia

The ignorant people of other faiths, in their emotionally filled rants and outbursts against Islām allege the Messenger of Allah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) slept with the body of Fātimah bint Asad RaḍiAllāhū ‘Anha based on the wording of this ḥadīth. Such horrible claims are often regurgitated by people who follow and believe in Christianity.

This is an outright lie and a desperate attempt to discredit Islām, such claims are often raised by people who have not read anything about Islām and rather just take some information from websites, who extend most of their efforts to concoct fallacious allegations against Islām.

This treacherous claim rests on the words فاضطجع They claim the word means to sleep, lay down ie he lay down with Fātimah bint Asad to have sex with her and this Arabic word is often used to denote to lie down and sleep with someone. We seek refuge in Allāh from such lies and aspersions. Āmīn



Answer

Firstly: we have shown this ḥadīth is weak in the preceding discourse, but let's assume for arguments sake that it was authentic, then;

Secondly: The word اضطجع means to lie, lie down, recline, repose and sleep according to the well known Arabic dictionaries. It does not mean to sleep or to lay down for sex. This is also the word the Christians use in their Arabic translation of the Bible. Hence, they say وَدَخَلَ أَلِيشَعُ الْبَيْتَ وَإِذَا بِالصَّبِيِّ مَيِّتًا وَمُضْطَجِعًا عَلَى سَرِيرِهِ. [And when Elisha was come into the house, behold, the child was dead, and laid upon his bed. (2Kings 4:32) Kings James Version).

So one asks, does the word laid here also mean, 'lay to have sex?' Of course it does not! Then why is this meaning specified and restricted to the ḥadīth only.

Thirdly: the wording of the ḥadīth clearly mentions the Messenger of Allāh (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) entered the grave after it was dug and the body of Fātimah bint Asad RaḍiAllāhū 'Anha had not been lowered into the grave. The Messenger of Allāh (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) lay in the grave after it was dug by his companions. The grave had a Laḥd, which is a horizontal opening in the vertically dug grave. The Messenger of Allāh (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) also dug the grave and the Laḥd after which he lay in it. Thereafter, he stood up and eventually the body was lowered into the grave.

It should therefore be noted; the body was lowered into the grave after he stood up - the body was not even in the grave when he was lying down in it! What kind of necrophilia was this? We presume the claimants can further shed some light on this matter, for the claimants are likely to know the reality and details of necrophilia the best, perhaps from experience in the modern Christian atheistic world, because surely one only accuses others of things they have experience, practice and knowledge about.

So we ask again? How is the alleged incident even possible when the Messenger of Allāh (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) did not even lie next to the body, unless the detractors have developed other forms of sex!!! Again, this would not be surprising because this is what happens when you abandon your scriptures by distorting the divine message they contained.

The wording of the report further shows the great care and love the Messenger of Allāh (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) had for Fātimah bint Asad RaḍiAllāhū ‘Anha, the alleged wording says,

“When camphor water was brought, Allāh’s Messenger (Peace Be Upon Him) poured some water into his hands. Then Allāh’s Messenger (Peace Be Upon Him) took off his shirt and clothed her with it and used his own sheet of cloth as her coffin.”

This showed the love and care the Messenger of Allāh (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) had for her due to her status. The detractors show more affection and care for animals and dogs and regularly bathe them, how about Fātimah bint Asad RaḍiAllāhū ‘Anha, who was his paternal aunt and looked after him just like his mother! At what expense is the human mind and intelligence being carelessly wasted.

Fourthly: another indication which shows the futility of this repulsive allegation is the fact that the Messenger of Allāh (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) used his shirt and wrapped it around her and then used his own sheet of cloth as her coffin, the words are,

“Then Allāh’s Messenger (Peace Be Upon Him) took off his shirt and clothed her with it and used his own sheet of cloth as her coffin.”

Again, a sane, upright and normal human being asks, why would a person use their own shirt to wrap the corpse of his paternal aunt - a mother like figure, then use his own sheets as her coffin, then dig her grave with his own hands, then lie in her grave and supplicate to the creator to forgive and have mercy on her (allegedly as the ḥadīth is weak), then to have her lowered in the grave, then unfasten the coffin sheets and shirt and then indulge in necrophilia? Absolutely preposterous!

We would like to exercise our common sense by using our brains and minds, given to us by our creator and ask, what were the other companions doing during this incident of necrophilia? Why do this in the grave and not on the ground if they were looking?

These people have no idea about the stature, uprightness and credibility of the illustrious companions, that they would allow someone to do such a heinous act in front of them. The companions were powerful, they were Ūsāmah bin Zayd, Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī, ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb and the Abyssinian companion, May Allāh be pleased with all of them. Who does not know the lofty credentials of ‘Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb, that even satan was forced to change paths when he would see him due to his, principles, morals, standards, character and firm belief. That the likes of these companions just stood there and watched this evil incident to unfold.

Fifthly: the detractors should know in Islām purification and cleanliness play a pivotal role in the daily life of Muslims. For example, Muslims are instructed to hold their private parts with their left hand because they have been instructed to eat with their right. They are instructed to sit down while relieving themselves, they are instructed to protect themselves and their clothes from urine and faeces, they are instructed to clean themselves with



water, they are instructed to wash their hands everytime they relieve themselves, they are instructed to conceal their private parts from others and much more.

The Muslims were given these instructions by the Messenger of Allāh (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), whose words in the Religion are taken as divine texts, ie from the Prophetic Ḥadīth. This said, the rules, regulations and etiquettes for sexual intercourse between legally married partners in Islām require a greater level of purification and cleanliness.

The point being, on another occasion the Messenger of Allāh (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) asked his companions to help lower a body into a grave, and he asked them if any of them were in a state of sexual impurity, ie if they had spent the night with their lawful wives. One of the companion who was in a state of sexual impurity was asked not to help in lowering the body (Bukhārī).

This honours the deceased, ie the people who help lower the deceaseds body are in a state of ritual purity and clean. So when a person is in a state of sexual impurity and he is not allowed to partake in lowering the deceased, then how about the act of sexual intercourse with a corpse! Let alone the rules and regulations Muslims have when it comes to intimacy and intercourse.

We mentioned examples of how Muslims uphold purification and cleanliness while relieving themselves and at the same token the clever people who regurgitate these treacherous lies about the Messenger of Allāh (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), are the same people who do not even wash their hands when they go to the toilet, they have cascades of urine droplets on their clothes and toilet seats. They are the same people who would not bathe for weeks, just less than 100 years and when they would bathe, the whole family would use the water, whereas our glorious Prophetic Divine teachings go back 1400 years.



Therefore, it is absolutely absurd and a despicable aspersion to even suggest this notion of necrophilia, which is an outright treacherous lie.

We have shown this ḥadīth is weak and to use it to prove and argue impermissible tawassul is incorrect, contrary to the authentic evidences.

By the two weak slaves of Allāh,

Abū Ḥibbān Malak

Abū Khuzaimah Imran Masoom Anṣārī

15th Dhul Hijjah 1438H/ 6th September 2017

Birmingham, England.